



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/147795/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Cooke, William Michael and Kumar, Arun (2020) U.S. Philanthropy's Shaping of Management Education in the 20th Century: Toward a Periodization of History. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. pp. 21-39. ISSN: 1537-260X

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0277>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Learning &  
Education

**US PHILANTHROPY'S SHAPING OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE 20th CENTURY: TOWARDS A PERIODIZATION OF HISTORY**

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Learning &amp; Education</i>
Manuscript ID	AMLE-2017-0277-RES.R4
Manuscript Type:	Research & Reviews
Submission Keywords:	History of Management Education, Critical Management Studies
Abstract:	<p>Scholarship on US philanthropic foundations and the Americanization of management education has hitherto focussed on specific nations or regions or on particular historical moments. We build on this scholarly corpus to present, for the first time, a meta-history of the 20th century role of US philanthropy in shaping management education around the world. Having outlined the meaning and purpose of "periodization," we propose three periods. First, within the USA from the 1920s post-Progressive Era up to the 1960s, where philanthropic foundations used management education to address internal US social problems and establish its economic pre-eminence worldwide. Second, Europe post-WWII to the 1980s, where management education was intended to enable western European reconstruction and fight communism; and later to integrate then Soviet Bloc into the west. Third, the Third World from the post-1945 development era up until the onset of neoliberal globalization, where US foundations' management education interventions sought the technocratic modernization of former subject nations. In each of these, we conclude, the US foundations' programs for management education worked to preserve US international interests, and promote US "soft power," in ways unique to each time/place as well as in ways common across them.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **US PHILANTHROPY'S SHAPING OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE**  
5  
6 **20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY: TOWARDS A PERIODIZATION OF HISTORY**  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 **BILL COOKE<sup>1</sup>**

20 Professor in Strategic Management  
21 University of York  
22 MBA/020, Freboys Lane  
23 Heslington, York  
24 United Kingdom.  
25 YO10 5GD  
26 bill.cooke@york.ac.uk  
27 +44 (0) 1904 32 5050  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 **ARUN KUMAR**

33 Lecturer in International Management  
34 University of York  
35 LMB/226, Freboys Lane  
36 Heslington, York  
37 United Kingdom.  
38 YO10 5GD  
39 arun.kumar@york.ac.uk  
40 +44 (0) 1904 32 5306  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56 <sup>1</sup> Co-authors listed in alphabetical order of surname  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Peer Review Proof - Not Final Version

## US PHILANTHROPY'S SHAPING OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY: TOWARDS A PERIODIZATION OF HISTORY

### ABSTRACT

Scholarship on US philanthropic foundations and the Americanization of management education has hitherto focussed on specific nations or regions or on particular historical moments. We build on this scholarly corpus to present, for the first time, a meta-history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century role of US philanthropy in shaping management education around the world. Having outlined the meaning and purpose of “periodization,” we propose three periods. First, within the USA from the 1920s post-Progressive Era up to the 1960s, where philanthropic foundations used management education to address internal US social problems, and establish its economic pre-eminence worldwide. Second, Europe post-WWII to the 1980s, where management education was intended to enable western European reconstruction and fight communism; and later to integrate then Soviet Bloc into the west. Third, the Third World from the post-1945 development era up until the onset of neoliberal globalization, where US foundations’ management education interventions sought the technocratic modernization of former subject nations. In each of these, we conclude, the US foundations’ programs for management education worked to preserve US international interests, and promote US “soft power,” in ways unique to each time/place as well as in ways common across them.

**Keywords:** Periodization; Americanization; history of management education; US philanthropy; development; modernization; soft power.

## INTRODUCTION

Crafted around the extensive use of management techniques and practice, contemporary philanthrocapitalism is presented as novel in its harnessing of the profit motive for social good to deliver high-impact and strategically engaged giving (Bishop & Green, 2008). Directed at innovating profitable solutions, it is believed to be capable of attracting further interest and investment and potentially solve complex social problems. This claim of its newness and distinctiveness has however been characterized as historical amnesia: its business-like approach, obsession with impact and shared premise of absent differences between morals and markets make it similar to earlier forms of philanthropy from the 20<sup>th</sup> century (McGoey, 2015). As the power of private philanthropic foundations continues to grow (Parmar, 2012; Roelofs, 2015), there have been growing calls for historical and historicized understanding of contemporary philanthrocapitalism (Guilhot, 2007; McGoey, 2015).

In response, this article sets out the “determining influence” (Khurana, Kimura & Fourcade, 2011) of the USA’s largest philanthropic foundations over management education in three particular places around the world at particular historic moments from the 20<sup>th</sup> century. That is, we offer a “periodization” (Fear, 2014). In so doing, we contribute to established scholarship on Americanization of management and education (for e.g., Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Gemelli, 1998; Khurana, 2007; Kipping, Engwall & Üsdiken, 2008; Kumar, 2019; Üsdiken, 2004). The periodization we offer enables us to single out foundations’ management education interventions as part of a broader mission to establish USA’s geo-political place and power in the world. This US mission has taken many forms, archetypally from “hard” military and economic power through to the “soft power” of cultural influence, of which the latter is our focus here. Nye (2004) famously argued that soft power makes others (nation-states in his

1  
2  
3 analysis) *want* to do what the dominant power wants, rather than compelling them to do so. We  
4  
5 show that US foundations worked to internationalize management education in support of US  
6  
7 soft power abroad but that this was intimately rooted to foundations' programs for management  
8  
9 education domestically. At home and abroad, foundations' interventions in management  
10  
11 education were part of their characteristic "scientific philanthropy." Like contemporary  
12  
13 philanthrocapitalism, scientific philanthropy aimed to diagnose and combat the root causes of  
14  
15 social problems instead of their symptoms (Howe, 1980). Its roots lay in US business leaders'  
16  
17 belief that "society could be improved through the systematic discovery and application of  
18  
19 knowledge" (Sealand, 2003: 239); and involved both making gifts for scientific research and  
20  
21 training with a particular emphasis on technical and applied fields, as well as approaching gift-  
22  
23 making scientifically.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 The article is structured as follows: we begin with a detailed discussion on periodization  
30  
31 and its features, including the three periods that follow from our periodization. Used here as the  
32  
33 article's organizing framework, it constitutes our overarching contribution, which is discussed  
34  
35 next along with the two further sub-contributions it enables. The three periods, following our  
36  
37 periodization, are discussed next. In our Discussion, we outline the relations within and across  
38  
39 the preceding three periods. In the concluding section, we outline a research agenda for the  
40  
41 future.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **PERIODIZATION IN HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP**

48  
49 Historians concur that periodization is one of their most important scholarly tasks (e.g., Bentley,  
50  
51 1996; Jordanova, 2006). It ranks "among the more elusive tasks of historical scholarship"  
52  
53 (Bentley, 1996: 749). Consequent to periodization, periods enable further deep contextualization  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of the history of management education, and analyses which address continuities, similarities,  
4 disjunctures and difference between and within specified moments of time and place. They are,  
5 however, eternally mutable (e.g., Jordanova, 2006), continually open to revision, debate,  
6 extension, and even abandoning, for example, as new historical data emerge. Periods are an  
7 artefact of historians' interpretative construction and not objective tree ring markers of time  
8 (Howell & Prevenier, 2001; Jordanova, 2006). The choice of object is determinative of the  
9 periods constructed. To explain this further, periodization can be used to categorize the histories  
10 of large-scale world events: of whole countries, or the western world, or even of global-cross-  
11 continent cross-cultural engagements (see Bentley, 1996). Simultaneously, periodization can also  
12 be conducted of objects of analysis and of phenomena which might otherwise be seen as  
13 subsidiary the large scale, and encompassed with them (e.g. Hollander et al., 2005 on  
14 periodization in marketing history).

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Our periodization, definitively, is of US philanthropies' interventions in the establishment  
32 of management education. Yet, at the same time, it engages with histories and periodizations of  
33 broader phenomena: notably US domestic and foreign policy, and within this of US soft-power  
34 in the world. Cooke and Alcadipani (2015) set out, inter alia, the increasing focus on the global  
35 dimension of management education. More generally, such a focus means that periodizations of  
36 engagements between different nations and cultures are increasingly important (Bentley, 1996).  
37 "As historians take global perspectives to the past and analyse human perspectives from broad  
38 and comparative perspectives," Bentley (1996: 749) adds, "questions of periodization identify  
39 themselves with increasing insistence."

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 For Fear (2014: 178), "periodization offers a framework for understanding certain  
52 environmental contexts that must be considered to understand [...] strategies and micro-  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 organizational processes” (Fear’s particular historical focus). Here, the words “periodization”  
4 and “period” are deceptive. Historians embed location *and* time in their meaning. They are  
5 inevitably contestable; and “space-bound” to certain regions, countries, or various spatial  
6 categories (e.g., Europe cities). Historians must be “wary of building ‘universal’ theories that are  
7 ‘ahistorical’ (without a sense of time) or ‘a-cultural’ (without a sense of place, say a national or  
8 regional context)” (Fear, 2014: 178). Furthermore, from the late 20th century on, historians have  
9 avoided *teleology* in their work: or periodizations that frame the past as a neat sequence of  
10 progress which have brought us to the present and take us to an ideal future. This is also  
11 expressed as a problematization of *linearity* (Howell & Prevenier, 2001), notably challenged in  
12 Burrell’s (1997) *Pandemonium*.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Our periodization here is, therefore, non-teleological and non-linear. Each period  
27 identified enables an initially standalone account of the relation between US philanthropy and  
28 the development of management education within it. Each has a rough and ready start and finish  
29 date, and a specific set of global locations. But there is overlap, too, in time and space, and we  
30 see the spatial dynamics of our periodization with the USA as a site from which management  
31 ideas and practices emanate – in our case, those related to management education. In  
32 denaturalizing this process, we follow others on the Americanization of management knowledge  
33 (e.g., Engwall, 2004, Kipping et al., 2004), and postcolonial histories of management (e.g.,  
34 Kumar, 2019). Unique here is our focus on periodizing US foundations’ philanthropic  
35 interventions in management-education-in-the-world.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Spelling the periods out, our first is the post-Progressive era within the USA, from circa  
50 mid-1920s through to the late-1960s, wherein philanthropies’ engagements with management  
51 education were nonetheless international in ambition. The beginning of this period falls roughly  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in the middle of Khurana's (2007) first period of institutionalization of business schools in the  
4 USA; but it built on prior efforts by Rockefeller and Carnegie to improve management practice,  
5  
6 The period concludes at the start of the 1970s, which saw a domestic and international switch  
7  
8 from the corporatist model of state, business and citizen relations to the all-conquering of  
9  
10 marketized paradigm (Khurana, 2007; Parmar, 2012). The second period we discuss is Europe  
11  
12 post-WWII through to the 1980s. Here the initial spatial focus was Western Europe in  
13  
14 reconstruction post-1946; later this expanded to the then Soviet bloc; and the third period we  
15  
16 discuss covers philanthropies' efforts to transfer Western modes of management education to the  
17  
18 Third World<sup>2</sup> in the name of modernization and International Development.<sup>3</sup> This began in the so  
19  
20 called post-1946 International Development era and ended with the rising dominance of  
21  
22 neoliberal International Development interventions from 1980 onwards. That dominance is  
23  
24 ongoing, as yet has no end date, and we write from within it, so that is where our periodization  
25  
26 ends, for the time being. It is, also, too early to provide a historical analysis. We do not, however,  
27  
28 propose an "end of history;" our schema can be modified in the future, not least with new periods  
29  
30 added.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 A key motivation for our choice of periodization as a theoretical framing is to  
39  
40 demonstrate that metaphysical sophistication existed for historians prior to management studies'  
41  
42 historic turn. However, in the language of that turn, this is an analytically structured history  
43  
44 Constructed around a narrative of events, structures and causes, analytically structured history  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50 <sup>2</sup> This term does not imply a ranking. Throughout the 1960s-70s, it was used as a shorthand for  
51 countries not aligned with the US/NATO (i.e. the First World) and the Soviet bloc (the Second  
52 World).

53 <sup>3</sup> International Development, as what agencies like the World Bank, USAID and Oxfam do, is  
54 capitalized here to avoid confusion with other generic forms of development. We do the same for  
55 Development Management as management in/for International Development.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reframes secondary material into a narrative (Rowlinson et al., 2014) and that is what we do  
4 here, albeit substituting “published” for “secondary” material (for e.g., Henry Ford’s memoirs  
5 cited below can be both secondary and primary). However, we propose the term “analytical  
6 constructions of history,” as it is clearer about the interpretive agency of the historian and  
7 enables periodizations to be seen not simply as a frame for subsequent historical analysis, but an  
8 analytical yet contestable end in themselves. The periods set out here emerge from our separate  
9 and joint attempts as researchers to cluster the narratives in common derived from our close  
10 readings of secondary sources on philanthropy, many of which we cite here. Alongside this, our  
11 immersions as empirical researchers in primary sources on philanthropy and management  
12 education, and our analyses of these sources in Brazil, India, UK, and the USA has informed our  
13 co-construction of the periodizations we offer.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **PERIODIZATION AS CONTRIBUTION**

32  
33 Our periodization per se is, then, our overarching contribution. *Doing* periodization enables and  
34 requires the explication of historical events, of themselves, and relationally, both temporally and  
35 spatially. This contribution will help subsequent scholars, who may simply apply our  
36 periodization, amend it, critique it on ontological, epistemic, and/or methodological grounds,  
37 even propose that it is set aside. In this, we hope to set the ball rolling on work which debates  
38 how given periodizations, and periodizations in general enable the *extractions* of accounts from  
39 more widely focused literatures. If our major contribution is periodization per se, though, there  
40 are two consequent sub-contributions: one which we term “revelatory” and the other  
41 “explanatory.” Our act of periodization is *revelatory* in that it enables the revealing – as  
42 constructions, for certain – of the periods we set out. This is consequent to the *consolidation* of  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 accounts from a broader literature with narrower focussed single case studies, in our case of  
4 philanthropic interventions in management education, which in turn have their own  
5 contextualization. In this, the act of periodization here is intrinsically *analytic* and *synthetic*, as  
6  
7 choices are made about fitting source material to a periodization. They are also analytically  
8 enabling of comparisons, through the identification of themes, motivations, imperatives and  
9 responses common and distinctive within and between periods. Often misunderstood, our  
10 contention is that the construction of a particular history is an end in itself, and not simply a  
11 prerequisite to something else. The point of writing history, therefore, is not merely to provide an  
12 empirical context for theorizing. Historiography has theory embedded within it and is consequent  
13 to conceptualizations of the relation between space, time and events.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 In setting out our three periodic categories we inevitably justify, and explain, using  
27 published sources why they are appropriate and valid. Hence our second, *explanatory* sub-  
28 contribution. We explain the broad patterns of philanthropic intervention in management  
29 education over the given time period and its international locales, and between and within the  
30 periods we set out. The ongoing success, or otherwise with which future accounts of such  
31 interventions “fit” within our periodization, will of course, be a test of its validity.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Caveats to Our History**

43  
44 The general caveats that apply to historiographical scholarship (literally “writing history”) apply  
45 here. History is “epistemologically fragile” (Jenkins, 1991: 13). The past is gone, so it cannot be  
46 ontologically real in the present. Historical scholarship requires interpretation, which requires  
47 selecting and excluding from sources, published or otherwise. The categories we propose (in our  
48 case, the three periods) are both derived from those sources, but also determine what is seen as  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relevant and irrelevant in those sources. Stipulating the mutability of periods, therefore, derives  
4  
5 not least from a recognition that they can be self-fulfilling historicizations (Cooke, 1999).  
6

7  
8 The exemplars of the three periods below were all funded by the Ford Foundation, the  
9  
10 leading foundation in the development of management education through business schools as  
11  
12 current historical knowledge stands. Yet our claim in this paper is for the US philanthropies in  
13  
14 general, notably the “big three” (Arnove, 1980). Rockefeller and Carnegie as well as Ford were  
15  
16 instrumental in developing business schools’ intellectual resources. Carnegie, for example,  
17  
18 funded Talcott Parsons’ work that is the basis of business school understandings of  
19  
20 organizational culture (Gilman, 2003; Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Rockefeller funded the  
21  
22 establishment of Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (TIHR) in 1946, from which came  
23  
24 inter-alia the Leicester Conference management training processes, and theoretical resources like  
25  
26 *The Enterprise and its Environment* (Rice, 1963) and *Systems of Organization* (Miller & Rice,  
27  
28 1967). The international and highly cited journal *Human Relations* was the joint project of the  
29  
30 Rockefeller-funded TIHR and the US Research Center for Group Dynamics, which was part of  
31  
32 Rensis Likert’s Carnegie funded Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan  
33  
34 (Burns & Cooke, 2015). Research is, clearly, still required to identify and classify what each  
35  
36 philanthropy contributed to management education in its different forms, past and present. What  
37  
38 is evident, nonetheless, is that although at present Ford seems pre-eminent in the foundation of  
39  
40 business schools, it built on the work of other US foundations in providing the intellectual  
41  
42 resources for those schools.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 We are conscious of avoiding the teleological fallacy that the present content and shape  
50  
51 of management education in USA and beyond is directly and uniquely attributable to  
52  
53 philanthropic foundations. Acknowledging Khurana et al.’s (2011) “dominating institutions”  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 description does not mean we accept them as hegemonic in the general use of the term (contra  
4  
5 Roelofs, 2015). Rather, our analysis supports the Gramscian, nuanced usage of the term  
6  
7 preferred by Parmar (2012; also see the period three below) is more persuasive. In each of the  
8  
9 following three sections, we set out the philanthropic interventions in support of management  
10  
11 education in each period. These sections, to reiterate, comprise our revelatory sub- contribution.  
12  
13 The discussion which follows provides our explanatory sub-contribution; and then in our  
14  
15 conclusion, we suggest areas of future research.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **PERIOD ONE: ENCOURAGING MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE POST-** 22 **PROGRESSIVE ERA USA (1920s-1960s)** 23 24

25  
26 Although our focus here is on US foundations' programs between 1920s-1960s, the precursor to  
27  
28 this period one was Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations' interventions in the late-19<sup>th</sup> and  
29  
30 early-20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Consequent to the social disruption caused by the rise of large US  
31  
32 corporations in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the sciences, professions and universities offered the  
33  
34 "structures and rationales" necessary for the re-establishment of social order (Khurana, 2007).  
35  
36 This coming together and the subsequent quest for social order was the context in which  
37  
38 university-based management education emerged in USA from 1890-1920. But for management  
39  
40 education to become an academic discipline worthy of being taught in the country's universities,  
41  
42 it needed to shift from its vocational origins to and achieve the status of science (Locke, 1989). It  
43  
44 needed, therefore, to "validat[e] its own rationality, disinterestedness, and commitment to  
45  
46 commonly held values" (Khurana, 2007: 87). As the leadership of USA's leading collegiate and  
47  
48 graduate business schools, including the Deans of Harvard and Michigan reached a consensus  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 about a managerial “science” as the basis of management education and practice in the 1910s  
4  
5 (Khurana, 2007), it found a willing supporter in the US philanthropies.  
6

7  
8 From foundations’ point of view, this resonated with scientific philanthropy: investing in  
9  
10 “scientific” management research and education to foster practical knowledge and skills deemed  
11  
12 useful for commerce and industry. It also provided US foundations with an opportunity to  
13  
14 diagnose and manage social upheaval, for example following the 1892 workers’ revolt at  
15  
16 Carnegie’s Homestead Mills and the Ludlow Massacre in 1914, in a seemingly scientific  
17  
18 manner: objective and disinterested (Guilhot, 2007; Khurana, 2007; O’Connor, 1999). The  
19  
20 Ludlow Massacre, in particular, prompted John D. Rockefeller to take a keen interest in  
21  
22 industrial relations. He asked Beardsley Ruml (Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation  
23  
24 director from 1922-29) to support Elton Mayo’s work (O’Connor, 1999). Both Rockefeller and  
25  
26 Ruml wanted to research social problems accompanying industrialization, including those  
27  
28 relating to the workforce, industrial conflict and social anomie (Khurana, 2007). US foundations  
29  
30 focussed on universities which were already championing educational modernization (Sealand, 2003),  
31  
32 including North Carolina, Yale, Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, and Chicago which  
33  
34 encouraged new directions of research and training in established fields or even new fields of  
35  
36 study altogether. These fields sought to establish their authority by devising means to cope with  
37  
38 the continually destabilizing external social context in 1920s and 1930s (see O’Connor, 1999 for  
39  
40 a detailed account of Human Relations, for e.g.). We note too that the first ever Organization  
41  
42 Development (OD) intervention, where business school faculty integrated and applied  
43  
44 Rockefeller Foundation sponsored (Burnes & Cooke, 2013) Tavistock NTL group  
45  
46 dynamics/team work, systems theory and action research was at a New Jersey Esso plant in  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
1958, where “memories of [its] unruly, militant strikes in the 1930s still lingered in the viscera of

1  
2  
3 (...) the managers and the union men” (Kleiner, 1996: 50). Douglas MacGregor, of Theory X  
4 and Y fame, led the intervention.  
5  
6

7  
8 Despite the interest and financial support from philanthropic foundations, the  
9  
10 institutionalization of management education in university-based business-schools in the USA,  
11  
12 leading up to WWII, was not an easy or smooth process. While there were periods of  
13  
14 considerable success, it was blighted by problems of quality amongst graduates, lack of  
15  
16 curricular coherence, quality of teaching resources and personnel issues, among others (Augier &  
17  
18 March, 2011). These problems were later consolidated in H. Rowan Gaither Jr.’s 1949 Report,  
19  
20 which became the basis of legitimizing US foundations’ interventions in management education  
21  
22 in the post-WWII USA (Khurana, 2007). Writing of that post-World War II environment,  
23  
24 Khurana (2007) identified the increasing threat of communism as contributing to the USA’s  
25  
26 philanthropic foundations’ enthusiasm for promoting research and training in management. In  
27  
28 fact, the relation between USA’s anti-communism and the development of managerial ideas has  
29  
30 a longer trajectory. The Ford Foundation’s eponymous founder, Henry Ford, made his impelling  
31  
32 anti-communist motivations and their particular relevance for US managerial expertise clear as  
33  
34 early as 1922:  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 As soon as [Russia] began to run (...) factories by committees, they went to rack and ruin  
41 (...) As soon as they threw out the skilled man, thousands of tons of precious materials  
42 were spoiled. The fanatics talked the people into starvation. The Soviets are now offering  
43 the engineers, the administrators, the foremen and superintendents (...) large sums of  
44 money if only they will come back. Bolshevism is now crying out for the brains and  
45 experience which it yesterday treated so ruthlessly (Ford, 1922: 5).  
46  
47

48 His continuation makes the parallel to the USA and its managers clear: “The same influence that  
49  
50 drove the brains, experience, and ability out of Russia is busily engaged in raising prejudice here.  
51  
52 We must not suffer the stranger, the destroyer, the hater of happy humanity to divide our people”  
53  
54 (Ford, 1922: 5).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 These motivations and the use of management education and practice to thwart  
4  
5 communism were enacted by Gaither Jr. (Ford Foundation's President from 1953-56). The  
6  
7 Soviet Union's economic growth was perceived as the single biggest threat to the USA, and in  
8  
9 need of immediate counter-measures (Schlossman, Sedlak & Wechsler, 1987). Gaither Jr. had  
10  
11 already written (1949: 70) that the US economy in its own right, and as a global exemplar "high  
12  
13 output, the highest possible level of constructive employment and a minimum of destructive  
14  
15 instability". Effective management practice, therefore, had a central role to play by consolidating  
16  
17 and promoting the US economy, which was—in turn—essential for preserving and promoting  
18  
19 US democracy. Framed in this way, management research and education were oriented towards  
20  
21 the international application of best management practice against communism during the Cold  
22  
23 War as a patriotic obligation for Americans. In 1958, Gaither Jr. stated: "the Soviet challenge  
24  
25 require[d] that we seek out and utilize the best intelligence of American management—and in  
26  
27 turn put[...] on management a national responsibility of unparalleled dimensions" (cited from  
28  
29 Khurana, 2007: 239-240). Gaither Jr.'s earlier 1949 Report had laid down five key areas of work  
30  
31 for the Ford Foundation. Program Area Three related to economic development including  
32  
33 improvement in administration of economic organizations and satisfactory labour-management  
34  
35 relations; while Program Area Five related to individual behaviour and human relations,  
36  
37 "increasing the use of knowledge of human behaviour in [the] professions, and by planners,  
38  
39 administrators, and policy makers in government, business, and community affairs" (Gaither Jr.,  
40  
41 1949: 91).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Guided by the Report, the Ford Foundation supported a range of management education  
50  
51 initiatives. In the decade from 1954 onwards, it disbursed US\$35mn. to business schools and  
52  
53 related associations in the USA (Carroll, 1959). Ford funded scientific research, its practical  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 applications, and training faculty members to teach and research. As well as improving research,  
4  
5 curricula, students, and faculty, the intention was to shape management as a “scientific”  
6  
7 discipline, promoting specific epistemological traditions and research methods (Augier & March,  
8  
9 2011; Khurana, 2007; Tadajewski, 2006, 2009). The Ford Foundation invested strategically and  
10  
11 heavily in the graduate programs of five leading schools, expected to become exemplars of  
12  
13 research-led management education. At Carnegie Tech’s Graduate School of Industrial Relations  
14  
15 (GSIA), described as a “poster child of change,” there was an explicit focus on building the  
16  
17 disciplinary foundations of management education through sociology, psychology, law and  
18  
19 political science (Augier & March, 2011: 123). Indeed, it was anticipated that management  
20  
21 would push the boundaries of these foundational disciplines as well, nudging them towards  
22  
23 practical application.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 During this period, the Pierson (1959) and Gordon-Howell (1959) Reports,  
30  
31 commissioned by Carnegie and Ford Foundations respectively, were used to further reform  
32  
33 management education. Management education was depicted as in crisis and the remedies were  
34  
35 discussed as if they had “emerged independently from systematic research” (Khurana, 2007:  
36  
37 238). The Reports proposed the new graduate-level business education to be led by research-  
38  
39 oriented faculty trained in scientific studies of management. Significant, here, was their  
40  
41 continuing re-orientation of management as a “science,” no longer driven by cultivated skills of  
42  
43 intuition and judgement, but instead by informed, objective decision making; prefiguring the  
44  
45 rigor-relevance debate (Gulati, 2007). Although the Gordon-Howell Report (1959) is widely  
46  
47 cited as the basis of this debate, McLaren (2018) proposes a counter-history in AMLE.  
48  
49 Supporting our point, McLaren cites the influence of the Ford Foundation and the Cold War as  
50  
51 key factors re-orienting management education and research toward science. The pillars of the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 revised curriculum, resulting from foundations' interventions in management education, were:  
4  
5 organizational behaviour, economics including understanding of wider economic systems and  
6  
7 firm behaviour and performance, quantitative management science including accounting,  
8  
9 simulation and statistics to inform managerial decision-making, and study of links between  
10  
11 businesses, government and democracy (Carroll, 1959; Khurana, 2007).  
12  
13

14  
15 In the next two sections, we focus on foundations' influential role in the rise of American  
16  
17 soft power via management education in post-WWII Europe and further afield. Although the  
18  
19 time periods might overlap, we would argue that foundations' interventions at home in USA and  
20  
21 in Europe were premised in different but related geo-political interests.  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **PERIOD TWO: MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND RECONSTRUCTION IN** 27 28 **EUROPE (POST WWII-1980s)** 29

30  
31 The influence of North American management on Europe was relatively meagre prior to WWII,  
32  
33 but since then "there has been a widespread penetration of American approaches to the  
34  
35 researching and teaching of management and thus to curricular composition" (Üsdiken, 2004:  
36  
37 88). As part of the European Recovery Program, more popularly known as the Marshall Plan, the  
38  
39 USA was involved in the reconstruction of European economy and enhancing its productivity  
40  
41 through the transfer of American technology and management (Bjarnar & Kipping, 1998, Carew  
42  
43 1989). The active role of US foundations alongside and subsequent to the Marshall plan in  
44  
45 Europe post WWII has been substantially researched; and within this, landmark studies have  
46  
47 been conducted on the Americanization of management education in Europe, notably by Carew  
48  
49 (1987), Gemelli (1995, 1998), Kieser (2004), and Engwall (2004), Kipping, and Üsdiken (e.g.,  
50  
51 Kipping, Üsdiken & Puig, 2004; Üsdiken, 2004). Carew shows that the Ford Foundation  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “became a second home for senior Marshall Plan staff” (1987:195), most notably the Marshall  
4 Plan’s head Paul G. Hoffman, who succeeded Henry Ford II as the Ford Foundation’s president  
5 in 1950 (and who later headed the United Nations Development Programme, cf our period three  
6 below). Using detailed empirical sources, Carew makes clear that US foundations’ involvement  
7 was determined by Cold War geo-politics, central to which were the desires to counter Western  
8 European communism and establish a trans-Atlantic alliance (Sutton, 1998). He also describes  
9 how the US government worked to influence European trades unions towards US style  
10 collaborative labour-management collective bargaining. With a shared commitment to  
11 productivity improvement at its core, they used educational programs such as those of the  
12 ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trades Unions). This, Carew (1987: 82) adds “it  
13 seems possible [...] benefitted from (...) funding labelled Ford Foundation (...) when it came  
14 from the Michigan Foundation — a CIA front.”  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Drawing on the Notes drafted by Shepard Stone, the protagonist of the Ford Foundation’s  
32 European program, Sutton (1998: 27-28) has argued that the program’s objectives were to  
33 “strengthen efforts to develop a free and democratic society in Europe [through] basic research in  
34 social and economic problems, (...) development of schools of business administration; [and]  
35 development of the social sciences.” The involvement of US foundations in post-War Europe  
36 was driven, therefore, by the two key rationales of collaborating with western Europe in holding  
37 off the threat of communism and building a common pool of talent (Kieser, 2004). And  
38 secondly, the foundations’ desire to address specific needs within post-war Europe, particularly  
39 the weaknesses within the European social sciences as perceived by US agencies (Sutton, 1998).  
40 Robert McNamara, for example, argued that “[m]odern management education - the level of  
41 competence, say, of the Harvard Business School is practically unknown in industrialized  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Europe” (McNamara cited from Gemelli, 1998: 174). According to Gemelli (1998), Ford  
4  
5 Foundation’s programs for management in Europe can be classified into two phases. The first,  
6  
7 which ran from 1952-1965 was dominated by the twin strategies of Americanization and  
8  
9 Europeanization. Starting from 1966, the second phase was centred on the Internationalization of  
10  
11 management education. We discuss these next.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Americanization and Europeanization in 1950s-1960s**

18  
19 Starting from the early 1950s, US foundations’ early programs focused on building managerial  
20  
21 capacity within Europe through education and training, as part of the post-WWII Reconstruction  
22  
23 (Engwall, 2004; Gemelli, 1998; Kieser, 2004; Kipping et al., 2004). In Britain, for example,  
24  
25 there was growing agreement between the Attlee government and their American counterparts,  
26  
27 as part of the Marshall Plan that management practice in the country was in need of reform as it  
28  
29 was seen to be lacking the professionalism and dynamism of their American counterparts  
30  
31 (Tiratsoo, 2004). The leaders of British enterprises in the 1950s and early 1960s were, Alastair  
32  
33 Mant (1979) argued, so psychoanalytically dependent on an idealized myth of the USA that they  
34  
35 collectively believed that catastrophe would ensue if its approaches to management education  
36  
37 were not pursued. This dependency began in WWII, and was notably deepened by a 1951 visit to  
38  
39 the USA by the Marshall Plan-funded Anglo-American Council on Productivity (AACP). Its  
40  
41 British members returned “full of glowing and uncritical admiration of the American  
42  
43 management education scene” (Mant, 1979: 41). He adds “the British vision of America was  
44  
45 built on an East-Coast, British Oriented, Brooks Bros sub-culture” (Mant, 1979: 75).<sup>4</sup>  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>4</sup> Brooks Brothers being the archetypal conservative male outfitter, headquartered, like the big  
56  
57 three philanthropies, in New York.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Arguing for a new system of management education with a “British Harvard” at the top  
4 (Tiratsoo & Tomlinson, 1993) and downwards, there were increasing efforts aimed at the  
5 establishment of Americanized management education over the next two decades (Tiratsoo,  
6 1998, 2004). Among others, the Ford Foundation played an active and influential role. It was  
7 instrumental in financing the establishment and development of the London Business School and  
8 Manchester Business School, both founded in 1965, and the Warwick Business School founded  
9 in 1967 (Tiratsoo, 2004). Elsewhere, in Mediterranean Europe, Ford Foundation and the Harvard  
10 Business School were again at the forefront of financial and institutional support of management  
11 education institutions in the 1950s (Kipping et al., 2004). Modelled on American counterparts in  
12 form and content, the Ford Foundation supported the establishment of Istituto Postuniversitario  
13 per lo Studio dell’Organizzazione Aziendale (IPSOA), Turin in 1952 (also see Gemelli, 1995);  
14 İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü (İİE), Istanbul in 1954; and Institut Européen d’Administration des  
15 Affaires (INSEAD), Paris and Instituto Superior de Estudios de la Empresa, Barcelona, both in  
16 1958 (Kipping et al., 2004).

17  
18  
19 However, foundations’ efforts towards Americanization of management education were  
20 not unilateral and did not result in replication (again, a related strand of scholarship has dealt  
21 with the challenges to US management models and practices, e.g., Djelic, 1998; Zeitlin, 2000).  
22 In an overview of Americanization of management education, Üsdiken (2004) concludes that  
23 even though the Americanization of the form of management education (the two-year, generalist,  
24 MBA programs for graduates) was less successful, the Americanization of content was far more  
25 so. In the United Kingdom, for example, success of Ford Foundation’s early efforts was marred  
26 by the labelling of US management as totalitarian, anti-American sentiment, and a lack of  
27 enthusiasm both from within the industry and the governments in UK at different times  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Tiratsoo, 1998, 2004). This ultimately led to the development hybrid forms of management  
4 education in UK (Tiratsoo & Tomlinson, 1998), Mediterranean Europe (Kipping et al., 2004),  
5 and in the Third World too (Kipping et al., 2008; Srinivas, 2008). Similarly arguing against the  
6 smooth narrative of knowledge transfer in Germany, Kieser (2004: 94) argues that the  
7 introduction of quantitative, scientific research within management was less a product of  
8 Americanization, but more so on account of the “ideologization of German management sciences  
9 in the Third Reich, that their research should be as neutral and objective—as scientific—as  
10 possible”.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Such adaptation, contestation, hybrid innovation, and modification have been identified as is commonly understood as Europeanization, which worked occasionally as a competitor of Americanization (Nolan, 2014). Europeanization emerged as early as 1953-54 as a result of the lack of enthusiasm towards US assistance, in management training first and later in management education programs (Boel, 2002). The calls for Europeanization were prompted, variously, by national self-interest, growing fears within Europe that it was being left behind the two superpowers, and the growing recognition of the need to accommodate contextual specificities, including the differences in trajectories of influence of science and technology on the economy among European countries (Boel, 2002; Gemelli, 1998; Kieser, 2004). Different from US management, proponents of European management envisioned it as having a cross-disciplinary base integrating US pattern of management education with a European transnational culture. They gained further momentum in the early 1960s with the emerging drive towards European integration, including the need for common standards in management education and training, and changes in global trade (Gemelli, 1998). Responding to this, Ford Foundation moved towards supporting two different but related forms of programs for management education in Europe

1  
2  
3 from the late 1950s. It continued with grants aimed at increasing productivity as part of its  
4 Program Area III on strengthening the economy; and made additional grants that were informed  
5 by its Program Area I on international affairs (Gemelli, 1998). Following the Gaither Report  
6 (1949), activities under Program Area I aimed, at least statedly, on promoting world peace and  
7 establishing a new global order based of law and justice. Ford Foundation's activities under  
8 Program Area I included, inter alia, strengthening individual academic as well as non-academic  
9 centres of management education and training across Europe, and support to outstanding  
10 individuals from the fields of management studies and practice. The new European schools, it  
11 was believed, were to become the centres of independent research on industrial productivity in  
12 Europe. According to officers of the Ford Foundation and those supported by them, however, it  
13 was not particularly successful (Gemelli, 1998).

14  
15 Both Gemelli (1998) and Kieser (2004) are clear, though, that the strategy of  
16 Europeanization was, paradoxically, part of or even wholly an alternate route to Americanization  
17 of management education on that continent. Gemelli (1998: 201) makes clear that US academics  
18 sent to European institutions, as part of the Ford Foundation's "Pool of Professors Program," had  
19 two main functions: teaching and "giving policy advice to the new institutions to set them off in  
20 the 'right direction'." That direction was related to enforcement of US standards of management  
21 education. Relatedly, they were also responsible for the selection of individuals sent to USA for  
22 further specialist training, including as part of the Fulbright program. Further geo-political  
23 changes within Europe, as we argue in the section below, led to the internationalization of Ford  
24 Foundation's programs for management education. It lends further credence to our contention  
25 that they were imbricated within US foreign policy interests with a view to protecting and  
26 promoting them.

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **Towards Internationalization in Eastern Europe**

By the late-1960s, the contours of the Ford Foundation's International Affairs program had begun to change. As it adopted internationalization as its institutional strategy, the Foundation's conception and use of management education also changed. Management education was no longer seen as a geo-political issue—that is as part of USA's efforts at combating communism and anti-Americanism; instead it was seen as a potentially strategic weapon in the impending internationalization of Eastern Europe (Gemelli, 1998). There was growing recognition of the need to bridge the divide between the West and the East as the nation-states of Eastern Europe began to show signs of movement towards market-based economics in the 1970s.

Management education promised to provide the necessary means of attaining economic development in the Eastern European Soviet Bloc countries (Gemelli, 1998). Informed by the wider shifts in global politics, Ford Foundation's programs on management education moved from Americanization and Europeanization to internationalization. According to Gemelli (1998: 231), the Ford Foundation's European management education program, therefore, was the product of simultaneous and differentiated interventions which had a common background in developing internationalization both as a pattern of a professionalized business elite and of educational institutions, in activating cooperation (...) and as a tool to implement interactive strategies between Western (...) and Eastern countries.

Overall, European responses, specificities, and integration prompted shifts within US philanthropic foundations' program on management education. They were, nonetheless, motivated by the twin needs to counter anti-Americanism and to promote Americanism in Europe; and served ultimately US foreign policy interests.

### **PERIOD THREE: MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE THIRD WORLD (POST WWII-1980s)**

There is a long and established history of philanthropic involvement in International Development in the Third World (Arnove, 1980; McGoey, 2015; Parmar, 2012; Roelofs, 2003). This scholarly corpus has argued that in the name of International Development, philanthropic foundations—US foundations in particular compared to other European foundations (Marten & Witte, 2008)—have engaged in establishing and consolidating American hegemony, in the Gramscian sense of the word. It does not mean total domination (contra Khurana et al, 2011); but draws attention to conflict between political actors, shared worldviews between the hegemon and the hegemonized, where it can be difficult, sometimes, working out which is which.

The historical background to US philanthropic foundations' engagement in International Development in the post-WWII period included, inter alia, the growing demand for raw material shortly after the post-WWII period with the US, and the search for new markets outside the US for its industries. Equally, if not more, prominent in public discourse and policy making was the urgent need to build a US-friendly global order (Escobar, 1995). This was the period in which many previously colonized countries from Asia and Africa became independent; but also one in which theorists from some Third World locations, notably Latin America, began to argue that their independence was not real: politically or economically. Hence, 1949 onward saw the emergence of dependency theory and theorists of underdevelopment in Latin America who argued that there was a relationship of quasi-, or informal-, or business - imperialism between ostensibly independent Third World nations and the US and European imperial powers (Escobar, 1995). In its context of Cold War, International Development was imagined and articulated in the US-President Harry S. Truman's (1949) Point Four Program to help the "the free peoples of the

1  
2  
3 world (...) to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more  
4  
5 mechanical power to lighten their burdens.” But alongside this humane mission sat the desire to  
6  
7 counter the threat of communism in precisely the same countries where International  
8  
9 Development was to provide its material, and, as it immediately appeared, cultural benevolence.  
10  
11 This threat was frequently seen to exist alongside, and synonymous with nationalist  
12  
13 independence and post-independence movements in formal colonies, and other countries whose  
14  
15 colonial subordination was sustained by alternative forms of governance (Escobar, 1995; Sachs,  
16  
17 1992).

18  
19  
20  
21 Driven by scientific philanthropy (as set up in relation to our first periodization), US  
22  
23 foundations explicit aim was to attack the root causes of poverty in the Third World (Parmar,  
24  
25 2012). Poverty, then, was viewed as “part of the study of the economic life of the people as a  
26  
27 whole” (Bremner, 1956: 173). Philanthropic foundations’ development programs addressed the  
28  
29 economic lives of the countries and peoples in need of upliftment. In this, management was seen  
30  
31 as particularly crucial to solving the crises of poverty and consequent social unrest (Dar, 2008;  
32  
33 Escobar, 1995). Alongside cognate fields such as public administration, town planning, and  
34  
35 public policy, management education, in particular, was expected to facilitate the creation of  
36  
37 professional competence, leadership capacity and a managerial cadre to serve Third World  
38  
39 development (Arnove, 1980; Parmar, 2012). An archetypally imperial model saw in a number of,  
40  
41 but not all, Third World countries, civil servants’ in the leadership of public-sector industry  
42  
43 while private enterprise was either family-run or relied on managing agencies or services of  
44  
45 expatriate managers. These forms of enterprise, the International Development narrative stated,  
46  
47 required a new pool of competent, well trained, and incorruptible managers (Srinivas, 2008;  
48  
49 Staples, 1992). The new managerial cadre was also required for the planning and implementation  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of International Development programs financed by US foundations and other aid agencies (Dar  
4 & Cooke, 2008). In both cases—management for developmental enterprise and management of  
5  
6 & Cooke, 2008). In both cases—management for developmental enterprise and management of  
7  
8 development interventions in the Third World—US philanthropies were at the forefront. They  
9  
10 funded management education institution in the sense of business schools; and also those for  
11  
12 specialist forms of management and administration, for example rural development, cooperative  
13  
14 management, and public administration (Staples, 1992). The former were intended to provide  
15  
16 economic development and cultural modernization, the latter more directly aimed at solving the  
17  
18 poverty that had been ‘discovered’ in the Third World (Escobar, 1995; Srinivas, 2008).  
19  
20

21  
22 As part of their scientific philanthropy which involved focussing on strategic countries,  
23  
24 the US foundations supported programs that aimed at building networks of scholars and  
25  
26 universities in “a few of the strategically located and potentially important developing countries”  
27  
28 (Bolling, 1982: 1).<sup>5</sup> Of these our focus here is Brazil and India. We acknowledge that this choice  
29  
30 results not least from our own prior research interests and the still emergent nature of research on  
31  
32 this periodization of philanthropies work which has focused on these countries (e.g. Alcadipani,  
33  
34 2010; Alcadipani & Rosa, 2011; D’Mello, 1999; Srinivas, 2008). The fact is, though, that these  
35  
36 were very strategically significant nations for US international relations at the time. Given its  
37  
38 size, location, poverty, and the spectre of Nehruvian socialism, India was seen as the “next  
39  
40 critical battleground of the Cold War,” after China, by Ford’s 1950-1953 President Paul G.  
41  
42 Hoffman (Sackley, 2012: 237). The links between International Development and its strategic  
43  
44 use in the pursuit of US foreign policy and interests in Latin America as part of hemispheric  
45  
46 integration and USA’s dominance are also well documented (Escobar 1995). Brazil is and was  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52  
53  
54 <sup>5</sup> The International Development aid provided by philanthropic foundations has been similarly  
55 directed, by and large, at a small number of middle-income countries and not the poorest nations.  
56 These include South Africa, India, Mexico, Brazil and to a lesser extent, Russia (Sulla, 2006).  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the largest economy in South America. Cooke and Alcadipani (2015), for example, have already  
4 set out how its strategic geo-political significance, US-anti-communism, and shared US-  
5  
6 Brazilian aspirations for social and economic development fed into foundations' management  
7  
8 education work there. Although theirs was a case study of the setting up of a single school, the  
9  
10 Sao Paulo Business School (EAESP), they are clear that US support for that school in particular  
11  
12 was intended inter-alia as a flagship which would train faculty and develop learning materials for  
13  
14 the whole of Brazil, and possibly, Latin America. Part of their contribution was to identify how  
15  
16 Brazilian actors, with support of Ford's US representative in Brazil, were able to subvert Ford  
17  
18 project goals to deal with local priorities - not least ensuring faculty received US dollar  
19  
20 subventions at a time when the local currency, the Cruzeiro, was subject to hyperinflation.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 As the post-War period continued, the Ford Foundation led the establishment of the  
27  
28 management institutions in Third World countries like India and Brazil (Cooke & Alcadipani,  
29  
30 2015; Kumar, 2019; Srinivas, 2002, 2008). Collaborating with the government and private sector  
31  
32 in India, it supported the training of doctoral students and faculty, faculty exchange, library and  
33  
34 curricular development, and consultancy expertise (Hill, Hayes & Baumgartel, 1973). Through  
35  
36 professional associations and later the establishment of autonomous management education  
37  
38 institutions such as the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) at Calcutta and Ahmedabad in  
39  
40 the early-1960s, the Ford Foundation played a significant role in the Americanization of  
41  
42 management education in India. Its intense and extensive influence in shaping management  
43  
44 education in the country: setting curricula, pedagogy, teaching material, and institutional design,  
45  
46 led to the mimicry of form, content, and delivery of US management education (Srinivas, 2008).  
47  
48 Even though its influence was less diffuse outside the prestigious IIMs (in whose establishment  
49  
50 Ford Foundation played a formative role), its efforts were no less persistent. Drawing on its  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 programs at the Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad and the war over pedagogy,  
4  
5 Kumar (2019) has argued that the Foundation's efforts were animated by the perceived need to  
6  
7 distinguish US neo-colonialism from British imperialism, the latter being the earlier order.  
8  
9 Stigmatizing Henley's pedagogic syndicates, the drawbacks in British and Indian management  
10  
11 knowledge, and the deficit of modernity in the latter country, the Ford Foundation appointed  
12  
13 staff and consultants who attempted to replace syndicates with Harvard's case method.  
14  
15

16  
17 Similarly in Brazil, early attempts at institutionalizing management education in Sao  
18  
19 Paulo, Brazil's business capital, were based and on mimicry of US content, curricula and  
20  
21 pedagogy, with local academics translating live during the classrooms what the US professors  
22  
23 taught in English. During the 1960s, the Ford Foundation supported the development of text-  
24  
25 books in Portuguese and the doctoral training of established Brazilian faculty in the US (Cooke  
26  
27 and Alcadipani 2010, Alcadipani, 2010; Alcadipani & Rosa, 2011). In doing so, there was an  
28  
29 explicit and underlying focus on the Americanization of management education in Brazil. This  
30  
31 formed a part of the wider efforts to break the earlier academic links between Latin America and  
32  
33 Europe, and instead establish US as its centre – efforts for which were also supported by the  
34  
35 Rockefeller Foundation starting from the 1930s (Tosiello, 2000). This coincided with the launch  
36  
37 of Kennedy's high spending anti-communist Alliance for Progress initiative in Latin America  
38  
39 (Rabe, 1999); which warrants further research on nexus between the US foundations, institutions  
40  
41 such as AFP which were directly linked to US foreign policy, and management education.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Speaking of Latin American in-toto, Ibarra-Colado (2006: 468) states that management  
48  
49 education, therefore, was "centred on the totalitarian pragmatism of the 'one best way' and the  
50  
51 supposed scientific character of a set of logical and highly formalized mathematical knowledge".  
52  
53 Noting the colonizing influence of this and in a curious self-implication, Anderson (1987: 9)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 wrote that “many of them have secured much of their own business education in the US and all  
4 of them have been surrounded by and bathed in US models,” which had prevented the  
5  
6 development of indigenous Brazilian management education. Similar to International  
7  
8 Development, then, management education became another site and means of establishing the  
9  
10 post-WWII, neo-colonial global order (Escobar, 1995; Kumar, 2019).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Philanthropy and Development Management**

18  
19 The role of US foundations in the globalization of management education in the Third World  
20 also came via Development Management (Cooke, 2004). Although often presented as part of  
21 progressive change (Thomas, 1999), Development Management has been criticized variously: as  
22 continuity of colonial administration (Cooke, 2003, 2004) and as part of the growing  
23 professionalization, post-WWII, to counter the threat of communism in Third World (Escobar,  
24 1995); and its role in the emergence of global managerialism, characterized by “de-  
25 ideologisation and technisation of decision-making” (Murphy, 2008: 150). Building on these  
26 critiques, Cooke and Dar (2008) posit the combination of International Development and  
27 managerialism as forming the “dual modernization” of the Third World. Although more  
28 frequently attributed to bi- and multi-lateral aid institutions such as US-AID, the World Bank  
29 and the International Monetary Fund (Cooke, 2004; Murphy, 2008), this does not detract from  
30 the point being made about the US philanthropies and management education, but rather lends it  
31 credence. To illustrate, Ford Foundation grants to the Sao Paulo Business School totalled around  
32 US\$0.6m between 1961 and 1965, a significant amount of money at the time. But alongside this  
33 was the even more substantial US\$5.5million discussed above for its building, which came from  
34 USAID. They functioned, therefore, in consolidating a uniquely American “heritage” in  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 management education (Clegg & Ross-Smith, 2003: 88). The foundations' interventions were  
4  
5 guided by the objective of protecting and promoting US soft power in the Third World (Parmar,  
6  
7 2012).  
8  
9

10 The contribution regarding our periodization in the post-WWII development era Third  
11  
12 World is particularly significant in terms of its implications for the shape of management  
13  
14 education in the present. International students and faculty are currently a significant part of the  
15  
16 global management education community. However, management education has, by and large,  
17  
18 failed to engage adequately with the historical and no less problematic involvement of the US  
19  
20 foundations and their influence on the history and present shape of the field. AMLE has been  
21  
22 prescient in its attention to the history of management education (Bridgman, Cummings &  
23  
24 McLaughlin, 2016; Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Cummings & Bridgman, 2016; McLaren, 2018);  
25  
26 and we would not have been able to raise this question without its pioneering role. There is,  
27  
28 however, clear and extensive scope for considerable further research, a point we now go on to  
29  
30 elucidate.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **DISCUSSION**

39  
40 The previous three sections, setting out the three periods and the historical logic for their  
41  
42 specification, provide what we call the “revelatory” sub-contribution – that is, we showed that  
43  
44 there was a rationale for their construction, and in essence revealed what the three periods were,  
45  
46 temporally and spatially. In this section, we discuss these relations within and across our  
47  
48 periodization to draw out our sub-contribution two - the “explanatory” contribution, where we  
49  
50 attempt to account for the periodization in toto – that is the periods together, in terms of their  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 similarities, and patterns within and between them – and within this foundations’ motivations  
4 and imperatives for their involvement in management education.  
5  
6

7  
8 Following the social upheaval caused by industrial capitalism, US foundations became a  
9  
10 willing partner to the proponents of university-based business schools in the country in reshaping  
11 management knowledge, education and practice “scientifically” (Khurana, 2007), particularly as  
12 foundations themselves shifted to a scientific philanthropic approach to gift-making (Howe,  
13 1980). The remaking of management education and practice as a science between 1920s-1960s  
14 provided the domestic foundation for the consolidation and projection of the US soft power,  
15 abroad (Nye, 2004). Tracing US foundations’ work generally—like us, first domestically and  
16 then, globally—Parmar (2012) has argued that their goals have always been the establishment of  
17 US supremacy and re-casting the world in US ways, thus promoting Americanization of and  
18 across the globe. This pursuit of the promotion of US soft power has required that the world is  
19 systematically reformed: that is saved from communism, nationalism, and isolationism in the  
20 Cold War era. The underlying assumption of US philanthropies was of the cultural and economic  
21 supremacy of their country, in and of itself, and which also translated into the US’s political role  
22 of leading the world. Although there has been long-standing recognition of US dominance in  
23 management knowledge and education globally (Burrell, 1996 suggested the acronym NATO for  
24 North Atlantic Theory of Organizations), the periods we set out draw attention to management  
25 education’s function in expanding and consolidating US soft power. The interest of the US  
26 foundations in management education at home was derived from their understanding that the  
27 health of US democracy and economy was related to the quality of its business education  
28 through the performance of its business institutions (Khurana, 2007). Placed in its contemporary  
29 context, both in the 1920s and 1930s but more intensely in the Cold War period, their programs  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were informed by and served to build the case for US capitalism against communism and its  
4 global expansionism. In addition, Cooke (1999) has demonstrated that managerial rationalism  
5  
6 with its commitment to reason and fairness, was seen by US policy makers as providing an  
7 ideological and practice alternative to communism. The apparent pro-social justice, egalitarian  
8 and meritocratic appeals of communism in patrimonial, undemocratic and corrupt societies was  
9  
10 to be countered by the logic of managerialism, showcased domestically, as we shown in our  
11 discussion of the first period (also see Escobar, 1995, Cooke & Alcadipani 2015).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Projecting the superiority of US management education abroad, US foundations  
20 supported management education programs as part of the European Reconstruction, as discussed  
21 in our second period. Whether it was carried out through the twin strategies of Americanization  
22 and Europeanization in the 1950s and 1960s in the Western European countries, or through  
23 internationalization in the Eastern European Soviet bloc in 1970s, foundations' programs  
24 reflected the changing geo-political relations within Europe and internationally; but were  
25 conducted strategically with a view to consolidating US soft power (Gemelli, 1998). Elsewhere  
26 in the Third World too, foundations' programs for management education were carried out with  
27 a view to expanding US soft power. That their development programs were complicit in  
28 countering the rising challenge of nationalism in Latin America and the growing threat of  
29 communism in Asia and Africa, and the creation and expansion of markets for US production is  
30 already well known (Escobar, 1995; Gilman, 2003; Hess, 2003; Parmar, 2012; Sachs, 1992;  
31 Sackley, 2012). This was not only peculiar to the big three US foundations from the 20<sup>th</sup> century,  
32 but is corroborated by recent scholarship on present-day large US foundations, most notably the  
33 Gates Foundation. McGoey (2015), for example, has shown how the US foundations have  
34 engaged in making the rules of national and global governance to maintain their dominance.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 What we have done, here, is connect and draw attention to the use of management education as  
4 part of International Development in the Third World (also see Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015 for a  
5 related discussion). It was undertaken through funding networks of ideas and trained scientists,  
6 and influencing research in disciplines in particular ways, which were ultimately amenable to the  
7 global diffusion of US foreign policy interests (see Parmar, 2012).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Development—and we would argue management education too—became, therefore, the  
16 means by which the philanthropic foundations functioned to establish and consolidate USA's  
17 position at the helm of the neo-colonial global order (Kumar, 2019). Particularly congruent with  
18 this analysis is Cooke and Mills' (2008) re-assessment of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which  
19 Maslow himself argued was a model of national societal development as well as individual  
20 development. It had strong parallels, he claimed, with Rostow's (1990) modernization theory.  
21 Research from other fields and disciplines, including cognate disciplines such as economics,  
22 behavioral science and marketing, corroborates our claim of the influence of the US foundations  
23 and its dense linkages with the dominant political ideology and US foreign interests. albeit at  
24 different times and time-scales. In economics, for example, the Carnegie and Laura Spelman  
25 Rockefeller Memorial foundations led in establishing research institutions from the 1920s  
26 onwards to gather economic data and promote "scientific" research to diagnose social and  
27 political unrest, enhance labour productivity, and capital formation (Bulmer & Bulmer, 1981;  
28 Harris et al, 1959: 566). The behavioral sciences, likewise, were similarly enrolled by the Ford  
29 Foundation to lead quantitative, positivist, and functionalist research for organizations but also  
30 among countries and their international relations (Nodoushani, 2000); and were distinguished  
31 from the social sciences, which were seen to resonate with "socialism" (Solovey, 2001).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Elsewhere, Tadajewski (2006) has argued for a similar turn towards quantitative positivism in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the 1950 and 1960s as a result of foundations' programs, which were shaped by their  
4 contemporary Cold War context and the shift towards behavioral sciences. Further afield, Fisher  
5 (1983), for example, discusses foundations' influence in sociology as part of promoting  
6 American conservatism as an ideology. Similarly, Parmar (2012) has explained foundations'  
7 interventions in Area Studies and diffusion of democratic peace theory as part of and informed  
8 by contemporary US foreign policy. Relatedly, while the role of foundations in Americanization  
9 on management education in specific geographies has been acknowledged (Cooke & Alcadipani,  
10 2015; Üsdiken, 2004), we contribute further in explaining the involvement of the US foundations  
11 as part of the country's soft power.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 In addition to outlining the links with the US soft power that is common to the three  
25 periodizations that we have presented, there is one further similarity. It relates to foundations'  
26 posturing of their programs for management research and education as a force of modernization:  
27 of economy, industry, government administration, technologies, and management and control of  
28 workers, among others. Tracing the uniquely American formulation of "modernization" in the  
29 20<sup>th</sup> century, Gilman (2003) has argued that post-WWII it began to be used—for the first time  
30 ever—in connection with societies. This shift in the use of modernization by US social scientists  
31 in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century emerged from the most characteristic of American dilemmas: how to  
32 define the United States as exceptional and unique, while in the same breath insisting that its  
33 example was universal and exemplary. It led the US proponents of modernization to argue that  
34 the USA, therefore, "in all its exceptionalist glory, could be a beacon unto the world" (Gilman,  
35 2003: 63). As with the European Reconstruction and later Internationalization, management  
36 education as part of International Development was also premised in the cultural, economic and  
37 technological superiority of the "West," in our case USA as the neo-colonial power, with  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 modernization as the means of bridging this lag, which it is worth emphasizing was  
4  
5 conceptualized in both temporal and spatial sense (Chatterjee, 2011). Science, technology, and  
6  
7 social sciences (including management education, here), therefore, offered the means of  
8  
9 modernizing the Third World (Escobar, 1995; Seth, Gandhi & Dutton, 1998). Modernization,  
10  
11 American exceptionalism and its drive to serve as a “beacon unto the world,” therefore, underlay  
12  
13 the US philanthropic foundations’ programs—and their sponsored elite networks of intellectual  
14  
15 resources, researchers, and trainees (Parmar, 2012)—for management education. All of these,  
16  
17 ultimately, served American soft power.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **INTO THE FUTURE**

25  
26 As philanthrocapitalism sets about influencing agendas for social change globally and defining  
27  
28 the nature and areas of research through the creation of seemingly new institutional mechanisms  
29  
30 such as the grand challenges (many of which remain outside regulation) as a private institutional  
31  
32 actor, it is important to scrutinize contemporary philanthrocapitalism, closely, critically and  
33  
34 historically (Arnove, 1980; Parmar, 2012). Frequently presented as if new or pioneering,  
35  
36 philanthrocapitalism shares a number of features with scientific philanthropy, associated with US  
37  
38 philanthropic foundations from a century ago. In their shared pursuit of profits, while scientific  
39  
40 philanthropy invested in the expansion of markets, philanthrocapitalism engenders global  
41  
42 market-subjects (Mitchell & Sparke, 2016). Seeking high-impact, both subscribe to eliminating  
43  
44 causes—or barriers, as philanthrocapitalism frames them—over relieving symptoms (Bishop &  
45  
46 Green, 2008; Howe, 1980; Sealander, 2003). But most relevant, here, Guillhot (2007: 474) has  
47  
48 argued that  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 just as the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century philanthropists were trying to reduce the opposition  
55  
56 between capital and labor by investing in progressive scientific ideologies promising to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 overcome it, today's philanthropists struggle to reduce the opposition between financial  
4 institutions and NGOs by organizing their convergence and by creating a common  
5 curriculum for these emerging professionals of globalization.  
6

7  
8 Historical research on philanthropy such as ours is, therefore, significant, least of all as it helps  
9  
10 challenge philanthrocapitalism's claims of newness; but more importantly as it brings into view  
11  
12 the relation of philanthropic foundations and other key actors and their interests (McGoey,  
13  
14 2015), such as the US soft power, here. As we have argued, the philanthropic foundations'  
15  
16 programs for management education were shaped by the US foreign policy interests in three  
17  
18 periods and places. Furthermore, a historical perspective also brings into relief continuities with  
19  
20 prior models and mechanisms of philanthropy such as scientific philanthropy and the new kinds  
21  
22 of citizen-subjects imagined by it. Lastly, it could be argued that in imagination and in providing  
23  
24 the necessary institutional infrastructure, philanthrocapitalism's influential turn to management  
25  
26 has been shaped, in some measure, by US philanthropic foundations' scientific philanthropy for  
27  
28 management education from nearly a century ago.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Next, we outline potential areas for future research. First and foremost, despite the wider  
35  
36 acknowledgement of the role and influence of US philanthropic foundations on management  
37  
38 education, the empirical research base, though authoritative, is rather thin. It has concentrated,  
39  
40 geographically, on USA, parts of Western and Mediterranean Europe and mainly India and  
41  
42 Brazil from among Third World nations. There is, therefore, an urgent need and scope for further  
43  
44 archival research from a range of geographical locations (for example, Latin American countries  
45  
46 apart from Brazil, Southeast Asia, and Africa) and other historical epochs. The periodized history  
47  
48 that we have presented here, whose mutability we have already discussed, can serve as a useful  
49  
50 heuristic for further comparative work which, we argue, can be particularly insightful. Future  
51  
52 research endeavours will be aided by the relatively easy access to the archives of various  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 foundations. Thus, there is, at present, considerable scope for further research, particularly  
4 archival.  
5

6  
7  
8 Second, while our research has focused on the rise of US soft power, and the role of its  
9 foundations in this, we would argue that researching from the periphery will open up wider,  
10 possibly more revealing, scholarship on the ways by which US soft power was also contested  
11 and/or subverted. This will, hopefully, complicate the dominant narrative of Americanization.  
12  
13 Cooke and Alcadipani (2015), for example, have forcefully demonstrated the ways in which the  
14 Ford Foundation's financial support and strategic plans were subverted by the Brazilian  
15 colleagues at FGV-EAESP. Likewise, despite the Ford Foundation's persistent efforts at  
16 Americanization of management education in India, it was not always successful in displacing  
17 pre-existing pedagogic practices and their postcolonial connections (Kumar, 2019). Therefore,  
18 we need to identify other imperatives and logics that have shaped the present state of  
19 management education and the role of US philanthropic foundations therein.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Thirdly, there is a need to interrogate still other foundations, including those outside  
34 USA, and their influence on management education. So far, much of the available research has  
35 focused on the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. This is understandable given their markedly  
36 international character and the financial resources they have provided towards management  
37 education. However, there are other foundations, perhaps smaller, which continue to support  
38 management education, albeit on a smaller scale, internationally. Given the particular  
39 institutional characteristics of philanthropic organizations: their perceived autonomy and  
40 difference from the State, assumed commitment to public good, role in maintaining social order  
41 and perpetuating status quo despite claims to the contrary (Fisher, 1983), and the ways in which  
42 it is implicated as an outsider in the political outcomes (Parmar, 2012)—the significance of  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 further research on the influential role of private philanthropic organizations from elsewhere  
4  
5 cannot be possibly overstated.  
6

7  
8 Fourthly, and following from the point above, much of the available research has tended  
9  
10 to focus on the Americanization of management education, as if it were the only, and the only  
11  
12 problematic, centre of knowledge production and dissemination. Just as research on  
13  
14 Americanization of management education has drawn to attention to contestation, subversion and  
15  
16 hybridization (Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Gemelli, 1998; Kipping et al., 2004; Tiratsoo, 2004),  
17  
18 we would argue that research on non-US philanthropic organizations—such as bilateral and  
19  
20 multilateral aid institutions, which are equally complicit in disseminating management education  
21  
22 as part of the dual modernization of the Third World (Dar & Cooke, 2008)—will go a long way  
23  
24 in expanding our historical understanding of the present state of management education. It will,  
25  
26 we believe, reveal polyphonic historical trajectories of management education, their underlying  
27  
28 institutional imaginaries, and their insidious connections with international geo-politics.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 Fifthly, following from the dominant unilateral narrative of the role of its foundations in  
34  
35 re-shaping management in USA and its transfer to other parts of the globe begs the question what  
36  
37 existed prior to the domination of positivist, functionalist, application-orientated, quantitative,  
38  
39 management education, historically. We need further research on the specific ways and forces,  
40  
41 which undermined the practices and theories of management education of the past, and the role  
42  
43 of foundations, again, in doing so (Kumar, 2019). And if these educational traditions, curricular  
44  
45 resources and pedagogic techniques need to be salvaged and re-claimed in case these are of  
46  
47 significance to our present (Cummings & Bridgman, 2011, 2016; McLaren, 2018). Like them,  
48  
49 we have shown, using periodization, how a history of Americanization of management education  
50  
51 and the role of US foundations prompts us to think differently about their involvement. We  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 would argue that such a re-thinking is crucial to a better understanding of management education  
4 theories, practices, pedagogies, and resources; and for which further research is required to  
5  
6 identify them and re-instate them in management education, if needs be.  
7  
8  
9

10 In conclusion, following Cooke and Alcadipani (2015), we would argue that ours is a  
11 move “towards a global history” of management education. Global histories, according to  
12 Mazlish (1998), are both global in their scale and are histories of contemporary globalization.  
13 Informed by which, we have shown both global aspirations and outlined connections between  
14 scientific philanthropy, historically, and contemporary global—and we might as well add  
15 globalizing—philanthrocapitalism. As a response to the growing uncertainty and constant  
16 renegotiation over spatiality and regulation, Middell and Naumann (2010) argue that we need to  
17 historicize contemporary globalization in terms of: regimes of territorialization, portals and  
18 critical junctures of globalization. The latter two are particularly relevant, here. Portals refer to  
19 actors and sites which have served as “entrance points for cultural transfer” (Middell &  
20 Naumann, 2010: 162); and critical junctures refer to periods where new spatial relationships are  
21 established as part of a new global order. As part of their scientific philanthropy, US  
22 philanthropic foundations played an influential role as entrance points: bringing together experts,  
23 ideas and financial resources. But more importantly, as we have demonstrated, their efforts need  
24 to be understood within their contemporary context as critical junctures in the making of USA’s  
25 soft power within the global order. At the same time, we recognize the lacunae in this piece: our  
26 choice of periodization, as we have outlined, is mutable and further research is needed for the  
27 countries concerned, still others in their regions, and furthermore around the globe; including  
28 that relating to non-US foundations, alternatives, and modes of resistance. Overall, we would  
29 argue that interrogating the histories of philanthropic foundations in disciplining and  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 globalization of management education might help in recovering competing, and possibly  
4  
5 contradictory discourses. Through this, we can begin to re-construct alternate histories of the  
6  
7 present.  
8  
9

## 11 REFERENCES

- 12  
13  
14 Alcadipani, R. 2010. From Latin America to the world: Notes on the (possible) Latin American  
15 management styles. In A. Guedes, & A. Faria (Eds.), *International management and*  
16  
17 *International Relations*: 136-158. New York: Routledge.  
18  
19  
20 Alcadipani, R., & Rosa, A. R. 2011. From global management to glocal management: Latin  
21 American perspectives as a counter-dominant management epistemology. *Canadian Journal of*  
22  
23 *Administrative Sciences*, 28: 453-466.  
24  
25  
26 Anderson, D. 1987. *Management education in developing countries: The Brazilian experience*.  
27  
28 London: Westview Press.  
29  
30  
31 Arnove, R. (Ed.). 1980. *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The Foundations at home and*  
32  
33 *abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.  
34  
35  
36 Augier, M. & March, J. G. 2011. *The roots, rituals, and rhetorics of change: North-American*  
37  
38 *business schools after the Second World War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.  
39  
40  
41 Bishop, M., & Green, M. F. 2008. *Philanthrocapitalism: How giving can change the world*.  
42  
43 New York: Bloomsbury Press.  
44  
45  
46 Bjarnar, O. & Kipping, M. 1998. The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US management models  
47  
48 to Europe: An introductory framework. In M. Kipping & O. Bjarnar (Eds.), *The*  
49  
50 *Americanisation of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US*  
51  
52 *management models*: 1-17. London: Routledge.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Boel, B. 2002. The European Productivity Agency and American policy towards western Europe  
4 after the second world war. In D. Barjot (Ed.) *Catching up with America: Productivity missions*  
5 *and the diffusion of American economic and technological influence after the second world*  
6 *war*: 87-98. Paris: Presse de l'Universite de Paris-Sorbonne.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 Bolling, L. R. 1982. *Private foreign aid: U.S. philanthropy for relief and development*.

13  
14 Boulder: Westview Press.

15  
16  
17 Bremner, R. H. 1956. Scientific philanthropy, 1873-93. *Social Service Review*, 30(2): 168-173.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Bridgman, T., Cummings, S. & McLaughlin, C. 2016. Re-stating the case: How revisiting the development of the case method can help us think differently about the future of the business school. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 15(4): 724-741.

Bulmer, M., & Bulmer, J. 1981. Philanthropy and social science in the 1920s: Beardsley Ruml and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1922-29. *Minerva*, 19(3): 347-407.

Burnes, B. & Cooke, B. 2013. The Tavistock's 1945 invention of Organization Development: Early British business and management applications of social psychiatry. *Business History*, 55(5): 768-789.

Burrell, G. 1996. Normal science, paradigms, metaphors, discourses and genealogies of analysis. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*: 642-658.

London: Sage.

Burrell, G. 1997. *Pandemonium: Towards a retro-organization theory*. London: Sage.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. 1979. *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Carew, A. 1987. *Labour under the Marshall Plan: The politics of productivity and the marketing of management science*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

- 1  
2  
3 Carroll, T. H. 1959. A Foundation expresses its interest in higher education for business  
4 management. *The Journal of the Academy of Management*, 2(3): 155-165.  
5  
6  
7 Chatterjee, P. 2011. *Lineages of political society: Studies in postcolonial democracy*. New  
8 York: Columbia University Press.  
9  
10  
11 Clegg, S. R., Ross-Smith, A. 2003. Revising the boundaries: Management education & learning  
12 in a postpositivist world. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2(1): 85-98.  
13  
14  
15 Contardo, I., & Wensley, R. 2004. The Harvard business school story: Avoiding knowledge by  
16 being relevant. *Organization*, 11(2): 211-231.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Cooke, B. 1999. Writing the left out of management theory: The historiography of the management of change. *Organization*, 6(1): 81-105.
- Cooke, B. 2003. A new continuity with colonial administration: Participation in development management. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(1): 47-61.
- Cooke, B. 2004. The management of the (third) world. *Organization*, 11(5): 603–630.
- Cooke, B., & Alcadipani, R. 2015. Toward a global history of management education: The case of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of business administration, Brazil. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 14(4): 482-499.
- Cooke, B., & Dar, S. 2008. Introduction: The new development management. In S. Dar & B. Cooke (Eds.) *The new development management: Critiquing the dual modernization*: 1-17. London: Zed Books
- Cooke, B., & Mills, A. 2008. The right to be human and human rights: Maslow, McCarthyism and the death of humanist theories of management. *Management and Organizational History*, 3(1): 27-47.

1  
2  
3 Cummings, S. & Bridgman, T. 2011. The relevant past: Why the history of management should  
4 be critical for our future. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 10(1): 77-93.

5  
6  
7 Cummings, S. & Bridgman, T. 2016. The limits and possibilities of history: How a wider,  
8 deeper, and more engaged understanding of business history can foster innovative thinking.  
9  
10  
11  
12 *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 15(2): 250-267.

13  
14  
15 D'Mello, B. 1999. Management education: A critical appraisal. *Economic and Political Weekly*,  
16 34(48): M169-176.

17  
18  
19 Dar, S. 2008. Re-connecting histories: The dual modernization of development management.  
20  
21  
22 *Journal of Health Management and Organizations*, 22(2): 93-110.

23  
24 Dar, S., & Cooke, B. (Eds.). 2008. *The new development management: The dual*  
25 *modernization*. London: Zed Books.

26  
27  
28 Djelic, M.-L. 1998. *Exporting the American model: The post-War transformation of European*  
29 *business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

30  
31  
32 Engwall, L. 2004. The Americanization of Nordic management education. *Journal of*  
33 *Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 109-117.

34  
35  
36 Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*.  
37  
38  
39 Princeton: Princeton University Press.

40  
41  
42 Fear, J. 2014. Mining the past: Historicizing organizational learning and change. In M. Bucheli,  
43 & R. D. Wadhvani (eds) *Organizations in time: History, theory, methods*: 169-191. Oxford:  
44  
45  
46 Oxford University Press.

47  
48  
49 Ford, H. 1922. *My Life and Work*. Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co.

50  
51  
52 Fisher, D. 1983. The role of philanthropic foundations in the reproduction and production of  
53  
54  
55 hegemony: Rockefeller foundations and the social sciences. *Sociology*, 17(2): 206-233.

1  
2  
3 Gaither, R. H. Jr., & Study Committee. 1949. *Report of the study for the Ford Foundation on*  
4 *policy and program*. Detroit: Ford Foundation.

5  
6  
7  
8 Gemelli, G. 1995. American influence on European management education: The role of the Ford  
9 Foundation. *European University Institute Working Paper*. RSC No. 95/3. Florence.

10  
11  
12 Gemelli, G. 1998. From imitation to competitive-cooperation: The Ford Foundation and  
13 management education in Western and Eastern Europe (1950s-1970s). In G. Gemelli (Ed.). *The*  
14 *Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s): Cross fertilization of learning in social science*  
15 *and management*. 167-305. Brussels: European Interuniversity Press.

16  
17  
18  
19 Gemelli, G., & MacLeod, R. 2003. Introduction. *Minerva*, 41: 95-99.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Gilman, N. 2003. *Mandarins of the future: Modernization theory in Cold War America*.  
Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Guilhot, N. 2007. Reforming the world: George Soros, global capitalism and the philanthropic  
management of social sciences. *Critical Sociology*, 33: 447-477.

Gulati, R. 2007. Tent poles, tribalism and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in  
management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 775-782.

Harris, S. E., Calkins, R. D., Carroll, T. H., Coombs, P. H., Fabricant, S., Reynolds, L. G., &  
Koopmans, T. C. 1959. Round table on the organization and financing of economic research.

*American Economic Review*, 49(2): 560-561.

Hess, G. R. 2003. Waging the Cold War in the Third World: The foundations and the challenges  
of development. In L. J. Friedman & M. D. McGarvie (Eds.). *Charity, Philanthropy, and*  
*Civility in American History*: 319-339. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1  
2  
3 Hill, T. M., Hayes, W. W., & Baumgartel, H. 1973. *Institution Building in India: A Study of*  
4 *International Collaboration in Management Education*. Boston: Harvard University Graduate  
5  
6 School of Business Administration, Division of Research.  
7

8  
9  
10 Howe, B. 1980. The emergence of scientific philanthropy, 1900-1920: Origins, issues and  
11  
12 outcomes. In R. Arnove (Ed.). *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at*  
13 *home and abroad*: 25-54. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.  
14

15  
16  
17 Howell, M., & Prevenier, W. 2001. *From reliable sources: An introduction of historical*  
18 *methods*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.  
19

20  
21  
22 Ibarra-Colado, E. 2006. Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America:  
23  
24 Thinking otherness from the margins. *Organization*, 13(4): 463-488.  
25

26  
27 Jenkins, K. 1991. *Re-thinking history*. London: Routledge.

28  
29 Jordanova, L. 2006. *History in practice* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Education.

30  
31  
32 Khurana, R. 2007. *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American*  
33 *business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton:  
34  
35 Princeton University Press.  
36

37  
38  
39 Khurana, R., Kimura, K. and Fourcade, M. 2011. *How foundations think: The Ford*  
40 *Foundation as a dominating institution in the field of American business schools*. [Working  
41  
42 Paper 11-070]. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.  
43

44  
45  
46 Kleiner, A. 1996. *The age of heretics: Heroes, outlaws and the forerunners of corporate*  
47 *change*. London: Nicholas Brierly.  
48

49  
50  
51  
52 Kieser, A. 2004. The Americanization of academic management education in Germany. *Journal*  
53 *of Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 90-97.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Kipping, M., Engwall, L., & Üsdiken, B. 2008. Preface: The transfer of management knowledge  
4 to peripheral countries. *International Studies of Management and Organization* 38(4): 3-16.  
5

6  
7 Kipping, M., Üsdiken, B., & Puig, N. 2004. Imitation, tension, and hybridization: Multiple  
8 Americanizations of management education in Mediterranean Europe. *Journal of Management*  
9  
10 *Inquiry* 13(2): 98-108.  
11  
12

13  
14 Kumar, A. 2019. From Henley to Harvard at Hyderabad? (Post and neo-) Colonialism in  
15 management education in India. *Enterprise and Society* 20(2): 366-400  
16  
17

18  
19 Locke, R. R. 1989. *Management and higher education since 1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge  
20 University Press.  
21  
22

23  
24 Locke, R. R. 1996. *The collapse of the American management mystique*. Oxford: Oxford  
25 University Press.  
26  
27

28  
29 Mant, A. 1979. *The rise and fall of the British manager, second edition*. Pan Books: London.  
30

31 Marten, R., & Witte, J. M. 2008. *Transforming development?: The role of philanthropic*  
32 *foundations in international development cooperation*. GPPi Research Paper Series No. 10.  
33  
34  
35 Berlin: Global Public Policy Institute.  
36

37  
38 Mazlish, B. 1998. Comparing global history to world history. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary*  
39 *History*, 28(3): 385-395.  
40  
41

42  
43 McGoey, L. 2015. *No such thing as a free gift: The Gates Foundation and the price of*  
44 *philanthropy*. London: Verso.  
45  
46

47 McLaren, P. G. 2018. Stop blaming Gordon and Howell: Unpacking the complex history behind  
48 the research-based model of business education. *Academy of Management Learning and*  
49 *Education*, published online first: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0311>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Middell, M., & Naumann, K. 2010. Global history and the spatial turn: From the impact of area  
4 studies to the study of critical junctures of globalization. *Journal of Global History*, 5(1): 149-  
5  
6 170.  
7

8  
9  
10 Miller, E. J., & Rice, A. K. 1967. *Systems of organization: The control of task and sentient*  
11  
12 *boundaries*. London: Tavistock Publications.  
13

14 Mitchell, K., & Sparke, M. 2016. The new Washington Consensus: Millennial philanthropy and  
15 the making of global market subjects. *Antipode*, 48(3): 724-749.  
16  
17

18  
19 Murphy, J. 2008. The rise of global managers.” In S. Dar, & B. Cooke (Eds.), *The new*  
20  
21 *development management: The dual modernization*: 18-40. London: Zed Books.  
22

23 Nodoushani, O. 2000. Epistemological foundations of management theory and research  
24 methodology. *Human Systems Management*, 19: 71-80.  
25  
26

27  
28 Nolan, M. 2014. Americanization? Europeanization? Globalization? The German economy since  
29 1945. *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 54: 49-63.  
30  
31

32  
33 Nye, J.S. Jr. 2004. *Soft power: The means to succeed in world politics*. New York: Public  
34  
35 Affairs Press.  
36

37 O'Connor, E. S. 1999. The politics of management thought: A case study of the Harvard  
38 Business School and the human relations school. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1): 117-  
39  
40 131.  
41  
42

43  
44 Parmar, I. 2012. *Foundations of the American century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller*  
45  
46 *foundations in the rise of the American power*. New York: Columbia University Press.  
47

48  
49 Rice, A. K. 1963. *The enterprise and its environment: A system theory of management*  
50  
51 *organization*. London: Tavistock Publications.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Roelofs, J. 2015. How Foundations exercise power. *The American Journal of Economics and*  
4 *Sociology*, 74(4): 654-675.

7 Rostow, W. W. 1990. *The stages of economic growth: A non-Communist manifesto*.

9 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition.

12 Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J., & Decker, S. 2014. Research strategies for organizational history: A  
13 dialogue between historical theory and organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*,  
14 39(3): 250-274.

19 Sachs, W. 1992. Introduction. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to*  
20 *knowledge as power*: 1-5. London: Zed Books.

24 Sackley, N. 2012. Foundation in the Field – The Ford Foundation’s New Delhi Office and the  
25 construction of development knowledge, 1951-1970.” In U. Herbert & J. Leonhard (Eds.).  
26 *American Foundations and the coproduction of world order in the twentieth century*: 232-60.  
27 Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

33 Schlossman, S., Sedlak, S., & Wechsler, H. 1987. The ‘New Look’: Ford Foundation and the  
34 revolution in business education. In R. R. Locke (Ed.), *Management education*: 139-198.

37 Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

40 Sealander, J. 2003. Curing evils at their source: The arrival of scientific giving. In L. J. Friedman  
41 & M. D. McGarvie (Eds.), *Charity, philanthropy, and civility in American History*: 217-239.  
42 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

47 Seth, S., Gandhi, L., & Dutton, M. 1998. Postcolonial studies: A beginning... *Postcolonial*  
48 *Studies*, 1(1): 7-11.

51 Solovey, M. 2001. Project Camelot and the 1960s epistemological revolution: Rethinking the  
52 politics-patronage-social science nexus. *Social Studies of Science*, 31(2): 171-206.

1  
2  
3 Srinivas, N. 2012. Epistemic and performative quests for authentic management in India.  
4  
5 ***Organization***, 19(2): 145-158.

7 Srinivas, N. 2008. Mimicry and revival: The transfer and transformation of management  
8 knowledge to India, 1959-1990. ***International Studies of Management and Organization***,  
9  
10 38(4): 38-57.

14 Srinivas, N. 2002. Cultivating Indian management: Institutions, subjectivity, and the nature of  
15 knowledge. In van Iterson et al. (Eds.). ***The civilized organization: Norbert Elias and the future***  
16  
17 ***of organization studies***: 151-169. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

21 Staples, E. S. 1992. ***Forty Years: A Learning Curve. The Ford Foundation Programs in India***  
22  
23 ***1952-1992***. New Delhi: The Ford Foundation.

26 Sulla, O. 2006. ***Philanthropic foundations: Actual versus potential role in international***  
27  
28 ***development assistance***. Mimeo, World Bank Global Development Finance Report Group.

31 Sutton, F. X. 1998. The Ford Foundation and Europe: Ambitions and ambivalences. In G.  
32 Gemelli (Ed.). ***The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s): Cross fertilization of learning***  
33  
34 ***in social science and management***: 21-67. Brussels: European Interuniversity Press.

37 Tadjewski, M. 2006. The ordering of marketing theory: The influence of McCarthyism and the  
38 Cold War. ***Marketing Theory***, 6(2): 163-199.

42 Tadjewski, M. 2009. The politics of the behavioral revolution in organization studies.  
43  
44 ***Organization***, 16(5): 733-754.

47 Thomas, A. (1999). What makes good development management? ***Development in Practice***, 9(1-  
48  
49 2): 9-17.

51 Tiratsoo, N. 1998. Americanization resisted?: US and indigenous influences on the birth of the  
52 first British schools. In G. Gemelli (Ed.). ***The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s)***:  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Cross fertilization of learning in social science and management***: 351-372. Brussels: European  
4  
5 Interuniversity Press.

6  
7  
8 Tiratsoo, N. 2004. The 'Americanization' of management education in Britain. ***Journal of***  
9  
10 ***Management Inquiry***, 13(2): 118-126.

11  
12 Tiratsoo, N., & Tomlinson, J. (1993). ***Industrial efficiency and state intervention: Labour 1939-***  
13  
14 ***51***. London: Routledge.

15  
16  
17 Tiratsoo, N., & Tomlinson, J. 1998. ***The Conservatives and industrial efficiencies (1951-1964):***  
18  
19 ***Thirteen wasted years***. London: Routledge.

20  
21 Tosiello, R. J. 2000. Max Ascoli: A lifetime of Rockefeller connections. In G. Gemelli (Ed.).  
22  
23 ***The unacceptables: American foundations and refugee scholars between the two wars and***  
24  
25 ***after***: 107-140. Brussels: PIE Lang.

26  
27  
28 Truman, H. S. 1949. ***Inaugural address, delivered on January 20, 1949***. Harry S. Truman  
29  
30 Presidential Library and Museum, retrieved from  
31  
32 [https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr\\_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm](https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm)

33  
34  
35 Üsdiken, B. 2004. Americanization of European management education in historical and  
36  
37 comparative perspective: A symposium. ***Journal of Management Inquiry***, 13(2): 87-89.

38  
39 Zeitlin, J. 2000. Introduction. In J. Zeitlin & G. Herrigel (Eds.). ***Americanization and its limits:***  
40  
41 ***Reworking US technology and management in post-War Europe and Japan***: 1-50. Oxford:  
42  
43 Oxford University Press.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60