This is a repository copy of *Really useful knowledge? Critical management education in the UK and the US*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/2418/

Article:

Really useful knowledge? Critical Management Education in the UK and the US.

Abstract

This article reviews the Critical Management Education (CME) literature produced since 1995 and compares its development in the United Kingdom with that of the United States. It explores the relationship between CME, as an academic field, and that of Critical Management Studies (CMS), the wider movement that deploys critiques drawn from sociology and political science perspectives. In the UK the origins of CME are in established debates about utilitarian versus liberal education and in radical adult education theory - quite separate from the CMS movement. In the US however, the article argues that business schools and the academy are sites that the CMS is attempting to colonise and CME cannot, in that context, be separated from the CMS project.

Keywords

Critical Management Education History United States United Kingdom literature review

Introduction

This article attempts to capture a sense of how the field of Critical Management Education (CME) has developed in the UK and the US in the last ten years by reviewing the educational literature associated with Critical Management Studies (CMS). CMS is the academic project that challenges the idea that management is a disinterested technical process by applying analytical perspectives from critical and postmodern theorists to management as social and economic practice. The article traces how CMS academics in the US and the UK have used education as an entry strategy into wider critical debates about the nature and purpose of management. It suggests that the contrasting histories of business schools in each country accounts for many of the differences in the role envisaged for education in transforming management and in the foothold CMS can gain in the academy. And in respect of the UK the article challenges the assumption that CME is 'merely' an offshoot of the larger CMS project by demonstrating that its pedagogical assumptions reveal a longer history based in radical and adult education.

Higher education institutions occupy an interesting role in relation to management practice and theory. They are simultaneously recipients and translators of mainstream management ideas *and* producers of critical research on it. Management education is a site where the inherent tensions in these processes of reception, translation and transmission are experienced and for the last decade these have been examined and written about under the aegis of Critical Management Education. A review of the literature at this point is timely. Ten years into the Anglo-American project of criticality in management we can no longer assume that 'second generation' of researchers now entering an established field will have the same priorities and preoccupations as the generation that created it. There are already marked differences in the way that criticality is deployed and received in the US and UK. To date the UK has been responsible for defining and driving critical approaches to management education but there is no guarantee that this will remain the case. As the market for, as well as the content of, management education becomes global in nature the context in which criticality is practised and made possible change alongside the student population. In the UK especially, where funding of higher education has become increasingly dependent on the fees paid by students outside of the member states of the European Union, there are renewed pressures for management programmes to train students for management rather than educate them about management, the latter being an aim that demands the inclusion of critique. Whether this

augurs a change of direction for Critical Management Education or reinvigorates the original debates in the field remains to be seen.

The article is structured in the following way. In the first section I discuss the evolution of CMS in the UK and how it sought to use education as a means of actively disrupting the reproduction of management practice in addition to being the source of textual critique of its practices. In Section Two I turn to the US literature and argue that, by contrast, CMS has been constrained in the way that it deploys critiques of management education because of the strength of the business school tradition. CMS has attempted to make inroads into US business schools by arguing the need for critical content to be introduced via ethics courses rather than arguing for pedagogical changes. In the final section of the paper I reflect on what this comparative review tells us about the role of education in the critical project.

Criticality and Management Education in the UK

In the first part of this section I argue that Critical Management Education's success is a result of its take-up by academics working within the established field of adult education, which already possessed a significant critical tradition. The second part examines the body of literature that has established a model of CME within the UK and then concludes by suggesting how this model has led to further published work on the difficulties of implementation.

Old debates in new bottles: the emergence of Critical Management Education in the UK

In 1992 Alvesson and Willmott published an edited book, *Critical Management Studies,* which is generally held to mark the start of the CMS project in the UK. Differing from previous critical approaches in that it posited power, rather than exploitation, as the motive behind domination in the labour process (Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson, 2001) CMS was therefore free to explore a wide range of theories outside of traditional Marxist critiques of capitalist organisations. Given the focus on power and its expression in organisations it is not surprising the work of Foucault figured largely in the early CMS critiques. But in addition to the general post-modern turn what was most noticeable about the articles that followed in the wake of Alvesson and Willmott's book was the way in which management education was identified as a key site for challenging mainstream management theory.

Turning attention on to their own educational programmes was not an altogether obvious strategy for CMS. But, even so, many academics that identified with this critical project set out to deliberately provoke a debate in higher education institutions about the aims and objectives of the management programmes they provided. Notable amongst these early texts and articles were Willmott's 'provocations to a debate' (1994) in the newly rebranded journal <u>Management Learning</u>, Fox's 'debate' (1994), Grey and Mitev's 'polemic' (1995) and the edited collection by French and Grey '*Re-thinking Management Education*' (1996) - still perhaps the most useful collection for setting out the grounds of the critical challenge to management through education. CME's challenge to management education, as French and Grey saw it, was to wrestle it out of the utilitarian death grip it had been in since the 1980s and recast it in the liberal/radical tradition. The study of management in higher education would be modelled not on engineering or medicine but on politics and the expectation would be that individuals would study management in order to understand and analyse management as a social, political and moral practice (French and Grey, 1996) rather than as training.

As French and Grey acknowledged at the time, the debate as to whether management education should be defined as being study *for* business or study *about* business was not one that CME either originated or owned. Macfarlane (1997) noted that in the 1980s there were at least four studies of management education or the business studies degree from an educational perspective that identified the distinction between being for or about management (i.e. Brown

and Harrison, 1980; Tolley, 1983; Boys, 1988; Silver and Brannan, 1988). Ever since its establishment in UK higher education in the 1960s the business studies or management degree (especially at undergraduate level) has been pulled, in terms of curriculum design and values, between opposing views of its content. Added to the liberal versus utilitarian debate were continuing arguments over the balance and desirability of so-called 'hard' and 'soft' subjects in the curriculum, the emphasis on quantitative or qualitative analysis, application versus theory and the differences in approach between undergraduate and postgraduate study. The problem being that there

> … is no singular concept of 'Business Studies'. A diverse range of disciplines must compete for space within the framework of a Business Studies degree. As an eclectic, multi-disciplinary area it is problematic to label Business Studies in terms of [a single dichotomy] … it is [however] possible to identify a framework for the analysis of the Business Studies curriculum. One axis is provided by the dichotomy between the aim of Business Studies as a study for business or about business. The second axis is obtained by analysing Business Studies in terms of humanities or science-based knowledge (Macfarlane, 1997: 7-8)

As far back as the 1950s US commentators on management education had identified a certain entrenched British preference for liberal programmes. Murphy complained not only of how Britain had largely ignored Scientific Management until the 1930s but also of management education curricula that "were cultural-centred, with liberal education as the objective rather than highly specialized preparation for employment" (1953: 39). A decade later yet another observer from the US observed, perhaps with a little more cultural sensitivity, that management education could not be separated from other aspects of a nation's educational or social setting and questioned whether "… there *needs* to be a uniformity in the development of management education in all European countries" (Kast, 1965: 75 emphasis added). However, the view from the US in the 1960s was that the UK management education system was showing promising signs of conforming to the US business school model. Kast wrote approvingly in his survey of European management education of the Robbins Report, which recommended the establishment of two major schools for postgraduate management education. He also considered the Franks Report, which put forward specific recommendations arising from that earlier report, as both welcome and revolutionary. Yet both reports reflected the same familiar liberal versus utilitarian tensions in UK education debates. Franks commented that businessmen feared the university would

> "…make the school over in its own traditional image. Instead of being thoroughly vocational and practical, with courses and programmes designed to help managers … it will become like other departments of a university, concerned with the advancement of knowledge and its communication, turning out scholars and not men better fitted for management" (Franks, 1963 cited in Kast, 1965: 82).

But the debates on vocational versus liberal education go back further than the 20th Century. The title of this article refers to the concept of 'Really Useful Knowledge', a term used originally in the 19th Century by a radical education movement that defined its own curricula and pedagogies around what they felt workers needed to know (Johnson, 1979). Education provided by the state offered subjection via educational content that was designed to make people productive workers, profitable and quiescent (Martin, 2000) i.e. *merely* useful knowledge. *Really* useful knowledge, on the other hand, would provide people with the sort of knowledge that would enable them to be autonomous, critical and (perhaps) dissenting citizens (Martin, 2000). Both Critical Management Studies and Critical Management Education are contemporary expressions of the same concern that the role of management education is not just to make better managers but also to make a better society.

The arguments that formed part of the rationale for Critical Management Education in the 1990s in effect reframed these older (although perhaps forgotten) debates. But the argument was not 'just' about the appropriate balance between utilitarianism and liberalism it was also, like the debate over useful knowledge, a reaction against the "unacknowledged politics of management education" (Grey, 2004: 185), which was why it was of interest to the CMS movement. The call for more critical forms of management education was a response to the more general and widespread socio-economic dominance of neo-conservatism. CME wanted to reclaim management education from the control of those, like Murphy half a century before, who wanted it to be "highly specialized preparation for employment" (1953: 39). Business schools had, since the 1980s, become unashamedly enmeshed with corporate interests and values of the free market and despite purporting to teach the 'facts' of management were instead transmitting the 'values' that sustained and justified capitalism (Grey, 2004: 185). CMS academics might have been content to have their challenge remain at the level of questioning the role of higher education in the capitalist economy but their 'provocations' about management education had attracted the attention of scholars interested in the possibilities for challenging existing programmes in respect of the pedagogical process. It is *this* group that took the CME project on to the next stage.

The pedagogical perspective on Critical Management Education

Critical Management Education today is associated with writing that challenges the politics of management education and/or experiments with pedagogy that seek to minimise harmful power dynamics and/or seeks to raise the critical consciousness of students. Much of the work associated with CME has a distinct radical adult education flavour and, in the UK context, this is almost certainly the result of the influence of Lancaster University's Department of Management Learning. Lancaster's specialism in management development and education research and pedagogically innovative postgraduate courses pre-date the CMS 'provocations', but it is worth noting that one of the early contributors to the CMS education debate was a Lancaster academic - Steve Fox (1994) and that another Lancaster scholar, Michael Reynolds (1998, 1999a, 1999b) has been central to the intellectual project of working through the implications of emancipatory education theory for management education and development practice. Reynolds' publications have formed the basis of what is accepted as the major tenets of critical management education practice and aims, whilst other Lancaster contributors[1] to the field (past and present) include Cunliffe (2001)[2], Elliott (2003), Elliott and Turnbull (2005), Perriton (2000, 2004), Snell (1986) and Swann (2005).

Perriton and Reynolds (2004) have argued that the links between what becomes known as Critical Management Education and radical education theory are visible as far back as the mid to late 1980s. Snell (1986) based his critique of management education and development on Giroux's[3] ideas on emancipation and advocated a 'radical perspective' on management development, which included encouraging 'negative feedback to confront behaviour that is sexist, racist, authoritarian or manipulative,' (1986: 57). And it was certainly the case that in those early days academics exploring the possibilities for management education cited the work of Freire[4] - one of the major figures of radical adult education - widely. Critiques of

---

[1] Either employed by Lancaster or who studied for higher degrees at that institution.
[2] Although now based in the US.
[3] Henry Giroux (1943-) is considered one of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the US. Now a cultural critic his educational contribution was in challenging racism and sexism and other forms of exploitative power and suggesting the need for multiple forms of literacy to negotiate and challenge society.
[4] Paulo Freire (1921-1997) was a Brazilian educator who worked with the poor and dispossessed. His most famous publication "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" outlines his approach to allowing the oppressed to identify oppression for themselves and commit to its transformation and the subsequent development of a liberating pedagogy.

management education also predated CMS. Anthony (1986) criticised management education and Reed and Anthony (1992) rebuked business school academics for their uncritical stance. Both these papers helped create the idea that such a thing as a critical management educator would be desirable.

But what did CME borrow from radical and adult education? In their attempt to identify the basic pedagogical beliefs that underpin CME practice, Reynolds and Perriton (2004) suggested the following aspects were usually discernible:

- A belief that management education should involve questioning the assumptions embedded in both theory and professional practice, and posing questions about management and education that are moral *and* technical in nature.
- An interest not just in the means by which management is achieved but also to what ends it is pursued. As a result the processes of power and ideology are often the focus of classroom discussions, including the way in which management power is subsumed within the social fabric of institutional structures, procedures and practices and often reproduces existing disadvantages around race, class, age or gender.
- An orientation towards notions of the community, even if that concept is not accepted unconditionally, which comes from a concern with the social rather than just the individual.
- An underlying emancipatory aim, where management education of this type is seen as part of the realisation of a more just society based on fairness, democracy and empowerment (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004: 66).

Critical Management Education is based on the belief that it is possible (and desirable) for the management educator to position themselves in some sense 'outside' of management theory and practice, despite being in an institution that certificates the successful understanding of the theories on offer and, often, the unquestioning reproduction of practice. The pedagogical tool most commonly used is critical reflection, a method that is believed enables teachers to enter into dialogue with students in order to change oppressive management practices through resistance and the adoption of new organisational forms.

What gets written about?

Writing about Critical Management Education falls into three identifiable categories. I have already covered the set of papers and texts identified as belonging, in time and intent, to the creation of Critical Management Studies as an academic movement in the UK and which set out a position with respect to Critical Management Education. The category includes Willmott (1994), Fox (1994), Grey and Mitev's (1995) and French and Grey (1996). The second category of writing includes those papers that are largely responsible for defining and maintaining the boundaries of the field that this early work on critical management education sought to create. This is the category of writing that enables people like me to produce yet more texts that confidently present the 'agreed' tenets upon which CME practice is based (see above) and which also help reinforce the set of textual markers (Fournier and Grey, 2000) that delineate the academic field. Work in this category, over a period of years, establishes the key texts and authors in the field as well as modifying accepted key methods and theoretical perspectives. For example, there are those papers that explore the need for critical reflection to be part of the pedagogical practice of CME (e.g. Reynolds 1998, 1999) or of the utility of marrying critical reflection and action learning approaches (Willmott, 1997; Reynolds and Vince, 2004). Perriton's (2000) paper is one that argues that critical approaches are also found

in in-house management development programmes i.e. a contribution to the expansion of the sites CME can be applied to. There are papers that use critical theorists to try to improve critical encounters with students (e.g. Elliott, 2003 who uses Gramsci in this way and Samra-Fredericks, 2003 who favours a Habermasian approach). Almost inevitably there are the papers that problematise and critique the assumptions of CME (e.g. Reynolds, 1999; Reynolds and Trehan, 2001, 2003; Perriton and Reynolds, 2004; Perriton, 2004; Fenwick, 2005). And finally, there are the papers that periodically attempt a 'reality check' on the field - asking questions regarding the continuing relevance of the critical project in business schools (Grey, 2002), the nature of the relationship between management practitioners and educators (Elliott and Reynolds, 2002; Watson, 2001) or whether any meaningful management education can take place in the age of Ritzer's 'McUniversity (Case and Sylvester, 2002).

One of the effects of establishing a literature that sets out the core pedagogical features of CME is that it encourages and legitimates a third category of writing, where academic practitioners report on their own critical educational interventions either in terms of process or content. Amongst the first to publish an account of the difficulty of being critical in UK management classrooms were Thompson and McGivern (1996). Subsequent tales of difficulty and resistance in introducing critical content include Kearins and Springett (2003), who explore the difficulties of teaching issues of sustainability in the management classroom. Hagen, Miller and Johnson (2003) tackle the perennial concern about what sort of reception critical academics get in the MBA classroom (see also Sinclair, 2000) and, in their case, also question whether the gender of the academic has a bearing on the outcome. Humphries and Dyer (2005) report on the introduction of critical and postmodern theoretical perspectives into their teaching and Fulop (2002) reflects on the additional difficulties of writing a textbook that incorporates critical perspectives. The oft-quoted article by Mingers (2000) is somewhat unusual in writing about critical theory alongside introducing the concept of 'criticality' to student. Other management academics have recorded their own difficulties in attempting to introduce critical reflection into the classroom. Reedy's (2003) paper, for example, comments on the asymmetries of power in the concept of a critical learning community. Catterall, Maclaran and Stevens (2002) consider both the positive and negative aspects of introducing critical reflection into the marketing curriculum.

The interest of academics in how the process of management education could be altered to produce critical management practitioners certainly accounts for the large number of CME publications in comparison to the US field. But the readiness of academics to write about their teaching rather than other, more obvious forms of activism, has not been without criticism. Thompson (2001) commented (unfavourably) that the emphasis in critical management was more on the 'studies' than on engagement with issues that affected people in employment. And Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson (2001) have noted that

> All too often, the answer from critical management studies is to write another paper. But writing another paper, which will only be read by other academics, in order to advance our academic careers, can hardly count as 'free conscious activity' … (2001: 357-358)

It is a useful reminder, before we move on to look at CME in the US context, that 'success' in general academic terms might be measured in terms of publications, conferences and theoretical contribution but that its own constituents might base their judgements on altogether different criteria. Both the comments above suggest that the criteria of success from those positioned outside of the CMS project, yet still committed to critical approaches to management, is nothing less than proof that CME has transformed employment relationships between management and labour for the better.

Criticality and Management Education in the United States

To appreciate the particular way in which Critical Management Education plays itself out in the US context it is necessary to understand the constraints that business schools place on the CMS project in that country. This section of the paper therefore looks at the historic development of business schools with their complex interplay between profession, curricula and research paradigms. It then argues the educational opportunities that CMS had available to exploit were much smaller than those in the UK and that this is evident in the relatively small size of the CME field in the US.

The Business School model in the US: its history and intellectual legacy

In the late 1800s, whilst the UK was still experimenting on a small scale with amateur radical approaches and having (typically) ad hoc debates about vocational education the US was developing its business school model to provide professional training guided by technical rationality. College enrolments for all programmes grew rapidly in the years 1915-1925, fuelled by the provision of secondary education and the rise of technical and professional occupations (Nelson, 1992). Wharton was the sole provider of business education for over a decade from 1881, but in the years immediately prior to 1900 six other institutions started business qualifications and thirty-three more joined their ranks before the outbreak of World War One. Immediately after WWI there were an additional 117 programmes and there were, on average, 6000 degrees per annum awarded in business management by the mid-1920s (Nelson, 1992). Bornemann (1961) notes that most of these early programmes focused on accounting and finance to feed the demand for instruction that went further than just bookkeeping. And although the demand for accountants created by the expansion of industry in this time period explains some of the hunger for these courses, Nelson (1992) also suggests that the institutions themselves had perceived that

> … middle-class parents would only pay college tuitions if they were confident that their sons (and some daughters) would qualify for well-paying jobs [and that institutions] aggressively developed new curricula that satisfied the needs of employers and the demands of parents and students. (Nelson, 1992: 78)

In this way a university curriculum was created that was not only tied to the nation's economic structure but also the concerns of its white-collar and middle-class interests (Nelson, 1992).

If a pragmatic positioning amongst middle-class career aspirations was then (as it is now) a useful strategy for maximising student recruitment there were some adjustments that needed to be made in order for business to be viewed as a legitimate academic subject from within the academy. Nelson (1992) argues that it took until the 1930s for the 'first phase' of US business education to be complete - where management education was no longer a novelty, graduates were employed in large organisations and academic jobs were secure. Security of academic positions was an issue all throughout the early part of the 20th century as business schools negotiated the tensions between a practical curriculum and the academic need for theoretical rigour.

This early concern of business academics for acceptance within the academy led to, as Locke (1993) comments, on an exaggerated concern with rigour and scientific method that is still a feature of US academic work today. US management theory was keen to mirror the sciences and not the more liberal subject areas and adopted, in turn, developments and methods from mathematics, Boolean logic, statistics, econometrics, linear programming and the behavioural sciences (Locke, 1993). Even the field of organisational behaviour – where CMS would find a foothold in the 1990s – was not, as it was in the UK, a field open to sociological and philosophical influences. Instead,

> … the behavioural sciences claimed a scientific status but they, like neoclassical economics, in order to strengthen the scientific rigor of their work, borrowed heavily from statistics and applied mathematics. (Locke, 1993: 24)

Although we might assume from their 'special relationship' in relation to economic and political concerns that the UK and US would share a common history in relation to management education it is far from the case.

New debates in old bottles: the constraint of CMS by the US educational context

The background of the development of Critical Management Studies in the United States of America has been rehearsed elsewhere - most notably in an editorial of the <u>Academy of Management Journal</u> (Eden, 2000) and in the Special Issue on CMS published by the journal <u>Organization</u> in 2002 (e.g. Adler, 2002a). CMS started life as a pre-conference workshop at the 1998 meeting of the Academy of Management (AOM) in San Diego although US academics were active in the CMS movement before this time. Amongst the raft of international critical texts on management published in the mid-90s was one by US academics Boje, Gephardt and Thatchenkery (1996) and critical academics from both sides of the Atlantic were sufficiently well networked to co-convene streams at the inaugural International CMS Conference just a year later in the UK. Indeed, there were a number of edited critical texts published in the mid-1990s that included UK, European and US based academic contributions (e.g. Alvesson and Willmot, 1996; Linstead, Grafton-Small and Jeffcutt (1996); French and Grey, 1996).

Paul Adler became one of the main spokespersons for CMS in the US following the AOM workshop. His statement of the aims of CMS is clear (but not definitive) as he is at pains to stress the openness of CMS to a wide range of critical views.

> … 'critical' is not meant to signal a specific commitment to any particular school of thought … rather we include proponents of all the various theoretical traditions that can help us understand the oppressive character of the current management and business system. (Adler, 2002a, 387-388)

Adler approaches his general outline of what CMS is in relation to three basic questions: what is criticality ranged 'against', on whose behalf are CMS scholars being critical and in the name of what? He defends, as deliberate and not accidental, the framing of CMS as being 'against' business as an instrument of domination and the idea that it is only the pursuit of profit that will guarantee the wider goals of justice, community, human development and ecological balance (Adler, 2002a: 387). Statements of what CMS was *for* would, in his opinion, represent "a kind of petty-bourgeois-intellectual effort to assert control over a process of struggle and change that is necessarily somewhat chaotic" (Adler, 2002a: 389). Worse than that, of course, they would inevitably be watered down because of the need to represent the minimum position that could be agreed on. Notwithstanding all of that CMS does have a statement of intent which suggests that the current goals of business (i.e. profit) are too narrow and that there are wider human goals of 'justice, community, human development, ecological balance' (2002a: 387) that should also be taken account of.

Although Adler's statement makes clear that CMS seeks to modify the behaviour of business to secure wider human goals than profit, the primary battleground of the CMS movement appears to be the business school itself. In contrast to CMS academics in the UK who were able to see management education as a tool with which they could transform management practice, US academics were aware that the business school was a fortress that would easily repel its attempts to colonise it.

The narrow opportunities offered by the business school to CME are best illustrated by the debate over ethics programmes that erupted after the Enron scandal. Adler grasped a rare opportunity of self-doubt on the part of business schools to press for 'critical self-reflection, for we believe that these scandals may have something to do the way that our own institutions function' (Adler, 2002b: 148). He questioned whether US business schools ensured that students were given ethics training, whether theories of motivation treated economic gain as the highest goal, queried the celebration of the invisible hand of the market that was taken-for-granted in the economic paradigm, pointed the finger at the overwhelmingly conservative political make-up of business faculty and, finally, suggested that too little attention was paid to the training of students as future citizens rather than managers only. CMS suggested, as a remedy, the restoration of and emphasis on ethics courses, the creation of courses on the comparative national histories of business, government and society and broadening the study of organisations to include government, unions and not-for-profit organisations (2002b: 149). It was, at heart, a proposal that (part) of the management education curriculum should be *about* management rather than *for* management. But whilst the Enron and other corporate scandals unsettled the academy briefly it was not enough for it to open itself to even limited curriculum reform and CMS, once again, reverted to trying to carve out a place for itself within the dominant educational form.

This pre-occupation with how CMS fitted into business schools rather than on the critiques it offered management theory is the striking feature of the Special Issue of Organization. Almost all the contributors were pessimistic about the role CMS could occupy in higher education institutions. In his article Zald, for example suggests two (remote) possibilities for the CMS project. The first is for it to assume a marginal position "tolerated … but not taken quite seriously, especially in the elite schools", and the second is for it to help redefine what is taught in the core curriculum and how research ought to be undertaken (Zald, 2002: 366). But CMS academics in the US are, according to Zald, positioned in the 'less core' (2002:378) departments such as Organizational Behaviour (OB) by personal inclination and likely, because of their critical stance to the institution, to be excluded from executive education and core curriculum decisions. Despite the size of OB departments they hardly attract any prestige within business schools and are forced to justify their role in the curriculum because they cannot demonstrate a definite contribution to the bottom line. In short, the chances are weighed against CMS achieving even modest educational influence. Zald also acknowledges the point that Locke (1993) makes in relation to the historical development of the business school and the degree to which disciplines become locked in to particular views of knowledge and methodologies. The 'orbit' of the social sciences has been firmly established around the positivistic and empirical and kept there by the "general currents of intellectual life" and by "the institutional contexts, within disciplines and within academic and non-academic scholarly environments" (Zald, 2002: 370). CMS, in his view, lacks the impact necessary to change its orbit concluding that critical perspectives have simply arrived too late to influence or be seen as relevant in institutional or disciplinary contexts.

Other contributors to Organization followed Zald's lead. Although Scully (2002) starts her paper by critiquing the surface theory taught to MBA students she soon turns her CMS gaze upon the promotions procedures in universities. Huff and Huff (2002) use their paper to repeat their concerns about the failure of critical management approaches to interact with actual organisations and their problems rather than remaining in the world of theoretical problems. And in his contribution, Nord (2002) advises CMS to deliberately adopt an opportunistic rather than revolutionary strategy and to use teaching opportunities to introduce counter-paradigmatic perspectives and critical texts. Walsh and Weber (2002) are also keen not to stray too far from existing paradigms and counsel CMS scholars not to turn their backs on the underlying problems of work as this is the only guaranteed route to influence. The caveat being that these are problems defined by business rather than CMS academics.

The academy strikes back?

It is difficult, writing from the perspective of the UK and the benefit of that liberal tradition within management education, to understand the dynamic between CMS and the Academy of Management (AOM) – the US association that represents management scholars and that publishes some of the most prestigious academic journals in the field. Just in percentage terms it is probably the case that the AOM has more vegetarian members than those who identify as belonging to CMS, yet clearly CMS has caught the attention of the AOM and they are not sure they like what they see. In an editorial on the challenges posed by the CMS agenda Eden presents CMS as radical *and* sociological (in that the object of study goes beyond the organisation or individual to encompass the role of business in society) (Eden, 2003). The issue, however, that the AOM has is with the *political* aims of CMS.

> … their declared aim is not limited to unlocking Nature's secrets, but to generating change that will result in a societal system that better accords with their values. That is, there agenda is as much, if not more, politically driven than scientifically motivated" (Eden, 2003: 390)

Yet the Academy does not dismiss the concerns of CMS (as it understands them) out of hand, there is agreement that there are imbalances in the system but the solution to these problems can be achieved through our existing knowledge, not by importing radical political solutions. It is the thought of CMS *as a group* acting politically that appears threatening when previous *individual* critical voices such as Marta Calas, Linda Smircich and Stanley Deetz attracted little official attention. Radicalism, according to Eden, is associated with 'youthful tyros entering the profession, an alienation from established norms and a strong urge to effect change…"(2003: 391) and also as simply not necessary. There is the belief, evident in the approach to non-standard management education approaches, that organization studies already has the theoretical basis for an *apolitical* solution to many of the issues that CMS scholars raise through its traditional association with humanistic organisational psychology. The default preference, when social issues are raised in relation to management, is simply to turn to humanist approaches and others that don't privilege theory (the possibility of paradigm shift) over practice (conservatism). Walter Nord, for all he is a supporter of CMS illustrates this problem when he recalls that he was attracted, as a young researcher, to the work of Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, Argyris and others because they espoused the values of "improving work life for lower-level participants and helping them gain influence" and to "champion a sort of organizational democracy" (Nord, 2002:439-440). Although he personally had his own later 'political turn' through the reading of Marx there are many in the field of organizational studies who retain the faith in humanist psychology to do the work of CMS in non-political ways.

In the end all the AOM had to do was to remind CMS scholars of the rules and logic of the academic marketplace they operate in. Even Zald recognises that there will be some locations in which a CMS orientation is welcome but that the usual rules for academic acceptance will still prevail i.e. "Those who publish in A list journals that follow more entrenched criteria of evaluation will have easier time of it than those who publish in different forms with more unconventional methodologies" (2002: 380). Eden makes the same point when he challenges CMS scholars to come out of the classroom and to compete on the basis of their published research.

> … the next step [for CMS] should be a spate of top-quality, theory-based research articles submitted to AMJ using current methods in the field. Critical scholars should be able to get across many of their points while playing the research game by its methodological rules … [the claim is] that we hide behind rules that discriminate against their critical methods to protect ourselves by screening out their message …The counter charge is for the critters to stop using the demands of positivism as an

excuse and start doing the kind of research that gets published." (Eden, 2003: 393-393)

It is possible to heap irony upon irony in this advice from the AOM. In the US CMS academics are being asked to stop acting politically and to produce more publications. In the UK Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson (2001), as seen above, disparaged the habit of CMS academics writing articles rather than becoming politically engaged. And there is also the irony that, even as the AOM was exhorting its CMS community to – figuratively speaking – come in from the cold there were calls from within the business school community to focus *less* on scientific rigour and playing by the methodological rules.

The challenge to the US business school model – however difficult it may be to dislodge it from its historically determined path – is more likely to come from the establishment than the Critical Management Studies community. Recently an assortment of respected business school academics have joined Henry Mintzberg in calling for a major rethink of the assumptions underpinning and objectives of the US model. Although their critiques are not 'critical' in the sense that CMS academics might identify with they have shown a remarkable willingness to argue against the scientific model for methodology and for a more liberal base to management education. Some, such as Bennis and O'Toole (2005), argue for a modified version of a professional school similar to law and medicine. Their vision for the business school may be constrained by an interpretation of relevance that takes it away from the critical model but their support for an Aristolean education that includes moral reasoning and practical wisdom alongside a liberal arts component is not hostile to the perspectives used by CMS. Similarly Pfeffer and Tong (2002, 2004) are sympathetic to the idea that business schools could reinterpret their purpose as "developing important, relevant knowledge and serving as a source of critical thought and inquiry about organizations and management, and by doing so advancing the general public interest …" (2004: 1503). They note, however, that the size of the CMS group within the overall academy makes reinvention along these lines unlikely. What these mainstream commentators on business schools all agree on is that the market forces that have been unleashed by the business schools themselves by presenting "themselves and their value proposition primarily … as a path to career security and financial riches" (Pfeffer and Tong, 2004: 1503) will force changes. Whether these changes push business schools more towards a professional and relevancy model or towards a liberal curriculum and critical thought model remains to be seen but change, with or without CMS input, is seen as necessary and inevitable.

What gets written about?

Unsurprisingly, given the situation described above there are few signs in the US management education literature to suggest that any form of specifically CMS oriented call to action in respect of the curriculum – either as a contribution to ethics education or more general topics - is being responded to. Or, if it is developing in the management classroom, it is not yet making great inroads into published accounts of practice. Even Wankel and DeFillipi's (2002) edited collection "Rethinking Management Education for the 21st Century" could hardly be said to have made large strides towards new pedagogical practices with the two contributions in the section on criticality (Reed, 2002; Antonacopolou, 2002) based in Canada and the UK respectively. Indeed the book largely reflects the non-mainstream approaches to management education that explore aesthetic (e.g. Nissley, Taylor and Butler, 2002; Nissley and Casey, 2002), experiential (Kayes, 2002) or humanist approaches that either wear their politics lightly or, more commonly, not at all. In pursuing humanist and experiential themes they have, of course, much in common with UK approaches, which have shown a preference for pedagogical theory drawn from existing adult education discourses. But one might have assumed, given that the US was developing its CMS theory at the same time as its educational practices that there would have been more evidence of innovative political engagement.

However, as Bailey comments, innovation "…be it in management or education or management education, is, in the final analysis, about bridging theory and practice" (2004: 441). This general concern with acknowledging the equal (if not dominant) position of management practice in determining pedagogical approach is visible in Smith's (2003) paper on critical thinking in management. Smith surveys the work of Michael Reynolds (1997, 1999a, 1999b) and Mingers (2000) in relation to what CME might offer the management educator and wonders "… what would replace all the instrumental knowledge jettisoned from business school curricula" (2003: 29) if CME became more broadly established as an approach in management education? The insistence that management pedagogy act as a bridge between theory and practice also accounts for the promotion of service learning, the involvement of students in 'meaningful community service that addresses local needs' (Dipadova-Stocks, 2005: 345), as a way of addressing the concerns of CMS but in a non-political way. Service learning creates "…a new bridge concept …[and] points to a fuller understanding of how one can acquire expertise that is adequate to the demands of the 21st century - its technical, moral and civic demands" (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2005: 359). The work of Cunliffe (2001, 2003) in exploring social poetics and other dialogic practices is a relatively rare example of European theoretical traditions trumping the cultural bias towards centering management practice in the US by an academic based in the US, albeit moving there from the UK. Perhaps this represents nothing more than the exception proving the rule in respect of 'critical' management education approaches in the US.

Conclusions

This article has attempted to explain the use of education as an entry strategy in order to bring critical debates about the nature and purpose of management to the fore. It suggested that the histories of business schools in the UK and US could explain the differing presentation of both CMS and CME in each country. In respect of the UK I challenged the assumption that CME is 'merely' a smaller offshoot of the CMS project by demonstrating that its pedagogical assumptions reveal a longer history based in radical and adult education. In the case of the US I believe the disconnection of CME from adult education and its isolation within the logic of the business school has ensured its marginal position. Where there *are* calls for reform and reinvention these are coming from the mainstream commentators who see, to invert the Audre Lorde quotation, the logic of using the master's tools to argue for the dismantling the master's house rather than importing arguments from the CMS. But even commentators such as Pfeffer and Tong are pessimistic about the likely success of any move towards reinvention:

> … the likelihood of profound change or reform in contemporary management education, at least in the United States and at least as practiced by university-based business schools, seems limited. We do not foresee the appearance of forces or actors that can reasonably be expected to overcome the inertia that …maintain the current model of business education and research. (Pfeffer and Tong, 2002: 91-92)

The pessimism surrounding the possibility of change in the US business school model because of the inertia produced by history shows reinforces the importance of the past to both the UK management education model *and* the development of a distinct CME literature. The likelihood of creating a strong CME field spontaneously from the CMS project in the mid-1990s was slim; instead the pre-existing literature in radical and adult education was adapted and built on. The 'accidental' aspect of the development of the field is the use by the early authors in the CMS movement of education as the way of starting the debate about what sort of management theory was required. This in turn allowed that small, but active, group of academics who were already exploring radical education concepts as a way of framing discussions about management education and development to expand the research agenda. CME, for this group, became the means by which they could join in wider management

debates about management theory and also bring in their own sub-field closer to core Business School concerns.

There is little doubt that this relationship between CMS and CME has been mutually beneficial in the UK. The availability of good quality management education journals has encouraged the publication of articles on the use of critical theories in management programmes, case studies detailing experiments in critical pedagogy and has ensured that the wider CMS project gains exposure. The UK's Research Assessment Exercise, which places a great deal of pressure on the production of published articles, will also have been a reason why articles detailing an academic's pedagogical practice have also flourished in this time period.

Both the adoption of CME by academics already writing about critical approaches to management education (i.e. representatives of Lancaster University's Department of Management Learning) and the incentives to publish accounts of critical management 'in action' in the classroom because of the RAE probably account for the greater number of CME publications to come out of the UK compared to the US. Yet, even though the numbers of CME publications might have been smaller if neither of those two conditions existed, the educational history of a country still appears to have an effect on the way that criticality in management can be expressed. The history of liberal education in the UK allows CMS work to be considered (mostly) as a valid and non-threatening contribution to management research, even when the CMS 'label' is a statement of political orientation. However, in the US, the positivist epistemology and methodological orientation of the business school tradition weighs heavily on the attempt to produce politically and socially challenging research. It lacks, at least in respect of business schools, a tradition of debate about pedagogical choice or useful knowledge. It is such an established model that CMS can only have modest ambitions in relation to the curriculum (ethics courses) and acknowledges the difficulties of gaining a higher profile from the non-core disciplines where it has managed to gain a foothold.

The irony of Critical Management Education is that it doesn't, as it fondly imagines, determine the educational context in which critical management practitioners are formed. Instead it is the pre-existing educational context that determines whether it is possible for CMS to exist as an idea or not in the first place. Our criticality in the present is dependent on the criticality of others in the past.

Bibliography

Adler, P. (2002a) Critical in the name of whom and what? *Organization*, 9(3): 387-395.

Adler, P. (2002b) Corporate scandals: It's time for reflection in business schools. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3): 148-149.

Alvesson, M and Willmott, H (1992) *Critical management studies*, London: Sage

Alvesson, M and Willmott, H (1996) *Making sense of management: A critical introduction*, London: Sage

Anthony, P.D. (1986) *The foundation of management*, London: Tavistock

Antonacopoulou, E (2002) Corporate universities: The domestication of management education, in C. Wankel and R. DeFillipi (eds) (2002) *Rethinking Management*

Education for the 21st Century. Research in Management Education and Development. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Bailey, J. R. (2004) Arranging marriages between theoretical traditions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(4): 440-441.

Bennis, W and O'Toole, J (2005) How business schools lost their way, *Harvard Business Review*, 83 (5), 96-104

Boje, D.M., Gephart, R.P., Jr., and Thatchenkery, T.J. (eds.) (1996) *Postmodern management and organization theory*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bornemann, A. (1961) The Development of the teaching of management in the school of business, *The Journal of the Academy of Management*, 4 (2): 129-136

Boys, C.J. (1988) Business Studies, in C.J. Boys, J. Brenna and M. Henkel (eds.) *Higher education and the preparation for work*, London: Jessica Kingsley

Brown, D and Harrison, M.J. (1980) The demand for relevance and the role of sociology in business studies degrees, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, (4): 54-61

Case, P., & Selvester, K. (2002) Watch your back - Reflections on trust and mistrust in management education. *Management Learning*, 33(2): 231-247.

Catterall, M., Maclaran, P., & Stevens, L. (2002) Critical Reflection in the Marketing Curriculum. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24(3): 184.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2001) Everyday Conversations: A Social Poetics of Managing. *Concepts and Transformation*, 6(3): 295-315.

DiPadova-Stocks, L. N. (2005) Two Major Concerns About Service-Learning: What if We Don't Do It? And What if We Do? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(3): 345-353.

Eden, D. (2003) From the Editors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4): 390-394.

Elliott, C. (2003) Representations of the intellectual: Insights from Gramsci on management education. *Management Learning*, 34(4): 411-427.

Elliott, C., & Reynolds, M. (2002) Manager-educator relations from a critical perspective. *Journal of Management Education*, 26(5): 512-526.

Elliott, C and Turnbull, S (2005) *Critical thinking in human resource development*, London: Routledge

Fenwick, T. (2005) Ethical dilemmas of critical management education: Within classrooms and beyond. *Management Learning*, 36(1): 31-48.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1): 7-32.

French, R., & Grey, C. (1996) *Rethinking management education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fulop, L. (2002) Practising what you preach: Critical management studies and its teaching. *Organization*, 9(3): 428-436.

Gibson, R (1986) *Critical theory and education*, London: Hodder and Stoughton

Grey, C. (2002) What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 26(5): 496-511.

Grey, C. (2004) Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(2): 178-186.

Grey, C., & Mitev, N. (1995). Management Education - a Polemic. *Management Learning*, 26(1): 73-90.

Grey, C., & Willmott, H. (2002) Contexts of CMS. *Organization*, 9(3): 411-418.

Hagen, R., Miller, S., & Johnson, M. (2003) The 'Disruptive consequences' of introducing a critical management perspective onto an MBA programme - The lecturers' view. *Management Learning*, 34(2): 241-257.

Hassard, J., Hogan, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2001). From Labor Process Theory to Critical Management Studies. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 23(3): 339-362.

Huff, A. S., & Huff, J. O. (2002) In Sight, but Out of Mind: Dilemmas That Diminish the Chances for Reconstructed Policy Sciences. *Organization*, 9(3): 447-452.

Humphries, M., & Dyer, S. (2005). Introducing critical theory to the management classroom: An exercise building on Jermier's "Life of Mike". *Journal of Management Education*, 29(1): 169-195.

Johnson, R (1979) 'Really useful knowledge': radical education and working-class culture, 1790-1848 in, J. Clarke, C. Critcher and R. Johnson (eds.) *Working Class Culture*, London: Hutchinson of London

Kast, F (1965) Management Education in Europe, *The Academy of Management Journal*, 8 (2): 75-89

Kayes, D. C. (2002) Experiential Learning and Its Critics: Preserving the Role of Experience in Management Learning and Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(2): 137-149.

Kearins, K., & Springett, D. (2003). Educating for Sustainability: Developing Critical Skills. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(2): 188-204.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. 2005. Toward a Scholarship of Engagement: A Dialogue Between Andy Van de Ven and Edward Zlotkowski. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(3): 355-362.

Linstead, S., Grafton-Small, R and Jeffcutt, P (eds) *Understanding management*, London: Sage

Locke, R (1993) *Management and Higher Education since 1940*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Macfarlane, B (1997) In search of an identity: lecturer perceptions of the Business Studies first degree, *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 49 (1): 5-20

Martin, I (2000) Reconstituting the agora: Towards an alternative politics of lifelong learning. Paper presented by the Adult Education Research Association conference, June 2-4 Vancouver [http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/2000/martini-final.pdf]

Mingers, J. (2000) What is it to be Critical? *Management Learning*, 31(2): 219.

Murphy, M (1953) Education for Management in Great Britain, *The Journal of Business of the University of Chicago*, 26 (1): 37-47

Nelson, D (1992) Scientific management in the transformation of university business education, in D Nelson (ed.) *A mental revolution: Scientific Management since Taylor*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Nissley, N and Casey, A (2002) The politics of the exhibition: Viewing corporate museums though the paradigmatic lens of organizational memory, *British Journal of Management*, 13: S35-S45.

Nissley, N., Taylor, S. S. & Butler, O. (2002) The Power of Organizational Song: An organizational discourse an aesthetic expression of organizational culture. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science.,* Vol 2(1), pp 47-62

Nord, W. (2002) Spinning Disciplines with Mayer Zald: Some Further Thoughts on Critical Management Studies and Management Education. *Organization*, 9(3): 437-446.

Perriton, L. (2000) Verandah Discourses: Critical Management Education in Organizations. *British Journal of Management*, 11(3): 227.

Perriton, L., (2004) "A reflection of what exactly? A provocation regarding the use of 'critical' reflection in Critical Management Education, in R. Vince and M. Reynolds (eds) *Critical Reflection* , London: Ashgate Publishing

Perriton, L., & Reynolds, M. (2004) Critical Management Education. *Management Learning*, 35(1): 61-77.

Pfeffer, J and Tong, C (2002) The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1 (1), 78-95

Pfeffer, J and Tong, C (2004) The business school 'business': Some lessons from the US experience, *Journal of Management Studies*, 41 (8), 1501-1520

Reed, D (2002) Management education in an age of globalization: The need for critical perspectives, in C. Wankel and R. DeFillipi (eds) (2002) *Rethinking Management Education for the 21st Century. Research in Management Education and Development.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Reed, M and Anthony, P (1992) Professionalizing management and managing professionalization: British management in the 1980s. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29 (Sept): 591-613

Reedy, P. (2003) Together We Stand? An Investigation into the Concept of Solidarity in Management Education. *Management Learning*, 34(1): 91.

Reynolds, M. (1998) Reflection and critical reflection in management learning. *Management Learning*, 29(2): 183-200.

Reynolds, M. (1999a) Grasping the Nettle: Possibilities and Pitfalls of a Critical Management Pedagogy. *British Journal of Management*, 10(2): 171-184.

Reynolds, M. (1999b) Critical Reflection and Management Education: Rehabilitating Less Hierarchical Approaches. *Journal of Management Education*, 23(5): 537-553.

Reynolds, M and Trehan, K (2001) Classrooms as real world: Propositions for a pedagogy of difference, *Gender and Education*, 13 (4): 357-372

Reynolds, M and Trehan, K (2003) Learning from difference? *Management Learning*, 34(2): 163-180

Reynolds, M. and Vince, R (2004) Critical Management Education and Action-Based Learning: Synergies and Contradictions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(4): 442-456.

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003) A Proposal for Developing a Critical Pedagogy in Management from Researching Organizational Members' Everyday Practice. *Management Learning*, 34(3): 291-312.

Scully, M. A. (2002) Confronting Errors in the Meritocracy. *Organization*, 9(3): 396-401.

Silver, H and Brennan, J (1988) *Liberal vocationalism*, London: Methuen

Sinclair, A (2000) Teaching managers about masculinities: Are you kidding? *Management Learning*, 31 (1): 83-101

Smith, G. F. (2003) Beyond Critical Thinking and Decision Making: Teaching Business Students How To Think. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(1): 24-51.

Snell, R.S. (1986) Questioning the ethics of management development: A critical review, *Management Education and Development*, 17 (1): 43-64

Swan, E (2005) On bodies, rhinstones and pleasures: Women teaching managers, *Management Learning*, 36(3): 317-333

Thompson, J., & McGivern, J. 1996. Parody, process and practice - Perspectives for management education? *Management Learning*, 27(1): 21-35.

Tolley, G (1983) Foreword, in D. Graves (ed) *The hidden curriculum in business studies*, Chichester: Higher Education Foundation

Voronov, M., & Coleman, P. T. 2003. Beyond the Ivory Towers. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(2): 169.

Walsh, J. P., & Weber, K. 2002. The Prospects for Critical Management Studies in the American Academy of Management. *Organization*, 9(3): 402-410.

Wankel, C and DeFillipi, R (2002) *Rethinking Management Education for the 21st Century. Research in Management Education and Development.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Watson, T. J. (2001) Beyond Managism: Negotiated Narratives and Critical Management Education in Practice. *British Journal of Management*, 12(4): 385.

Willmott, H. (1997) Making learning critical: Identity, emotion, and power in processes of management development. *Systems Practice*, 10(6): 749-771.

Zald, M. N. 2002b. Spinning Disciplines: Critical Management Studies in the Context of the Transformation of Management Education. *Organization*, 9(3): 365-385.