Article:

Cooke, William Michael orcid.org/0000-0003-3800-6689 and Kumar, Arun orcid.org/0000-0003-0064-794X (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

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

Journal:	*Academy of Management Learning & Education*
Manuscript ID	AMLE-2017-0277-RES.R4
Manuscript Type:	Research & Reviews
Submission Keywords:	History of Management Education, Critical Management Studies

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 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.

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

BILL COOKE[1]
Professor in Strategic Management
University of York
MBA/020, Freboys Lane
Heslington, York
United Kingdom.
YO10 5GD
bill.cooke@york.ac.uk
+44 (0) 1904 32 5050

ARUN KUMAR
Lecturer in International Management
University of York
LMB/226, Freboys Lane
Heslington, York
United Kingdom.
YO10 5GD
arun.kumar@york.ac.uk
+44 (0) 1904 32 5306

[1] Co-authors listed in alphabetical order of surname

US PHILANTHROPY'S SHAPING OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE 20th 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 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.

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 20th 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 20th 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 analysis) *want* to do what the dominant power wants, rather than compelling them to do so. We show that US foundations worked to internationalize management education in support of US soft power abroad but that this was intimately rooted to foundations' programs for management education domestically. At home and abroad, foundations' interventions in management education were part of their characteristic "scientific philanthropy." Like contemporary philanthrocapitalism, scientific philanthropy aimed to diagnose and combat the root causes of social problems instead of their symptoms (Howe, 1980). Its roots lay in US business leaders' belief that "society could be improved through the systematic discovery and application of knowledge" (Sealander, 2003: 239); and involved both making gifts for scientific research and training with a particular emphasis on technical and applied fields, as well as approaching gift-making scientifically.

The article is structured as follows: we begin with a detailed discussion on periodization and its features, including the three periods that follow from our periodization. Used here as the article's organizing framework, it constitutes our overarching contribution, which is discussed next along with the two further sub-contributions it enables. The three periods, following our periodization, are discussed next. In our Discussion, we outline the relations within and across the preceding three periods. In the concluding section, we outline a research agenda for the future.

PERIODIZATION IN HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP

Historians concur that periodization is one of their most important scholarly tasks (e.g., Bentley, 1996; Jordanova, 2006). It ranks "among the more elusive tasks of historical scholarship" (Bentley, 1996: 749). Consequent to periodization, periods enable further deep contextualization of the history of management education, and analyses which address continuities, similarities, disjunctures and difference between and within specified moments of time and place. They are, however, eternally mutable (e.g., Jordanova, 2006), continually open to revision, debate, extension, and even abandoning, for example, as new historical data emerge. Periods are an artefact of historians' interpretative construction and not objective tree ring markers of time (Howell & Prevenier, 2001; Jordanova, 2006). The choice of object is determinative of the periods constructed. To explain this further, periodization can be used to categorize the histories of large-scale world events: of whole countries, or the western world, or even of global-cross-continent cross-cultural engagements (see Bentley, 1996). Simultaneously, periodization can also be conducted of objects of analysis and of phenomena which might otherwise be seen as subsidiary the large scale, and encompassed with them (e.g. Hollander et al., 2005 on periodization in marketing history).

Our periodization, definitively, is of US philanthropies' interventions in the establishment of management education. Yet, at the same time, it engages with histories and periodizations of broader phenomena: notably US domestic and foreign policy, and within this of US soft-power in the world. Cooke and Alcadipani (2015) set out, inter alia, the increasing focus on the global dimension of management education. More generally, such a focus means that periodizations of engagements between different nations and cultures are increasingly important (Bentley, 1996). "As historians take global perspectives to the past and analyse human perspectives from broad and comparative perspectives," Bentley (1996: 749) adds, "questions of periodization identify themselves with increasing insistence."

For Fear (2014: 178), "periodization offers a framework for understanding certain environmental contexts that must be considered to understand [...] strategies and microorganizational processes" (Fear's particular historical focus). Here, the words "periodization" and "period" are deceptive. Historians embed location *and* time in their meaning. They are inevitably contestable; and "space-bound" to certain regions, countries, or various spatial categories (e.g., Europe cities). Historians must be "wary of building 'universal' theories that are 'ahistorical' (without a sense of time) or 'a-cultural' (without a sense of place, say a national or regional context)" (Fear, 2014: 178). Furthermore, from the late 20th century on, historians have avoided *teleology* in their work: or periodizations that frame the past as a neat sequence of progress which have brought us to the present and take us to an ideal future. This is also expressed as a problematization of *linearity* (Howell & Prevenier, 2001), notably challenged in Burrell's (1997) *Pandemonium*.

Our periodization here is, therefore, non-teleological and non-linear. Each period identified enables an initially standalone account of the relation between US philanthropy and the development of management education within it. Each has a rough and ready start and finish date, and a specific set of global locations. But there is overlap, too, in time and space, and we see the spatial dynamics of our periodization with the USA as a site from which management ideas and practices emanate – in our case, those related to management education. In denaturalizing this process, we follow others on the Americanization of management knowledge (e.g., Engwall, 2004, Kipping et al., 2004), and postcolonial histories of management (e.g., Kumar, 2019). Unique here is our focus on periodizing US foundations' philanthropic interventions in management-education-in-the-world.

Spelling the periods out, our first is the post-Progressive era within the USA, from circa mid-1920s through to the late-1960s, wherein philanthropies' engagements with management education were nonetheless international in ambition. The beginning of this period falls roughly in the middle of Khurana's (2007) first period of institutionalization of business schools in the USA; but it built on prior efforts by Rockefeller and Carnegie to improve management practice,. The period concludes at the start of the 1970s, which saw a domestic and international switch from the corporatist model of state, business and citizen relations to the all-conquering of marketized paradigm (Khurana, 2007; Parmar, 2012). The second period we discuss is Europe post-WWII through to the 1980s. Here the initial spatial focus was Western Europe in reconstruction post-1946; later this expanded to the then Soviet bloc; and the third period we discuss covers philanthropies' efforts to transfer Western modes of management education to the Third World[2] in the name of modernization and International Development.[3] This began in the so called post-1946 International Development era and ended with the rising dominance of neoliberal International Development interventions from 1980 onwards. That dominance is ongoing, as yet has no end date, and we write from within it, so that is where our periodization ends, for the time being. It is, also, too early to provide a historical analysis. We do not, however, propose an "end of history;" our schema can be modified in the future, not least with new periods added.

A key motivation for our choice of periodization as a theoretical framing is to demonstrate that metaphysical sophistication existed for historians prior to management studies' historic turn. However, in the language of that turn, this is an analytically structured history Constructed around a narrative of events, structures and causes, analytically structured history

[2] This term does not imply a ranking. Throughout the 1960s-70s, it was used as a shorthand for countries not aligned with the US/NATO (i.e. the First World) and the Soviet bloc (the Second World).
[3] International Development, as what agencies like the World Bank, USAID and Oxfam do, is capitalized here to avoid confusion with other generic forms of development. We do the same for Development Management as management in/for International Development.

reframes secondary material into a narrative (Rowlinson et al., 2014) and that is what we do here, albeit substituting "published" for "secondary" material (for e.g., Henry Ford's memoirs cited below can be both secondary and primary). However, we propose the term "analytical constructions of history," as it is clearer about the interpretive agency of the historian and enables periodizations to be seen not simply as a frame for subsequent historical analysis, but an analytical yet contestable end in themselves. The periods set out here emerge from our separate and joint attempts as researchers to cluster the narratives in common derived from our close readings of secondary sources on philanthropy, many of which we cite here. Alongside this, our immersions as empirical researchers in primary sources on philanthropy and management education, and our analyses of these sources in Brazil, India, UK, and the USA has informed our co-construction of the periodizations we offer.

PERIODIZATION AS CONTRIBUTION

Our periodization per se is, then, our overarching contribution. *Doing* periodization enables and requires the explication of historical events, of themselves, and relationally, both temporally and spatially. This contribution will help subsequent scholars, who may simply apply our periodization, amend it, critique it on ontological, epistemic, and/or methodological grounds, even propose that it is set aside. In this, we hope to set the ball rolling on work which debates how given periodizations, and periodizations in general enable the *extractions* of accounts from more widely focused literatures. If our major contribution is periodization per se, though, there are two consequent sub-contributions: one which we term "revelatory" and the other "explanatory." Our act of periodization is *revelatory* in that it enables the revealing – as constructions, for certain – of the periods we set out. This is consequent to the *consolidation* of accounts from a broader literature with narrower focussed single case studies, in our case of philanthropic interventions in management education, which in turn have their own contextualization. In this, the act of periodization here is intrinsically *analytic* and *synthetic*, as choices are made about fitting source material to a periodization. They are also analytically enabling of comparisons, through the identification of themes, motivations, imperatives and responses common and distinctive within and between periods. Often misunderstood, our contention is that the construction of a particular history is an end in itself, and not simply a prerequisite to something else. The point of writing history, therefore, is not merely to provide an empirical context for theorizing. Historiography has theory embedded within it and is consequent to conceptualizations of the relation between space, time and events.

In setting out our three periodic categories we inevitably justify, and explain, using published sources why they are appropriate and valid. Hence our second, *explanatory* sub-contribution. We explain the broad patterns of philanthropic intervention in management education over the given time period and its international locales, and between and within the periods we set out. The ongoing success, or otherwise with which future accounts of such interventions "fit" within our periodization, will of course, be a test of its validity.

Caveats to Our History

The general caveats that apply to historiographical scholarship (literally "writing history") apply here. History is "epistemologically fragile" (Jenkins, 1991: 13). The past is gone, so it cannot be ontologically real in the present. Historical scholarship requires interpretation, which requires selecting and excluding from sources, published or otherwise. The categories we propose (in our case, the three periods) are both derived from those sources, but also determine what is seen as relevant and irrelevant in those sources. Stipulating the mutability of periods, therefore, derives not least from a recognition that they can be self-fulfilling historicizations (Cooke, 1999).

The exemplars of the three periods below were all funded by the Ford Foundation, the leading foundation in the development of management education through business schools as current historical knowledge stands. Yet our claim in this paper is for the US philanthropies in general, notably the "big three" (Arnove, 1980). Rockefeller and Carnegie as well as Ford were instrumental in developing business schools' intellectual resources. Carnegie, for example, funded Talcott Parsons' work that is the basis of business school understandings of organizational culture (Gilman, 2003; Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Rockefeller funded the establishment of Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (TIHR) in 1946, from which came inter-alia the Leicester Conference management training processes, and theoretical resources like *The Enterprise and its Environment* (Rice, 1963) and *Systems of Organization* (Miller & Rice, 1967). The international and highly cited journal *Human Relations* was the joint project of the Rockefeller-funded TIHR and the US Research Center for Group Dynamics, which was part of Rensis Likert's Carnegie funded Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan (Burns & Cooke, 2015). Research is, clearly, still required to identify and classify what each philanthropy contributed to management education in its different forms, past and present. What is evident, nonetheless, is that although at present Ford seems pre-eminent in the foundation of business schools, it built on the work of other US foundations in providing the intellectual resources for those schools.

We are conscious of avoiding the teleological fallacy that the present content and shape of management education in USA and beyond is directly and uniquely attributable to philanthropic foundations. Acknowledging Khurana et al.'s (2011) "dominating institutions" description does not mean we accept them as hegemonic in the general use of the term (contra Roelofs, 2015). Rather, our analysis supports the Gramscian, nuanced usage of the term preferred by Parmar (2012; also see the period three below) is more persuasive. In each of the following three sections, we set out the philanthropic interventions in support of management education in each period. These sections, to reiterate, comprise our revelatory sub- contribution. The discussion which follows provides our explanatory sub-contribution; and then in our conclusion, we suggest areas of future research.

PERIOD ONE: ENCOURAGING MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE POST-PROGRESSIVE ERA USA (1920s-1960s)

Although our focus here is on US foundations' programs between 1920s-1960s, the precursor to this period one was Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations' interventions in the late-19th and early-20th centuries. Consequent to the social disruption caused by the rise of large US corporations in the late 19th century, the sciences, professions and universities offered the "structures and rationales" necessary for the re-establishment of social order (Khurana, 2007). This coming together and the subsequent quest for social order was the context in which university-based management education emerged in USA from 1890-1920. But for management education to become an academic discipline worthy of being taught in the country's universities, it needed to shift from its vocational origins to and achieve the status of science (Locke, 1989). It needed, therefore, to "validat[e] its own rationality, disinterestedness, and commitment to commonly held values" (Khurana, 2007: 87). As the leadership of USA's leading collegiate and graduate business schools, including the Deans of Harvard and Michigan reached a consensus about a managerial "science" as the basis of management education and practice in the 1910s (Khurana, 2007), it found a willing supporter in the US philanthropies.

From foundations' point of view, this resonated with scientific philanthropy: investing in "scientific" management research and education to foster practical knowledge and skills deemed useful for commerce and industry. It also provided US foundations with an opportunity to diagnose and manage social upheaval, for example following the 1892 workers' revolt at Carnegie's Homestead Mills and the Ludlow Massacre in 1914, in a seemingly scientific manner: objective and disinterested (Guilhot, 2007; Khurana, 2007; O'Connor, 1999). The Ludlow Massacre, in particular, prompted John D. Rockefeller to take a keen interest in industrial relations. He asked Beardsley Ruml (Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation director from 1922-29) to support Elton Mayo's work (O'Connor, 1999). Both Rockefeller and Ruml wanted to research social problems accompanying industrialization, including those relating to the workforce, industrial conflict and social anomie (Khurana, 2007). US foundations focussed on universities which were already championing educational modernization (Sealander, 2003), including North Carolina, Yale, Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, and Chicago which encouraged new directions of research and training in established fields or even new fields of study altogether. These fields sought to establish their authority by devising means to cope with the continually destabilizing external social context in 1920s and 1930s (see O'Connor, 1999 for a detailed account of Human Relations, for e.g.). We note too that the first ever Organization Development (OD) intervention, where business school faculty integrated and applied Rockefeller Foundation sponsored (Burnes & Cooke, 2013) Tavistock NTL group dynamics/team work, systems theory and action research was at a New Jersey Esso plant in 1958, where "memories of [its] unruly, militant strikes in the 1930s still lingered in the viscera of

(…) the managers and the union men" (Kleiner, 1996: 50). Douglas MacGregor, of Theory X and Y fame, led the intervention.

Despite the interest and financial support from philanthropic foundations, the institutionalization of management education in university-based business-schools in the USA, leading up to WWII, was not an easy or smooth process. While there were periods of considerable success, it was blighted by problems of quality amongst graduates, lack of curricular coherence, quality of teaching resources and personnel issues, among others (Augier & March, 2011). These problems were later consolidated in H. Rowan Gaither Jr.'s 1949 Report, which became the basis of legitimizing US foundations' interventions in management education in the post-WWII USA (Khurana, 2007). Writing of that post-World War II environment, Khurana (2007) identified the increasing threat of communism as contributing to the USA's philanthropic foundations' enthusiasm for promoting research and training in management. In fact, the relation between USA's anti-communism and the development of managerial ideas has a longer trajectory. The Ford Foundation's eponymous founder, Henry Ford, made his impelling anti-communist motivations and their particular relevance for US managerial expertise clear as early as 1922:

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

His continuation makes the parallel to the USA and its managers clear: "The same influence that drove the brains, experience, and ability out of Russia is busily engaged in raising prejudice here. We must not suffer the stranger, the destroyer, the hater of happy humanity to divide our people" (Ford, 1922: 5).

These motivations and the use of management education and practice to thwart communism were enacted by Gaither Jr. (Ford Foundation's President from 1953-56). The Soviet Union's economic growth was perceived as the single biggest threat to the USA, and in need of immediate counter-measures (Schlossman, Sedlak & Wechsler, 1987). Gaither Jr. had already written (1949: 70) that the US economy in its own right, and as a global exemplar "high output, the highest possible level of constructive employment and a minimum of destructive instability". Effective management practice, therefore, had a central role to play by consolidating and promoting the US economy, which was—in turn—essential for preserving and promoting US democracy. Framed in this way, management research and education were oriented towards the international application of best management practice against communism during the Cold War as a patriotic obligation for Americans. In 1958, Gaither Jr. stated: "the Soviet challenge require[d] that we seek out and utilize the best intelligence of American management—and in turn put[...] on management a national responsibility of unparalleled dimensions" (cited from Khurana, 2007: 239-240). Gaither Jr.'s earlier 1949 Report had laid down five key areas of work for the Ford Foundation. Program Area Three related to economic development including improvement in administration of economic organizations and satisfactory labour-management relations; while Program Area Five related to individual behaviour and human relations, "increasing the use of knowledge of human behaviour in [the] professions, and by planners, administrators, and policy makers in government, business, and community affairs" (Gaither Jr., 1949: 91).

Guided by the Report, the Ford Foundation supported a range of management education initiatives. In the decade from 1954 onwards, it disbursed US$35mn. to business schools and related associations in the USA (Carroll, 1959). Ford funded scientific research, its practical applications, and training faculty members to teach and research. As well as improving research, curricula, students, and faculty, the intention was to shape management as a “scientific” discipline, promoting specific epistemological traditions and research methods (Augier & March, 2011; Khurana, 2007; Tadajewski, 2006, 2009). The Ford Foundation invested strategically and heavily in the graduate programs of five leading schools, expected to become exemplars of research-led management education. At Carnegie Tech’s Graduate School of Industrial Relations (GSIA), described as a “poster child of change,” there was an explicit focus on building the disciplinary foundations of management education through sociology, psychology, law and political science (Augier & March, 2011: 123). Indeed, it was anticipated that management would push the boundaries of these foundational disciplines as well, nudging them towards practical application.

During this period, the Pierson (1959) and Gordon-Howell (1959) Reports, commissioned by Carnegie and Ford Foundations respectively, were used to further reform management education. Management education was depicted as in crisis and the remedies were discussed as if they had “emerged independently from systematic research” (Khurana, 2007: 238). The Reports proposed the new graduate-level business education to be led by research-oriented faculty trained in scientific studies of management. Significant, here, was their continuing re-orientation of management as a “science,” no longer driven by cultivated skills of intuition and judgement, but instead by informed, objective decision making; prefiguring the rigor-relevance debate (Gulati, 2007). Although the Gordon-Howell Report (1959) is widely cited as the basis of this debate, McLaren (2018) proposes a counter-history in AMLE. Supporting our point, McLaren cites the influence of the Ford Foundation and the Cold War as key factors re-orienting management education and research toward science. The pillars of the revised curriculum, resulting from foundations' interventions in management education, were: organizational behaviour, economics including understanding of wider economic systems and firm behaviour and performance, quantitative management science including accounting, simulation and statistics to inform managerial decision-making, and study of links between businesses, government and democracy (Carroll, 1959; Khurana, 2007).

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

PERIOD TWO: MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND RECONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE (POST WWII-1980s)

The influence of North American management on Europe was relatively meagre prior to WWII, but since then "there has been a widespread penetration of American approaches to the researching and teaching of management and thus to curricular composition" (Üsdiken, 2004: 88). As part of the European Recovery Program, more popularly known as the Marshall Plan, the USA was involved in the reconstruction of European economy and enhancing its productivity through the transfer of American technology and management (Bjarnar & Kipping, 1998, Carew 1989). The active role of US foundations alongside and subsequent to the Marshall plan in Europe post WWII has been substantially researched; and within this, landmark studies have been conducted on the Americanization of management education in Europe, notably by Carew (1987), Gemelli (1995, 1998), Kieser (2004), and Engwall (2004), Kipping, and Üsdiken (e.g., Kipping, Üsdiken & Puig, 2004; Üsdiken, 2004). Carew shows that the Ford Foundation "became a second home for senior Marshall Plan staff" (1987:195), most notably the Marshall Plan's head Paul G. Hoffman, who succeeded Henry Ford II as the Ford Foundation's president in 1950 (and who later headed the United Nations Development Programme, cf our period three below). Using detailed empirical sources, Carew makes clear that US foundations' involvement was determined by Cold War geo-politics, central to which were the desires to counter Western European communism and establish a trans-Atlantic alliance (Sutton, 1998). He also describes how the US government worked to influence European trades unions towards US style collaborative labour-management collective bargaining. With a shared commitment to productivity improvement at its core, they used educational programs such as those of the ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trades Unions). This, Carew (1987: 82) adds "it seems possible [...] benefitted from (…) funding labelled Ford Foundation (…) when it came from the Michigan Foundation — a CIA front."

Drawing on the Notes drafted by Shepard Stone, the protagonist of the Ford Foundation's European program, Sutton (1998: 27-28) has argued that the program's objectives were to "strengthen efforts to develop a free and democratic society in Europe [through] basic research in social and economic problems, (…) development of schools of business administration; [and] development of the social sciences." The involvement of US foundations in post-War Europe was driven, therefore, by the two key rationales of collaborating with western Europe in holding off the threat of communism and building a common pool of talent (Kieser, 2004). And secondly, the foundations' desire to address specific needs within post-war Europe, particularly the weaknesses within the European social sciences as perceived by US agencies (Sutton, 1998). Robert McNamara, for example, argued that "[m]odern management education - the level of competence, say, of the Harvard Business School is practically unknown in industrialized

Europe" (McNamara cited from Gemelli, 1998: 174). According to Gemelli (1998), Ford Foundation's programs for management in Europe can be classified into two phases. The first, which ran from 1952-1965 was dominated by the twin strategies of Americanization and Europeanization. Staring from 1966, the second phase was centred on the Internationalization of management education. We discuss these next.

Americanization and Europeanization in 1950s-1960s

Starting from the early 1950s, US foundations' early programs focused on building managerial capacity within Europe through education and training, as part of the post-WWII Reconstruction (Engwall, 2004; Gemelli, 1998; Kieser, 2004; Kipping et al., 2004). In Britain, for example, there was growing agreement between the Attlee government and their American counterparts, as part of the Marshall Plan that management practice in the country was in need of reform as it was seen to be lacking the professionalism and dynamism of their American counterparts (Tiratsoo, 2004). The leaders of British enterprises in the 1950s and early 1960s were, Alastair Mant (1979) argued, so psychoanalytically dependent on an idealized myth of the USA that they collectively believed that catastrophe would ensue if its approaches to management education were not pursued. This dependency began in WWII, and was notably deepened by a 1951 visit to the USA by the Marshall Plan-funded Anglo-American Council on Productivity (AACP). Its British members returned "full of glowing and uncritical admiration of the American management education scene" (Mant, 1979: 41). He adds "the British vision of America was built on an East-Coast, British Oriented, Brooks Bros sub-culture" (Mant, 1979: 75).[4]

[4] Brooks Brothers being the archetypal conservative male outfitter, headquartered, like the big three philanthropies, in New York.

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

However, foundations' efforts towards Americanization of management education were not unilateral and did not result in replication (again, a related strand of scholarship has dealt with the challenges to US management models and practices, e.g., Djelic, 1998; Zeitlin, 2000). In an overview of Americanization of management education, Üsdiken (2004) concludes that even though the Americanization of the form of management education (the two-year, generalist, MBA programs for graduates) was less successful, the Americanization of content was far more so. In the United Kingdom, for example, success of Ford Foundation's early efforts was marred by the labelling of US management as totalitarian, anti-American sentiment, and a lack of enthusiasm both from within the industry and the governments in UK at different times

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

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

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

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 world (...) to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens." But alongside this humane mission sat the desire to counter the threat of communism in precisely the same countries where International Development was to provide its material, and, as it immediately appeared, cultural benevolence. This threat was frequently seen to exist alongside, and synonymous with nationalist independence and post-independence movements in formal colonies, and other countries whose colonial subordination was sustained by alternative forms of governance (Escobar, 1995; Sachs, 1992).

Driven by scientific philanthropy (as set up in relation to our first periodization), US foundations explicit aim was to attack the root causes of poverty in the Third World (Parmar, 2012). Poverty, then, was viewed as "part of the study of the economic life of the people as a whole" (Bremner, 1956: 173). Philanthropic foundations' development programs addressed the economic lives of the countries and peoples in need of upliftment. In this, management was seen as particularly crucial to solving the crises of poverty and consequent social unrest (Dar, 2008; Escobar, 1995). Alongside cognate fields such as public administration, town planning, and public policy, management education, in particular, was expected to facilitate the creation of professional competence, leadership capacity and a managerial cadre to serve Third World development (Arnove, 1980; Parmar, 2012). An archetypally imperial model saw in a number of, but not all, Third World countries, civil servants' in the leadership of public-sector industry while private enterprise was either family-run or relied on managing agencies or services of expatriate managers. These forms of enterprise, the International Development narrative stated, required a new pool of competent, well trained, and incorruptible managers (Srinivas, 2008; Staples, 1992). The new managerial cadre was also required for the planning and implementation of International Development programs financed by US foundations and other aid agencies (Dar & Cooke, 2008). In both cases—management for developmental enterprise and management of development interventions in the Third World—US philanthropies were at the forefront. They funded management education institution in the sense of business schools; and also those for specialist forms of management and administration, for example rural development, cooperative management, and public administration (Staples, 1992). The former were intended to provide economic development and cultural modernization, the latter more directly aimed at solving the poverty that had been 'discovered' in the Third World (Escobar, 1995; Srinivas, 2008).

As part of their scientific philanthropy which involved focussing on strategic countries, the US foundations supported programs that aimed at building networks of scholars and universities in "a few of the strategically located and potentially important developing countries" (Bolling, 1982: 1).[5] Of these our focus here is Brazil and India. We acknowledge that this choice results not least from our own prior research interests and the still emergent nature of research on this periodization of philanthropies work which has focused on these countries (e.g. Alcadipani, 2010; Alcadipani & Rosa, 2011; D'Mello, 1999; Srinivas, 2008). The fact is, though, that these were very strategically significant nations for US international relations at the time. Given its size, location, poverty, and the spectre of Nehruvian socialism, India was seen as the "next critical battleground of the Cold War," after China, by Ford's 1950-1953 President Paul G. Hoffman (Sackley, 2012: 237). The links between International Development and its strategic use in the pursuit of US foreign policy and interests in Latin America as part of hemispheric integration and USA's dominance are also well documented (Escobar 1995). Brazil is and was

[5] The International Development aid provided by philanthropic foundations has been similarly directed, by and large, at a small number of middle-income countries and not the poorest nations. These include South Africa, India, Mexico, Brazil and to a lesser extent, Russia (Sulla, 2006).

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

As the post-War period continued, the Ford Foundation led the establishment of the management institutions in Third World countries like India and Brazil (Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Kumar, 2019; Srinivas, 2002, 2008). Collaborating with the government and private sector in India, it supported the training of doctoral students and faculty, faculty exchange, library and curricular development, and consultancy expertise (Hill, Hayes & Baumgartel, 1973). Through professional associations and later the establishment of autonomous management education institutions such as the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) at Calcutta and Ahmedabad in the early-1960s, the Ford Foundation played a significant role in the Americanization of management education in India. Its intense and extensive influence in shaping management education in the country: setting curricula, pedagogy, teaching material, and institutional design, led to the mimicry of form, content, and delivery of US management education (Srinivas, 2008). Even though its influence was less diffuse outside the prestigious IIMs (in whose establishment Ford Foundation played a formative role), its efforts were no less persistent. Drawing on its programs at the Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad and the war over pedagogy, Kumar (2019) has argued that the Foundation's efforts were animated by the perceived need to distinguish US neo-colonialism from British imperialism, the latter being the earlier order. Stigmatizing Henley's pedagogic syndicates, the drawbacks in British and Indian management knowledge, and the deficit of modernity in the latter country, the Ford Foundation appointed staff and consultants who attempted to replace syndicates with Harvard's case method.

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

Speaking of Latin American in-toto, Ibarra-Colado (2006: 468) states that management education, therefore, was "centred on the totalitarian pragmatism of the 'one best way' and the supposed scientific character of a set of logical and highly formalized mathematical knowledge". Noting the colonizing influence of this and in a curious self-implication, Anderson (1987: 9) wrote that "many of them have secured much of their own business education in the US and all of them have been surrounded by and bathed in US models," which had prevented the development of indigenous Brazilian management education. Similar to International Development, then, management education became another site and means of establishing the post-WWII, neo-colonial global order (Escobar, 1995; Kumar, 2019).

Philanthropy and Development Management

The role of US foundations in the globalization of management education in the Third World also came via Development Management (Cooke, 2004). Although often presented as part of progressive change (Thomas, 1999), Development Management has been criticized variously: as continuity of colonial administration (Cooke, 2003, 2004) and as part of the growing professionalization, post-WWII, to counter the threat of communism in Third World (Escobar, 1995); and its role in the emergence of global managerialism, characterized by "de-ideologisation and technisation of decision-making" (Murphy, 2008: 150). Building on these critiques, Cooke and Dar (2008) posit the combination of International Development and managerialism as forming the "dual modernization" of the Third World. Although more frequently attributed to bi- and multi-lateral aid institutions such as US-AID, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Cooke, 2004; Murphy, 2008), this does not detract from the point being made about the US philanthropies and management education, but rather lends it credence. To illustrate, Ford Foundation grants to the Sao Paulo Business School totalled around US$0.6m between 1961 and 1965, a significant amount of money at the time. But alongside this was the even more substantial US$5.5million discussed above for its building, which came from USAID. They functioned, therefore, in consolidating a uniquely American "heritage" in management education (Clegg & Ross-Smith, 2003: 88). The foundations' interventions were guided by the objective of protecting and promoting US soft power in the Third World (Parmar, 2012).

The contribution regarding our periodization in the post-WWII development era Third World is particularly significant in terms of its implications for the shape of management education in the present. International students and faculty are currently a significant part of the global management education community. However, management education has, by and large, failed to engage adequately with the historical and no less problematic involvement of the US foundations and their influence on the history and present shape of the field. AMLE has been prescient in its attention to the history of management education (Bridgman, Cummings & McLaughlin, 2016; Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Cummings & Bridgman, 2016; McLaren, 2018); and we would not have been able to raise this question without its pioneering role. There is, however, clear and extensive scope for considerable further research, a point we now go on to elucidate.

DISCUSSION

The previous three sections, setting out the three periods and the historical logic for their specification, provide what we call the "revelatory" sub-contribution – that is, we showed that there was a rationale for their construction, and in essence revealed what the three periods were, temporally and spatially. In this section, we discuss these relations within and across our periodization to draw out our sub-contribution two - the "explanatory" contribution, where we attempt to account for the periodization in toto – that is the periods together, in terms of their similarities, and patterns within and between them – and within this foundations' motivations and imperatives for their involvement in management education.

Following the social upheaval caused by industrial capitalism, US foundations became a willing partner to the proponents of university-based business schools in the country in reshaping management knowledge, education and practice "scientifically" (Khurana, 2007), particularly as foundations themselves shifted to a scientific philanthropic approach to gift-making (Howe, 1980). The remaking of management education and practice as a science between 1920s-1960s provided the domestic foundation for the consolidation and projection of the US soft power, abroad (Nye, 2004). Tracing US foundations' work generally—like us, first domestically and then, globally—Parmar (2012) has argued that their goals have always been the establishment of US supremacy and re-casting the world in US ways, thus promoting Americanization of and across the globe. This pursuit of the promotion of US soft power has required that the world is systematically reformed: that is saved from communism, nationalism, and isolationism in the Cold War era. The underlying assumption of US philanthropies was of the cultural and economic supremacy of their country, in and of itself, and which also translated into the US's political role of leading the world. Although there has been long-standing recognition of US dominance in management knowledge and education globally (Burrell, 1996 suggested the acronym NATO for North Atlantic Theory of Organizations), the periods we set out draw attention to management education's function in expanding and consolidating US soft power. The interest of the US foundations in management education at home was derived from their understanding that the health of US democracy and economy was related to the quality of its business education through the performance of its business institutions (Khurana, 2007). Placed in its contemporary context, both in the 1920s and 1930s but more intensely in the Cold War period, their programs were informed by and served to build the case for US capitalism against communism and its global expansionism. In addition, Cooke (1999) has demonstrated that managerial rationalism with its commitment to reason and fairness, was seen by US policy makers as providing an ideological and practice alternative to communism. The apparent pro-social justice, egalitarian and meritocratic appeals of communism in patrimonial, undemocratic and corrupt societies was to be countered by the logic of managerialism, showcased domestically, as we shown in our discussion of the first period (also see Escobar, 1995, Cooke & Alcadipani 2015).

Projecting the superiority of US management education abroad, US foundations supported management education programs as part of the European Reconstruction, as discussed in our second period. Whether it was carried out through the twin strategies of Americanization and Europeanization in the 1950s and 1960s in the Western European countries, or through internationalization in the Eastern European Soviet bloc in 1970s, foundations' programs reflected the changing geo-political relations within Europe and internationally; but were conducted strategically with a view to consolidating US soft power (Gemelli, 1998). Elsewhere in the Third World too, foundations' programs for management education were carried out with a view to expanding US soft power. That their development programs were complicit in countering the rising challenge of nationalism in Latin America and the growing threat of communism in Asia and Africa, and the creation and expansion of markets for US production is already well known (Escobar, 1995; Gilman, 2003; Hess, 2003; Parmar, 2012; Sachs, 1992; Sackley, 2012). This was not only peculiar to the big three US foundations from the 20th century, but is corroborated by recent scholarship on present-day large US foundations, most notably the Gates Foundation. McGoey (2015), for example, has shown how the US foundations have engaged in making the rules of national and global governance to maintain their dominance.

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

Development—and we would argue management education too—became, therefore, the means by which the philanthropic foundations functioned to establish and consolidate USA's position at the helm of the neo-colonial global order (Kumar, 2019). Particularly congruent with this analysis is Cooke and Mills' (2008) re-assessment of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which Maslow himself argued was a model of national societal development as well as individual development. It had strong parallels, he claimed, with Rostow's (1990) modernization theory. Research from other fields and disciplines, including cognate disciplines such as economics, behavioral science and marketing, corroborates our claim of the influence of the US foundations and its dense linkages with the dominant political ideology and US foreign interests. albeit at different times and time-scales. In economics, for example, the Carnegie and Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial foundations led in establishing research institutions from the 1920s onwards to gather economic data and promote "scientific" research to diagnose social and political unrest, enhance labour productivity, and capital formation (Bulmer & Bulmer, 1981; Harris et al, 1959: 566). The behavioral sciences, likewise, were similarly enrolled by the Ford Foundation to lead quantitative, positivist, and functionalist research for organizations but also among countries and their international relations (Nodoushani, 2000); and were distinguished from the social sciences, which were seen to resonate with "socialism" (Solovey, 2001). Elsewhere, Tadajewski (2006) has argued for a similar turn towards quantitative positivism in the 1950 and 1960s as a result of foundations' programs, which were shaped by their contemporary Cold War context and the shift towards behavioral sciences. Further afield, Fisher (1983), for example, discusses foundations' influence in sociology as part of promoting American conservatism as an ideology. Similarly, Parmar (2012) has explained foundations' interventions in Area Studies and diffusion of democratic peace theory as part of and informed by contemporary US foreign policy. Relatedly, while the role of foundations in Americanization on management education in specific geographies has been acknowledged (Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015; Üsdiken, 2004), we contribute further in explaining the involvement of the US foundations as part of the country's soft power.

In addition to outlining the links with the US soft power that is common to the three periodizations that we have presented, there is one further similarity. It relates to foundations' posturing of their programs for management research and education as a force of modernization: of economy, industry, government administration, technologies, and management and control of workers, among others. Tracing the uniquely American formulation of "modernization" in the 20th century, Gilman (2003) has argued that post-WWII it began to be used—for the first time ever—in connection with societies. This shift in the use of modernization by US social scientists in the mid-20th century emerged from the most characteristic of American dilemmas: how to define the United States as exceptional and unique, while in the same breath insisting that its example was universal and exemplary. It led the US proponents of modernization to argue that the USA, therefore, "in all its exceptionalist glory, could be a beacon unto the world" (Gilman, 2003: 63). As with the European Reconstruction and later Internationalization, management education as part of International Development was also premised in the cultural, economic and technological superiority of the "West," in our case USA as the neo-colonial power, with modernization as the means of bridging this lag, which it is worth emphasizing was conceptualized in both temporal and spatial sense (Chatterjee, 2011). Science, technology, and social sciences (including management education, here), therefore, offered the means of modernizing the Third World (Escobar, 1995; Seth, Gandhi & Dutton, 1998). Modernization, American exceptionalism and its drive to serve as a "beacon unto the world," therefore, underlay the US philanthropic foundations' programs—and their sponsored elite networks of intellectual resources, researchers, and trainees (Parmar, 2012)—for management education. All of these, ultimately, served American soft power.

INTO THE FUTURE

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

> just as the 19th and early 20th century philanthropists were trying to reduce the opposition between capital and labor by investing in progressive scientific ideologies promising to

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

Historical research on philanthropy such as ours is, therefore, significant, least of all as it helps challenge philanthrocapitalism's claims of newness; but more importantly as it brings into view the relation of philanthropic foundations and other key actors and their interests (McGoey, 2015), such as the US soft power, here. As we have argued, the philanthropic foundations' programs for management education were shaped by the US foreign policy interests in three periods and places. Furthermore, a historical perspective also brings into relief continuities with prior models and mechanisms of philanthropy such as scientific philanthropy and the new kinds of citizen-subjects imagined by it. Lastly, it could be argued that in imagination and in providing the necessary institutional infrastructure, philanthrocapitalism's influential turn to management has been shaped, in some measure, by US philanthropic foundations' scientific philanthropy for management education from nearly a century ago.

Next, we outline potential areas for future research. First and foremost, despite the wider acknowledgement of the role and influence of US philanthropic foundations on management education, the empirical research base, though authoritative, is rather thin. It has concentrated, geographically, on USA, parts of Western and Mediterranean Europe and mainly India and Brazil from among Third World nations. There is, therefore, an urgent need and scope for further archival research from a range of geographical locations (for example, Latin American countries apart from Brazil, Southeast Asia, and Africa) and other historical epochs. The periodized history that we have presented here, whose mutability we have already discussed, can serve as a useful heuristic for further comparative work which, we argue, can be particularly insightful. Future research endeavours will be aided by the relatively easy access to the archives of various foundations. Thus, there is, at present, considerable scope for further research, particularly archival.

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

Thirdly, there is a need to interrogate still other foundations, including those outside USA, and their influence on management education. So far, much of the available research has focused on the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. This is understandable given their markedly international character and the financial resources they have provided towards management education. However, there are other foundations, perhaps smaller, which continue to support management education, albeit on a smaller scale, internationally. Given the particular institutional characteristics of philanthropic organizations: their perceived autonomy and difference from the State, assumed commitment to public good, role in maintaining social order and perpetuating status quo despite claims to the contrary (Fisher, 1983), and the ways in which it is implicated as an outsider in the political outcomes (Parmar, 2012)—the significance of further research on the influential role of private philanthropic organizations from elsewhere cannot be possibly overstated.

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

Fifthly, following from the dominant unilateral narrative of the role of its foundations in re-shaping management in USA and its transfer to other parts of the globe begs the question what existed prior to the domination of positivist, functionalist, application-orientated, quantitative, management education, historically. We need further research on the specific ways and forces, which undermined the practices and theories of management education of the past, and the role of foundations, again, in doing so (Kumar, 2019). And if these educational traditions, curricular resources and pedagogic techniques need to be salvaged and re-claimed in case these are of significance to our present (Cummings & Bridgman, 2011, 2016; McLaren, 2018). Like them, we have shown, using periodization, how a history of Americanization of management education and the role of US foundations prompts us to think differently about their involvement. We would argue that such a re-thinking is crucial to a better understanding of management education theories, practices, pedagogies, and resources; and for which further research is required to identify them and re-instate them in management education, if needs be.

In conclusion, following Cooke and Alcadipani (2015), we would argue that ours is a move "towards a global history" of management education. Global histories, according to Mazlish (1998), are both global in their scale and are histories of contemporary globalization. Informed by which, we have shown both global aspirations and outlined connections between scientific philanthropy, historically, and contemporary global—and we might as well add globalizing—philanthrocapitalism. As a response to the growing uncertainty and constant renegotiation over spatiality and regulation, Middell and Naumann (2010) argue that we need to historicize contemporary globalization in terms of: regimes of territorialization, portals and critical junctures of globalization. The latter two are particularly relevant, here. Portals refer to actors and sites which have served as "entrance points for cultural transfer" (Middell & Naumann, 2010: 162); and critical junctures refer to periods where new spatial relationships are established as part of a new global order. As part of their scientific philanthropy, US philanthropic foundations played an influential role as entrance points: bringing together experts, ideas and financial resources. But more importantly, as we have demonstrated, their efforts need to be understood within their contemporary context as critical junctures in the making of USA's soft power within the global order. At the same time, we recognize the lacunae in this piece: our choice of periodization, as we have outlined, is mutable and further research is needed for the countries concerned, still others in their regions, and furthermore around the globe; including that relating to non-US foundations, alternatives, and modes of resistance. Overall, we would argue that interrogating the histories of philanthropic foundations in disciplining and globalization of management education might help in recovering competing, and possibly contradictory discourses. Through this, we can begin to re-construct alternate histories of the present.

REFERENCES

Alcadipani, R. 2010. From Latin America to the world: Notes on the (possible) Latin American management styles. In A. Guedes, & A. Faria (Eds.), ***International management and International Relations***: 136-158. New York: Routledge.

Alcadipani, R., & Rosa, A. R. 2011. From grobal management to glocal management: Latin American perspectives as a counter-dominant management epistemology. ***Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences***, 28: 453-466.

Anderson, D. 1987. ***Management education in developing countries: The Brazilian experience***. London: Westview Press.

Arnove, R. (Ed.). 1980. ***Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The Foundations at home and abroad***. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Augier, M. & March, J. G. 2011. ***The roots, rituals, and rhetorics of change: North-American business schools after the Second World War***. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bishop, M., & Green, M. F. 2008. ***Philanthrocapitalism: How giving can change the world***. New York: Bloomsbury Press.

Bjarnar, O. & Kipping, M. 1998. The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US management models to Europe: An introductory framework. In M. Kipping & O. Bjarnar (Eds.), ***The Americanisation of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US management models***: 1-17. London: Routledge.

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

Bolling, L. R. 1982. ***Private foreign aid: U.S. philanthropy for relief and development***. Boulder: Westview Press.

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

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.

Carroll, T. H. 1959. A Foundation expresses its interest in higher education for business management. ***The Journal of the Academy of Management***, 2(3): 155-165.

Chatterjee, P. 2011. ***Lineages of political society: Studies in postcolonial democracy***. New York: Columbia University Press.

Clegg, S. R., Ross-Smith, A. 2003. Revising the boundaries: Management education & learning in a postpositivist world. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education***, 2(1): 85-98.

Contardo, I., & Wensley, R. 2004. The Harvard business school story: Avoiding knowledge by being relevant. ***Organization***, 11(2): 211-231.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Escobar, A. 1995. ***Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World***. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kieser, A. 2004. The Americanization of academic management education in Germany. ***Journal of Management Inquiry***, 13(2): 90-97.

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

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

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

Locke, R. R. 1989. ***Management and higher education since 1940***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Locke, R. R. 1996. ***The collapse of the American management mystique***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

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

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

McLaren, P. G. 2018. Stop blaming Gordon and Howell: Unpacking the complex history behind the research-based model of business education. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education***, published online first: https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0311

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rice, A. K. 1963. ***The enterprise and its environment: A system theory of management organization***. London: Tavistock Publications.

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

Rostow, W. W. 1990. ***The stages of economic growth: A non-Communist manifesto***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tiratsoo, N. 1998. Americanization resisted?: US and indigenous influences on the birth of the first British schools. In G. Gemelli (Ed.). ***The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s):***

Cross fertilization of learning in social science and management: 351-372. Brussels: European Interuniversity Press.

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

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

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

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

Truman, H. S. 1949. ***Inaugural address, delivered on January 20, 1949***. Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and Museum, retrieved from https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm

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

Zeitlin, J. 2000. Introduction. In J. Zeitlin & G. Herrigel (Eds.). ***Americanization and its limits: Reworking US technology and management in post-War Europe and Japan***: 1-50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.