

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

19 **BILL COOKE¹**

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

31
32 **ARUN KUMAR**

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

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

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

Peer Review Proof - Not Final Version

US PHILANTHROPY'S SHAPING OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION IN THE 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

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

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

47 **PERIODIZATION IN HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1
2
3 in the middle of Khurana's (2007) first period of institutionalization of business schools in the
4 USA; but it built on prior efforts by Rockefeller and Carnegie to improve management practice,
5
6 The period concludes at the start of the 1970s, which saw a domestic and international switch
7
8 from the corporatist model of state, business and citizen relations to the all-conquering of
9
10 marketized paradigm (Khurana, 2007; Parmar, 2012). The second period we discuss is Europe
11
12 post-WWII through to the 1980s. Here the initial spatial focus was Western Europe in
13
14 reconstruction post-1946; later this expanded to the then Soviet bloc; and the third period we
15
16 discuss covers philanthropies' efforts to transfer Western modes of management education to the
17
18 Third World² in the name of modernization and International Development.³ This began in the so
19
20 called post-1946 International Development era and ended with the rising dominance of
21
22 neoliberal International Development interventions from 1980 onwards. That dominance is
23
24 ongoing, as yet has no end date, and we write from within it, so that is where our periodization
25
26 ends, for the time being. It is, also, too early to provide a historical analysis. We do not, however,
27
28 propose an "end of history;" our schema can be modified in the future, not least with new periods
29
30 added.
31
32
33
34
35
36

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

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

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

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

31 **PERIODIZATION AS CONTRIBUTION**

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

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

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

42 **Caveats to Our History**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Towards Internationalization in Eastern Europe

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 **Philanthropy and Development Management**

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

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

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

38 **DISCUSSION**

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

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

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

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

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

1
2
3 What we have done, here, is connect and draw attention to the use of management education as
4 part of International Development in the Third World (also see Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015 for a
5 related discussion). It was undertaken through funding networks of ideas and trained scientists,
6 and influencing research in disciplines in particular ways, which were ultimately amenable to the
7 global diffusion of US foreign policy interests (see Parmar, 2012).
8
9
10
11
12
13

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

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

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

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

24 **INTO THE FUTURE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

6
7
8 Second, while our research has focused on the rise of US soft power, and the role of its
9 foundations in this, we would argue that researching from the periphery will open up wider,
10 possibly more revealing, scholarship on the ways by which US soft power was also contested
11 and/or subverted. This will, hopefully, complicate the dominant narrative of Americanization.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 REFERENCES

12
13
14 Alcadipani, R. 2010. From Latin America to the world: Notes on the (possible) Latin American
15
16 management styles. In A. Guedes, & A. Faria (Eds.), *International management and*
17
18 *International Relations*: 136-158. New York: Routledge.

19
20
21 Alcadipani, R., & Rosa, A. R. 2011. From global management to glocal management: Latin
22
23 American perspectives as a counter-dominant management epistemology. *Canadian Journal of*
24
25 *Administrative Sciences*, 28: 453-466.

26
27
28 Anderson, D. 1987. *Management education in developing countries: The Brazilian experience*.
29
30 London: Westview Press.

31
32
33 Arnove, R. (Ed.). 1980. *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The Foundations at home and*
34
35 *abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

36
37
38 Augier, M. & March, J. G. 2011. *The roots, rituals, and rhetorics of change: North-American*
39
40 *business schools after the Second World War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

41
42
43 Bishop, M., & Green, M. F. 2008. *Philanthrocapitalism: How giving can change the world*.
44
45 New York: Bloomsbury Press.

46
47 Bjarnar, O. & Kipping, M. 1998. The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US management models
48
49 to Europe: An introductory framework. In M. Kipping & O. Bjarnar (Eds.), *The*
50
51 *Americanisation of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the transfer of US*
52
53 *management models*: 1-17. London: Routledge.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

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

13
14 Boulder: Westview Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

London: Sage.

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

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

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

1
2
3 Carroll, T. H. 1959. A Foundation expresses its interest in higher education for business
4 management. *The Journal of the Academy of Management*, 2(3): 155-165.

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

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

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

21 Cooke, B. 1999. Writing the left out of management theory: The historiography of the
22 management of change. *Organization*, 6(1): 81-105.

26 Cooke, B. 2003. A new continuity with colonial administration: Participation in development
27 management. *Third World Quarterly*, 24(1): 47-61.

31 Cooke, B. 2004. The management of the (third) world. *Organization*, 11(5): 603–630.

33 Cooke, B., & Alcadipani, R. 2015. Toward a global history of management education: The case
34 of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of business administration, Brazil. *Academy of*
35 *Management Learning and Education*, 14(4): 482-499.

40 Cooke, B., & Dar, S. 2008. Introduction: The new development management. In S. Dar & B.

42 Cooke (Eds.) *The new development management: Critiquing the dual modernization*: 1-17.
43 London: Zed Books

46 Cooke, B., & Mills, A. 2008. The right to be human and human rights: Maslow, McCarthyism
47 and the death of humanist theories of management. *Management and Organizational History*,
48 3(1): 27-47.

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

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

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

16
17
18 Dar, S. 2008. Re-connecting histories: The dual modernization of development management.
19
20
21
22 *Journal of Health Management and Organizations*, 22(2): 93-110.

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

27
28 Djelic, M.-L. 1998. *Exporting the American model: The post-War transformation of European*
29
30
31 *business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

32
33 Engwall, L. 2004. The Americanization of Nordic management education. *Journal of*
34
35
36 *Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 109-117.

37
38 Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*.
39
40
41 Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Gilman, N. 2003. *Mandarins of the future: Modernization theory in Cold War America*.
28 Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

29
30
31
32 Guilhot, N. 2007. Reforming the world: George Soros, global capitalism and the philanthropic
33 management of social sciences. *Critical Sociology*, 33: 447-477.

34
35
36
37 Gulati, R. 2007. Tent poles, tribalism and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in
38 management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 775-782.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

36
37
38 Khurana, R., Kimura, K. and Fourcade, M. 2011. *How foundations think: The Ford*
39 *Foundation as a dominating institution in the field of American business schools*. [Working
40
41 Paper 11-070]. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
42
43

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

48
49
50 Kieser, A. 2004. The Americanization of academic management education in Germany. *Journal*
51 *of Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 90-97.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23
24 Nodoushani, O. 2000. Epistemological foundations of management theory and research
25 methodology. *Human Systems Management*, 19: 71-80.
26
27

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

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

37
38 O'Connor, E. S. 1999. The politics of management thought: A case study of the Harvard
39 Business School and the human relations school. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1): 117-
40
41 131.
42
43

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

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

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

5
6
7 Rostow, W. W. 1990. *The stages of economic growth: A non-Communist manifesto*.

8
9
10 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition.

11
12 Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J., & Decker, S. 2014. Research strategies for organizational history: A
13
14 dialogue between historical theory and organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*,
15
16 39(3): 250-274.

17
18
19 Sachs, W. 1992. Introduction. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to*
20
21 *knowledge as power*: 1-5. London: Zed Books.

22
23
24 Sackley, N. 2012. Foundation in the Field – The Ford Foundation’s New Delhi Office and the
25
26 construction of development knowledge, 1951-1970.” In U. Herbert & J. Leonhard (Eds.).
27
28 *American Foundations and the coproduction of world order in the twentieth century*: 232-60.
29
30 Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

31
32
33 Schlossman, S., Sedlak, S., & Wechsler, H. 1987. The ‘New Look’: Ford Foundation and the
34
35 revolution in business education. In R. R. Locke (Ed.), *Management education*: 139-198.

36
37
38 Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.

39
40 Sealander, J. 2003. Curing evils at their source: The arrival of scientific giving. In L. J. Friedman
41
42 & M. D. McGarvie (Eds.), *Charity, philanthropy, and civility in American History*: 217-239.
43
44 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

45
46
47 Seth, S., Gandhi, L., & Dutton, M. 1998. Postcolonial studies: A beginning... *Postcolonial*
48
49 *Studies*, 1(1): 7-11.

50
51 Solovey, M. 2001. Project Camelot and the 1960s epistemological revolution: Rethinking the
52
53 politics-patronage-social science nexus. *Social Studies of Science*, 31(2): 171-206.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Srinivas, N. 2012. Epistemic and performative quests for authentic management in India.

4
5 ***Organization***, 19(2): 145-158.

6
7
8 Srinivas, N. 2008. Mimicry and revival: The transfer and transformation of management
9
10 knowledge to India, 1959-1990. ***International Studies of Management and Organization***,
11
12 38(4): 38-57.

13
14 Srinivas, N. 2002. Cultivating Indian management: Institutions, subjectivity, and the nature of
15
16 knowledge. In van Iterson et al. (Eds.). ***The civilized organization: Norbert Elias and the future***
17
18 ***of organization studies***: 151-169. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

19
20
21 Staples, E. S. 1992. ***Forty Years: A Learning Curve. The Ford Foundation Programs in India***
22
23 ***1952-1992***. New Delhi: The Ford Foundation.

24
25
26 Sulla, O. 2006. ***Philanthropic foundations: Actual versus potential role in international***
27
28 ***development assistance***. Mimeo, World Bank Global Development Finance Report Group.

29
30
31 Sutton, F. X. 1998. The Ford Foundation and Europe: Ambitions and ambivalences. In G.
32
33 Gemelli (Ed.). ***The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s): Cross fertilization of learning***
34
35 ***in social science and management***: 21-67. Brussels: European Interuniversity Press.

36
37
38 Tadjewski, M. 2006. The ordering of marketing theory: The influence of McCarthyism and the
39
40 Cold War. ***Marketing Theory***, 6(2): 163-199.

41
42
43 Tadjewski, M. 2009. The politics of the behavioral revolution in organization studies.
44
45 ***Organization***, 16(5): 733-754.

46
47
48 Thomas, A. (1999). What makes good development management? ***Development in Practice***, 9(1-
49
50 2): 9-17.

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

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

5
6
7
8 Tiratsoo, N. 2004. The 'Americanization' of management education in Britain. ***Journal of***
9 ***Management Inquiry***, 13(2): 118-126.

10
11
12 Tiratsoo, N., & Tomlinson, J. (1993). ***Industrial efficiency and state intervention: Labour 1939-***
13 ***51***. London: Routledge.

14
15
16
17 Tiratsoo, N., & Tomlinson, J. 1998. ***The Conservatives and industrial efficiencies (1951-1964):***
18 ***Thirteen wasted years***. London: Routledge.

19
20
21 Tosiello, R. J. 2000. Max Ascoli: A lifetime of Rockefeller connections. In G. Gemelli (Ed.).
22 ***The unacceptables: American foundations and refugee scholars between the two wars and***
23 ***after***: 107-140. Brussels: PIE Lang.

24
25
26
27
28 Truman, H. S. 1949. ***Inaugural address, delivered on January 20, 1949***. Harry S. Truman
29 Presidential Library and Museum, retrieved from
30
31 https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm

32
33
34
35 Üsdiken, B. 2004. Americanization of European management education in historical and
36 comparative perspective: A symposium. ***Journal of Management Inquiry***, 13(2): 87-89.

37
38
39
40 Zeitlin, J. 2000. Introduction. In J. Zeitlin & G. Herrigel (Eds.). ***Americanization and its limits:***
41 ***Reworking US technology and management in post-War Europe and Japan***: 1-50. Oxford:
42 Oxford University Press.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60