This is a so-called personal version (author's manuscript as accepted for publishing after the review process but prior to final layout and copyediting) of the article.

Vaara, E. and Faÿ, E. (2012) Reproduction and Change on the Global Scale: A Bourdieusian Perspective on Management Education. Journal of Management Studies

Researchers are kindly asked to use the official publication in references.

**Reproduction and Change on the Global Scale:
A Bourdieusian Perspective on Management Education**

Professor Eero Vaara
(Corresponding author)
Hanken School of Economics
Department of Management and Organization
Perhonkatu 6B, P.O.Box 479
00101 Helsinki, Finland
Phone: +358 50 3059 359
Email: eero.vaara@hanken.fi

&

EMLYON Business School
Lyon, France

Professor Eric Faÿ
EMLYON Business School
Lyon, France

**Reproduction and Change on the Global Scale:
A Bourdieusian Perspective on Management Education**

Abstract. Despite a proliferation of critical studies on management education, there is a paucity of knowledge of the ways in which problematic beliefs, values and practices are reproduced in and through management education. By drawing on and extending Bourdieu's seminal work, this paper offers a new perspective on reproduction on the global scale. Our framework spans three inter-related levels of analysis: the dominant beliefs, values and practices (nomos and doxa) of management in global society, the structuration of the field of management education on a global scale, and the prevailing pedagogical practices in management education programs. Our analysis adds to critical studies of management education by elucidating the overwhelming institutional forces of reproduction and thus explaining how difficult it is to effect change in the prevailing ideas, values and practices. Unlike most critical analyses, we also explain how change might take place and what it would require. Thus, our analysis advances studies of reproduction in this era of globalization more generally. It also provides an example of how Bourdieusian ideas can be applied and expanded upon in novel ways in research on education in general and management education in particular.

Key words: management education, ideology, field, practice, globalization, capital

**Reproduction and Change on the Global Scale:
A Bourdieusian Perspective on Management Education**

“The insistence with which economic leaders advocate education that is subordinated to their technical and, above all, social (i.e. ethical and political) demands, is a consistent trend which has manifested itself time and time again, both in practice (setting up schools, courses, special coaching, etc.) and rhetoric.” (Bourdieu and St. Martin, 1987, p. 35, our translation)

The expansion of management education during the past 150 years can be seen as one of the greatest success stories in higher education. Especially after the Second World War, we have seen a proliferation of business schools and the development of all kinds of management degrees. Alongside the professionalization of management (Khurana, 2007), management education has started to resemble a global institution (Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor, 2005; Meyer, Ramirez, Frank and Schofer, 2007). Hence, while significant differences exist between countries and universities (Locke, 1989; Mazza, Sahlin-Andersson and Pedersen, 2005), general templates of management education linked with specific beliefs, values and practices are increasingly shared across the globe (Wedlin, 2006).

In recent years, this success story has, however, been strongly criticized. Critical studies of management education, often under the label Critical Management Education (CME), have focused attention on the ethical and ideological concerns associated with management education ranging from short-term profit orientation (Mintzberg 2004; Khurana, 2007) to an overall spread of neoliberal values (French and Grey, 1996; Knights, 2008; Contu, 2009). Critical scholars have also challenged the prevailing pedagogical models and provided new alternatives (Reynolds, 1999;

Cunliffe, Forray and Knights, 2002; Cunliffe and Linstead, 2009; Antonacopoulou, 2010). Furthermore, they have analyzed the ways in which the institutionalization of management education, including rankings (Hedmo, 2004; Wedlin, 2006) and accreditations (Julian and Ofori-Dankwa, 2006; Lowrie and Willmott, 2009), leads to homogenization. Yet this critical stream of research has not fully addressed one of the most fundamental issues: the reproduction of problematic beliefs, values and practices in and through management education. This is unfortunate as it has impeded researchers from understanding how and why management education seems unable to deal with its widely discussed ethical problems and hence to renew itself.

To partially bridge this research gap, the objective of this paper is to provide a systematic analysis of the reproduction of beliefs, values and practices in management education in this era of globalization. For this purpose, we draw from and extend the theories and concepts of Pierre Bourdieu (1988, 1990, 1991, 2000). Bourdieu provides a fruitful basis for such analysis because he argued that education systems tend to reproduce the power position of the elite and the prevailing ideas (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Furthermore, Bourdieu's concepts enable one to connect macro-level structural explanations of social systems with micro-level analysis of learning and socialization and thus to develop multi-faceted understanding of reproduction (Bourdieu, 1990, 2000; Lingard et al. 2009).

However, Bourdieu's ideas and concepts, which were developed with the French education system in mind, cannot be as such applied to management education as a global institution. In fact, apart from rare critical comments on French *grande écoles* such as the one above, Bourdieu never explicitly examined business schools or similar educational institutions. Moreover, although he was a frequent critic of

globalization, his analysis of education focused on the national level. Hence, we need to extend his notions of reproduction in a national sphere to develop an understanding of reproduction as part of globalization. Accordingly, we do not examine the reproduction of the interests of the elite or associated beliefs and values at the national level, but focus on the reproduction of specific beliefs, values and practices that cohere with the interests of the global elite on a global scale. We use the idea of ‘scales’ (Spicer, 2006) to focus on reproduction and change on the global scale rather than focusing attention on regional, national or local specificities or dynamics. To provide a comprehensive analysis of reproduction, we concentrate on three inter-related levels of analysis: the dominant articulated (nomos) or underlying (doxa) beliefs, values and practices of management in global society (society), the structuration of the field of management education on a global scale (field), and the prevailing pedagogical practices in management education (pedagogy).

We first elucidate the institutional forces of reproduction; we argue that management education plays a special role in ideological reproduction by legitimating the interests of the transnational business elite (society), that the field of management education is characterized by convergence on a global scale (field), and that prevailing pedagogical practices tend to reproduce problematic cognitive, linguistic and behavioral dispositions (pedagogy). We then examine the possibilities for change; we propose that change requires reflexivity and striving for academic autonomy globally (society), that the globalization of management education can also imply divergence in terms of alternatives and crossvergence in terms of joint efforts to emphasize ethical consciousness and critical reflection (field), and that pedagogy may be able to

overcome pre-reflexive opposition if it builds on a sense of ‘uneasiness’ and takes subjectivity seriously (pedagogy).

In all, this analysis contributes to critical management education studies by elucidating the overwhelming institutional forces of reproduction and thus explaining how difficult it is to effect change in management education, not to speak of management practices. Unlike most critical studies, we also clarify how change can take place and what it requires. By so doing, we shed light on the forces of transformation that are rarely elaborated on critical analyses. Furthermore, our analysis advances studies of reproduction in this era of globalization more generally. It also provides an example of how Bourdieusian ideas can be applied and expanded upon in novel ways in studies of higher education in general and management studies in particular.

AN OVERVIEW OF STUDIES OF CRITICAL MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

A comprehensive review of research on management education is beyond the scope of this paper, but here we will provide an overview of recent discussions in CME (Contu, 2009). In a nutshell, this literature has focused on six inter-related themes: practical relevance, ethical implications, ideological reproduction, globalization, pedagogical solutions, and institutionalization.¹ First, a key part of this discussion has concentrated

¹This critique has most often focused on the dominant model that has been developed in US business schools and thereafter spread to other countries (Moon, 2002; Mintzberg, 2004; Spender, 2005; Khurana, 2007). However, there are notable differences between business schools and these differences should be emphasized in this context. For example, American and European business schools and respective programs tend to differ in terms of the experience required before entering the programs (Üsdiken, 2004; Wedlin, 2006). Thus, the general critique applying to inexperienced students participating in management education in the US is less relevant for many European programs (Gosling and Mintzberg, 2004). Also, there are immense differences across American schools, the nature of their programs, and the quality of teaching. In Europe, in turn, the criticism tends to focus on the problems encountered when applying US-driven models in other kinds of settings (Wedlin, 2006). Unfortunately,

on the question of whether management education provides knowledge and skills that are practically relevant. Both more mainstream (Leavitt, 1989; Gosling and Mintzberg, 2004, 2006; Pfeffer and Fong, 2002, 2004; Ghoshal, 2005) and critical (French and Grey, 1996; Starkey, Hatchuel, Tempest, 2004) scholars have concluded that the current pedagogical practices are to a large extent inappropriate for effective learning by future managers. In his influential book, Mintzberg (2004) argued that teaching has been overly theoretical and functional and that the role of experience has been downplayed in most current programs. Others have followed suit and reflected on the role of theory and practice in management and education (Ghoshal, 2005). However, the issue of relevance is complicated. Knights (2008) provided an illuminating summary and critical analysis of the discussion on ‘practical relevance’, revealing contrasting arguments in this debate. On this basis, he concluded that excessive emphasis on ‘relevance’ is counterproductive and even dangerous, if and when it leads to a subordination of academic independence to income and status.

Second, these and other researchers have also taken explicit ethical stances (Ghoshal, 2005; Mintzberg, 2004). For example, Ghoshal famously linked management education with Enron and other ethical problems of contemporary managerial praxis (2005). Mintzberg (2004) in turn has argued that management education inculcates unethical behavior in ways that students are unable to recognize. Recently, the financial crisis has raised serious concerns about the role of management education in moral development (Miller, 2009) and about the usefulness of codes of conduct and ethical guidelines (Waples et al., 2009).

studies on the particular features of management education in Asia and other areas are scarce (see, however, Sturdy and Gabriel (2000) and Krishnan (2008)).

Third, providing a more in-depth explanation to the ethical problems, critical management scholars have focused on the ideological basis of management education. Most of these analyses have argued that management education promotes and legitimates neo-liberal values (Parker and Jary, 1995; Prasad and Caproni, 1997; Parker, 2002; Case, 2006; Hendry, 2006; Wong, 2009). In their edited volume, French and Grey (1996) elucidated the historical and ideological foundations of management education emphasizing the central role of neo-liberal values. Grey (2002) in turn explained how management education legitimates managerialism and ‘turbo-capitalism’ with all kinds of problematic implications. Recently, researchers have linked this ideology to the financial crisis; for example, Wong (2009) argued that the roots of the financial crisis lie in neoliberal market fundamentalism reproduced in business education.

Fourth, closely related to the previous theme, scholars have also specifically critiqued the implications of internationalization and globalization. This has been conceptualized as Americanization, cultural imperialism or neo-colonialism (Parker and Jary, 1995; Costea, 1999; Mellahi, 2000). The common thread in these reflections has been to point out that the development of management education has first and foremost meant the spreading of American ideas, beliefs and values; this has implied a poor fit with local challenges as well as the destruction of original concepts. For instance, based on their experiences in Malaysia, Sturdy and Gabriel (2000, p. 986) concluded that “Western management ideas are at the same time fashionable, ‘effective’ and ‘modern’ but also potentially divisive, dangerous and smacking of neo-imperialism.” Krishnan (2008) in turn demonstrated that a fulltime MBA in India enhanced self-oriented values and reduced the importance of others-oriented values.

Fifth, scholars have also focused on pedagogical questions, that is on how to improve the methods of teaching and learning (Cunliffe et al., 2002; Cunliffe and Linstead, 2009). They have mostly drawn from critical pedagogy in adult learning (e.g., Giroux, 1981). Willmott (1994) advocated ‘critical action learning’, Reynolds (1999) called for a ‘critical management pedagogy’ based on in-depth reflection, and Hendry (2006) suggested turning to the humanities to learn how to reconcile opposite demands and to build trustworthiness. Others have underlined using one’s own experiences as a basis for learning. Roberts (1996) argued that students’ own experiences in project teams can be used as an opportunity to reflect on management, Samra-Fredericks (2003) proposed using ‘everyday practice’ – e.g., in the form of recorded conversations – as a basis for learning, and Gosling and Mintzberg (2006) promoted interactive learning based on experience and requiring thoughtful reflection. To avoid future ethical crises, Boyce (2008) called for ethical reflection that is systemic and takes the risks of neoliberal globalization seriously. Wright (2010) emphasized the role of historical understanding and argued that learning from the past can help to prevent problems such as the financial crisis. Antonacopoulou (2010) in turn explained how reflexive critique based on Aristotle’s notion of *phronesis* (practical knowledge) can be taught in business schools.

However, the experiences in advocating critical pedagogy have often been disappointing (Currie and Knights, 2003). For example, Hagen, Miller, and Johnson (2003) described problems in introducing ‘well-intended’ and ‘advanced’ learning methods to students whose expectations are something else. Fenwick (2005) provided another example of the ethical and practical problems in organizing critical interventions that conflict with students’ beliefs and values. Raelin (2009) in turn

argued that pressures to conform to standardized classroom teaching are highly resistant as they are based on long-standing beliefs and traditions.

Sixth and finally, there is a trajectory of theoretical thought focusing on the institutionalization of management education. This has included analyses describing the historical development of management education – or aspects of it – in a critical spirit (Whitley, Thomas and Marceau, 1981; Crainer and Dearlove, 1999; Zald, 2002; Goodrick, 2002; Spender, 2005; Khurana, 2007, Ashcraft and Allen, 2009; Raelin, 2009). For example, in an early analysis, Whitley et al. (1981) studied management education programs in the UK and France and concluded that these programs provide important cultural capital for career progression – that they consequently benefit the elite. Zald (2002) in turn provided a rare reflection on the development of critical thinking in management education. More recently, Khurana (2007) offered an institutional analysis of the professionalization and de-professionalization of management. He concluded that instead of professional ideals, socialization into market capitalism has become the dominant theme in management education.

Important for our purposes, institutional analyses have also examined the spread of management education models internationally (Engwall, 2004, 2007; Mazza et al., 2005). They have most often concluded that this development has involved both standardization but also new kinds of translations and models. Others have focused on the role of rankings and accreditation as mechanisms of standardization in management education. Elsbach and Kramer (1996) provided an insightful analysis of the organizational implications of rankings. Hedmo (2004) and Wedlin (2006) explained how management education is governed by rankings and explained their wider significance for European business schools. Durand and Maguire (2005) and Quinn-

Trank and Washington (2009) focused on the central role of AACSB. This discussion has included harsh criticism. For example, Julian and Ofori-Dankwa (2006) argued that the implications of accreditation may be harmful for the longer-term development of management education. Lowrie and Wilmott (2009, p. 411) in turn elaborated on “the educationally unhealthy consequences of an established regional mode of accreditation becoming an international benchmark for business education consumption.”

These analyses help to explain crucial problems and challenges in management education. However, the fact remains that there is a paucity of knowledge about one of the most fundamental issues: the reproduction of problematic beliefs, values and practices in and through management education on a global scale. By analysis of reproduction, we do not mean ideological critique or institutional analysis of the spread of specific systems or practices per se, but systematic study of the ways in which management education as a global institution tends to reproduce the very problems CME has been pointing to. Such an analysis must deal with multiple forces of reproduction and span several levels of analysis so that we can better understand how exactly management education is linked with prevailing societal ideas and values, how the development of the field itself including rankings and accreditation contributes to reproduction, and how all this is reflected in and reinforced in prevailing pedagogical practices on a global scale. This is why we now turn to Bourdieu, whose work on higher education is highly relevant to a theoretically-grounded systematic analysis of reproduction.

APPLYING AND EXTENDING BOURDIEU’S WORK ON REPRODUCTION

Bourdieu's work has been influential in critical analyses of education (Gunter, 2002; Grenfell and James, 2004; Lingard et al., 2005; Rawolle and Lingard, 2008; Kloot, 2009). Management scholars have also drawn from Bourdieu's ideas and theories (Oakes, Townley and Cooper, 1998; Ramirez, 2001; Mutch, 2003; Everett and Jamal, 2004; Emirbayer and Johnson, 2008; Golsorkhi, Leca, Lounsbury and Ramirez, 2009; Friedland, 2009; Robinson and Kerr, 2009). However, his work has been rarely used in the context of management education (see, however, Whitley et al., 1981; Wedlin, 2006). This is surprising in view of the fact that an essential part of Bourdieu's work has dealt with higher education, elaborating on the specific characteristics and power relations within this field (Bourdieu, 1970, 1988, 1998; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Grenfell and James, 2004; Lingard et al., 2005; Kloot, 2009).

We draw from Bourdieu's studies on educational institutions that provide powerful conceptual tools for analysis of change in management education and of the impediments to it. His key argument is that education is the central node for reproduction of the social order (Bourdieu, 1970; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Thus, a recurrent theme in Bourdieu's work was to explain how the elite succeed in reproducing their power position and the prevailing ideas and values, which is precisely the argument that we use and elaborate on in this paper to understand institutionalized impediments to change in management education. Although authority is granted to academia, their seemingly independent position is historically, culturally, and economically dependent on the elite in society (Bourdieu, 1990). In particular, education tends to reproduce prevailing 'nomos' – "the principle of vision and division of a social order" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 143) – and 'doxa' – "a set of fundamental beliefs which does not even need to be asserted in the form of an explicit, self conscious

dogma” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 15). Bourdieu emphasized that the doxa and nomos appear as ahistorical universals and that people are usually not able to critique the prevailing nomos and doxa (2000, p. 160).

Central in Bourdieu’s analysis is the concept of ‘field’, that is an arena where a group of actors – in our case universities and business schools – strive for similar objectives and follow particular rules (Bourdieu, 1988). Although Bourdieu analyzed the structuring of the French university field, this perspective can also be applied to management education. In Bourdieu’s critical framework, educational institutions and programs are set up not only for the espoused objectives of learning and knowledge production, but to create ‘symbolic capital’ for those who undergo the education process (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Bourdieu, 1991). All this is related to the competition in the field, that is to attempts by educational institutions to be as well positioned as possible in the field and thus linked with as much symbolic capital as possible.

The pedagogical work then leads to the inculcation of ‘habitus’, that is an embodied system of dispositions for perceiving, thinking, feeling, and acting that guide the actions of individuals but does not determine them (Harker, 1984; Mutch, 2003; Reay, 2004). Through habitus, Bourdieu’s analysis provides the mediating connection between the objective (structures of the field) and the subjective (individuals), thus linking the positioning in the field with the dispositions of individual actors (Harker, 1984; Mutch, 2003; Reay, 2004). It is this habitus that provides the micro-level manifestation of both the objectives and the effects of management education.

However, Bourdieu’s ideas cannot be applied directly to management education as a global institution. Hence, we wish to extend his framework in three

ways. First, while Bourdieu provides detailed accounts of the French education system, his approach reflects methodological nationalism. As Bourdieu's own work focused on the French education system, it is not straightforward to apply his ideas to international or global management education, which has largely developed in the US and then spread across the globe. The state-driven French university and *grande école* system and the American and now global market-based business school model have obvious differences that should be taken seriously. Furthermore, Bourdieu's own empirical work was conducted primarily in the 1960s and 1970s, and education has changed a great deal since then (Wedlin, 2006; Khurana, 2007). In this paper, we wish to extend his original ideas to the global scene – which necessitates an understanding that globalization involves several scales (Spicer, 2006). That is, reproduction and change may proceed in different ways on global, regional, national or local scales.

Second, Bourdieu's analysis of fields in general and education in particular can provide a relatively static view on the development of these systems. In contrast, our starting point is to view management education as an emerging and developing global institution (see also Lingard et al., 2005). That is, rather than seeing management education – or its various local, national or global fields – as fixed, we argue that it is fruitful to concentrate precisely on the processes of institutionalization and boundary drawing (see also Wedlin, 2006, for similar arguments about institutionalization of management education). Although such analysis can span several scales, we will in this paper focus on the global level – on the templates, values, beliefs and practices that characterize management education across the globe and reproduction and change in them. This also allows us to reflect on the ways in which this development involves convergence, divergence or crossvergence (Ralston, 2008).

Third, Bourdieu's work has been criticized for an inherent determinism in the form of emphasizing reproductive forces at the expense of agency (Mutch, 2003; Robbins, 2005; Savage, Warde and Devine, 2005). While this is the tendency characterizing Bourdieu's early work, this is not the case in his later work (Bourdieu, 2000). In our analysis, we wish to focus on reproduction but also explore the possibilities for agency and change. Hence, we combine insights of 'early' (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990) and 'later' Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 2000) to provide a better understanding of the conditions under which change is possible. This is the key to understanding both the dynamics of reproduction as well as the ways in which transformation and change can be effected.

This leads us to examine reproduction at three inter-linked levels of analysis: the nomos and doxa of management in global society (society), the structuration of the field of management education on a global scale (field), and the prevailing pedagogical practices in management education programs (pedagogy). We will first focus on the dynamics of reproduction and then turn to consider how change might be effected.

REPRODUCTION IN AND THROUGH MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

So how do the forces of reproduction operate? We will first argue that management education can be seen as part of global ideological reproduction and that the beliefs, values and practices that are in the interests of the elite are reproduced and legitimated in and through management education. Then we will focus on the structuration of management education as a field and argue that positioning of the universities and business schools as well as accreditation and rankings tend to lead to convergence on the global scale. We will then zoom in on pedagogical processes and explain how

management education programs tend to reinforce cognitive, discursive and behavioral and dispositions that people already associate with management. Finally, we will provide a summary model and elaborate on the linkages between these forces operating at the three levels of analysis.

Society: Management education as part of global ideological reproduction

Bourdieu's key argument was that education is the central means for reproduction of the social order and the prevailing understanding of the world (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Bourdieu, 2000). The point is that the established management education institutions reproduce *nomos* (the articulated vision) and *doxa* (fundamental beliefs) in ways that are not arbitrary, but reflect the interests of the elite in society (Bourdieu, 1988; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). This can be understood by historical evolution; societal structures, order, and prevailing ideas and values that have co-evolved and developed over time to support each other (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Thus, the independence of educational institutions is 'relative' (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990), and the positions and very existence of educational institutions in the longer run are economically and culturally dependent on the elite in society (Bourdieu, 1988). In particular, educational institutions are 'pedagogical authorities' that serve to legitimate the current *nomos* and *doxa*. Pedagogical work in educational institutions thus "relies on one of the motors which will be at the origin of all the subsequent investments: the search for recognition" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 166).

We argue that this view is very useful for understanding the development of management education – the history of which can be seen as a struggle for the legitimation and professionalization of 'business' and 'management' (Moon, 2002;

Spender, 2005; Mintzberg, 2004; Khurana, 2007). For example, the first business schools in American research universities were started by local business elites precisely to legitimate the new social and economic order – and their own power position (Mintzberg, 2004; Khurana, 2007). This later led to the institutionalization of business schools as an essential part of the American research university system, which was based – unlike European universities – on funding from local and national business (Khurana, 2007). The history of European business schools is complicated and varies significantly from country to country (Wedlin, 2006). Nevertheless, business schools have flourished in Western Europe since the Second World War (Kieser, 2004; Kipping, Üsdiken and Puig, 2004; Engwall, 2007). Interestingly, when American-type programs were set up in post-war Europe, an underlying motive was a need to legitimate a US-type of market economy in countries where its triumph was not a foregone conclusion (Kieser, 2004; Khurana, 2007). We have seen similar development in Eastern Europe, Asia and other parts of the world more recently.

Bourdieu was somewhat ambiguous in terms of his approach to the concept of ideology. However, his central point about the reproduction of *nomos* and *doxa* in education along with the interest of the elite is essentially an ideological argument. This is also the case with his analysis of ‘symbolic violence’, that is the way the prevailing values that cohere with the interests of the elite are imposed upon people (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). This interpretation of Bourdieu is very helpful as it allows us to better understand why problematic ideas and values related to neo-liberalism are reproduced in management education on the global scale. The key difference is that while Bourdieu focused on ‘state nobility’ in France or nation states more generally (1998), the analysis of the global development of management

education requires an analogous understanding of global nomos and doxa around economic and business activity and global business elites that are no longer defined by their geographical identity (see also Beck, 2000; Castells, 2000).

Moreover, Bourdieu was an outspoken critic of neo-liberalism and the risks of the financialization of society (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2001). His critique resonates very well with the claims of both mainstream scholars regarding the legitimization of ‘unethical practices’ (Mintzberg, 2004; Ghoshal, 2005) and the concerns of critical management scholars about the ideological underpinnings of management education in contemporary capitalism (French and Grey, 1996; Parker and Jary, 1995; Sturdy and Gabriel, 2000; Case, 2006; Hendry, 2006; Wong, 2009). To put it bluntly, according to the Bourdieusian view, the ‘turbo-capitalism’ (Grey, 2002) promoted by management education or the ‘Enronification’ (Ghoshal, 2005) that seems to pass unnoticed are not coincidences, but almost unavoidable outcomes of the new global order

It is important to emphasize that actors involved – including practicing managers, researchers, teachers and students – are seldom able to question the global nomos and doxa. Bourdieu used economics as an example of such naturalization by arguing that economists typically believe in ‘utility’ and ‘rational choice’ but fail to address how the underlying preferences are economically determined and socially shaped (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 160). It is easy to see the parallel in management education where maximization of profits and an instrumental approach to social and human concerns seem to prevail (Ghoshal, 2005).

In Bourdieu’s work, the relative autonomy of education institutions is the key issue in terms of ideological reproduction. On the one hand, to maintain authority, educational institutions are in the long run dependent on the consent of the elite and

their offerings have to meet the espoused (learning) and underlying (legitimation) needs of the elite (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). On the other, going too far in only repeating the commonly held ideas and values undermines the status and position of education institutions as ‘credible knowledge producers’ and challenges their ‘masked independence’ (Bourdieu, 1987, 1998). However, it should be noted that management education runs the special risk of losing its academic autonomy because of its close ties to the business community (Engwall, 2007; Khurana, 2007; Knights, 2008).

Field: Convergence on the global scale

Central in Bourdieu’s analysis is the concept of ‘field’. In academia, universities and schools try to position themselves to be as close to the center of the field as possible (Bourdieu, 1988). Whereas Bourdieu analyzed the structuring of the French academic field, it is possible to extend this view to deal with management education as a global institution. In fact, positioning has become an increasingly salient characteristic of the recent development business schools and universities on a global scale (Wedlin, 2006). Typically, this positioning has meant attempts to follow and even mimic the universities and schools that are in the center of the field internationally – for better or worse (see also Wedlin, 2006). We argue that this convergence is an important piece in the puzzle of why change is so difficult to effect in management education.

In Bourdieu’s framework, positioning deals with capital. Capital provides a linkage to classical work by Weber on status, but also shows Bourdieu’s preoccupation with economic metaphors in describing processes of exchange (Bourdieu, 1990; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). In these processes, cultural, social and other types of capital are exchanged, created, and transformed between social actors. Symbolic

capital is at the nexus of Bourdieu's theorization: it describes the resources the social actors possess on the basis of honor, prestige, or recognition, and functions as an authoritative embodiment of value (Bourdieu, 1990). This capital is what educational institutions create in pedagogical work, what they are paid for, and what the students receive in exchange for their financial and other investments. In Bourdieu's theorization this symbolic capital is linked with 'distinction', that is with what separates those who have undergone specific education from those who have not (Bourdieu, 1996). Thus, the most reputable universities and schools offer the higher promise of symbolic capital and distinction offered through a degree: "The hierarchy of institutions ... is closer to the market value of the academic credentials than any academic value" (Bourdieu and St. Martin, 1987, p. 19).

This focus on symbolic capital leads universities and business schools to focus on the superficial aspects of their offerings – in a way that has been termed 'marketization' (Pfeffer and Fong, 2004; Mintzberg, 2004; Khurana, 2007). Bourdieu warns us that such marketization is precisely the kind of pathological feature that develops when educational institutions sacrifice their relative independence and ideals in exchange for short-term gains (Bourdieu, 1998). Khurana provides an illustrative example of such marketization: "A top business school recently took out a full-page ad in an airline magazine that posed the question "Want a hard-working investment?" The ad then described the value of the school's program in financial terms: "We don't just teach you how to make and manage solid investments, we'll be one. We're proud to say our program was recently named one of the top 10 'MBAs for your buck' by Forbes magazine." (Khurana, 2007, p. 346). Thus, marketization is a primary reason for the de-professionalization and loss of ethical values in management education.

Another, and an arguably deeper level problem is that the production of similar kind of capital may also involve ‘symbolic violence’ (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). That is, by mimicking the leading universities and business schools, others reproduce the prevailing beliefs, values, and dispositions that become taken as legitimate and natural. This reproduction is problematic because it involves either replacement of previous beliefs, values, and dispositions and/or impedes the adoption or development of alternative beliefs, values, and dispositions. On the global scale, it is easy to see how this kind of convergence is linked with problems such as cultural imperialism or neo-colonialism (Parker and Jary, 1995; Sturdy and Gabriel, 2000). However, it is also likely to impede critical reflection more generally.

This convergence has been strongly promoted by the increasingly powerful role of accreditation and rankings of business schools. The role of accreditation has been heavily debated in recent years (Julian and Ofori-Dankwa, 2006; Zammuto, 2008; Moskal, Ellis and Keon, 2008), but most agree they have a significant standardizing impact on the development of management education. The rankings in turn provide explicit arenas to compare positioning and construct hierarchies in management education (Wedlin, 2006). Among others, Elsbach and Kramer (1996) provide examples of the pressures that this development puts on specific universities and business schools in terms of their identity construction and reputation building. For our purposes, it is important to emphasize that accreditation and rankings are explicitly linked with the emergence and development of global management education templates – with its homogenizing effects (Hedmo, 2004; Wedlin, 2006; Quinn Trank and Washington, 2009). Thus, there are strong institutional forces that seem to reinforce current models on the global scale – including the features that have been strongly

criticized (Lowrie and Wilmott, 2009). As Bourdieu and St. Martin put it: “Thus the grandes écoles [e.g., business schools] could be seen as a complex network of specific relationships whereby a certain dominating structure or social space, perceived as a set of objective differences and distances which – to a certain extent – are transferred directly to subjective distances and more or less universally recognized as legitimate, are socially produced and reproduced” (Bourdieu and St. Martin, 1987, p. 46, our translation).

Pedagogy: Reproduction of dispositions in management education programs

Bourdieu emphasized the embodiment of knowledge as a key to understanding pedagogy. At the individual level, primary (childhood) and secondary (education) socialization lead to the inculcation of a set of particular dispositions: a ‘habitus’. The habitus can then be seen as a generative grammar, the basis that individuals draw from in their everyday practice.

Education involves the inculcation of a habitus in the process of socialization (Brubaker, 1993; Bernstein, 1996; Mutch, 2003). In fact, the productivity of pedagogical work can be measured by the distance between the habitus that it intends to inculcate and the dispositions that were previously inculcated (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Bourdieu emphasizes that this socialization often reaffirms already existing dispositions; in particular that educational institutions tend to legitimate and naturalize dominant beliefs, values, and practices (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Thus, we argue that ‘habitus’ provides a needed conceptual tool to analyze socialization in management education – and a way to understand reproduction in and through pedagogical practices.

The habitus inculcated in management education includes interlinked cognitive, discursive, and behavioral dispositions. The cognitive dispositions involve abilities to learn to make sense of the world in a particular way. It is illuminating to reflect on cognitive categories that are internalized as legitimate and natural in management education. Such cognitive dispositions do not emerge out of nothing, but have been learned during primary socialization and then further crystallized and appropriated in management education. For example, the idea that business enterprises should be able to operate with as little societal inference as possible is an ideological

argument that is ingrained by evangelist metaphors of guidance by an invisible hand (McCloskey, 1998) and rationalistic metaphors that simplify the societal or political implications of decisions and actions (Lakoff, 2008). Furthermore, it seems that the overarching cognitive model in management education is to prioritize financial performance over any other concerns. Mintzberg (2004), for example, argued that rather than ‘management’, management education focuses solely on ‘business’. There is an excessive focus on short-term gains at the expense of reflection on the broader problems and challenges faced by the management of business or other organizations. He goes as far as to state that management programs “encourage a style of management that is likewise impatient, aggressive, and self-serving, obsessed with being “on top” to manipulate the “bottom line,” “downsizing” to raise the “shareholder value”” (2004, p. 92).

Such acquired models also involve distinctions of thinking versus doing that originate from modern Western philosophy and have characterized management literature ever since Taylor. Such cognitive disposition legitimate and naturalize the view that management’s role is to be in charge of decision-making and planning while the role of personnel is to implement the decisions and plans (Knights and Morgan, 1991). Furthermore, it is typical to conceptualize people, culture or nature as resources to be exploited. For example, the tradition in human resource management tends to discipline organizational members and lead to a disregard of genuine human experiences (Townley, 1993). Such models tend to construct a sense of superiority and distinction from others as a key part of managerial identity.

The discursive dispositions are interesting since the content of management education consists mostly of new managerial discourses and conceptual frameworks

and the skills that students learn revolve around the rhetoric of decision-making. From a critical perspective, the ability to use the most fashionable managerial jargon provides a means of distinction between those who have completed management education programs and those that have not. Furthermore, convincing and persuasive rhetoric provides students and managers with a way to deal with complex issues in a way that works to their advantage. In his analysis of the French elite schools, Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1988; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990) illustrated how the students learned to “summon quickly ideas” and “to treat issues in an honorable manner” with their discursive skills and thereby to create a positive image, but not necessarily anything else. The same tendency seems to characterize management education where the appearance of ‘knowledge’ or expertise’ may undermine more profound reflection or learning. Moreover, the ability to treat controversial issues in persuasive and convincing but simplistic ways may support ethically questionable ideas and practices (Sturdy, Brocklehurst, Winstanley and Littlejohns, 2006).

Finally, management education also legitimates and naturalizes specific kinds of behavioral dispositions. For example, management education tends to advocate certain types of dress codes and habits that reflect elitist distinction (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997). Without going into details, these habits tend to reinforce the identity of managers as a special class of leaders that have particular rights (e.g., the ability to make decisions in a hierarchical chain of command) and responsibilities (e.g., the prioritization of financial performance and shareholders above anything else). In all, the point is that management education reproduces a myriad of dispositions that form a generative grammar for the future managers. Unfortunately, many of these dispositions

involve problematic tendencies that are difficult to change as they have been internalized, legitimated and naturalized in and around management education.

Thus, at the level of pedagogy, students want to learn what appears to be in their benefit and what they believe that management education programs should provide – even if the programs reinforce problematic dispositions. As has been shown in critical studies of management pedagogy, these expectations are difficult to break (Currie and Knights, 2003; Hagen et al., 2003; Fenwick, 2005; Raelin, 2009; Antonacopoulou, 2010). This is precisely what can be expected from a Bourdieusian perspective that underscores the willingness of students to become like the elite. In the case of management education, it is a question of more or less conscious comparison of the dispositions of (seemingly) successful managers and other members of the elite.

Summary: The system of reproduction

In all, the reproductive forces are multiple and span several levels of analysis, which elucidates how and why management education as a global institution tends to reinforce the very problems that have been pointed out by CME and other scholars (see Figure 1 below).

Insert Figure 1 about here

Prevailing nomos and doxa about management reflect the interests of the global elite, including ethically questionable ideas about business and management. Management education most often serves to legitimate the dominant nomos and doxa rather than being able to challenge problematic beliefs, values and practices. Because of limited

academic autonomy, the development of the field of management education by and large follows the development of global society. In this field, management education institutions tend to focus on symbolic capital (prestige and status) while actual learning or critical thinking are given less emphasis. Thus, universities and business schools usually attempt to position themselves in the center of the field, which leads to standardization on a global scale. This convergence is further strengthened by accreditation and rankings. Because of these pressures, the pedagogical practices of universities and business schools are usually conventional. This means that management education programs tend to reinforce problematic cognitive, linguistic and behavioral dispositions. The inculcation is often voluntary as the students expect to acquire symbolic capital and become like the global elite.

POSSIBILITIES FOR CHANGE IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Having explained how reproduction occurs at three inter-linked levels of analysis (society, field and pedagogy), we now focus on the possibilities for change in management education. Bourdieu's framework is often seen as deterministic as it focuses on the structural features of educational systems that are reproduced over time through pedagogical action. So far, our analysis has emphasized the institutionalized features of this system that help to explain how and why problematic beliefs, values and practices tend to be reproduced. However, it would be a mistake to think that Bourdieusian analysis could not be elaborated on to allow room for agency and change (Harker, 1984; Mutch, 2003; Mutch, Delbridge and Ventresca, 2006). In fact, it is crucial to recall that according to Bourdieu, a degree of autonomy is inherent in both pedagogical action and work. In this spirit, we will in the following focus on the ways

in which one can promote change at our three levels of analysis: promotion of reflexivity and striving for academic autonomy (society), legitimating divergence and crossvergence within the field of management education (field), and overcoming pre-reflexive opposition and development of ethical subjectivity in pedagogy (pedagogy).

Society: Promotion of reflexivity and striving for academic autonomy

Bourdieu's work allows one to view pedagogical work and authority in openly critical terms and thus to promote reflexivity. At the societal level, the crucial issue is to be able to challenge the prevailing nomos and doxa and thus resist ideological reproduction. This kind of change is possible only by striving to maintain and increase the degree of academic autonomy that pedagogical institutions and authorities have despite their dependence on the elite and prevailing nomos and doxa around business and management.

For Bourdieu, who spoke about the crucial role of 'sociology of education' and 'sociology of sociology', the crucial question was to increase awareness of the problems of the reproduction of prevailing societal and institutional orders. In his framework, such reflexivity should focus on exposing 'symbolic violence' (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990), that is the ways in which education imposes people to adopt ideas and values that may not be in their interests, and it also helps to expose some of the underlying ideological concerns in and around management education. Thus, this perspective allows one to focus attention on tendencies such as instrumentalism (Sturdy and Gabriel, 2000; Waples et al., 2010), neocolonialism (Parker and Jary, 1995) or gendered prejudice (Sinclair, 2000; Ropers-Huilman, 2001) that seem to plague management education. Conceptualizing these tendencies as symbolic violence

reveals the ways in which specific beliefs, values, and practices are promoted while others are silenced, censored or denied through pedagogical work and authority. Moreover, exposing such symbolic violence can pave the way to alternative ways of organizing management education.

Bourdieu provided many examples of how to promote reflexivity in education. Overall, he called academics to expose taken-for-granted assumptions that are dominant in society and/or promoted in educational institutions (Bourdieu, 1988), which has also been proposed in the critical discussion around management education (French and Grey, 1996; Mintzberg, 2004; Dehler, 2009). Bourdieu also vehemently criticized the ways in which the selection of students tends to favor those who already have specific dispositions – usually coming from the dominant classes – and place others in a disadvantageous position (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). This concern is acute in management education where a critical discussion of selection and recruiting has been lacking.

In Bourdieu's framework, actors vested with pedagogic authority play a central role in reproduction. At the same time, such actors can also promote and legitimate change at the societal level. Bourdieu's analysis of the French education system provides few examples of such change projects (Bourdieu, 1988; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Bourdieu, 2000). However, he was very explicit in advocating activism (Swartz, 2003; Golsorkhi et al., 2009). In fact, toward the end of his life he was a passionate – and controversial activist – in France who combined critical theoretical reflections with outspoken societal engagement (Lahire, 2001; Corcuff, 2003). In today's mediatized society, such activism can and should involve more international or even global reach.

However, Bourdieu reminds us that societal mobilization is not usually effective unless it focuses on structures that are themselves in crisis. Throughout his work, Bourdieu emphasized the role of disrupting events and crises in the transformation of social systems in general and educational institutions in particular (Bourdieu, 1988, pp. 180-197; 2000). On the one hand, the point was that reproduction will prevail until something extraordinary happens. On the other, such situations would also open up possibilities for change. As he put it: “The symbolic transgression of a social frontier has a liberating effect in its own right because it enacts the unthinkable. But it is itself possible and symbolically effective only if certain conditions are fulfilled. The structures that are contested must themselves be in a state of uncertainty and crisis that favors uncertainty about them and an awakening of critical consciousness of their arbitrariness and fragility” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 236).

This means that opportunities for change in management education may be found precisely in times of crisis – when people are generally exposed to apparent problems in management education or management praxis more generally. It is possible to view the critical discussions around corruption in cases such as Enron or the ongoing global financial crisis as a platform to promote change. Indeed, several critical scholars have precisely argued that the recent crises should lead to a rethinking of management education (Boyce, 2008; Starkey and Tempest, 2009; Wong, 2009; Shiller, 2010). However, as Bourdieu underlined, such crises are not themselves likely to lead to changes unless engaged actors are able to promote alternatives and mobilize forces.

Interestingly, Knights has recently argued (2008) that it is important for the development of management education to maintain epistemological distance between

the business community and the business schools. This emphasis on the relative autonomy is precisely the conclusion that can be drawn from Bourdieu's analysis, but Bourdieu would also argue for another level of distancing, that is a reflexive attitude toward the prevailing tendencies in the academia many of which contribute to the reproduction of problematic ideas, values and practices in contemporary society (Bourdieu, 1988; Bourdieu, 2000).

Field: Legitimation of divergence and crossvergence

Our analysis has so far focused on the strong institutional forces that lead to convergence in the institutionalization of the practices of management education, but it is not the whole picture. This is because the actors within management education have the power to develop the field in and through their own examples and joint efforts. There is – as Bourdieu develops it in his *Pascalian Mediations* (2000) – a significant 'margin of freedom' for those having the 'symbolic power' of producing capital.

This may involve divergence in terms of offering new alternatives. Interestingly, just like analyses of globalization more generally (Mann, 2000; Lingard et al., 2005; Spicer, 2006), studies of management education have pointed out that while the global scene may be favoring standardization, a closer look at national and local contexts show a variety of translations (Segev, Raveh and Farjourn, 1999; Kipping et al., 2004; Wedlin, 2006). As Mazza et al. (2005, 471) put it: "[W]e should not take labels as clearly signifying local practices. Instead, while labels of various kinds seem to travel easily and rapidly across the globe, local variations and distinctions remain." On the one hand, this may mean that the critics may have painted an overly simplistic picture of the current state and future of management education by

discarding the variety of alternatives that already exist. On the other hand, this divergence can also be seen as a worthwhile counter-force to the homogenization effects at the global scale. In the best of cases, this divergence can produce ethically sustainable and reflexive alternatives to the prevailing standards.

However, for the reasons discussed above, it is neither easy to position a university or business school in a way that differs from the prevailing expectation, nor to sell new kinds of programs to students. Bourdieu's notion of capital can, however, help to better understand how such positioning and offering could succeed. The crucial point is that the new alternatives have to be perceived as valuable capital in terms of furthering understanding of current problems or even preventing or helping to solve them. In the cases that this can be achieved, the new alternatives can form a basis for new positioning of universities and business schools and thus transform the field in question or its boundaries – locally, nationally or even globally.

As discussed above, the institutionalization of international management education is strongly affected by rankings and accreditations. The critique of these forces underscores that standardization and homogenization seem to reproduce and even reinforce prevailing fundamental problems in management education and stifle the emergence of new ideas (Julian and Ofori-Dankwa, 2006; Lowrie and Wilmott, 2009). However, accreditation agencies in particular may act as agents promoting change for the better in terms of ethical consciousness and critical reflection in built into management education institutions and programs (see also Moskal et al., 2008; Zammuto, 2008). Ideally, such development can lead to crossvergence (Ralston, 2008), that is to the development of new global templates and values on a global scale.

Thus, our Bourdieusian approach to change does not negate the potential of change initiatives, but helps to put them into perspective. It is not easy to change the institutionalized structures in management education (Raelin, 2009; Starkey and Tempest; Ashcraft and Allen, 2009). Yet there is room for change if it is accompanied by new knowledge framed as potentially valuable capital and/or if central actors in the field – including accreditation agencies – are able to promote new templates and values for management education institutions and programs.

Pedagogy: Overcoming pre-reflexive opposition and taking subjectivity seriously

Bourdieu's argument is that changes in pedagogical work have to be based on some kind of 'discontent' or 'unease' (Bourdieu, 2000; Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Otherwise they will face quasi-instinctive rejection based on a misfit between the suggested new ideas, values and practices and what they perceive as the appropriate habitus of international or global managers (Hagen et al., 2003; Fenwick, 2005; Raelin, 2009). This is because the habitus includes "durable solidarities, loyalties that cannot be coerced because they are grounded in incorporated laws and bonds, those of the *esprit de corps*" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 145). Changes will also be resisted because of a willingness to maintain the status quo and all the capital that one has invested in or started to accumulate.

Hence, change toward critical reflection and ethical consciousness has to be linked with genuine experiences of problems among students gathered in working life or during the process of education. The implication is that rather than playing down problematic experiences – which is often the case with management education that focuses on 'success recipes' – pedagogy aiming at change should build on such

experiences. This new kind of approach appears particularly appropriate in view of the prevailing tendencies that seem to simplify complex social and political issues (see our discussion on dispositions above). By taking the problematic experiences seriously, one can illuminate the discrepancies between the idealized models in management and lived experience in organizations and thus focus attention on ethical dilemmas that otherwise easily pass unnoticed. In this view, teachers who have pedagogical authority should see themselves “acting as symbolic triggers capable of legitimating and ratifying a sense of unease and diffused discontent” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 235). This is the crucial means to promote critical consciousness and reflexivity in Bourdieu’s framework where the acquired dispositions tend to be reproduced in a pre-reflexive manner (Bourdieu, 1990).

Our analysis of reproduction has cast doubt on whether new innovations in curricula or learning methods can bring about change per se. As explained above, their adoption has to be based on the problematization of current ideas, values and practices. This resonates with what some critical management education scholars have already argued for (Grey, 2002; Currie and Knights, 2003; Hendry, 2006; Knights, 2008; Boje and Al Arkoubi, 2009; Contu, 2009). In fact, there are interesting examples of successful pedagogical efforts that build on students’ experiences. Mintzberg’s (2004) call for pedagogy that draws from one’s genuine experiences and interactive learning has inspired many critically oriented change initiatives. Antonacopoulou (2010) has in turn recently described how critical thinking that is linked with one’s own practical experiences can lead to successful learning outcomes. What our analysis underscores is an explicitly critical approach to one’s own experiences to avoid the reproduction of dispositions that would easily be seen as normal or natural.

In Bourdieusian terms, such efforts can lead to ‘ars invendi’, that is a reflexive capacity to develop the dispositions linked with the managerial habitus. Such learning can also involve development of ‘ethical subjectivity’ (e.g., Miller, 2009) – an issue that Bourdieu has not directly addressed in his analyses focusing on habitus and dispositions. However, for example Foucault’s technologies of the self (Foucault, 1993) can complement this picture because they show how conscious development of one’s own subjectivity amidst all kinds of structural constraints and normative pressures is both possible and necessary. This may involve specific reflection and dialogue that a person performs with an aim of becoming an ethical subject. Similarly, for instance Henry’s (1973; 1999) ideas about the desire for a good life with and for others can be part of these kinds of learning processes. In addition to focusing on specific dispositions and self-development, such learning can involve deliberate reflection of the Other. Such learning is not, however, easy as it may involve discarding previous principles and painful assessment of one’s previous actions (Faÿ, 2008). Thus, it is possible to extend Bourdieusian analysis to better comprehend how ethical consciousness can be promoted in management education programs. As mentioned above, there are innovative pedagogical methods that attempt to increase ethical consciousness. Our analysis adds to these methods by an explicit emphasis on all-encompassing critical thinking that both problematizes prevailing dispositions and aims at developing new ethical ones as part of one’s managerial subjectivity.

In all, our Bourdieusian analysis helps to avoid naïve idealism in trying to solve the problems of management education with new content or learning methods. However, extending and elaborating on his initial ideas about the inculcation of dispositions as part of managerial habitus also helps us to see under which conditions

promotion of critical thinking and ethical consciousness may be possible and what it can entail in management pedagogy.

Summary: Change in the system of reproduction

In sum, our analysis points to the ways in which the reproductive forces can be resisted and change initiated and supported at societal, field and pedagogical levels (see Figure 2 below).

Insert Figure 2 around here

At the societal level, it is important to focus attention on the problems in prevailing global management beliefs, values and practices and the way in which management education exercises symbolic violence. Academics can act as critics at national as well as global scales; while this is not easy, it can lead to increasing awareness of the problems, especially in times of crisis. By striving for academic autonomy, the field of management education can develop to a direction that allows for alternatives to the standard models and offerings. This development can include both the legitimization of divergence in terms of alternatives and crossvergence in terms of new, ethically conscious and sustainable models on the global scale. Finally, this development necessitates new pedagogical approaches that aim at overcoming pre-reflexive opposition and development of ethical subjectivity.

CONCLUSION

In spite of a proliferation of critical research on management education (French and Grey, 1996; Khurana, 2007; Knights, 2008; Contu, 2009; Rousseau, forthcoming; Khurana and Spender, forthcoming), there is a paucity of knowledge of the ways in

which problematic beliefs, values and practices are reproduced in and through management education on the global scale. This has hampered the theoretical development of CME but also prevented us from fully comprehending how and why it is so difficult to effect change in management education models, templates and practices despite their shortcomings. In this paper, we have sought to bridge this research gap by drawing from and extending Bourdieu's 1988, 1990, 1991, 2000) seminal work on higher education. In particular, we have developed a multifaceted analytical framework that spans three levels of analysis: the dominant beliefs, values and practices (nomos and doxa) of management in global society (society), the structuration of the field of management education on a global scale (field), and the prevailing pedagogical practices in management education programs (pedagogy). The key idea is that to fully understand reproduction, as well as possibilities for change, there is a need to examine the close linkage of management education with the prevailing societal values on the global scale, the forces of convergence, divergence and crossvergence in the field of management of education, and the ways in which cognitive, behavioral and discursive dispositions are inculcated in management education programs. While recognizing the complexity and diversity of forms of management education, we have focused on the global scale to grasp what is happening with or can happen with the general templates, values and practices.

Implications for theory

Our analysis contributes to research in CME by elucidating the overwhelming institutional forces of reproduction and thus explaining how difficult it is to effect change in the prevailing ideas, values and practices. Most importantly, our analysis

brings together macro-level ideological analysis, meso-level analysis of the educational field and micro-level analysis of practices and dispositions. Each of these explanations adds a piece to the puzzle of understanding reproduction in and through management education. Together, they demonstrate the overwhelming structural and systemic impediments to renewal. Our framework thus helps to explain why it is so difficult to successfully change management education, not to speak of management praxis.

Unlike most critical analyses (French and Grey, 1996; Khurana, 2007; Knights, 2008; Lowrie and Willmott, 2009), we also explain how and under which conditions reproduction may be resisted and change can take place. In this view, universities and business schools operate in a highly structured system, but nevertheless have a margin of freedom to do things differently. Thus, it is possible to resist the forces of reproduction and initiate change. Such efforts can and must span critique at the societal level, efforts to promote new alternatives for academic institutions in management education, and promotion of pedagogical approaches and methods that build on critical consciousness and ethical subjectivity. However, as our analysis, bringing about fundamental change in the global institution of management education is very difficult and usually only happens during special times of crisis.

By so doing, our analysis adds to the institutional studies of management education (Whitley, 1984; Reed and Anthony, 1992; Engwall and Zamagni, 1998; Wedlin, 2006; Khurana, 2007; Raelin, 2009) by spelling out the ways in which institutionalization involves reproduction. Previous institutional analyses have elucidated the ways in which institutionalization shapes management education, but they have tended to provide historical descriptions of institutional development (Wedlin, 2006; Khurana, 2007) or focus on specific aspects of institutionalization such

as the role of rankings (Elsbach and Kramer, 1996; Wedlin, 2006) and accreditations (Durand and Maguire, 2005; Quinn-Trank et al., 2009). To date, this stream of research has lacked theoretical models that would allow one to go a step further in more systematic critical analysis. Our framework does just that by drawing from and extending Bourdieu's provocative but well-established concepts. This allows one not only to point to the various forces of reproduction at several levels of analysis, but also to understand their inter-linkages and systemic effects.

This analysis also specifically contributes to our understanding of reproduction as part of the globalization of management education. While the problematic effects of globalization have received attention in CME (Parker and Jary, 1995; Costea, 1999; Mellahi, 2000), there has been little reflection on how reproduction takes place on the global scale. Our analysis offers a new perspective for this purpose by elaborating analyzing the forces of reproduction as part of the globalization of management education. Importantly, we have expanded the general notion of reproduction that tends to mean the reproduction of the elite and their interests in a given social and geographical space (Bourdieu, 1970; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Our analysis extends this notion to the global scale, which implies focus on the dominant beliefs, values and practices rather than more concrete interests of a given group of people. Thus, we provide a more dynamic perspective that arguably helps to better understand the reproductive forces at play as part of the globalization of management education. It also allows one to move beyond the ideas of a fixed (geographical) elite to an analysis of how management education produces, reproduces and legitimates a new kind of transnational or global management elite. By so doing, this study also adds to the more general discussion in education policy focusing on

effects of globalization on education and the role of education in globalization (Burbules and Torres, 2000; Lingard et al., 2005).

More generally, this analysis provides an example of how Bourdieu's work can be used in studies of management and organizations (Hirsch and Lounsbury, 1997; Oakes et al., 1998). Bourdieu's theories have great potential in terms of providing theoretically grounded tools for critical analysis, but they have not been fully utilized in management and organization studies (Oakes et al., 1998; Ramirez, 2001; Mutch, 2003; Everett and Jamal, 2004; Friedland, 2009). This is undoubtedly related to the complex and sometimes ambiguous nature of Bourdieu's concepts, specific problems due to his focus on the French case in his empirical analyses, as well as to some (usually unfounded) prejudices against his critical approach to sociological analysis. We believe, however, that his conceptual tools can greatly aid in critical analyses of management more generally (Everett, 2002; Emirbayer and Johnson, 2008; Vaughan, 2008; Golsorkhi et al., 2009).

This is not to say that we should adopt Bourdieu's ideas in an uncritical way; we should instead try to see how they can help in shedding more light on specific structural features and masked power relationships in management and organizations. We believe that our extensions to Bourdieu's work can be very helpful in this regard. First, it is important to be able to translate Bourdieu's nation-specific ideas to the global context. As demonstrated, this can be done by focusing attention on different scales (Spicer, 2006). Second, it is also useful to not to conceptualize fields as static arena, but to focus on their dynamics, struggles and boundary drawing (Wedlin, 2006). Third, and most importantly, it is important not to interpret Bourdieu from an overly

deterministic lens, but also to acknowledge the ways in which agency operates and change can take place in his original theorizations (Harker, 1984; Reay, 2004).

Implications for practice

While a significant part of research on management education has focused on the content and methods of learning, we have focused on the bigger picture. Thus, the value of our analysis lies more in the elaboration on the underlying root causes of the problems of management education than in providing straightforward advice as to how to redesign management education. In fact, as our analysis of the overwhelming forces of reproduction shows, there are no quick fixes that would miraculously transform management education on the global scale. Nevertheless, there are means to resist the reproductive forces and ways to initiate change. In fact, our analysis provides clear implications for societal discussion about management praxis, education policy, the strategies of universities and business schools, and the development of management education programs and learning methods.

If anything, our Bourdieusian analysis underscores the importance of critical societal discussion about management praxis. Even if it is very difficult to change prevailing beliefs, values and practices, critical voices are needed to raise awareness of the problems and associated symbolic violence. Bourdieu himself provides an example of academic activism, and one can find more recent examples such as the late Tony Judt's critique of neoliberalism (Judt, 2010). As to management scholars in general and CME scholars in particular, the challenge is to get the critical messages across, beyond the relatively closed circles of critically minded academics. One example is Mintzberg's book "*Managers, not MBAs*" (2004) that triggered a great deal of critical

discussion by questioning the practical relevance and ethical aspects of MBA education. Others should follow suit in popularizing their ideas. In our mediatized global society, such critique can also use new means such as social media to create social movement toward change.

It is easy to critique prevailing education policies, much more difficult to effect change in the national level, not to speak of the global scale. Nevertheless, our analysis clearly indicates that management education, perhaps more so than most other fields, has suffered from a lack of academic independence, which has led to an inability to foster critical thinking about management praxis. The means to coordinate and develop management education are limited on the global scale, but the promotion of the relative autonomy of management education vis-à-vis the interests of the business elite in all kinds of policy-making fora certainly seems like the right thing to do. Moreover, actors such as accreditation agencies could play a new kind of role; instead of agents of homogenization, they could promote alternatives and actively develop and legitimate new ethical ideas and standards.

As to the strategies of universities and business schools, it seems that they have far too often focused on short-term gains and marketization, providing degrees in standard packages. Differentiation has been limited, and alternatives based on critical thinking and new kinds of practices have been scarce. Our analysis, however, indicates that universities and business schools could do otherwise; provide new kind of capital to the students, and thereby create sustainable competitive advantage. Universities, business schools and actors such as accreditation agencies should recognize the value of divergence as well to promote crossvergence in terms of critical thinking and ethical

consciousness. This is of course easier said than done, but the vast field of management education should provide opportunities for differentiation on the global scale.

Our analysis clearly demonstrates that conventional teaching methods are a key part of the reproduction of dominant beliefs, values and practices and problems associated with them. We have instead underscored the capacity for critical thinking and ethical subjectivity. While other scholars (Mintzberg, 2004; Antonacopoulou, 2010), have spoken about the use one's own experiences as a basis for learning, we emphasize the need to problematize one's own and others' experiences to be able to avoid mindless reproduction of the very dispositions that need to be critiqued and changed. Furthermore, problematization should be accompanied with the development of new dispositions as part of ethical managerial subjectivity. It is again easier to argue for change than to change teaching and learning methods, especially as such changes easily go against students' expectations. Nevertheless, our analysis clearly indicates that new learning methods are needed to resist reproduction and that change requires the breaking of self-reinforcing expectations. Importantly, times of crisis – such as the ongoing global financial crisis – tend to increase awareness of problems and senses of discontent and uneasiness and thus provide an opportunity for change.

Ideas for future research

While concentrating on an overall theoretical explication of reproduction and change in management education, we may have paid insufficient attention to the important differences between management education in the US, Europe, Asia and elsewhere. Thus, future research should focus on the processes of transformation, translation or recontextualization in various national and local contexts (for examples, see Engwall, 2004; Kipping et al., 2004; Mazza et al., 2005). Such studies could critically examine

the ways in which the specific translations or hybridizations shape the various fields and sub-fields of management education and redraw boundaries. Such analyses could significantly enrich our understanding of globalization and the role of management education in it (see also Lingard et al., 2005). It would be particularly important to provide examples of how new emerging forms may reproduce or solve some of the problems associated with contemporary management education.

Future studies could also go further in the analysis of how management education links with broader managerial praxis (for similar ideas in CSR, see Scherer and Palazzo, 2011). This could be done by zooming in on specific practices and dispositions and analyzing how they are made sense of and appropriated in academia and praxis. Again it would be helpful to understand both the reproduction and legitimation of prevailing practices and the ways in which novel, hopefully ethical practices are developed and appropriated. In future work, Bourdieu's insights could also be complemented with other theoretical perspectives that would focus more on subjective experiences and their role as a basis for reflexivity, critical thinking and ethical consciousness.

Finally, this study also opens up new avenues in studying reproduction per se. We have extended the notion of reproduction to the global scale to focus on the dominant beliefs, values and practices rather than more concrete interests of a given group of people in a specific space. Future studies could examine how exactly management education contributes to the production and reproduction of new global elite and what it implies in terms of (in)equality, justice and ethical consciousness. Such analyses should focus attention on the various types of trans- and multinational elites and the legitimation of their interests and also examine the 'others' over which

elites attempt to exert power. A particularly interesting issue would be to examine the ways in which multinational corporations and business schools work together to produce specific 'global' interests and identities for the new generations of managers and what this implies for critical thinking or ethical consciousness.

REFERENCES

- Antonacopoulou, E. P. (2010). 'Making the Business School more 'critical': Reflexive critique based on phronesis as a foundation for impact'. *British Journal of Management*, **21**, 6-25.
- Ashcraft, K. L. and Allen, B. J. (2009). 'Politics even closer to home: Repositioning CME from the standpoint of communication studies'. *Management Learning*, **40**, 11-30.
- Beck, U. (2000). 'The cosmopolitan perspective'. *British Journal of Sociology*, **51**, 79-105.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Boje, D. and Al Arkoubi, K. (2009). 'Critical management education beyond the siege'. In Armstrong, S and Fukami, C. *The Sage Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1970). *La reproduction*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Tr. R. Nice, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and de Saint Martin, M. (1987). 'Agrégation et ségrégation', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 69, 2-50.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. - C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (2001). 'New Liberal Speak: Notes on the New Planetary Vulgate', *Radical Philosophy*, **105**, 2-5.
- Boyce, G. (2008). 'The social relevance of ethics education in a global(ising) era: From individual dilemmas to system crises'. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. **19**, 255-290.
- Brubaker, R. (1993). 'Social theory as habitus'. In Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E. and Postone, M. *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burbules, N. and Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Case, P. (2006). 'Management education and the philosophical life: A response to John Hendry'. *Management Learning*, **37**, 283-89.
- Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Contu, A. (2009). 'Critical Management Education'. In Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T. and Willmott, H. *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corcuff, P. (2003). *Bourdieu autrement. Fragilités d'un sociologue de combat*. Paris: Textuel.
- Costea, B. (1999). 'International MBAs and globalisation: celebration or end of diversity?'. *Human Resource Development International*, **2**, 309-311.
- Crainer, S. and Dearlove, D. (1999). *Gravy Training: Inside the Business of Business Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Cunliffe, A. L. and Linstead, S. A. (2009). 'Introduction: Teaching from critical perspectives'. *Management Learning*, **40**, 5-9.
- Cunliffe, A., Forray, J. M., and Knights, D. (2002). 'Considering management education: Insights from critical management studies'. *Journal of Management Education*, **26**, 489-95.
- Currie, G. and Knights, D. (2003). 'Reflecting on critical pedagogy in MBA education'. *Management Learning*, **34**, 27-50.
- Dehler, G.E. (2009). 'Prospects and possibilities of critical management education: Critical beings and a pedagogy of critical action'. *Management Learning*, **40**, 31-49.
- Durand, R. and McGuire, J. (2005). 'Legitimizing agencies in the face of selection: The case of AACSB'. *Organization Studies*, **26**, 165–196.
- Elsbach, K. D. and Kramer, R. M. (1996). 'Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week rankings'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **41**, 442-476.
- Emirbayer, M. and Johnson, V. (2008). 'Bourdieu and organizational analysis'. *Theory and Society*, **37**, 1-44.
- Engwall, L. (2004). 'The Americanization of Nordic management education'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **13**, 109-117.
- Engwall, L. (2007). 'The anatomy of management education'. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **23**, 4-35.
- Engwall, L., and Zamagni, V. (1998). *Management Education in Historical Perspective*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Everett J. (2002). 'Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu'. *Organizational Research Methods*, **5**, 56-80.
- Everett, J. and Jamal, T. B. (2004). 'Multistakeholder collaboration as symbolic marketplace and pedagogic practice'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **13**, 57-78.
- Fay, E. (2008). 'Derision and Management'. *Organization*, **15**, 831-850.

- Fenwick, D. (2005). 'Ethical dilemmas of critical management education: Within classrooms and beyond'. *Management Learning*, **36**, 31-48.
- Foucault, M. (1993). 'About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: Two lectures at Dartmouth'. *Political Theory*, **21**, 198-227.
- French, R. and Grey, C. (1996). *Rethinking Management Education*. London: Sage.
- Friedland, R. (2009). 'The endless fields of Pierre Bourdieu'. *Organization*, **6**, 887-917.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). 'Bad management theories are destroying good management practices'. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **4**, 75-91.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling*. Temple University Press: Philadelphia.
- Golsorkhi, D., Leca, B., Lounsbury, M. and Ramirez, C. (2009). 'Analysing, accounting for and unmasking domination: On our role as scholars of practice, practitioners of social science and public intellectuals'. *Organization*, **6**, 779-797.
- Goodrick, E. (2002). 'From management as a vocation to management as a scientific activity: An institutional account of a paradigm shift'. *Journal of Management*. **28**, 649-668.
- Gosling, J. and Mintzberg, H. (2004). 'The education of practicing managers'. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, **45**, 19-22.
- Gosling, J. and Mintzberg, H. (2006). 'Management education as if both matter'. *Management Learning*, **37**, 419-428.
- Grenfell, M. and James, D. (2004). 'Change in the field – changing the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research'. *British Journal of Sociology*, **4**, 507-523.
- Grey, C. (2002). 'What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education'. *Journal of Management Education*, **26**, 496-512.

- Gunter, H. (2002). 'Purposes and positions in the field of education management'. *Educational Management and Administration*, **30**, 7-26.
- Hagen, R., Miller, S. and Johnson, M. (2003). 'The 'disruptive consequences' of introducing a critical management perspective onto an MBA program: The lecturers' view'. *Management Learning*, **34**, 241-57.
- Harker, R. (1984). 'On reproduction, habitus and education'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **5**, 117-27.
- Hedmo, T. (2004). *Rule-Making in the transnational space: The development of European accreditation of management education*. Doctoral thesis at Uppsala University.
- Hendry, J. (2006). 'Educating managers for post-bureaucracy: The role of the humanities'. *Management Learning*, **37**, 267-81.
- Henry, M. (1973). *The Essence of Manifestation*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Henry, M. (1999). 'Material phenomenology and language'. *Continental Philosophy Review*. **32**, 343-365.
- Hirsch, P. M., and Lounsbury, M. (1997). 'Ending the family quarrel: Towards a reconciliation of "old" and "new" institutionalism'. *American Behavioral Scientist*, **40**, 406-418.
- Judt, T. (2010). *Ill Fares the Land*. London: Penguin Books.
- Julian, S. D. and Ofori-Dankwa, J. C. (2006). 'Is accreditation good for the strategic decision making of traditional business schools?'. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **5**, 225-233.
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as Profession*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Khurana, R. and Spender, J. C. 'Herbert A. Simon on what ails Business Schools: More than 'a problem in organizational design'. *Journal of Management Studies*. Forthcoming.

- Kieser, A. (2004). 'The Americanization of academic management education in Germany'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **13**, 90-97.
- Kipping, M., Üsdiken, B. and Puig, N. (2004). 'Imitation, tension and hybridization: Multiple "Americanizations" of management education in Mediterranean Europe'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **13**, 98-108.
- Kloot, B. (2009). 'Exploring the value of Bourdieu's framework in the context of institutional change studies in higher education'. *Studies in Higher Education*, **34**, 469-481.
- Knights, D. and Morgan, G. (1991). 'Strategic discourse and subjectivity: Towards a critical analysis of corporate strategy in organizations'. *Organization Studies*, **12**, 251-273.
- Knights, D. (2008). 'Myopic rhetorics: Reflecting epistemologically and ethically on the demand for relevance in organizational and management research'. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **4**, 537-552.
- Krishnan, V. R. (2008). 'Impact of MBA education on students' values: Two longitudinal studies'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **83**, 233-246.
- Lahire, B. (2001). *Le travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu. Dettes et critiques*. Paris: Editions La Découverte and Syros.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). *The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century Politics with an 18th-Century Brain*. New York: Viking.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1989). 'Educating our MBAs: On teaching what we haven't taught'. *California Management Review*, **31**, 38-50.
- Lingard, B., Rawolle, S. and Taylor, S. (2005). 'Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu'. *Journal of Education Policy*, **20**, 759-777.
- Locke, R. R. (1989). *Management and Higher Education Since 1940. The Influence of America and Japan on West Germany, Great Britain and France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lowrie, A. and Willmott, H. (2009). 'Accreditation sickness in the consumption of business education: The vacuum in AACSB standard setting'. *Management Learning*, 40(4): 411-420.
- Mann, M. (2000). 'Has globalization ended the rise and the rise of the nation-state?'. In Held, D. and McGrew, A. *The Global Transformations Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mazza, C. Sahlin-Andersson, K. and Pedersen, J. (2005). 'European constructions of an American model: Developments of four MEA programmes'. *Management Learning*, **36**, 471-491.
- Mellahi, K. (2000). 'The teaching of leadership on UK MBA programs: A critical analysis from an international perspective'. *The Journal of Management Development*, **19**, 297-309.
- McCloskey, D. (1998). *The Rhetoric of Economics*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Meyer, J., Ramirez, F., Frank, D. and Schofer, E. (2007). Higher Education as an Institution'. In Gumport, P. *The Sociology of Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miller, R. A. (2009). 'The ethics narrative and the role of the business school in moral development'. *Journal of Business Ethics*. **90**, 287-293.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Moon, H. (2002). *The Globalization of Professional Management Education, 1881-2002: Its Rise, Expansion and Implications*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Moskal, P., Ellis, T. and Keon, T. (2008). 'Summary of assessment in higher education and the management of student-learning data'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **7**, 269-278.

- Mutch, A. (2003). 'Communities of practice and habitus: A critique'. *Organization Studies*, **24**, 383-401.
- Mutch, A., Delbridge, R., and Ventresca M. (2006). 'Situating organizational action: The relational sociology of organizations'. *Organization*, **13**, 607-625.
- Oakes, L. S., Townley, B. and Cooper, D. J. (1998). 'Business planning as pedagogy: Language and control in a changing institutional field'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **43**, 257-293.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against Management: Organisation in the Age of Managerialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Parker, M. and Jary, D. (1995). 'The McUniversity: Organisation, management and academic subjectivity'. *Organization*, **2**, 319-338.
- Pfeffer, J. and Fong, C. T. (2002). 'The end of the business school'. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **1**, 78-95.
- Pfeffer J. and Fong, C. T. (2004). 'The business school "business": Some lessons from the US experience'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **41**, 1502-1520.
- Prasad, A. and Caproni, P. J. (1997). 'Critical theory in management classroom: Engaging power, ideology, and praxis'. *Journal of Management Education*, **21**, 284-291.
- Pratt, M. G. and Rafaeli, A. (1997). 'Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **4**, 862-898.
- Quinn-Trank, C. and Washington, M. (2009). 'Maintaining the legitimacy of legitimating organizations: The institutional work of the AACSB and its constituents in business education'. In Lawrence, T. and Suddaby, R. *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Raelin, J. (2009). 'The practice turn-away: Forty years of spoon-feeding in management learning'. *Management Learning*, **40**, 401-410,

- Ralston, D. (2008). 'The crossvergence perspective: reflections and projections'. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39, 27–40.
- Ramirez, C. (2001). 'Understanding social closure in its cultural context: Accounting practitioners in France (1920-1939)'. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, **26**, 391-418.
- Rawolle, S. and Lingard, B. (2008). 'The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and researching education policy'. *Journal of Education Policy*, **23**, 729-741.
- Reay, D. (2004). 'It's all becoming a habitus: Beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **25**, 431-444.
- Reed, M. and Anthony, P. (1992). 'Professionalizing management and managing professionalization – British management in the 1980s'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **5**, 591-613.
- Reynolds, M. (1999). 'Grasping the nettle: Possibilities and pitfalls of a critical management pedagogy'. *British Journal of Management*, **10**, 171-84.
- Roberts, J. (1996). 'Management education and the limits of rationality: The conditions and consequences of management practice'. In French, R. and Grey, C. *Rethinking Management Education*. London: Sage.
- Robbins, D. (2005). 'The origins, early development and status of Bourdieu's concept of 'cultural capital''. *British Journal of Sociology*, **56**, 13-30.
- Robinson, S. K. and Kerr, R. (2009). 'The symbolic violence of leadership: A critical hermeneutic study of leadership and succession in a British organization in the post-Soviet context'. *Human Relations*, **6**, 875-903.
- Ropers-Huilman, R. (2001). 'Feminist post-structuralism in higher education: Opportunities for transforming teaching and learning'. *Organization*, **5**, 388-95.
- Rousseau, D. M. 2012. 'Designing a better Business School: Channeling Herbert Simon, addressing the critics, and developing actionable knowledge for professionalizing managers'. *Journal of Management Studies*. Forthcoming.

- Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003). 'A proposal for developing a critical pedagogy in management from researching organizational members' everyday practice'. *Management Learning*, **34**, 291-312.
- Savage, M., Warde, A. and Devine, F. (2005). 'Capitals, assets, and resources: some critical issues'. *The British Journal of Sociology*, **56**, 31-47.
- Segev, E., Raveh, A. and Farjourn, M. (1999). 'Conceptual maps of the leading MBA programs in the United States: Core courses, concentration areas, and the ranking of the school'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **20**, 549-565.
- Scherer, A. G. and Palazzo, G. (2011) 'The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **48**(4): 899–931.
- Shiller, R. J. (2010). 'How should the financial crisis change how we teach economics?' *Journal of Economic Education*, **41**, 403-409.
- Sinclair, A. (2000). 'Teaching managers about masculinities: Are you kidding?'. *Management Learning*, **31**, 83-102.
- Spender, J. - C. (2005). 'Speaking about management education: Some history of the search for academic legitimacy and the ownership and control of management knowledge'. *Management Decision*, **43**, 1282-1293.
- Spicer, A. (2006). 'Beyond the convergence-divergence debate: The role of spatial scales in transforming organizational logic'. *Organization Studies*, **27**, 1467-1483.
- Starkey, K., Hatchuel, A. and Tempest, S. (2004). 'Rethinking the business school'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **41**, 1521-31.
- Starkey, K. and Tempest, S. (2009). 'From crisis to purpose'. *Journal of Management Development*. **28**, 700-710.
- Sturdy, A. and Gabriel, Y. (2000). 'Missionaries, mercenaries or car salesmen? MBA teaching in Malaysia'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **37**, 979-1002.

- Sturdy, A., Brocklehurst, M., Winstanley, D., and Littlejohns, M. (2006). 'Management as a (self) confidence trick: Management ideas, education and identity work'. *Organization*, **11**, 841-860.
- Swartz, (2003). 'From critical sociology to public intellectual: Pierre Bourdieu and politics'. *Theory and Society*, **32**, 791-823.
- Townley, B. (1993). 'Focault, power knowledge, and its relevance for human-resource management'. *Academy of Management Review*, **3**, 518-545.
- Üsdiken, B. (2004). 'Americanization of European management education in historical and comparative perspective: A symposium'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **13**, 87-90.
- Vaughan, D. (2008). 'Bourdieu and organizations: The empirical challenge'. *Theory and Society*, **37**, 65-81.
- Waples, E., Antes, A., Murphy, S., Connelly, S. and Mumford, D. (2009). 'A meta-analytic investigation of business ethics instruction'. *Journal of Business Ethics*. **87**, 133-151.
- Wedlin, L. (2006). *Ranking business schools*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Whitley, R. D., Thomas, A. and Marceau, J. (1981). *Masters of Business. Business Schools and Business Graduates in Britain and France*. London: Tavistock.
- Whitley, R. (1984). The scientific status of management research as a practically-oriented social science. *Journal of Management Studies*, **4**, 369-390.
- Willmott, H. (1994). 'Management education: Provocations for a debate'. *Management Learning*, **25**, 105-36.
- Wong, L. (2009). 'The crisis: A return to political economy'. *Critical perspectives on international business*, **5**, 56-77.
- Wright, R. (2010). 'Teaching history in business schools: An insider's view'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. **9**, 697-700.

Zald, M. N. (2002). 'Spinning disciplines: Critical management studies in the context of the transformation of management education'. *Organization*, **9**, 365-385.

Zammuto, R. F. (2008). 'Accreditation and the globalization of business'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **7**, 256-268.

Figure 1 The System of Reproduction in Management Education on a Global Scale

Figure 2 Change in Management Education on a Global Scale