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Adding, transforming, or more?
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Introduction
In this chapter I foreground how the absence of a robust engagement with history in the literature on management education has contributed in part to the abstraction of the knowledge that we teach to our students in business schools. The manner in which we present management knowledge once history and historical context is written-out of the content means that our textbooks are more likely to serve as an intellectual entry point and values-based framework for managerialism than for management. In response to this condition I suggest that the solution is neither simply adding history back in, as some have recommended (Wren, 2005), nor just the re-historicizing of knowledge as others have encouraged (Cummings & Bridgman, 2011; Stager Jacques, 2006). Instead, I argue that we must also give scholars and students the conceptual tools to allow them to develop an historical consciousness. Awareness of how ‘management’ knowledge comes to be created and presented in historical terms will enable us to critically assess the knowledge and theory we deliver and which students are exposed to; whether it is located in the texts used in our classrooms or the popular business press.

I lay out my argument in the following manner. First, I describe some of the past conditions which have contributed to the current ahistorical nature of management and organizational studies (MOS) research and relatedly to management education. Second, I situate the scholarship found at the intersection of history and management education in light of the call for an historic turn. In doing this I wish to highlight the different approaches that have been used to argue for more history in management education and to position these arguments against the management textbook as a pedagogic tool. In the final section, I draw upon the most recent work being undertaken in disciplinary history to demonstrate why instilling an historical awareness in ourselves and our students can serve as an important tool for thinking critically about management and for separating management knowledge from managerialist ideology.

MOS and the loss of history
History and historical consideration of past management and business practices was once intended to be the gateway for the development of a theory of business. At the newly created
business school at Harvard it was believed that the systematic study of the past experiences of business would allow academics and practitioners to move away from the traditions of ‘rule of thumb’ (Donham, 1922a, 1922b) and vocationalism towards a proper science of business (Brown, 1938). However, while this project did bear some academic fruit, e.g. the Harvard Case System, the development of a science of business ultimately based upon history would fail as history as a constitutive element was to be overwritten and then edited out by the arrival of a more scientific approach to the study of business itself (Boothman, 2001; Weatherbee, 2012).

The subsuming of this first historical orientation would result from the interplay of three discourses taking place in the broader social context within which we would see the emergence and development of the professionalized and disciplinary form of MOS in the decade after the Second World War (Augier, March & Sullivan, 2005). These discourses included: the rise of the natural sciences, the growth and legitimization of the Business School/MOS within the university, and finally, the social changes to the normative roles expected of science, technology, and management/management education. All three of these discourses would come to constitute and be constituted by the growth and socio-economic changes taking place in the post-war West.

The notion of ‘Big Science’ arose out of the relationship that had developed between industry and government during the Second World War. This first cooperative impulse was accelerated by the emergence of the Cold War. This period thus saw the intertwining of foreign policy, the economy, and academia on a scale previously unknown in modern times. This relationship would be intensely sustained for several decades as the knowledge-producing capacities in the West, government, industry, and the university, were harnessed for national security purposes (Abella, 2009). This relationship created a new demand-driven approach for research and knowledge production. It shifted national-level resource focus to what was seen as a less risky, more economical, and instrumentally oriented investment model for knowledge production and technological advancement. This new formulation of scientific practice would become the norm within the natural sciences and would eventually spill over into the social sciences as well (Galison & Hevly, 1992; Kinsella, 1999).

While the social sciences had already been moving towards a more functional and quantitative orientation during the first part of the twentieth century (Lasswell, 1951), this shift was accelerated as the social sciences found themselves competing for research funding with the natural sciences in the Cold War context. To compete for attention from government and funding agencies, researchers in the social sciences would increasingly adopt or emulate the methodological practices of experimentation and quantification used in the sciences. These methods would thus grow to become the dominate norm throughout the academy in general (Galison & Hevly, 1992; Kinsella, 1999) and in the social-policy-organization strand of sociology in particular (Wagner, 2001).

As the policy or administrative science branch of sociology was the intellectual conduit through which the study of business would seek to create its disciplinary boundaries (see for example Parsons, 1956a, 1956b) the nascent MOS would follow the methodological pathways carved out by the social sciences. This movement gained significant momentum when business schools reacted to the Ford and Carnegie studies (Carter, 1998; Gordon & Howell, 1959; Pierson, 1959). In order to legitimate their place within the university, business schools rapidly ‘scientized’ themselves in response to the observations and recommendation contained in these reports (McKenna, Cotton & Van Auken, 1997; Nelson, 1961). The escape hatch used by business schools to avoid accusations of continued vocational or trade-schoolism was to vigorously embrace the latest scientific norms and practices (Khurana, 2007).

Therefore, it was in the very emergence and growth of MOS as a separate field of study that management researchers embraced a positivistic and functionalist approach to theory
development and thought (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Weatherbee, 2012). At a time when the Cold War meant that research, policy, and business were expected to work to protect the free nations of the West, the Cold War would also have significant implications for the professionalization of MOS as an academic field, both in terms of how the management academy would structure itself and how management would become perceived in society at large (Genoe McLaren & Mills, 2008; Grant & Mills, 2006).

The academization and professionalization of MOS was reinforced and supported by a third and powerful discourse arising in the Second World War and accelerated by the Cold War afterwards. This was the growing sense, especially in the West, that the benefits of science and technology would be able to provide the technical and economic solutions necessary to address the problems of society (Hodgson, 2000). This belief, coalesced as a cultural orientation located primarily in the United States, would work to promote a world-scale socio-economic system founded on the concept of progress. Politically specific to the Democratic West, economically enabled by the potentials believed to be inherent in technological and scientific progress, this was to be a system where scientific progress would lead to an imagined future where technology and science had resolved all economic and political challenges. A system economically organized by a growing and professionalized class of managers to be harnessed and serve as the free world’s bulwark against the communist threat (Abella, 2009). One consequence amongst many was that the social orientation of the West was now set firmly towards the future (Iggers, 1982); an orientation which rendered cultural and social concerns with history and the past increasingly unimportant.

However, the Janus-faced nature of each discourse was such that while individually providing fertile ground for the explosive growth of business schools and management education, each would also contribute to the exclusion of substantive historical work from MOS research. These would interact to dehistoricize the academy in general (Koselleck, 2002) and MOS specifically (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004).\(^1\) History and historiographic considerations eventually became either ignored, marginalized, or quantized in such a way that historical work in MOS research would be largely restricted to the academic niches of Business Strategy and Business History (Khurana, 2007; Weatherbee, 2012). With the balance of MOS’s disciplinary practices having solidified around scientific theoretical and methodological norms and with history and historiographical concerns confined to these two sub-specialties, the marginalization of history from management education would follow a similar devolutionary path.

Management education and history

A century after the formal tenets of history and the study of business first encountered one another at Harvard, we have seen a renewal of interest prompted by a recent call for reengagement between the two disciplines; what has been coined, by those interested, as an historic turn in MOS (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004; Rowlinson this volume). While there is progress being made in the intellectual space(s) where history overlaps with MOS (Weatherbee et al., 2012) much remains still unexamined and underexplored (Stager Jacques, 2006). This is particularly true when observing the limited body of work located at the crossroads where history and management pedagogy intersect.\(^2\)

While the topic of how and what should be taught to students of management in business schools is one which has spawned lively debates for the last half century (see Bennis & O’Toole, 2005; Cheit, 1985; Donaldson, 2002; Gordon & Howell, 1959; Mintzberg, 2004; Porter & McKibbin, 1988) little of this attention has taken an interest in or focused on history as a component part of management education. The arguments made for the inclusion of history in management education, while persistent, have occupied the attention of only a very small set of
enthusiastic scholars (see the extensive and detailed arguments in Van Fleet & Wren, 2005; Wren, 1987; Wren & Van Fleet, 1983).

Even as the research and scholarly dialogue on history and management education still remains scanty;^3 what there is may be broadly separated into two different camps. While each camp views history as an important element of management education, indeed they are mutually sympathetic in this respect, they do differ as to what they see as the way to resolve the ahistorical condition. Distinctions between the two may be made along both temporal and intellectual contours. Temporally their origins lay on either side of the historic turn in MOS; intellectually they each take a different stance with regard to their theoretical positioning on the relationship between the past world and the historical representations we make of it. More importantly for my intent herein is one final difference. A difference which pivots on the purposes for which history should be used within management in relation to its project in the world, including both its scholarly and pedagogical deployments. For the purposes of this discussion I have loosely categorized each as being either additive or transformative in their orientation towards the use of history and its relationship with the management project and education.

**The adding and/or transforming of history in management education**

The additive approach pre-dates the call for an historic turn (for representative examples see Van Fleet & Wren, 2005; Wren, 1987; Wren & Van Fleet, 1983) and is the more established of the two. This approach was developed in concert with the academization of MOS in the business school and hence its intellectual traditions are firmly founded within the orthodoxies of both MOS and historical scholarship. Though it has been an almost marginalized sub-specialty within MOS, for over four decades now this small group has ardently presented a strong set of arguments identifying history as an essential and synergistic component of MOS education. To this end there have been regularly calls and prescriptions for the inclusion of history to be added at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Bedeian, 1976, 1998; Wren, 1987). Their overall intent has been to contribute to the construction of the history of the development of management thought and theory as a tool through which to inform business students of their theoretical and practical heritage, and to demonstrate the progressive and beneficial contributions made by scholars and notable practitioners of management and business (Wren & Bedeian, 2010).

However, despite the longevity of effort and the persistence of argument for the promotion of an historical agenda within MOS education, the survey studies that have been undertaken reveal that there has been a continuous and steady decline of the presence of management history taught within business programs (Madansky, 2008; Van Fleet & Wren, 2005; Wren & Van Fleet, 1983). So, the present ahistorical condition of management education, which they have meaningfully argued against and so eloquently lamented, continues in an unabated state (Stager Jacques, 2006).

While I have not revisited their detailed arguments in any granularity here, I am in agreement with their basic contention concerning the import of history for students of management. I too believe that there are many and significant benefits to having students understand the history and development of management thought, theory, and practice. I do, however, differ in my theoretical approach towards history and how such history should be deployed and employed within management studies and education. These preferences position the siting of my own ‘tent’ firmly in the bounds of the transformative camp.

Similar to scholars in the additive camp, proponents of the transformative approach are also a relatively small and loosely related group who share a common concern and interest in history, MOS, and management education in combination – to one extent or another. Unlike the
former group, however, this project is a very recent and still emerging stream of inquiry (see for example Cummings & Bridgman, 2011; Durepos, Weatherbee & Mills, 2011; Foster, Helms Mills & Mills, 2014; Mills, Weatherbee & Durepos, 2013). While there is a significantly greater degree of heterogeneity in the methods employed here when compared to the additive approach, transformative orientations are all similarly informed by theory of history and most of the scholarship in this camp intellectually cleaves to tenets of the historic turn in either its weaker or stronger forms. Research here has generally been either contemporaneous with recent developments in the field of history; that is, a movement away from a purely Rankean or realist notion (see Green & Troup, 1999 for a review of the various ‘schools’ of history) of history-work – the stronger form – or has arisen in reaction to the call for the more conventional address of history in MOS – the weaker form. While there are variations in this approach, some is more critical, some more historio-sociological, and some more socio-historical, most are more nuanced in their treatment of the contested nature of the historical representations of management thought and practice.

Thus, the intellectual positioning of the transformative approaches may be seen as trending away from the center where the stronger, more orthodox, and realist formula of history is used to shore the developmental premise of mainstream perspectives of MOS history. In this sense this approach sees a more valuable intersection of history and MOS at the periphery where stronger critique and critical approaches to historical representations of MOS become possible. In this respect the transformative camp shares more common ground with proponents of critical management studies (Alvesson & Wilmot, 1992), critical management education (Grey, 2004), and critical pedagogy (Boje & Al-Arkoubi, 2009) than to the additive approaches.

Though these two approaches diverge in terms of the epistemological and ontological assumptions they each make concerning the nature of the relationship of history to the past world (for a more detailed explanation on the differences between modern realism, postmodern anti-realism, and amodernist approaches to history see Durepos, this volume), they both are endorsing the rehistoricization of MOS. Primarily, by bringing more historical consideration into MOS. As this chapter centers on history at the site of management education, the challenges associated with infusing more history into research published in journals will be set aside in favor of a discussion of the management textbook.

The management textbook, history and ideology

While the textbook has been a key element in the American educational system for over a century it was not until after the Second World War where it would assume the rather hegemonic centrality it now occupies in college and university classrooms (Apple, 1991), a circumstance most especially true for management education in business schools (Cameron et al., 2003a; Stambaugh & Trank, 2010). It was at this time that textbook production became a large-scale industry and a significant actor in post-secondary education as a market formed in response to the sudden and overwhelming growth of enrollment in universities (Whitten, 1975) and business schools (Cheit, 1985). The first two decades after the war was a halcyon period for textbook production; millions of students entered university, business schools curricula blossomed, faculty clamored for teaching materials, and the prospect for profits lured publishers. Such was the rush into the textbook market that the textbook industry, which had but one dominant publisher before the war, had over 50 afterwards (Lichtenberg, 1992).

However, while this growth served to provide the textbooks needed to educate students, it also meant competition for market share became greater and fierce. As the textbook market developed and challenges between publishers heightened, textbook publishers would seek
new ways to garner market share and profits. In their search for an advantage they turned to a new mode of textbook production and in the third decade they would begin to use market rather than pedagogic logic to bring new textbooks to students. During the 1970s the ‘managed textbook’ process would be introduced. This innovation was so successful that it would be very quickly adopted by a majority of the dominant textbook publishers (Geersten, 1977). The managed textbook was a distinctly different approach than the previous author-centric or author-assisted methods. This new process was market-driven rather than subject-driven. It was now a profit-based construct where market forces would determine the content and form of the text and the market would come to supplant the author as the expert. Textbooks became the child of publishers rather than authors.

Using a combination of surveys of competing texts and student focus groups, publishers would seek ever more marketable forms for the presentation of content. Once the publishers had determined the market demand for the features, content, and format of the textbook they would then seek a suitable author or authors to complete the project. Authors would then be contracted to finalize the content, but with publishers retaining oversight and editorial control to ensure that the textbook continued to meet the publisher’s evaluation of market demand. This form of production would result in a publishing environment where the content across texts, even between significant competitor publishing houses, had become so similar that their textbooks were often considered clones of one another (Geersten, 1977).

During this same period, in the United States and Canada, university and college textbooks were becoming the authoritative source of disciplinary knowledge (Weatherbee, Dye & Mills, 2008) in undergraduate education where the content of the textbook had by now become the authoritative ‘final word’ (Graham, 1988). Students in introductory courses were increasingly expected to learn and digest the contents of the textbook and student learning was to be done in a rote fashion as knowledge of the content became the pragmatic gateway to a career after university (Rynes & Trank, 1999). For students the educational experience had now become a serialized pattern. A cycle of: study the textbook – be evaluated on its content – achieve a passing grade – accrue a course credit – repeat as necessary. Finally, accumulate sufficient credits to fulfill the requirements for a certificate, diploma, or degree and then graduate and get a job (Westhues, 1991).

As market logics came to dominate both textbook production and student motivation alike, each served as mimetic pressure for the convergence of the form and content of introductory or popularly adopted textbooks (Cameron et al., 2003b). Cumulatively disciplinary history and historical contextualization of fact and theory development was reduced or removed. Textbooks evolved to become compendiums comprised of similar statements of abstracted fact and theory (Baker, 1988; Hewitt, 1988; Stager Jacques, 2006) presented in a ‘rhetoric of conclusions’ (Schwab, 1962).

Now while history in management texts has yet to completely disappear, what remains has been observed to be truncated in form, prone to error (Wren, 1987), or has been so ‘bowdlerized’ it is of questionable utility (Stager Jacques, 2006). Interested observers from both camps recognize this deficit as the ‘chapter two’ problem (see Gibson et al., 2005; Jacques & Durepos, this volume; Stager Jacques, 2006). However, though each camp laments the loss of history and believes that management education must see history reintroduced, I suggest that there are deeper implications beyond the loss of history in its explicit form. While it is quite clear that management textbooks have lost history presented as history, we also need to attend to the implications of the implicit form as represented by the textbook itself.

Textbooks are conventionally presented as academic works comprised of the objective knowledge of a discipline or subject area which has been accumulated on a scientific basis. For MOS
the textbook presents to a reader our current understanding of what we know of management as a phenomenon in the world. However, as little if any content in university textbooks explains how the knowledge it contains was produced (Schuster, 2013) and with explicit historical considerations removed, textbooks serve as implicit histories. An implicit history is a format for knowledge which conceals its historical nature by absenting the choices previously taken within a discipline, past choices about what knowledge is to be presented and which facts or theories are to be included. Evidence of this may be observed in how knowledge germane to managing has been written in or written out for various socio-political reasons beyond scientific ones (Cooke, 1999, 2003). Thus, as implicit histories management textbooks also represent a distorted form of knowledge. I do not mean distorted in the sense that they may be challenged on the veracity of their rendering of persons and events of a past world nor for containing erroneous, inaccurate, or outdated theory (though some will argue they are that as well). Instead, I use distorted to mean that their implicit form is itself ideological. The textbook is a taken-for-granted set of fact and theory where the beliefs, values, and politics underpinning the text (Goatly, 2007), those of agents and the agential systems responsible for constructing the text, remain hidden behind the objective nature of its form.

While it has been apparent for some time now that business schools are sites of value inculcation (Alvesson, 1984; Seider, 1974) and that textbooks act as carriers of various ideologies (C. W. Mills, 1943), ideology as a function of the implicitness of history has not been well addressed in the pedagogical literature of management studies. Perhaps because the process of textbook production is not well understood by those who teach or learn from them (Apple, 1989)? Yet management texts have not drawn a significant amount of scholarly concern — even when recognized as products of economic markets and being subjected to the political influence of many actors and active agents (see the discussion on this very issue between Cameron et al., 2003a, 2003b; Gilbert, 2003; Mir, 2003)!

So if we are aware that social and cultural determinants contribute to the form and content of a textbook as much as the activities of scientific research (Stambaugh & Trank, 2010) and textbooks promote “visions of legitimate knowledge” (Apple, 1989: 282, emphasis added) which disseminate from textbooks into practice (Miner, 1984, 2003; Weatherbee, Dye, and Mills, 2008), then how should this be addressed in relation to the formulation of history in textbooks. Calling for more history to be added addresses the issue only partly. I suggest that this requires a two-part movement. In the first instance we can choose to study textbooks as implicit historical objects over time. In the second we need to inform ourselves as scholars as to how the production of disciplinary history is used and interpreted inside MOS and management pedagogy. Though there is little effort taken in MOS on the latter, fortunately there has been some headway in the former.

The study of textbooks and their formulations in relation to the historical context of their production has seen some scholarly interest in other related disciplines or specialties, for example sociology (Hewitt, 1988), economics (Watts, 1987), and accounting (Ferguson et al., 2009), and there is a similar and slowly growing literature in MOS. Researchers are attempting to illustrate how the content of management knowledge in textbooks is socio-historically determined and subject to change over time and the implications this has for understanding our own disciplinary formation and its canon. These have included studies of the portrayal of workers across the twentieth century (Foster & Mills, in press) and the changing nature of historical representation and dissemination of notable contributors to MOS thought and theory such as Peter Drucker (Genoe McLaren & Mills, 2008), Max Weber (Cummings & Bridgman, 2011), or of the portrayal of the contributions by other historical management figures such as F.W. Taylor (Payne, Youngcourt & Watrous, 2006), and Abraham Maslow (Dye, Mills & Weatherbee, 2005).
Others work to surface how the contemporary socio-political context is often reflected in the textbook yet remains historically unacknowledged – even given the perfect hindsight of time (Foster, Helms Mills, and Mills, 2014). Still others attempt to surface the processes wherein textbook knowledge is first constructed, reinterpreted, and finally transformed in the management practices outside of business schools has been another focus (Weatherbee, Dye, and Mills, 2008). However, there remains much more work to be done to fully explore the dynamics between MOS research, and the production and use of forms of history in and the management text (Stambaugh & Trank, 2010).

In the second case, how scholars and students do history-work, come to produce, learn, interpret, and deploy historical understanding, has yet to become a significant question in either MOS or its pedagogy. This should not be treated as a surprising circumstance for several reasons. As we have seen, historical consideration has been written out of MOS. Scholars of MOS are rarely trained historians so we remain dominated by an understanding of history derived from our common-sense notions of the relationship between the past world and representations of it (Weatherbee et al., 2012). This common-sense notion could be stated thusly: “a history is the outcome produced in the activities which sustain our effort to determine what happened in the past through the uncovering/discovering the facts of the past world and rendering them in as accurate a fashion as possible to discover the truth of the past.” This is a culturally specific and modernist view of history derived from and reproduced in the tradition of the Western European Enlightenment (Iggers, 1997, 2002; Munslow, 2000). So for those whose intellectual worldview does not consider alternative ways of knowing the world (e.g. postmodern, poststructural, postcolonial, etc.) this is history. I would offer that work in response to the call for an historic turn which, while making progress on its own terms, has yet to have any overall effect on the problematic of the past–history relationship in MOS. Finally, and relatedly, as theory of history lies outside our disciplinary domain the developments within this discipline, especially outside of North America, have not been adequately plumbed. For example, the emerging area of research undertaken in the pedagogy of history to understand forms of history, how they are created, and how they are learned and used (Rusen, 2004, 2005b; Sexias, 2006). In the section which follows I will briefly draw upon these developments to illustrate the work exploring these various modes of historical awareness.

Becoming historically conscious

The possession of historical knowledge is a necessary but insufficient condition for historical understanding (Rusen, 2005a). Knowledge of the past is, in and of itself, simply a collection of ‘facts,’ whether these facts are found in a textbook or an archive. Having a sense of the past, what Lukács defines as a ‘remembered past’ (1968), requires that historical information be given purposive meaning (Carr, 1961). Purposive meaning is only possible when facts are given a temporal orientation (Rusen, 2007c). The act of temporal orientation is that which positions facts in time and space and establishes some form of relationship between the past, the present, and the future. A history then, as distinguished from the narrative of individual memory, is produced when meanings are given to facts. Meanings as mediated via the interpretation of facts presented by various agents and for the purposes to which they are put (Minear, 1940).

While the act of making historical sense may be considered a universal phenomenon, how the knowledge of the past is made sense of, how and why it is transformed into history, is not! The making of history, like the making of a textbook, is a cultural production and learned practice (Rusen, 2007b). Variations in how collectivities, such as a discipline, process historical knowledge, indeed even how they determine what is historical knowledge, depends upon a set of underlying
meta-historical assumptions (Megill, 1994; White, 1973). It is these assumptions that determine how a discipline collects, categorizes, organizes, expresses, and uses knowledge of the past to achieve historical understanding in the present. It is a set of organizing concepts, the assumptions and practices which “educate us on how to know, deal and think about the past” (Liakos, 2010). Conceptualized as Historical Consciousness (Lukács, 1968; Rusen, 1984, 2004) it is the means by which an individual understands, gives meaning to, and relates themselves to the past, present, and future (Rusen, 2007a). Normatively, in the Western tradition, this is achieved by emplotting facts with a narrative structure (White, 1987).

Based upon the study of the development of historical consciousness and the variations in temporal orientation in the construction of history, that is, how cultural conceptions of history and historiography have changed over time, there are at least four modes of thinking in the historical consciousness of the West. These may be considered theoretically derived ‘ideal types’ and each comprises the configurations of meta-historical assumptions and the historical orientations that may be taken towards the past–present–future relationship and the past–history problematic. These configurations manifest as different modes of historical thinking and include the Traditional, Exemplary, Critical, and Genetic types (these descriptions have been synthesized from Megill, 1994; Rusen, 1984, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d; Sexias, 2006). While, in the theoretical fashion of ideal types, there are analytically significant differences between these modes, for example they tend to negate each other, in practice it is possible for them to simultaneously coexist in a culture or collectivity. Also, as there are stronger and weaker forms of historical thinking within each individual mode, it is possible for modes to overlap at the borders.

**Traditional:** In the Traditional Mode, the collective orientation to past–present–future relations is an orientation which is focused upon continuity and conservation of the past in the present. In comparison to other modes, this orientation is essentially conservative and fundamentalist. The significance of history is to be found in the maintenance of traditions and practices associated with the origins of the collective or other significant events of the collective’s past. The primary purpose of history is the preservation and maintenance of traditions over time. The past has a direct relevance for those living in the present as the history establishes and preserves collective identity. The production of history is the grounds for its belief and the collective’s history is highly resistant to change as it is simply taken-for-granted as learned. Public heritage and commemorative understandings (Lowenthal, 2006) are examples of this mode of thinking and orientation. In MOS, we can see this manifest in Heathrow Organizational Theory (Burrell, 1997; Clark & Rowlinson, 2004) and in the forms of history presented in many of our textbooks (Stager Jacques, 2006; Weatherbee, Dye, and Mills, 2008).

**Exemplary:** In the Exemplary Mode, the orientation of the past–present–future is one of progression and progress. This is a more modernist and common-sense form and understanding of history. The past informs the present through an understanding of general rules or laws deduced from the events of the past. It reflects the modern notions of progressive change and social progress made over time. Historical knowledge of the past is considered to be cumulative in nature and so the aggregation and increase in knowledge of the past represents progress. In this regard, the past is considered as a prelude to the present and the present in turn establishes the conditions to determine the future. While events of the past are recognized as having a historicity, the notions of change drawn from the study of past events are themselves considered relatively timeless. This mode of thinking has been and continues to be the dominant mode within Western historical consciousness and it has become a globally hegemonic pattern of understanding and representing the past (Burke, 2002). This approach gives rise to atheoretical or ahistorical forms leading to critiques on the basis of universalism, presentism, or scientism as found in the MOS’ canonical history (Weatherbee & Durepos, 2010).
Critical: In the Critical Mode, and here the term critical while similar is not the same employment as, for example, the use of critical in Critical Management Studies, the concepts of historical continuity and the unity of the past become problematized. This is done through the challenge and questioning of the epistemics of meta-theoretical assumptions and the practices associated with the production and understanding of the past–history relationship. This mode calls into question the validity of extant beliefs in historical precedents by historicizing them and is generally reflexive in epistemic and ontological meta-theoretic terms. Much of the history-work in this mode is premised on the relativism of standpoints and the assumptions of the mediation of reality through narrative and text. In MOS, this may be seen to be present in histories which follow the style of Foucauldian archaeo-geneological studies (Rowlinson & Carter, 2002) or those which privilege narrative and story elements in organizations (Boje, 1991).

Genetic: In the Genetic Mode of thinking, the past–present–future relationship is itself problematized and is understood to be a culturally and temporalized perspective. It is a reflexive mode which holds the most potential for epistemic, ontological, and semantic reflexivity in both meta-theoretic and meta-historical terms. It is also the least developed and is an emergent mode. It is a form of meta-reflexion which recognizes that there are multiple orientations and multiple ways to understand the past and to construct history and that understanding of the past and the practices of history production are outcomes of patterns of historical thinking. In MOS, a recent example of this form of orientation to the past–history relationship and the practice of history-work would be found in the work on ANTi-History, which itself is very recent (Durepos & Mills, 2012; Durepos, Mills & Weatherbee, 2012).

As “historical conventions function … as basic tools of thought” (Ermarth, 2007: 51) the most immediate benefits of the conceptualization of historical thinking may be found in the new and different questions that it invokes in how history is produced and used (Megill, 1994). These questions are equally applicable for the investigation and consideration of the challenges posed to the extant or intended use of history in MOS and management pedagogy. Indeed, these are questions which need to be answered by proponents of either the additive or transformative camps.

Adding, transforming, or more?

I see historical modes of thinking as ways of presenting “the human effort to understand the present and expect the future by understanding and interpreting the past” (Rusen, 2007b: 4). Therefore, analytically, it is insufficient to look at only the content and the form of a history (White, 1987), regardless of the representational form a ‘history’ takes, such as in a textbook. To understand the production and use of history in MOS and management pedagogy we need to look closely at the mode(s) of thinking which produce(s) and use(s) it. We need to surface and interrogate the historical assumptions that are used in the production and consumption in order to understand it as knowledge, as history, and as an outcome of historical thinking. This is important as historical understanding changes attitudes and can move both individuals and collectives to take action and change how we do things in the world (Carpenter, 1995).

Since textbooks are “highly stable and institutionalized” forms of knowledge (Stambaugh & Trank, 2010: 663) and the ideologies they contain are continuously ‘policed’ by the interests of the agents involved in their production, distribution and adoption (Apple, 2000, 2004), adding more of the same form of history potentially only reinforces that ideology by hiding it further behind the rhetoric of scientific conclusions of management. This leads me to conclude that simply adding more history into MOS or management pedagogy will not yield the benefits it is supposed to herald. Adding is an insufficient project in this respect. There is too much evidence...
in the world which runs contrary to the perceived benefits of managerialism and free-market
logics for me to accept otherwise (for one example, see Boje and Saylor, this volume, there are
of course numerous others). In order to change how students see management and avoid this we
must change how we as scholars see management. This will necessitate some historical awareness
on our part.

This is perhaps the greatest potential of historical thinking for MOS. It lies in recognizing
that historical thinking, how we organize and understand the past as a discipline, are only situ-
ated and historical effects (Foucault, 1979). Therefore, we can also change them in the present
or the future. This is an easier project if we are aware that we have changed them in the past.
Thus, transforming how we see history is the escape route from taken-for-granted thinking. I see
re-historicizing management knowledge as holding the potential for a return to understand-
ing managing as a necessary phenomenon and yet a contested concept. However, to avoid the
danger of replacing one ideology with another, we must seek to educate students in reflexive
terms (Grey, 2004), first through understanding how we have organized and managed in the past
and second through understanding how we have created the historical knowledge of that past
understanding.

The activity of organizing is a form of ‘wicked problem’ (Rittel & Webber, 1973) defined
by its very nature: chaotic, complex, and human. Solving wicked problems requires processes
of managing – that is “getting things done through people in organizations” (Locke & Spender,
2011: 174). As our perceptions of the past are always at work within organizations and the per-
sons within them (Warren & Tweedale, 2002) understanding how the past is rendered and pre-
sented should be a critical element of management education. Exposing students to the historical
dimensions of how management knowledge is produced and presented holds the potential to
re-contextualize and re-humanize the management project and counter-balance the ideological
effects of managerialism when masked as management.

Notes
1 Ultimately, MOS would so fervently embrace a scientific and quantitative orientation that some
two decades later it would be assessed as having become overly scientific and analytically oriented
as to make the research being conducted within so abstract as to be irrelevant to practitioners
(Porter & McKibbin, 1988). The debate which coalesced around the issues of academic rigor versus
practical relevance spawned a critique of MOS and its relationship with the business school model
which remains ongoing and unresolved (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Trank & Rynes, 2003; Tushman
et al., 2007).
2 A review of the major educational and history journals in MOS reveals a significant lack of attention
to the conjunctions of history and management education. The study of management education rarely
includes history and the study of history rarely speaks to management education. In the two primary
journals whose intellectual remit is management education – Academy of Management Education and
Learning and the Journal of Management Education – only nine articles which dealt explicitly with the
subject of history could be located. Conversely, in the two MOS journals whose specific focus is his-
tory – Management and Organizational History and the Journal of Management History – only five articles
which explicitly treated with history in management education could be located.
3 I have chosen to use the same term used by Daniel Wren to describe his assessment of the degree and
presence of history in management education over four decades ago in signal of what little has changed
(Wren, 1972).
4 I am not focused on the ideological effects of scientism, universalism, or presentism qua history which
has been discussed elsewhere (see for example Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Cooke, 2006; Cooke, Mills &
Kelley, 2005). Following Prasad & Cavanaugh (1997) I use the critical rather than the descriptive form
of ideology where it is “distorted knowledge” which passes itself off as objective and scientific and “fails
to unveil social contradictions” in its creation rather than simply implying a shared set of beliefs and
values (Prasad & Cavanaugh, 1997: 313)
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