CHANGING INSTITUTIONS: CRITICAL MANAGEMENT STUDIES AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT ☆

Hugh Willmott

ABSTRACT

Purpose – *To consider Critical Management Studies as a social movement*.

Design/methodology/approach – *The purpose is fulfilled by reflecting upon the history of Critical Management Studies by reference to social movement theory, institutional theory and the social theory of hegemony*.

Findings – *Critical Management Studies is plausibly understood as a social movement*.

☆Earlier versions of this chapter were presented at the Academy of Management Annual Conference, Hawaii, 2005 and at the European Group for Organization Studies Annual Conference, Bergen, 2006 and seminars at Imperial College London and the University of Warwick during 2007. The work involved as a panel member in the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise resulted in the draft being set aside. The invitation to contribute to this volume prompted me to return to it and update it. I would like to thank everyone who has participated in discussing, and providing comments on, the paper and to the editors of this collection for inviting me to contribute to it.

Getting Things Done
Dialogues in Critical Management Studies, Volume 2, 127–167

ISSN: 2046-6072/doi:10.1108/S2046-6072(2013)0000002011

Originality/value – *The chapter offers a fresh perspective on Critical Management Studies by representing it as a movement rather than as a specialist field of knowledge.*

Keywords: Critical Management Studies; ~~management knowledge;~~ management education; institutional change; social movement theory; institutional theory; social theory of hegemony

INTRODUCTION

A resurgence of interest in the relevance of social movement theory for the study of organizations (Davis & Thompson, 1994; Davis, McAdam, Scott, & Zald, 2005; Hambrick & Chen, 2008) has contributed to a wider process of flux and contestation in institutional theory (e.g. Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006; Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004, Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Proponents of institutional theory are wrestling to retain the core idea that organizational behaviour is enacted in and through 'highly elaborated institutional environments' (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 53) while endeavouring to account adequately for innovation and change (e.g. Fligstein & McCadam, 2012; Hirsch & Lounsbury, 1997; Lounsbury, Ventresca, & Hirsch, 2003). To address questions of innovation and change, a number of scholars (e.g. Amenta & Zylan, 1991; Davis, Morrill, Rao, & Soule, 2008; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003) have been drawn to social movement theory, not least as it is attentive to 'how political struggles shape cultural meaning systems and important socio-economic processes' (Lounsbury et al., 2003, p. 72).

This chapter focuses on the field of business knowledge and education; and, more specifically, the de/legitimation of knowledge produced and disseminated in and through business schools. It reflects on how, during the past couple of decades or so, the scope and content of this knowledge has been placed in question by the emergence and insurgence of critical studies of management. Known increasingly by its three letter acronym – CMS – critical management studies (CMS[1]) examined here as an example of what Hensmans (2003) terms a 'challenger Social Movement Organization'. The chapter builds upon Hensmans' (2003) engagement of Laclau's social theory of hegemony (STH) (Laclau, 1990; Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) to develop an appreciation of the role of CMS, as a social movement, in processes of de/institutionalization in the field of business knowledge and education.[2]

Of course, there have always been critics of management knowledge within business schools and more widely (see Grey, 1996). What were previously sporadic criticisms are now articulated in and through a social movement whose core membership is based in business schools but whose concerns resonate with, and can reach out to, activists, policy-makers, politicians, journalists and others ~~who share their concerns~~ (Jones, 2005; see also Reedy, 2008 for a critique). What they share, arguably, is a critical view that 'features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility often turn organizations into instruments of domination and exploitation' ('Domain Statement' for the Critical Management Studies Interest Group on the Academy of Management website: http://aom.pace.edu/cms/About/Domain.htm).

Applying STH, it is acknowledged how the identification of, on the one hand, 'the mainstream' (hereafter 'Mainstream') and, on the other, 'CMS' results from privileging a logic of equivalence so that diversity within each category is unified and polarized.[3] 'Mainstream' and 'CMS' are each 'empty signifiers' (Laclau, 2006) in the sense that they are sufficiently capacious to accommodate a wide~~r~~ range of meanings ~~that are taken to equivalents~~.[4] From an STH perspective, CMS is seen to challenge the objectivity and necessity of the incumbent 'Mainstream' form of business knowledge and education. A distinctive characteristic of STH is its conceptualization of *all* identities – the Mainstream as well as CMS, for example – as *political*. They are 'political' not just, or even principally, in the sense that identities are social constructions rather than natural givens (Berger & Luckmann, 196~~7~~), or because they are considered to lean towards the Left or the Right. Rather, they are political in that identifications are understood to be accomplished and precariously stabilized through hegemonic processes. In this way, the political is placed at the very centre of the social (Laclau, 1990, p. 33). For example, by disclosing the contingency of the Mainstream, CMS associate~~s~~ management with a conception of 'critical' that transgresses the limits of a narrow sense of 'criticality' that is preoccupied with refining and justifying the agenda of the Mainstream, as reflected in the dismissal of CMS by the declaration that 'all good scholarship is critical'. ~~On the one hand, it~~ would be absurd to claim that CMS has a monopoly of criticism within the field of business knowledge and education (see http://maxspeak.org/mt/archives/000818.html#more). ~~See~~, for example, the open letter to George Bush sent by numerous business school professors in October 2004 that highlights the budget deficit, identifies a 'fiscal crisis' and criticizes the divisiveness of the administration's tax policies. What counts as 'critical'/critique is unsettled since it is itself the target of critique. However,

within the Mainstream, criticism tends to be confined to filling in gaps and refining ~~in~~ a comparatively established and 'normalized' body of knowledge. In CMS, in contrast, there is greater emphasis upon problematizing assumptions and boundaries (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2010). From a CMS perspective, the sense of 'critical' invoked within the Mainstream is framed within a managerialist–scientistic–technocratic template of ideas, beliefs and values.

~~As~~ critical students of management challenge the objectivity of the Mainstream, they/we are seen to struggle within an 'open polity' (Zald, Morrill, & Rao, 2005) that is nonetheless hegemonically sutured (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) by a dominant, orthodox conception of what is legitimately counted as business knowledge and education – where 'business' is increasingly used as a shorthand to encompass management and extends to the public and not-for-profit sectors. In questioning and challenging the Mainstream, CMS presents a kind of insurgency which aspires 'to implement goals, programs, or policy choices which have been explicitly denied by the legitimate authority of the focal organization' (Rao, Morrill, & Zald, 2000; Tarrow, 2011; Zald & Berger, 1978, p. 838). As a social movement organization, CMS aims to change the field of business, particularly with regard to the reformation of management knowledge and its influence upon practice (see Eden, 2003; Grey, 2004, 2005; Spicer, Alvesson, & Karreman, 2009). In the language of neo-institutionalist analysis, CMS 'presents an alternative, and poses a challenge, to the established archetypal template'[5] (Greenwood & Hinings, 1993, 1996) of business knowledge and education. CMS feeds off, and contributes to, a process of 'normative fragmentation' (Oliver, 1991) as it makes more evident and amplifies the existence of divergent value orientations (e.g. with regard to 'profit', 'markets', 'gender', 'sustainability', etc.). CMS commends an alternative 'template' in a field where, in Greenwood and Hinings' words, 'some groups support the template-in-use, whereas others prefer an articulated alternative' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1035; see also Davis & Thompson, 1994). CMS is, in this sense, symptomatic and productive of the field's putative destabilization and prospective radical transformation.

The chapter is organized as follows. It begins by outlining the relationship between social movement theory and institutional theory. Next, the emergence of CMS in the field of business is considered, and its representation as a social movement rather than, say, a distinctive domain of knowledge or a group of specialists, is commended. Some limits of neo-institutionalism's capacity to analyse change are then identified before showing how STH offers an illuminating approach for studying the role of

social movements, such as CMS, in processes of (de)institutionalization. In its empirical focus and theoretical framing, the chapter is responsive to the assessment that there is a 'paucity of studies of activism in organizations [which] is surprising' (Lounsbury & Ventresca, 2003, p. 473); and supportive of the contention that 'useful insights may be gained by connecting localized investigations of intraorganizational activism to an analysis of broader social dynamics that shape the possibilities for voice and emancipation in particular settings' (*ibid*.).

CRITICAL MANAGEMENT STUDIES IN CONTEXT: INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND NORMATIVE FRAGMENTATION IN SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

Neo-institutionalist analysis (e.g. Greenwood & Hinings, 1996) has been developed to counteract an objectionable tendency in new institutionalism (e.g. Meyer & Rowan, 1977) to limit the role of actors (e.g. entrepreneurs) to their success or failure in following scripts prescribed by well established 'myths' and 'ceremonies'. Neo-institutionalism commends a shift from examining the institutional embeddedness of organizing practices to studying the transformative role of actors in processes of institutionalization and de-institutionalization. In this context, social movement theory is seen to be relevant for showing how actors, as movement members, 'alter' as well as become 'altered by' existing policies and institutions (Lounsbury et al., 2003, p. 74; see also Fligstein & McCadam, 2012; McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996; Tarrow, 2011) as they actively mobilize resources (Zald & McCarthy, 1980) and/or seize upon opportunities (Tilly, 1978) to organize their interests and advance their agendas.

Organization and Fragmentation in Business Education

Business schools, and indirectly the emergence of CMS within them, have developed to service a demand for graduates with pliable ideological leanings and some basic familiarity with managerialist knowledge. The equivalent of corporate 'finishing schools',[6] schools of business have been established by wealthy benefactors as well as by national and increasingly international corporations, agencies and governments. Given this pedigree, it is unsurprising that business knowledge and education have been shaped

by a Mainstream 'framing process' (Khurana, 2007; McAdam & Scott, 2005, pp. 15–16). Within this Mainstream framing, it is taken for granted that business education should be *for* business or at least be uncritical or minimally critical of its values and inattentive to its destructive social and ecological consequences. In the Mainstream, debate is confined to the question of what kind of knowledge and education (e.g. highly specialist or more general) serves business 'best'. Yet, when based in Universities, and when they are not merely milked 'cash cows' to cross-subsidize activities undertaken in other departments, business schools are subjected to established academic norms of scholarship and research. Where they are retained, these norms support an alternative framing that legitimizes critical forms of inquiry in which debate circles around questions of what the advancement of knowledge means, and/or how it best serves 'the public good' – that is, a good which is not self-evidently equated with what corporate executives or their shareholders regard as 'good'.

These co-constitutive or 'schizophrenic' (Zell, 2005, p. 274) framings[7] – which are characterized here, respectively, as 'commercial/training' and 'scholarly/education' – exist in an uneasy alliance where totalization of either framing is frustrated by their mutual dependence. Privileging the scholarly/education frame renders business schools vulnerable to the complaints that they are insufficiently relevant to business practice and/or inadequately preparing their recruits for industry (Daniel, 1998). Conversely, unrestrained pursuit of a training/commercial framing invites accusations of being so market, or ratings, driven as to displace educational goals (Porter, Rehder, & Muller, 1997), including the development of moral sensibility and awareness of business ethics (Ghoshal, 2005); and/or a failure to connect research activity to a bigger picture (Clegg, 2002; Hinings & Greenwood, 2002; Walsh, Weber, & Margolis, 2003). Such tensions, which are played out as struggles within business schools, present an opportunity for a less conservative and more progressive agenda to emerge, such as that articulated in CMS where questions about corporations, democracy and the public good are incorporated (Barley, 2007; Stern & Barley, 1996).

Tensions between commercial and educational frames are perhaps most sharply illustrated in the design and delivery of the Masters of Business Administration (MBA). Its contents and delivery tends to be organized to secure a good return – principally reputational but also pecuniary – for the business school as well as for corporations, sponsors and especially the recruits who make a financial investment in the production and acquisition of this highly commodified product. Questions about the research-base of what 'MBAs' are taught, the legitimacy of business as a practice and/or the

accountability of management to constituencies extending beyond senior managers or shareholders are rarely asked or they are marginalized (e.g. by ensuring that they receive some coverage in some part of the teaching programme, such as in an elective on ethics or corporate social responsibility). MBA purchasers and providers are complicit in a mutually assured delusion[8] to the extent that they believe any significant or sustained attention is given to such questions, let alone that they form part of the core (e.g. finance and marketing) of MBA programmes. As Pfeffer (2005, p. 1093) has observed, 'let's not kid ourselves – what the students are mostly buying *is not an education*, defined by what they learn and the skills they develop, but rather a credential that will enhance their career prospects and salaries' (emphasis added).[9] And yet, as business schools are located in Universities and award degrees, there remains some pressure – at least for the moment, and even if ~~it~~ is diminishing in deference to commercial considerations – to maintain at least a veneer of academic content and rigour. But this is usually restricted to research activities, and is evacuated from mainstream textbooks and case studies where critical frameworks and analyses are a rarity.

Significant issues – for example, post-colonialism and neo-colonialism in relation to post-1989 globalization, de-regulation culminating in the meltdown of financial markets in 2008 (Willmott, 2011) and the role of business in climate change ~~been~~ marginalized ~~from~~ core business school education and research (Dehler, 2009; Zald, 2002). Core research agendas, analytical frameworks and doctoral training do not equip business school faculty and students to examine these issues, despite mounting popular concern about the consequences of global capitalism. In the popular media, businesses, especially multinationals, are increasingly identified as conduits of anti-social, reactionary forces that mobilize their resources to lobby for, and advance, systems of 'free trade' in which they exploit all available planetary resources, including cheap labour, in a relentless pursuit of growth and profitability (Bello, Bullard, & Malhotra, 2000; Korten, 1995). As if operating in a parallel universe, and dominated by a commercial/training frame, most business school faculty exhibit an arrogant, or bewildered, ostrich-like, disinclination to address what Greenwood and Hinings (1996, p. 1028) characterize as 'the degree of instability in the face of external shocks' (e.g. corporate scandals – Enron, WorldCom; see Adler, 2002) or the global financial crisis (Willmott, 2011). The world has moved on but, from the perspective of CMS, much business education scores high on platitudes, self-justification and image management (Gioia & Corley, 2003), and low on critical scrutiny and wider relevance (see Willmott, 2012; Zell, 2001, 2005).

The Challenge of CMS

Proponents of CMS can be heard to give voice to what Hensmans (2003, p. 359) calls a 'marginal ideology in a field by positioning themselves as liberating emancipators'. So, for example, advocates of CMS question the value of programmes which amplify or endorse students' belief in shareholder value as any residual allegiance to broader, social values is cast aside (Aspen Institute, 2003; Khurana, 2007). CMS 'theorization' (Rao et al., 2003; Strang & Meyer, 1993) of business education (see Perriton & Reynolds, 2004) has drawn support from other commentators – such as Pfeffer and Fong (2002, 2003) and Trank and Rynes (2003) – who share elements of its critique. Pfeffer and Fong (2003), for example, call for a reorientation of business schools as they commend a move away from the competitive ratings game, where the business press decides the ranking criteria, and advocate the embrace of 'some core purpose more consistent with a professional ethos' (*ibid*., p. 1517; see also Trank & Rynes, 2003, p. 202).

A limitation of Pfeffer and Fong's prescription, which distances it from a CMS standpoint, is its casting of a nostalgic eye back to a past that most likely never existed, and its lack of concern to address the challenges of the present and the future.[10] A comparatively narrow conception of the purpose and accountability of business schools is advocated – that is, 'to the management profession that they ostensibly serve' (*ibid*., p. 1515; see also Khurana, 2007). There is no call for business academics to become engaged with critical thinking on fundamental issues – such as those of global poverty, ecological imbalance and neo-imperialism (Willmott, 2012). CMS, in contrast, identifies business as a key participant in the generation of these problems – for example, through a relentless pursuit of (rapacious and unbalanced) growth and by lobbying governments to accommodate the demands of business, or face the consequences (e.g. the relocation of business to a more benign or lower cost environment). Business has played a central role in funding administrations. Notably, major parties have come to depend on corporate sponsorship in return for which they provide business with huge subsidies and pursue policies that benefit their funders. For example, the occupation of Iraq and the subsequent process of 'reform' provided unprecedented opportunities for business expansion by private military firms[11] (Barley, 2006) as well as securing control over the oil reserves (see http://www.warprofiteers.com; see also Klein, 2004).

A core assumption of CMS, as a 'challenger social movement', is that knowledge of business and business education is too important to be dominated by a commercial frame in which so many human issues of critical

importance (e.g. women's rights, poverty, global warming, international security, etc.) – are unaddressed or considered only insofar as a business case can be made for their (selective) inclusion, or when public pressures become too intense to be ignored. What, then, of repeated expressions of concern for business schools to 'regain relevance'? The demand for greater relevance articulates the tension between commercial and educational framings of their purpose, a tension that has been expressed by faculty and pundits since the first schools were established in Universities (Daniel, 1998).[12] In the Mainstream, the disconnection from broader social and political issues is noted in Zald's (2002) commentary on the credentials of business school faculty:

> Where are the political sociologists and political economists on the faculties of schools of management? … capitalism has to be seen in its full global and civilizational context. In the rush to neo-liberalism and globalization we have ignored the dark side of globalization, the massive poverty, the cultural and personal costs of displacement, the conflicts and reactions to the spread of global capitalism. (*ibid.*, p. 203)

Political challenges, in which CMS participates, include a shift in the orientation of research and teaching away from a conservative, corporate conception of relevance (Willmott, 2012). The shift requires a deepening and extension of critical inputs into teaching and research agendas as a basis for reaching out beyond fellow researchers and teachers. It necessitates engagement 'in serious dialogue with managerial audiences' (Walsh & Weber, 2002) about issues that are silenced or trivialized in Mainstream business knowledge and education. Beyond academia, there is the challenge of connecting with producers and consumers around the world whose lives are directly or indirectly affected and avoidably blighted by ~~the~~ 'ideas, beliefs and values' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1026) – a ~~'~~template~~'~~ which defines and legitimizes a narrow conception of business and what is properly researched and taught in business schools (see Grey & Willmott, 2002; Willmott, 2008).

CMS: AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE TEMPLATE-IN-USE

The contribution and limits of neo-institutionalist analysis for understanding CMS as a social movement organization will now be considered. To this end, the heavily referenced[13] work of Greenwood and Hinings (1996) is taken to be exemplary of an emergent concern to incorporate

considerations of agency and power into the examination of processes of institutionalization and de-institutionalization.

Contours of Neo-Institutionalist Analysis

Neo-institutionalists build upon, yet also depart from, a premise common to both 'old' and 'new' institutional theory: namely, that 'institutionalized organizational behaviours' are 'stable, repetitive and enduring activities … " infuse[d] with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand"' (Oliver, 1991, p. 563, citing Selznick, 1957, p. 17). Neo-institutionalism is animated by the assessment that 'one of the core premises of institutional organization theory is to look at institutions as taken-for-granted scripts which *define* the constitutive expectations of actors' (Beckart, 1999, p. 781). Reacting against the structure-driven account of institutionalism developed by new institutionalists, neo-institutionalists pose the following kinds of question: 'How is it possible that actors can take a calculating position with regard to taken-for-granted rules?' (*ibid.*). In the field of business, a parallel question is: how is it possible to take a critical position in relation to the established Mainstream template?

Such questions highlight how, for neo-institutionalists, new institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) places excessive weight upon the imperative to comply with established routines, scripts and schema, and so encounters difficulties in accounting for mould-breaking innovation and change. Beckart (1999) identifies two broad, neo-institutionalist approaches for addressing this deficit. The first problematizes the homogeneity attributed by new institutionalists to 'structure'. Questioning the representation of structure(s) as coherent and totalizing, this approach commends an attentiveness to possible tensions and internal inconsistencies that may prompt and inspire agents to develop innovative responses. The second approach focuses upon 'agency' – in the form of institutional 'entrepreneurs' who, individually or collectively, ~~to~~ exploit 'strategic opportunities' by mobilizing resources within their environment. Instead of accounting for change by reference to structural fault-lines, the focus is upon the capacity of agents who 'take a reflexive position towards taken-for-granted rules' (Beckart, 1999, p. 790). Questioning the necessity and legitimacy of established rules and norms, space is opened up for alternative institutions fashioned by creative 'institutional entrepreneurs'. Such innovative action is understood to arise independently of the (consistency or otherwise of) established structures to whose reproduction it poses a threat.

Neo-Institutionalist Analysis of Change

According to Beckart (1999), Greenwood and Hinings' (1996) neo-institutionalist framework for analysing organizational change leans in the direction of the first, structure-driven approach. This assessment is, however, difficult to reconcile with Greenwood and Hinings' emphasis upon what they characterize as 'four aspects of an organization's internal dynamics – interests, values, power[14] dependencies, and capacity for action' (*ibid.*, p. 1032) – all of which connect to an agency-driven understanding of change and also resonate directly with insights developed in social movement theory (McAdam & Scott, 2005). That said, for Greenwood and Hinings, the formation of distinctive *interests* and *values* is associated with the differentiation of groups within organizations, such as the differentiation of CMS academics from Mainstream academics. In this respect, interests and processes of value formation are understood to be embedded within, and contingent upon, heterogeneity within the structural composition of organizations (e.g. business schools). It is this structural differentiation that is conceived to nurture '*the seeds of alternative ways of viewing the purposes of that organization*' (*ibid.*, p. 1033, emphasis added). Within organizations, groups are seen by Greenwood and Hinings to form coalitions that vie for dominance as they endeavour to translate their interests into favourable allocations of scarce and valued resources. In the field of business, CMS has emerged by forming and organizing informal groups, and by recruiting research students and early career lecturers. Within or across business schools and the wider Academy, critically minded scholars have engaged in co-authorship, run specialist seminar series, workshops and conferences and established an Interest Group within the Academy of Management which has become a sizable Division. In such ways, CMS members have forged an identity, and have gained access to symbolic as well as material resources – in the guise of prestigious appointments, research grants, teaching awards, doctoral students, etc.

Anticipating Beckart's (1999, p. 790) point about taking a reflexive position towards taken-for-granted rules, Greenwood and Hinings (1996) contend that a condition of the creation of an 'alternative template' (e.g. CMS) is making a (reflexive) connection between 'the prevailing template' and 'the distribution of privilege and disadvantage' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1035) so as to show that the template can be changed *only* by replacing the template, not by refining it. When commenting upon the political struggle involved in questioning and replacing the dominant template, they outline four possibilities that, arguably, are also pertinent for

analysing CMS as an intraorganizational and interorganizational social movement. In the first of these possibilities, virtually all groups remain committed to the prevailing (e.g. Mainstream) template-in-use; in the second, groups are indifferent to, but generally comply or acquiesce with, the established template; in the third, some groups support the template but others tend to favour 'an articulated alternative'; finally, in the fourth possibility, most groups prefer a single articulated alternative to the established template.

It is not wholly fanciful to imagine a scenario in business schools where, initially, most faculty are committed to the template (Position 1) or at least acquiescent (Position 2). These positions do not exclude the possibility of taking a reflexive position towards the taken-for-granted rules; but the dominance of the template-in-use operates to affirm the necessity of the Mainstream as a matter of conviction or at least resignation. Over time, some of those aligned with Positions 1 and 2 may reflect on their positioning, perhaps stimulated by exogenous developments – such as a continuing financial crisis or impending ecological crisis. Allegiances then gravitate to Positions 3 and 4. Greenwood and Hinings' neo-institutionalist point is that such shifts or movements are not unconnected to changing structural conditions but they also involve some degree of agential participation.

The Template-in-Use: A Complex of Managerialism, Scientism and Technocracy

If, following Greenwood and Hinings (1996), change occurs as a template-in-use is problematized and weakened, how might the established business template be characterized? As alluded to earlier, there probably ~~has~~ never been a unified and universal template or a uniform set of 'ideas, beliefs and values' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1026) for business. In the context of business schools, factions within as well as tensions between commercial/training and scholarly/education framings contribute to diversity both within and between schools. Nonetheless, the longest established and/or most widely acclaimed business schools, as rated by the business press (e.g. *Financial Times*, *Business Week*), have *tended* to harbour and promote a distinctive ('Mainstream') *complex of ideas and values*. At the risk of disregarding diversity, a convenient shorthand for this complex is 'managerialist', 'scientistic' and 'technocratic'; and its hallmark is the placing of the scholarly/education frame in the service of the commercial/training frame, with the former providing a measure of legitimacy for the latter.

The activities undertaken within business schools are *managerialist* insofar as the knowledge conveyed to students affirms the sovereign role and elevated status widely attributed to executives; or, at least, it presents an unthreatening portrayal of them and the corporations which they lead. Knowledge in business schools is *scientistic* when it uncritically mimics the trappings of science, in the form of elaborate methodological posturing, measurement and testing.[15] And business school knowledge and education are *technocratic* insofar they are valued primarily as a means of securing ends whose legitimacy escapes critical scrutiny.[16] This complex of managerialism, scientism and technocracy comprises the template for generating most, but not all, scholarly contributions in journals, textbooks, lectures and case studies. It is to the potency of such a complex that Hensmans (2003) refers when relating political conflicts to '…[the] organization of *systemic power relations* that almost invisibly pre-structures participants' sense-making possibilities' (*ibid.*, p. 375, emphasis added). Just what is 'at stake' becomes more clearly apparent when an alternative value commitment emerges and gains sufficient credibility to challenge established business knowledge and educational provision. By advancing different and more challenging research and by developing teaching topics and approaches that are responsive to 'multiple pressures providing inconsistent cues and signals' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1029), the challenger may, at the very least, 'open the possibility for … either deliberate or unwitting variation in practices' (*ibid.*). When what was previously experienced as self-evidently authoritative, becomes increasingly viewed as partial or contingent. Ideas that challenge the established framing of business knowledge and education, if they gain sufficient traction and support, then discredit and progressively displace the established template.

AU :4

CMS as an Alternative Template

The emergence of CMS announces what Oliver (1991, p. 565) calls an innovative, 'competitive value commitment' that names and amplifies a degree of '*normative fragmentation*' (emphasis added) in (some of) the institutionalized practices of business schools. The identification and institutionalization of CMS – as a specialism, as a genre, but especially as a movement – makes such fragmentation more explicit; with the prospect that 'the legitimacy of an established institutionalized organizational practice erodes' (Oliver, 1991, p. 564) – at least to the extent that some business school faculty are emboldened to identify more closely and openly

with 'ideas, beliefs and values' that deviate from the dominant template-in-use.

CMS resonates with, and draws inspiration from a number of intellectual and social movements – Marxism, feminism, environmentalism, anti-globalization, etc. Scholarly and rigorous as they frequently are, these ideas are also chastening for, if not challenging to, the corporate-friendly, commercially relevant, image projected by schools.[17] The formation and growth of CMS as an Interest Group, and then a Division, within the Academy of Management is indicative of its insurgency. Another indicator is the openness of CMS to re-imagining the notion of engagement in ways that are not limited to a dialogue with current or prospective managers but extend to an appreciation of the wider significance and influence of 'management' in processes of local and global social reproduction (see Murphy, 2006; Thompson, 2001), and so potentially reach 'a broader organizational constituency' (Fournier & Grey, 2000, p. 27; Grey & Willmott, 2002; Perriton, 2000). As Zald et al. (2005, p. 270) note, with regard to social movements like CMS, 'most [organizational] members have salient identities in and with other social groups, categories and statuses' – such as feminism, environmentalism, etc. As a manifestation of 'normative fragmentation' in business schools, CMS is propelled by wider campaigns and movements that dislocate hegemonic modes of (corporate) knowledge management (see, e.g. http://visar.csustan.edu/aaba/aaba.htm; http://www.criticalmanagement.org). It is therefore implausible to conceive of CMS – whether as a discipline, genre or movement – existing independently of a wider milieu in which received wisdoms shibboleths of capitalist modernity are subjected increasingly to radical doubt.

CMS AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT?

CMS members challenge a dominant template or framing of knowledge and education in which it is assumed that business schools are places of research and teaching *for* management and managers. CMS, in contrast, conceives of business schools as places for the *critical* study and education *of* management and managers in which the meaning and scope of management is not only extended but reframed.[18] In response to this challenge, guardians of the dominant template have sought ~~either~~ to exclude CMS – for example, by demonizing it as 'anti-management' or by identifying (and ghettoizing) it as a specialism, rather than as a movement, within the field of business research

and education. It is then either suppressed or it becomes segregated and domesticated within a (professionalized) spectrum of specializations. In this regard, some developments – such as the establishment of a CMS Division within the Academy of Management or the (mis)equation of CMS with variants of 'organization studies' – may reinforce its externally ascribed identity as a specialism, whereas, arguably, CMS is more adequately understood as a broad social movement which aspires to influence and transform the entire field of business knowledge and education – from marketing to operational research, and from international business to human resource management. (Alvesson, Bridgman, & Willmott, 2009; Alvesson & Willmott, 1992, 2012). This wider aspiration or mission is consistent with the understanding of social movements as:

> … collective enterprises seeking to establish *a new order of life*. They have their inception in a *condition of unrest*, and derive their motive power on one hand from *dissatisfaction with the current form of life*, and on the other hand, from wishes and hopes for a new system of living. The career of a social movement depicts the emergence of a new order of life. (Blumer, 1969, p. 99, cited in Crossley, 2002, p. 3, emphases added)

Something of the 'condition of unrest' and the 'new order of life' (Blumer, 1969, p. 99) to which CMS aspires is articulated in the 'Domain Statement' for Critical Management Studies Interest Group in the Academy of Management:

> ~~Our premise is that structural features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility often turn organizations into instruments of domination and exploitation.~~ Driven by a shared desire to change ~~this situation~~, we aim in our research, teaching, and practice to develop critical interpretations of management and society and to generate radical alternatives. Our critique seeks to connect the practical shortcomings in management and individual managers to the demands of a socially divisive and ecologically destructive system within which managers work. (http://aom.pace.edu/cms/About/Domain.htm)

Many, though by no means all, CMS activists and sympathizers would broadly endorse this statement of collective purpose and identity ~~('Our premise …')~~ while others would likely dissent from specific parts of this formulation. In this respect, CMS is typical of social movements 'characterised by a low degree of institutionalization, high heterogeneity, a lack of clearly defined boundaries and decision-making structures …' (Koopmans, 1993, p. 637, cited in Crossley, 2002, p. 7). Divisions and critics within CMS are a potential source of vitality and renewal but may also be a liability when, for example, they provoke or encourage a paralysis of endless, self-referential debate over what is 'really' CMS.[19] For reasons

sketched above, it is implausible to ascribe a unified set of 'interests' or 'values' to CMS members or supporters; to place its diverse elements within a single set of power dependencies; or, finally, to ascribe to them a shared capacity for action (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996).

The most palpable sign of CMS organization and activity has been its meetings. The first explicitly Critical Management Studies event, comprising about 25 invited participants from Europe and North America, took place in the United Kingdom in 1989.[20] The first open gathering around the CMS banner was organized in the United Kingdom in 1999 when 350 delegates from 19 countries attended the Critical Management Studies Conference, contributing 201 papers to 21 different streams. The UK's Economic and Social Research Council has funded a number of critical management projects and seminars across the field of business and management, from operational research to marketing, and from accounting to organization studies.

In the United States, Divisional status in the Academy has bestowed a degree of legitimacy upon Critical Management. This is of considerable importance in a context where there are fewer CMS academics and supporters in senior positions, especially with regard to placement or tenure decisions (see Scully, 2002). In the United Kingdom, in contrast, most of the elite tier of business schools (e.g. Warwick, Lancaster, Manchester, Bath, Cardiff, Cambridge) has appointed or promoted CMS academics to professorships – with obvious implications for future appointments and the direction of teaching and research.[21] These developments were necessarily supported, or at least accommodated, by professors already in post (see Eden, 2003). In McCarthy and Zald's (1977) terminology, these figures are 'conscience constituents' of CMS whose symbolic resources, in the form of endorsement, have raised the profile of CMS and/or at least inhibited its demonization. Whereas the approach to organizing CMS in the United Kingdom has been to operate largely independently of the Establishment (e.g. the British Academy of Management[22]), the US approach has been to piggy-back on the Academy of Management meetings prior to becoming an integral part of the Academy[23] and to organize 'stand-alone' conferences immediately before its annual meetings. Beyond the United States and United Kingdom, CMS is emergent in Latin America (Mandiola, 2010) and other developing countries (e.g. Alakavuklar & Parker, 2011; Ozcan, 2012), with an increasing number of meetings, workshops and conferences being held under the CMS banner around the world, and the appearance or translation of critical management texts in French, Spanish, Japanese and Chinese.

The sprawling as well as open, ill-defined nature of the CMS constituency makes participation and association comparatively easy, with low barriers to entry (but also exit). Nonetheless, it is often presumed by outsiders that CMS is a doctrinaire, sect-like movement where only converts or supplicants are welcome or feel comfortable. And there is ~~indeed~~ evidence to suggest that CMS activities carry a legacy of the Mainstream insofar as its practices are cliquey, male dominated and unaware or uncritical of, or even indifferent to its own forms of domination and exploitation (Butler & Spoelstra, 2012; see also footnote 2). On the other hand, a self-defined Mainstreamer ventured into a CMS meeting reports that:

> … realizing what kind of group I had strayed into, I thought, 'Here I am, Mr Mainstream, associate editor of Academy of Management Journal, in a hotbed of dissent, sedition, and insurrection. What am I doing here? But my second thought was that what I was hearing was interesting, if not fascinating, that it made a lot of sense, and that these are Academy members with a minority viewpoint that ought to be heard'. (Eden, 2003, p. 390)

In this assessment, CMS articulates a 'minority viewpoint' that is not (simply) negative but has something relevant to offer despite deviating significantly from the Mainstream: it 'made a lot of sense' and 'ought to be heard' (*ibid.*). Against this positive, if somewhat patronizing, evaluation of the 'sense' of CMS, a preparedness to adopt the decision-making structures of the Academy of Management could be interpreted as suggestive of a predisposition towards cooptation and incorporation by the Establishment, or at least a desire to have one's cake and eat it. Becoming an Academy of Management Division has implications, negative as well as positive, for the organization of CMS as it results in some energies being consumed in the politics of the Academy (cf. Selznick, 1949). It also risks CMS becoming equated with the mission and activities of the Division whereas a majority of CMS participants, even those who attend the biannual CMS conferences held in the United Kingdom since 1999, are not members of the Academy of Management. That said, it is also relevant to appreciate how the opportunity presented by involvement in the Academy to influence its direction, and mobilize its resources, has been leveraged. Notably, Paul Adler, who played the leading role in establishing the CMS Interest Group and in steering its successful application for Divisional status, was the Program Chair for the 2013 meeting of the Academy of Management. Its theme was 'Capitalism in Question'.[24] It should therefore not be assumed that the visibility and legitimacy derived from endorsement by the Academy is ~~wholly~~ a negative development for the growth and influence of CMS.

Eden (2003), for one, makes the assessment that 'there can be little doubt that the critters will have significant impact on Mainstream Academy values, thinking and action' (*ibid*., p. 390). The chance to enter and shape the Academy of Management provides a means of raising the profile of CMS and gaining some (ambivalent) legitimacy as well as mobilizing resources and organizing interests.

INSTITUTIONAL THEORY AND CHANGE: THE LIMITS OF NEO-INSTITUTIONALISM

The preceding account of CMS as a challenging social movement within the field of business point to a number of limitations of neo-institutional theory. The shortcomings include the playing down of the contested formation and reproduction of expectations; the conception of 'interests' as given and self-evident rather than socially organized and attributed; and reliance upon a view of power as a possession of individuals and groups that is exercised independently rather than organized systemically. These limitations serve to indicate why paying closer attention to the insights of other approaches, including social movement theory and STH, can be instructive when examining processes of de/institutionalization.

Greenwood and Hinings (1996, p. 1025) conceive of the realm of ideas, beliefs and values as productive of behaviour and locate it in an 'institutional context'. In this formulation, there is little sense of the constituent elements of this realm being established and politically contested through processes of struggle. In the case of CMS, struggles recur in relation to the established template and within the disparate membership of CMS. In Greenwood and Hinings' framework, however, little attention is given to how ideas, values and beliefs are reproduced, as well as transformed, through uncertain processes of social interaction. It is as if a unified and self-evident 'institutional context' exists 'out there' from which 'pressures' emanate, and to which behaviour, as a product of ideas, etc. must adapt, thereby promoting forms of 'entrepreneurship', if it is to survive and develop. Stability is not conceived as a consequence of hegemonic practices that may have a precarious legitimacy on account of their exclusion of elements that refuse, or escape, incorporation. Instead, in Greenwood and Hinings' thinking, interactions are comparatively stable because, it is conjectured, the 'pattern of an organization's structures and systems is provided by underpinning ideas and values' (*ibid*., p. 1025).

Consider Greenwood and Hinings' understanding of change in relation to the preceding account of CMS within the Academy. The position of CMS has precarious legitimacy amongst some (but by no means all) Academy members but also amongst some of its ~~membership~~ who, for example, characterize CMS *primarily* as a brand (Thompson, 2005). By associating or indeed equating CMS with the ~~cynical~~ pursuit of career any commitment to radical change is cynically dismissed and support is thereby lent to conservative forces as ~~any~~ aspiration to transform the field of business is lampooned.

The struggle to establish CMS is illustrated by the process of negotiating entry to the Academy of Management, gaining legitimacy and sustaining membership. ~~For example, a~~s an Interest Group, CMS was required to submit a three-year review report to the Academy. Its domain statement (see earlier) attracted some unfavourable feedback couched in terms of the AU :5 compatibility of the CMS Interest Group with the orientations of other Divisions of the Academy:

> As one reviewer commented, "The domain statement comes across as rather negative and somewhat close-minded given that it sets forth a strong premise; and also that it seems to suggest an emphasis on activism over scholarship … Other concerns were noted by a second reviewer: "As a number of members have indicated, a danger for CMS is that other Divisions consider the IG as irrelevant or too iconoclastic … A reviewer presents this challenge to CMS to genuinely ponder: 'The CMS has a highly motivating, strong values orientation but can alienate others who do not hold these values. *Is CMS prepared to keep its relationships with other Divisions open and mutual?*" (http://group.aomonline.org/cms/Announcements/2005%20review%20doc/CMS%20Review%20FINAL%204-20.doc)

Embedded in such feedback are taken-for-granted notions of what counts as 'scholarship' and 'ir/relevance', with the barely concealed threat to impede the development of CMS from an Interest Group to a Division if it places in question activities pursued by other Divisions. A limitation of Greenwood and Hinings' (1996) discussion of interests, power and agency is that it does not explore how individuals and groups are constituted by identifications with diverse and inconsistent practices. Instead, it is assumed that groups self-evidently or objectively have 'interests' ~~that~~ they endeavour, through the exercise of their power, 'to translate into favourable allocations of scarce and valued organizational resources' (*ibid*., p. 1033). Actors', or groups', interests are assumed to be known to them, or at least to be readily identifiable by a social scientific observer; and it is to the fulfilment of these interests that behaviour is understood to be purposefully directed as actors strive to transform or defend established structures. Change is

accounted for by the role of actors (individuals or groups) who 'gain power', or receive, power because it is 'in the interest of those in power to alter the organization's goals' (*ibid.*, p. 1038, citing Fligstein, 1991, p. 313). It is assumed that radical change is a likely outcome only when it is favoured by 'those in a position of privilege and power' (*ibid.*, p. 1038) – an assessment that is largely blind to *their dependences* on 'subordinates' whose allegiances may shift from the status quo to an alternative 'value commitment'. In this version of neo-institutionalism, analysis of the 'political', and the 'dynamics' of organizing, tends to drift back in the direction of rational choice theory in which the formation of agency and pursuit of interests becomes disconnected from their institutional constitution. Interests are invoked as if they exist or develop externally to the structural pressures of institutions within which interests are continuously organized; and agency is defined in terms of its capacity to resist or subvert such pressures (see also DiMaggio, 1988, p. 14; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004, p. 675). For example, processes of acquiring resources, including 'social skills' which are regarded as productive of change, are ascribed by Greenwood and Hinings to the actions of seemingly sovereign, 'entrepreneurial' agents.

In relation to the development of CMS, the neo-institutionalist approach would most likely attribute change to the role of certain 'entrepreneurial' actors – such as members of the Executive Committee of the CMS Division at the Academy of Management; the organizers of the biannual CMS Conferences; the authors of key CMS texts, etc. – whose interests are conceived to compel them to challenge established structures or at least expand its membership of CMS. Neo-institutionalist analysis attributes to actors a sovereignty based upon a *possessive* concept of power: 'organizationally defined groups vary in their ability to influence organizational change because they have differential power' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1038). The notion of 'power dependencies' is potentially fruitful inasmuch that it conceives of power as relational. However, an appreciation of the relational nature of power is limited to understanding how the power to influence organizational change is unevenly distributed: power is something that groups possess in greater or smaller measure. Aside from a reference to 'normative scheme(s)' (*ibid.*, p. 1038) which are conceived to underpin differential control over decision-making processes, a separation is assumed between, on the one side, the power attributed to sovereign actors and, on the other side, the institutional structures that they endeavour to change or preserve. 'Relations of power and domination' (*ibid.*) are conceptualized in terms of the unequal power of particular groups and individuals. Absent is a recognition of how the power attributed to these groups is systemically

invested, or institutionalized, in the institutional practices that place them in a position (of 'power') *and* which enable an ostensibly powerful position to be represented as a possession of actors. An alternative understanding, to be elaborated below, conceives of such practices as an articulation of the institutional 'myth' of sovereignty that is maintained to the extent that subjects are prevailed upon, more or less coercively, to identify themselves with, and invest in, its reproduction.

A Dialectical Alternative?

Does this imply that neo-institutional theory is fundamentally flawed? The answer could be 'yes' only if one assumes that 'power', 'interests' or 'agency' have an essence which is imperfectly grasped by, or reflected in, neo-institutional analysis. What can be said, instead, is that institutional theory is partial and limited – for example, in its conception of agency and power and in their application to the analysis of change; and that its formulation and application of these concepts tend to have performative effects which are, arguably, conservative. Other conceptualizations are possible that offer a different, less conservative way of representing processes of institutionalization. Before moving beyond the comparatively familiar theoretical terrain of neo-institutionalist analysis, it is relevant to consider briefly an innovative and theoretically sophisticated proposal for remedying its limitations.

Seo and Creed (2002) recommend the adoption by institutional theorists of a dialectical mode of analysis where institutional structures are conceived as heterogeneous and de-centred – in the sense of being composites of loosely coupled and more-and-less contradictory 'elements, practices and procedures' held together 'in the search for legitimacy and stability' (Seo & Creed, 2002, p. 228). This understanding resonates with insights developed in social movement theory and also with the earlier characterization of the institution of business education as comprising intertwined and conflicting, yet mutually dependent, framings. In the application of their framework, however, Seo and Creed switch to an agency-driven analysis in which change is attributed to 'the partially autonomous social actor' who is 'the active exploiter of social contradictions' (*ibid.*, p. 230). The explanation of change in organizations is located in the agency of the 'artful' (*ibid.*, p. 237) individuals and groups who are conceived to possess, or to have gained access to, the resources and capabilities necessary for pursuing their interests. There is a passing acknowledgement that 'frames themselves are

also the historical products of interinstitutional contradictions' (*ibid*., p. 237), but this is subsequently suspended in the discussion of 'praxis' which Seo and Creed (*ibid*., pp. 229–230) identify as 'perhaps the most important piece of the puzzle in understanding institutional change processes'.

Echoing analyses developed by proponents of institutional entrepreneurship, Seo and Creed's 'dialectical approach' emphasizes agents' 'ability to artfully mobilize different institutional logics and resources' (*ibid*., p. 240) that serve to 'legitimize and support their change efforts' (*ibid*., p. 242). Agents' exercise of power in developing or changing institutions is not connected to the 'logics and resources' that, arguably, make possible what Seo and Creed describe as agents. Power is attributed to abilities or skills as *possessions of actors* – a view that is common to analysis in which the transformation of fields is ascribed to the co-evolution of strategies deployed by incumbents of, and challengers to, dominant, taken-for-granted archetypes of organizing (e.g. Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Hensmans, 2003). There is little sense of the institutionalized operation of power as invested, for example, in discursive practices[25] that are constitutive of the representation of agency as sovereign ('partially autonomous') or in the formation of the capacities for action ascribed to agency (Willmott, 2011a).

SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY, THE SOCIAL THEORY OF HEGEMONY AND CMS: REFLECTIONS ON CHANGE

It has been noted how neo-institutional theorists examine change and stability in terms of how 'group members react' by virtue of their 'commitments and interests' and their 'ability to implement or enforce them by way of their existing power and capability' (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996, p. 1048).[26] It has been suggested that in order to appreciate how power is articulated in and through practices, including the discursive practices that impute to human beings a sense of sovereign agency, it is necessary to move away from a conceptualization of power and capability as the possession of sovereign agents exercised episodically to realize their interests. Whenever advocates of institutional theory or their critics argue along the lines that 'agents work to affect processes of institutionalization in ways that fit with their interests' (Phillips, 2003, p. 221), it is relevant to reflect upon how what is designated as the work of 'agency' or 'agents' interests' is institutionally constructed and signified. Such reflection is absent

from Hinings and Greenwood's framework, from Seo and Creed's (2002) application of dialectical analysis and from studies which focus more directly upon 'institutional entrepreneurship'. Change is ascribed to actors' skills and strategies (see also DiMaggio, 1988, p. 14 cited in Maguire et al., 2004, p. 658) without reflection upon how this proposition trades upon and reproduces a *particular* mode of analysis in which the sovereignty of agency is taken-for-granted as a *universal*. Its 'Other' – in the guise of 'structure' – is then invoked to justify agency by demonstrating how its sovereign will is enabled – for example, by 'contradictions' that the agent 'exploits' (Seo & Creed, 2002, p. 230). It is a mode of analysis that has become hegemonic as its necessity – the dualism/duality/dialectic of agency and structure – is placed beyond question. This is not to suggest that such analysis is wrong or incapable of producing valued knowledge. Rather, it is to invite greater openness to, and critical reflection upon, the basis and (performative) effects of the institutionalization of its truth.

Beyond the Agency-Structure Formula: The Social Theory of Hegemony

We have seen how, neo-institutionalists attribute change either to the creativity of agents, characterized as 'institutional entrepreneurs', who mobilize resources to challenge established practices; and/or to inconsistencies or contradictions in structures that stimulate and promote innovative forms of action; or, finally, to their dialectical interplay. Institutional analysts attracted to social movement theory have sought to advance the study of change by attending to the role of contested mobilization processes. As Schneiberg and Lounsbury (2008, p. 651) summarize this project:

> Regarding actors, it counter-poses challengers and champions of alternatives to standard accounts of states, professional associations and other incumbents as key players in fields. Regarding structure, it moves away from images of an isomorphic institutional world of diffusion, path dependence and conformity toward conceptions of fields as fluid and pluralistic sites of contestation, organized around multiple and competing logics and forms.

The linking of institutionalism to social movement theory valuably encourages a greater appreciation of 'politics and collective mobilization as motors of change' (*ibid*., p. 3). However, the proposed framework for analysing institutional formation and change continues to rest upon, and be restricted by, the established and naturalized agency-structure formula, or, to invoke Greenwood and Hinings' (1996) term, a 'template'. Incorporating

the insights of social movement theory improves the prospect of 'the relations between activity, collective or existing social contexts' being 'more systematically addressed' (*ibid.*; see, e.g. Osterman, 2006). But the established conceptualization of the categories of 'activity', 'collective organization' and 'social contexts' is preserved. In the absence of reflection upon the power-invested constitution of these categories, the idea of the sovereign agent is effectively transposed from the individual to the collective.

Drawing upon social movement theory, McAdam and Scott (2005) also elaborate and reinforce the agency-structure formula for understanding change as they give additional weight to 'governance structures' and the 'structure of political opportunities and constraints confronting the [social] movement' (*ibid.*, pp. 15, 16 citing McAdam et al., 1996, p. 2). Members of a social movement, such as CMS, are understood to contest established arrangements as they develop new visions, operate outside of established channels and/or exploit multiple logics or frames to mobilize support and bring about change whilst also registering how 'movements and change are endogenously shaped by institutions' (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008, p. 652). McAdam and Scott's framework takes for granted a conceptualization of structure and agency where classes of actors (dominants, challengers and governance units) confront a wider social environment (comprising external actors and external governance units) that may be found to be more or less benign or hostile for the realization of interests ascribed to such actors. At the same time, there are some equivocalities that place in question the coherence and exhaustiveness of this approach. Consider, for example, McAdam and Scott's (2005) acknowledgement of how it is not the events or processes per se that destabilize the established structure of political opportunity but, rather, a process of 'reactive mobilization' (*ibid.*, p. 18). As they put it,

> … it is generally not the destabilizing events/processes themselves that set periods of field contention and change in motion. Rather, it is a process of *reactive mobilization* defined by [a] set of highly contingent mobilizing mechanisms that mediate between change pressures and a significant episode of field contention … (*ibid.*)

This formulation is illuminating inasmuch as it attributes change to *processes* of 'reactive mobilization' rather than, say, to institutional entrepreneurs; and it also emphasizes the *contingent* operation of 'mobilizing mechanisms' (*ibid.*). This is important because, in the language of STH, the key 'mediating mechanism' – or, better, articulation of change – is *discursive practice*. McAdam and Scott's promising analytical move is then set back by

an untheorized appeal to actors' interests as the first of the mechanisms ('attribution of threat or opportunity') – is conceptualized in terms of how actors 'interpret events as representing new threats or opportunities to or for the realization of their interests' (*ibid.*, p. 19).

The Social Theory of Hegemony

Offering an alternative to established conceptual frameworks for analysing stability and change, STH is guided by an understanding that *lack* – and hence suffering and struggle – is an ontologically key feature of subjects and their/our worlds. 'Lack' is a manifestation of the world-openness of human incarnation[27] that makes possible the emergence of 'culture', or 'second nature' – what Lacan terms the Symbolic – through which the identity and significance of objects, including the identities ascribed to subjects, is constituted. Subjects are not, however, reducible to, or completely stabilized by, the social construction of identities. STH 'problematizes essentialist conceptions that privilege the determining role of either structure or agency … [and] … contests dualistic conceptions which are predicated on an external relationship between structures and agents' (Glynos & Howarth, 2007, p. 129). Instead of conceiving of the subject as a unified seat of consciousness that is occupied, as it were, by one or more identities, STH assumes (1) a 'thrown' subject for whom identification(s) are inescapable yet cannot provide a desired sense of fullness and (2) a distinctive conception of structure as an articulation of a struggle to engage with this 'thrownness' by providing sutures whose inherent precariousness makes possible, and indeed demands, involvement by subjects in processes of identification, including what has become termed ~~as~~ 'institutional work'. The moment of identification is 'the moment of the radical subject, which discloses the subject as an agent in its world' (*ibid.*).[28] Lack is constitutive both of the (precarious) structure and of the thrown subject. In sum, 'far from being a moment of the structure, the subject is the result of the impossibility of constituting the structure as such' (*ibid.*, citing Laclau, 1990, p. 41).[29] Accordingly, acts that (re)produce institutions are not theorized as the voluntary choices of sovereign agents but, rather, as articulating a lack in the structure that prompts and sustains processes of identification. As Laclau (1996, p. 92) puts it,

> If I need to identify with something it is because I do not have a full identity in the first place. These acts of identification are thinkable only as a result of the lack of the structure.

The ontology of STH understands conflicts and tensions as endemic to the establishment of identity/difference and also as productive of new objects – such as CMS or indeed STH – that become possible targets of identification. There are tensions between, on the one side, multiple forms of identity and associated processes of identification; and, on the other, what unavoidably lies beyond the reach of identifications – an Otherness that threatens to *dislocate* and undermine the necessarily limited claims (and control) of specific identifications.

The term 'dislocation' characterizes moments when the lack becomes evident prior to efforts to restore a sense of fullness through new forms of identification. Dislocations – whether trivial (e.g. being lost for a word) or extraordinary and cataclysmic (e.g. losing all sense of relevance of control) demonstrate the contingency of discursive structures (see Howarth & Stavrakakis, 2000). To take a case offered by McAdam and Scott (2005), ~~to illustrate~~ 'reactive mobilization': it may be suggested that, in the field of health care, a 'structure' once dominated by an occupational association became dislocated and was transformed by an engagement of discursive practices present within other associations, public organizations, corporate organizations and market processes. The mission of CMS is to contribute to the bringing about of a similar dislocation and transformation in the field of business.

To expand briefly upon key insights of STH, change is understood to be precipitated by dislocations in which the contingency of institutionalized discursive practices becomes apparent. The emergence and spread of CMS, for example, serves to articulate and expand a dislocation in the field of business research and education as it reactivates the contingency, and so unsettles the authority, of practices comprising the Mainstream. From the perspective of STH, CMS challenges the values and priorities of the Mainstream, including the treatment of employees as commodities ('human resources'), the institutionalization of patriarchy and neo-imperialism in business practice and its destructive ecological impacts, etc. Such concerns have direct affinities with other 'social movements' (see Spicer & Böhm, 2007), such as the Global Justice Movement[30] (GJM) and Occupy – a connection that is made in the following extract from a statement which highlights the centrality of democracy in the GJM:

> Democracy means that people have a voice in the decisions that affect them, including economic decisions. Democracy requires time and public space and quality education and freedom of information. And democracy means that no group can be excluded from power because of race, gender, sexual orientation, age, physical ability, or any other 'ism'.

> We stand for the right of communities to control their own destinies and resources, whether that is indigenous community preserving its land and culture or a neighborhood deciding to keep its local hospital open. Enterprises and businesses must be rooted in communities and accountable to them.
>
> … We also say that democracy, community, and true abundance are the real antidote to the despair that breeds terrorism, and the best means of assuring our global security. (Starhawk, 2000, n.d.; see also Cavanagh & Anderson, 2002)

Like other social movements, CMS comprises a wide diversity of elements. GJM has been aptly described as consisting of 'a rag tag army whose leading detachments include communists, anarchists, socialists, feminists, trade unionists, environmentalists, anti-racists, neo-hippies and alternate lifestylists, or numerous collections of the above' (Peart, n.d.). Whilst currently drawn primarily from an academic constituency, CMS contains, like the Mainstream, a range of 'detachments'. Specifically, it includes participants with a wide span of 'critical' intellectual orientations that range from hard core Marxism to varieties of post-modernism. It is 'fractured by multiple lines of division' that themselves do not 'demarcate clear ''camps'' or fixed positions within CMS, but rather [are] lines of movement, arguments and shifting alliances' (Fournier & Grey, 2000, p. 25). CMS and GJM exemplify movements constructed by a logic of equivalence which enables them to be much more than the sum of their parts.[31] The heterogeneity of CMS (and GJM) of course also renders them vulnerable to factionalism and disintegration but, more positively, it enables a flexibility, dynamism and process of self-renewal – at least so long as contingency is acknowledged and celebrated, thereby avoiding the totalizing fantasy that an identification with the particular discourse of a specific faction can somehow escape the radical contingency of social relations.

DISCUSSION

Social movement theory complements and extends institutional theory by appreciating de/institutionalization as an on-going, contested process of mobilization in which social movements pose 'collective challenges to authority in political and cultural domains' (Rao et al., 2003, p. 796). They share a rejection of versions of rational choice theory where actors are abstracted from the institutional contexts of their actions. However, when appealing to the power of actorhood as a catalyst of change, neo-institutionalists and social movement theorists come up against the paradox of embedded agency (Seo & Creed, 2002). Consistent application of the

constructionist credo articulated by Berger and Luckmann (1966) requires the development of a form of analysis that, in honouring the basic premise of institutional theory, also transgresses its confines. 'Agents' with 'interests' cannot be regarded as self-evident 'objectivities' (in Berger and Luckmann's terms) but, rather, must be understood as articulations of particular discursive practices of institutionalization (see Willmott, 2011a).

From an STH perspective, the agency-driven conceptualization of power and interests in neo-institutional analysis is extended and insufficiently challenged through an engagement of social movement theory (see McAdam & Scott, 2005). STH advances a radical version of constructionism that avoids idealism by insisting upon an ontological difference between the 'isness' of the world and its representation through discourse where dislocation is the guarantor of this difference. STH conceives of 'agency' and 'structure' as constructs that have no essential meaning or referents that can be known except through processes of constituting social objects within particular hegemonic discourses. Structure is no longer conceptualized in opposition to agency that it constrains (and/or enables). Rather, it signifies how social realities are institutionalized in particular ways through articulatory practices. So, for example, the 'isness' of management, whose representation is necessary yet ultimately impossible, is understood to be structured through particular discourses (or, better, discursive practices). 'Structure' is thereby (re)defined post-structurally, and not anti-structurally, AU :6 in a way that appreciates how every such 'structure' is inherently 'dislocated' (Laclau, 1990) as its presence is understood to depend on the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of other possible 'objectivities' against which it is defined, and with which those identified with a particular objectivity must struggle, even when the objectivity is comparatively stable, naturalized or habitualized – that is, institutionalized.

This approach at once builds upon and departs from Hensmans' (2003) application of Laclau's thinking to study social movement organization in which a strong residue of rational choice theory is retained. In STH, the 'ideological actor' (*ibid*., 2003, p. 359) is not the one who strives to establish possibilities for identification – or, as Hensmans puts it, in his agency-driven formulation, 'possibilities of strategic agency'. Rather, in STH, the 'ideological actor' is the one who fails to appreciate the contingency of any objectivity, including CMS, as s/he (mis)identifies (with) a particular discourse as a universalizing, totalizing one (see Laclau, 1990, p. 92). In STH, the creation of a boundary that defines an objectivity is largely an unintended consequence of the operation of a logic of equivalence that translates a disparate set of activities into something that holds them

together. Similarly, as noted earlier, an established core of the field of business and management is identified by CMS as 'Mainstream'. Elements that previously were known as distinctive, differentiated contributions to business practice and theory become homogenized by downplaying or disregarding differences; and, of course, as has already been noted, the 'objectivity' of CMS is itself inherently vulnerable to subversion by the logic of difference that, by highlighting divisions within CMS, threatens to break it up into a series of disparate sub-specialisms and factions.

From the perspective of STH, 'agency' is (a) power enacted through the mundane labour of managing and juggling diverse identifications. It is exemplified in competing identifications within and between CMS and Mainstream conceptions of business education, and their related notions about worthwhile or credible research. Subjects, Laclau writes, 'are condemned to be subjects by the very fact of dislocation. In this sense, however, efforts to rearticulate and reconstruct the structure also entail the constitution of the agents' identity and subjectivity' (Laclau, 1990, p. 50). In this light, participants in CMS are seen to engage in rearticulating and reconstructing business and management in the face of potential or actual dislocation(s). They/we are involved in reactivating what has become sedimented as we/they problematize the hegemony of the Mainstream by recalling and investing in what has been excluded, marginalized and devalued. It follows that any ambition to replace the Mainstream with CMS is a fantasy since all attempts to encompass the world of management are, from an STH perspective, inescapably partial and inherently contestable. It may be the ambition of advocates of a particular discursive practice, such as CMS, to dominate the wider field of discursivity but this is an impossibility since, paradoxically, it depends on difference (e.g. the Mainstream) to define and maintain its identity.

As the CMS domain statement makes clear (see earlier), it is not management as a universal that is challenged by CMS (CMS is not anti-management) but, rather, how it is implicated in the (re)production of specific features of contemporary society. What is deemed problematical about the Mainstream is not its advocacy of business schools or its education of managers per se but, rather, its content and form. With regard to content, the focus is upon diverse forms of domination, exploitation and subjugation in which business and management is implicated, and to which Mainstream thinking contributes by ignoring or normalizing them. With regard to form, CMS commends a democratic concept of knowledge production and dissemination in Universities, and of business schools within them, where the ideal of developing and sharing ~~of~~ knowledge as a public good is

prioritized – a 'public good' in the sense of knowledge that has public benefits as well as a good to which there is comparatively unimpeded access.

CONCLUSION

CMS has been here conceived and examined as a social movement, rather than a specialism or genre of management. Taking CMS as its focus, the chapter has focused upon the relevance and contribution of social movement theory for advancing analysis of change in institutions. Key to social movement theory is its engagement with political theory and its appreciation of the importance of processes of mobilization in engendering change. Through a critique of neo-institutionalist analysis of change, and a close consideration of the paradox of embedded agency, STH has been explored as a possible way of making politics central to institutional analysis while overcoming some limitations of neo-institutionalism and social movement theory.

The chapter has reflected upon the emergence and de-institutionalizing effects of CMS as a challenger social movement that operates intraorganizationally and interorganizationally across the field of business knowledge and education. Consistent with recent calls to incorporate the insights of social movement theory into institutional theory, a critical conception of power and agency has been applied that places the study of institutional change and innovation squarely in the terrain of political theory. Taking a lead from Hensmans' (2003) application of Laclau's thinking, the process of de/institutionalization has been conceived as one of contestation through which social relations are organized by discursive practices that either dominate or challenge particular fields of discursivity, such as that of business and management.

In departing from the theoretical moorings of much institutional theory and social movement analysis, Laclau's STH offers an alternative approach to studying organizations and organizing as processes of contestation and diffusion (see Cederstrom & Spicer, 2013). Conceiving of social movements as engines of institutional innovation, the skills and commitments associated with 'agency' are not held to exist in opposition to structures or 'institutionalized contexts'. Rather, incumbents as well as challengers – that is, members of the Mainstream as well as CMS – are conceived as articulating competing, composite discursive practices that become hegemonized to different degrees. It is the appeal of, and identification with, discursive practices that is responsive to a lack, and not the demand of

structures or the entrepreneurial agency attributed to individuals and/or groups, that is understood to offer a compelling account of processes of change which avoids becoming enmeshed in the paradox of embedded agency. Limitations of neo-institutional theory, including its incorporation of social movement theory, are seen to stem from a reluctance to recognize that the agency-structure formula is not a necessity, nor a given of institutional analysis, but, rather, a hegemonic construction in which a positivity, or objectivity, is (mis)attributed to 'agency' and 'structure'.

In conclusion, it can be asked whether STH aspires to replace more established forms of theory (e.g. institutional theory, social movement theory). The response is that retention of the agency-structure template favoured with neo-institutional analysis and social movement theory is unobjectionable so long as its limitations are fully and openly registered. In this regard, STH is of value in stimulating reflection upon the assumptions of the agency-structure template as it offers an alternative framework in which sedimented conceptions of agency, interests and power, as well as processes of change, are placed in question. Notably, in STH, attention is drawn to the role played by empty signifiers, such as 'Mainstream' and 'CMS', in the political process of mobilization through which subjectivities invest in, and become identified with, particular projects of institutionalization and de-institutionalization. It also highlights how 'lack' and 'dislocation' are critical for appreciating the possibility and dynamics of change. STH provides a distinctive and promising approach to studying de/institutionalization in which, critically, the political assumes a position of analytical centrality and where social movements are identified as motors of radical change (see especially Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 159 et seq). A challenge for this approach is to explore further how concepts that are key to STH, such as 'discursive practice' and 'identification' as well as 'dislocation' and 'lack', can inform detailed empirical analysis of processes of innovation and change (see Lok & Willmott, 2013) This challenge includes the further illumination of, and insights into, the struggles of CMS activists and supporters in de-institutionalizing and (re)forming the established template of business knowledge and education.

UNCITED REFERENCES

AU :7

Clemens and Cook (1999); Elliot and Reynolds (2002); Ephemara (2004); Fligstein (2001); Levy and Egan (2003); Lounsbury (2003); Norval (2000); Prasad (2003); Rowlinson and Hasssard (2011); Scott (1995); Zizek (1992).

NOTES

1. The emergence of the *term* 'CMS' tends to be associated with an edited collection of papers published in 1992 (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992). However, a critical tradition in business and management scholarship can be traced back at least as far as Baritz's (1960)*The Servants of Power* (see also Brief, 2000). Contributors to the Alvesson and Willmott collection formed a small (and comparatively well-established and elite) part of a much larger and less visible group of (mainly) business school academics who, for some time, had distanced themselves intellectually from the mainstream. This, it should be emphasized, was not an organized or unified group of academics but, rather, one that collectively shared a position of difference and subordination in relation to dominant management knowledge personified in the Academy of Management. The Critical Management Studies Workshop established in the late 1990s subsequently metamorphosed into an Interest Group, and then a Division, of the Academy of Management . In the United Kingdom and Europe, there has been a series of biannual conferences, beginning in 1999, ~~that on each occasion have attracted around 400 participants from over 25 countries.~~

2. It adds to a growing number or analyses and commentaries on the development and significance of CMS. Amongst these are Fournier and Grey (2000), Grey (2007), Thompson (2005), Adler, Forbes, and Willmott (2007) and Rowlinson and Hassard (2011).

3. Conversely, this front is undermined by the operation of a logic of difference that disputes the drawing of any sharp distinction between CMS and Mainstream, and thereby problematizes their respective identities and associated agential identifications. A number of contributions draw attention to important and uncomfortable continuities in the everyday practices of CMS and Mainstream academics (see, e.g. Bell & King, 2010; Wray-Bliss, 2003, 2004).

4. A 'logic of equivalence' (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) operates to de-focalize differences within each identity in a way that is productive of a seemingly dichotomous, clear-cut political frontier (e.g. Mainstream vs. non-Mainstream ~~or~~ CMS). Of course, the operation of this logic is itself problematical as there is always a prospect of a return of the repressed – that is, of a refocusing upon differences within the mainstream and/or CMS that threaten the sense unity and coherence ascribed to these identities by the logic of equivalence.

5. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) invoke the term 'template' and 'template-in-use' in a number of ways. Sometimes (*ibid*., p. 1028) they use it as equivalent to a design archetype (see Greenwood & Hinings, 1993) but elsewhere they conceive of a template more broadly to include content (e.g. purpose and philosophy) so that, for example, 'norms' are attributed to templates (*ibid*., p. 1038). It is the second meaning of template that is favoured here, and it is more consistent with Greenwood and Hinings' emphasis upon the importance of value commitments in understanding radical change. The origin of the use of the term is attributed to DiMaggio and Powell (1991, p. 27).

6. These schools were established to teach young women social skills and cultural norms which would enable them to fit into and succeed in male-dominated societies by, for example, acquiring the correct etiquette and attracting a suitable husband.

7. It is enshrined in the Joseph Wharton's donation that established a business school dedicated to promoting the study of entrepreneurship and business ethics (~~Srinivasan,~~ Kemelgor, ~~&~~ Johnson, 2000).

8. Such fantasies are difficult to renounce, even when they are cynically acknowledged as such, as affirm an established and respected sense of identity (Zizek, 1992).

9. This uncomfortable assessment is perhaps most evidently applicable to MBAs but it is also increasingly applicable to a growing number of undergraduates who are attracted to studying business rather than, or as a part of, more established academic subjects in the sciences or humanities.

10. Pfeffer and Fong (2003, p. 1516) commend ~~the~~ breaking free from constraints that impede the 'ability to provide critical, analytical thought and analysis on the role of corporation and the place of business and other organizations and society' but there is no indication that this would penetrate beyond established notions of corporate social responsibility.

11. Between May 2003 and June 2004, the Head of the Coalition Provisional Authority dismissed 500,000 state workers, including soldiers; opened Iraq to unrestricted imports; began to privatize state enterprises; lowered Iraq's corporation tax from 40% to 15% to entice multinationals into the country; and allowed full repatriation of all profits by foreign investors, etc. (see Guttal, 2005).

12. So, relevance is perhaps more credibly characterized as something that is yet to be accomplished rather than something to be 'regained'.

13. It is amongst the most heavily cited work in neo-institutionalist analysis.

14. *Po* the third 'aspect' of Greenwood and Hinings' (1996) model of internal dynamics is conceived in terms of the differential ability of groups to realize their interests and values in the production of an alternative template. Power is possessed by groups, but it is the template that '"gives" power to some groups and not to others' by virtue, for example, of the template's normative scheme that 'implies differential access to and control over key decision processes' (*ibid.*, p. 1038). And 'capacity for action' refers to the skills and competencies to secure and maintain the change – skills and competencies that are understood to be promoted by the institutional context.

15. The emphasis here is upon packaging studies in 'the trappings of science'. Rarely are business students encouraged to understand how research-based knowledge is constructed and institutionalized.

16. The research base of course content is largely unexplored (how many MBA students are required to read, let alone, interrogate, the journal articles and books that are the primary sources of the received wisdoms?) and to the extent that course material is based upon research, the focus is upon a superficial digest of its content presented in the obligatory bullet points.

17. Many CMS members are supporters of, or activists within, movements that critique business and management by highlighting its shortcomings (e.g. http://www.corpwatch.org; http://www.corporatewatch.org.uk).

18. Members of CMS disagree, and continue to disagree, sometimes vehemently, about precisely *what* theories and practices should replace those of the Mainstream. To date, there seems to be some (largely tacit) agreement that splits and factionalism is likely to be counterproductive, with the result that an ill-defined pluralism or 'big

tent' conception of CMS has predominated. CMS has not (yet?) been significantly disrupted or distracted by internal divisions (over strategy, normative commitment, intellectual orientation etc.) and so, for the time being, is open to accommodating a wide range of voices (see Adler et al., 2007).

19. As Grey (2005, pp. 24–25) has observed, participants in CMS may 'develop a common front against managerialism and all the assumptions to which it is related – hierarchy, globalization, masculinism, the primacy of markets, anti-unionism and so on – or engage in an endless debate about how this confrontation [between rival claimants upon CMS] is to be effected and what are the right theoretical resources …'. They may, in other words, become mired in agonizing and soul searching about whether motivations for participating in CMS are sufficiently pure or relations with sections of the audience (e.g. managers) are consistently open and empathetic (see Elliott & Reynolds, 2002; Reedy, 2008). ~~See also footnote 19.~~

20. It was from this event that many of the contributions to Alvesson and Willmott's (1992)*Critical Management Studies* were drawn.

21. In the United Kingdom, an unintended consequence of stringent research performance measurement of Universities, in the form of ~~the Research Assessment Exercise~~, has been the pressure to promote people with strong publication records irrespective of their orientation. This development has been significantly facilitated by editors of some key, UK-based journals who have actively solicited and supported critical work.

22. BAM ~~has~~ itself formed a (somewhat dormant) CMS Special Interest Group. This was primarily a top-down response to the visibility and popularity of this distinctive 'field' that has struggled to find committed champions.

23. This is not the place to reflect at any length upon the pros and cons of these approaches. It is worth noting, however, that in the United Kingdom, there is more of a history of stand-alone, self-funding conferences. The Labour Process Conferences, now in ~~their~~ 25th year (http://www.hrm.strath.ac.uk/ILPC/), is an example. University accommodation can be used that is comparatively cheap and flexible. Experience gained in organizing these conferences was crucial for the design and delivery of the Critical Management Studies Conferences. Also, outside the United States, there is perhaps less difficulty in openly applying for funding to attend a 'critical' conference whereas, in the United States, running the Workshop in the pre-conference period enabled it initially to be bundled with attendance at ~~(the legitimacy activities of)~~ the Academy.

24. The theme is presented as follows: 'The Academy of Management's vision statement says that we aim ''to inspire and enable a better world through our scholarship and teaching about management and organizations.'' The recent economic and financial crises, austerity, and unemployment, and the emergence of many economic, social, and environmental protest movements around the world have put back on the agenda some big questions about this vision: What kind of economic system would this better world be built on? Would it be a capitalist one? If so, what kind of capitalism? If not, what are the alternatives? Although most of our work does not usually ask such ''big'' questions, the assumptions we make about the corresponding answers deeply influence our research, teaching, and service' (http://aom.org/Events/2013-Annual-Meeting-of-the-Academy-of-Management.aspx, accessed 5 March 2013).

25. As discourse is a term used to convey diverse meanings, it is relevant to note that, in the social theory of hegemony, it refers to 'systems of meaningful practices that form the identities of subjects and objects' (Howarth & Stavrakakis, 2000, pp. 3–4).

26. It is as a consequence of this imputation that human beings find themselves constructed as sovereign agents who repeatedly endeavour to realize, or confirm, this sense of sovereignty. They/we are compelled to advance and defend this self-understanding, and thereby produce institutions, including forms of academic analysis, that reflect and reinforce a sense of (individual or group) agency as sovereign, and power as its possession.

27. This position is consistent with Berger and Luckmann's (1967) *Social Construction of Reality* which is a seminal text for institutional theory. As they put it, 'man's relationship to his environment is characterized by world-openness … the ways of becoming and being human are as numerous as man's cultures … the specific shape ~~of~~ into which [man's] humanness is molded is determined by those socio-cultural formations and is relative to their numerous variations. While it is possible to say that man has a nature, it is more significant to say that man constructs his own nature, or more simply, that man produces himself' (*ibid.*, pp. 65–67).

28. Because the common-sense conception of agency is so taken-for-granted, any challenge to its sovereignty tends to be interpreted as a nullification. For example, when reflecting upon the 'ontological scepticism' that they accredit to new institutional theory, Hirsch and Lounsbury (1997, p. 412) argue that 'neo-institutionalists … should concentrate on how actors construct themselves by drawing on available cultural models' in a way that should 'not, however, require the dissolution of actors as in a Foucauldian approach'. There are two difficulties with this argument. Firstly, post-structuralism, as articulated in such a Foucauldian approach, and also in Laclau's social theory of hegemony, does not dissolve actors but, rather, deconstructs their constitution and identification; and, secondly, the assertion that 'actors construct themselves …' adopts the commonsense conception of actors as sovereign entities, and thereby reproduces the limitations of analysis based upon the agency-structure formula.

29. 'Lack … is the primary ontological level of the constitution of the social. To understand social reality, then, is not to understand what society [or 'CMS'] *is*, but what *prevents it from being*' (Laclau, 1990, p. 44).

30. The media's preferred description for this movement is 'anti-globalization'. This is a particular interpretation which privileges the negative and excludes any mention of justice and overlooks the strong, positive advocacy of the global justice movement of 'a borderless world in which people can move freely; that is simply what "globalization from below" means, the mirror opposite of the capitalists' "globalization from above"' (Peart, n.d.).

31. The development of such movements, Laclau and Mouffe argue, is symptomatic of a realization that modernity, and within it capitalism, is productive of a 'proliferation of antagonisms' (*ibid.*, p. 163) that are not reducible to 'class' or any other social identity (*ibid.*, pp. 159, 167–168). Associated with this understanding is 'a renunciation of the subject as a unitary, transparent and sutured entity' as it is acknowledged how the identifications of subjects are overdetermined by multiple

relations of subordination; and also a 'polysemia' of ways in which particular antagonisms (around gender, ecology, development) are discursively constituted (*ibid*., p. 168).

REFERENCES

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

Adler, P., Forbes, L., & Willmott, H. C. (2007). Critical management studies. In A. Brief & J. Walsh (Eds.), *The academy of management annual review of organization and management* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Alakavuklar, O. N., & Parker, M. (2011). Responsibility and the local: The prospects for critical management in Turkey. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, *7*(4), 326–342.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. C. (1992). *Critical management studies*. London: Sage.

Arnesta, E., & Zylan, Y. (1991). It happened here: Political opportunity, the new institutionalism and the Townsend movement. *American Sociological Review*, *56*, 250–265.

Aspen Institute Initiative for Social Innovation Through Business. (2003). *Where will they lead? MBA student attitudes about business and society*. Retrieved from http://www.aspeninstitute.org

Baritz, L. (1960). *The servants of power*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Barley, S. R. (2007). Corporations, democracy and the public good. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *16*(3), 201–215.

Beckart, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change: The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organizations. *Organization Studies*, *20*(5), 777–799.

Bell, E., & King, D. (2010). The elephant in the room: Critical management studies conferences as a site of body pedagogics. *Management Learning*, *41*(4), 429–442.

Bello, W., Bullard, N., & Malhotra, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Global finance: New thinking on regulating financial markets*. London: Zed Books.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brief, A. P. (2000). Still servants of power. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*(4), 342–351.

Butler, N., & Spoelstra, S. (2012). Your excellency. *Organization*, *19*(6), 891–903.

Cavanagh, J., & Anderson, S. (2002). *What is the global justice movement?* Retrieved from http://www.ips-dc.org/global_econ/movement.pdf

Cederstrom, C., & Spicer, A. (2013). Discourse of the real kind: A post-foundational approach to organizational discourse analysis. *Organization*. doi:10.1177/1350508412473864

Clegg, S. (2002). Lives in the balance: A comment on Hinings and Greenwood's "disconnects and consequences in organization theory?" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*(3), 428–441.

Clemens, E. S., & Cook, J. (1999). Politics and institutionalism: Explaining durability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*, 441–466.

Crossley, N. (2002). *Making sense of social movements*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Daniel, C. A. (1998). *MBA: The first century*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Davis, G., & Thompson, T. (1994). A social movement perspective on social control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *39*, 141–173.

Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Scott, W.R., & Zald, M.N. (Eds.) (2005). *Social movements and organization theory*. Cambridge University Press. AU :8

Davis, G. F., Morrill, C., Rao, H., & Soule, S. A. (2008). Introduction: Social movements in organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *53*, 389–394.

Dehler, G. E. (2009). Prospects and possibilities of critical management education: Critical beings and a pedagogy of critical action. *Management Learning*, *40*(1), 31–49.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eden, D. (2003). Critical Management Studies and the *Academy of Management Journal:* Challenge and counterchallenge. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(4), 390–394.

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

Ephemara. (2004). 4(2). Retrieved from http://www.ephemeraweb.org AU :9

Fligstein, N. (1991). The structural transformation of American industry: An institutional account of the causes of diversification in the largest firms, 1919–1979. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory*, *18*(2), 105–125.

Fligstein, N., & McCadam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, *51*(3), 7–32.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(1), 75–91.

Gioia, D. A., & Corley, K. G. (2003). Being good versus looking good: Business school rankings and the Circean transformation from substance to image. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *1*, 107–120.

Glynos, J., & Howarth, D. (2007). *Logics of critical explanation in social and political theory*. London: Routledge.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Understanding strategic change: The contribution of archetypes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(5), 1052–1081.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*, 1022–1054.

Grey, C. (1996). Towards a critique of managerialism: The contribution of Simone Weil. *Journal of Management Studies*, *33*(5), 591–612.

Grey, C. (2004). Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *3*(2), 178–186.

Grey, C. (2005). Critical management studies: Towards a more mature politics. In D. Howcroft & E. Trauth (Eds.), *Handbook of information systems research*. London: Edward Elgar.

Grey, C. (2007). Possibilities for critical management education and studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *23*(4), 463–471.

Grey, C., & Willmott, H. C. (2002). Contexts of CMS. *Organization*, *9*(3), 411–418.
Guttal, S. (2005). *Silent war: The US's ideological and economic occupation of Iraq*. Social Research Institute, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok. Retrieved from http://www.focusweb.org
mans, M. (2003). Social movement organizations: A metaphor for strategic actors in institutional fields. *Organization Studies*, *24*(3), 355–381.
Hinings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (2002). Disconnects and consequences in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*, 411–421.
Hirsch, P. M., & Lounsbury, M. (1997). Ending the family quarrel: Toward a reconciliation of the "Old" and "New" Institutionalism. *American Behavioural Scientist*, *40*(4), 406–418.
Howarth, D., & Stavrakakis, Y. (2000). Introducing discourse theory and political analysis. In D. Howarth, A. J. Norval & Y. Stavrakakis (Eds.), *Discourse theory and political analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Jones, D. (2005). Change agents, double agents, secret agents: Theorizing activism from "Inside". Paper presented to the stream 'The Movements and Moments of Organizational Change', Critical Management Studies Conference, University of Cambridge, 4–6 July.
Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Klein, N. (2004). *Bagdad year zero*. Retrieved from http://auto_sol.tao.ca/node/view/855
Koopmans, R. (1993). The dynamics of protest waves: West Germany, 1965 to 1989. *American Sociological Review*, *58*(5), 637–658.
Korten, D. (1995). *When corporations ruled the world*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.
Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
Laclau, E. (2006). Ideology and post-Marxism. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *11*(2), 103–114.
Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.
Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
Levy, D. L., & Egan, D. (2003). A neo-Gramscian approach to corporate political strategy: Conflict and accommodation in the climate change negotiations. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(4), 803–829.
Lounsbury, M. (2003). The problem of order revisited: Towards a more critical institutional theory. In R. Westwood & S. Clegg (Eds.), *Debating organization: Point-counterpoint in organization studies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lounsbury, M., & Ventresca, M. (2003). The new structuralism in organization theory. *Organization*, *10*(3), 457–480.
Lounsbury, M., Ventresca, M., & Hirsch, P. (2003). Social movements, field frames and industry emergence: A cultural-political perspective on US recycling. *Socio-Economic Review*, *1*, 71–104.
Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment in advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*, 657–679.
Mandiola, M. P. (2010). Latin America's critical management? A liberation genealogy. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, *6*(2/3), 162–176.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D., & Scott, W. R. (2005). Organizations and movements. In G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Social movement and organization theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*(6), 1212–1241.

Murphy, J. (2006). Critical challenges to the emerging global managerial order. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, *2*(2), 128–146.

Norval, A. J. (2000). Trajectories of future research in discourse theory. In D. Howarth, A. J. Norval & Y. Stavrakakis (Eds.), *Discourse theory and political analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Oliver, C. (1991). The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization Studies*, *13*, 563–588.

Osterman, P. (2006). Overcoming oligarchy: Culture and agency in social movement organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*, 622–649.

Ozcan, K. (2012). From the Frankfurt school to business schools: Critical management studies in Turkey. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *20*(1), 107–123.

Peart, S. (n.d.). *What is the Global Justice Movement?* Retrieved from http://www.scottish socialistparty.org/international/esfssp2.html

Perriton, L. (2000). Verandah discourses: Critical management education in organizations. *British Journal of Management*, *11*, 227–237.

Perriton, L., & Reynolds, M. (2004). Critical management education: From pedagogy of possibility to pedagogy of refusal? *Management Learning*, *35*(1), 61–77.

Pfeffer, J. (2005). Mintzberg's unasked question. *Organization Studies*, *26*(7), 1093–1094.

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

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2003). Assessing business schools: Reply to Connolly. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *2*(4), 368–370.

Phillips, N. (2003). Discourse or institution? Institutional theory and the challenge of critical discourse analysis. In R. Westwood & S. Clegg (Eds.), *Debating organization: Point-counterpoint in organization studies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4), 635–652.

Porter, J., Rehder, R. R., & Muller, H. J. (1997). The invasion of the mind snatchers: The business of business education. *Selections*, *13*, 15–23.

Prasad, A. (Ed.). (2003). *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*. London: Palgrave.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, *4*, 795–843.

Rao, H., Morrill, C., & Zald, M. N. (2000). Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, *22*, 239–282.

Reedy, P. (2008). Mirror, mirror, on the wall: Reflecting on the ethics and effects of a collective critical management studies identity project. *Management Learning*, *39*(1), 57–72.

Rowlinson, M., & Hassard, J. (2011). How come the critters came to be teaching in business schools? Contradictions in the institutionalization of critical management studies. *Organization*, *18*(5), 673–689.

Sandberg, J., & Alvesson, M. (2010). Ways of constructing research questions: Gap-spotting or problematization? *Organization*, *18*(1), 23–44.

Schneiberg, M., & Lounsbury, M. (2008). Social movements and institutional analysis. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, W. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scully, M. (2002). Confronting errors in the meritocracy. *Organization*, *9*(3), 396–401.

Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. E. G. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*(2), 222–247.

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. (2009). Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations*, *62*(4), 537–560.

~~Srinivasan, S., Kemelgor, B., & Johnson, S.D. (2000). *Journal of Education for Business*, *76*(2), 75–80.~~ AU :10

Starhawk. (2000). *Turning the trolls to stone: Strategy for the Global Justice Movement*. Retrieved from http://www.starhawk.org/activism/activism-writings/trollstostone.html

Stern, R. N., & Barley, S. R. (1996). Organizations as social systems: Organization theory's neglected mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 146–162.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. (1993). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society*, *22*, 487–511.

Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *50*, 35–67.

Tarrow, S. (2011). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, P. (2001). Progress, practice and profits: How critical is critical management studies? Paper presented at the 19th annual international labor process conference, Royal Holloway College.

Thompson, P. (2005). Brands, boundaries and bandwagons: A critical reflection on critical management studies. In C. Grey & H. C. Willmott (Eds.), *Critical management studies: A reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Trank, C. Q., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Who moved our cheese? Reclaiming professionalism in business education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *2*(2), 189–205.

Walsh, J. P., & Weber, K. (2002). The prospects of critical management studies in the American academy of management. *Organization*, *9*(3), 402–410.

Walsh, J. P., Weber, K., & Margolis, J. D. (2003). Social issues and management: Our lost cause found. *Journal of Management*, *29*(6), 859–881.

Willmott, H. C. (2008). Critical management and global justice. *Organization*, *15*(6), 927–931.

Willmott, H. C. (2011). Making sense of the financial meltdown – An extended review of the spectre at the feast: Capitalist crisis and the politics of recession. *Organization*, *18*(2), 239–260.

Willmott, H. C. (2011a). Institutional work for what? Problems and prospects of institutional theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *20*(March), 67–72.

Willmott, H. C. (2012). Reframing relevance as "Social Usefulness": A comment on Hodgkinson and Starkey's 'not simply returning to the same answer over and over again'. *British Journal of Management*, *23*, 598–604.

Wray-Bliss, E. (2003). Research subjects/research subjections: Exploring the ethics and politics of critical research. *Organization*, *10*(2), 307–325.

Wray-Bliss, E. (2004). A right to respond? Monopolisation of 'Voice' in CMS. *Ephemera*, *4*(2), 101–120.

Zald, M. N. (2002). Spinning disciplines: Critical management studies in the context of the transformation of management education. *Organization*, *9*(3), 365–385.

Zald, M. N., & Berger, M. A. (1978). Social movements in organizations: Coups d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*, 823–861.

Zald, M. N., & McCarthy, J. D. (1980). Social movement industries: Competition and cooperation among social movement organizations. *Research in Social Movement, Conflict and Change*, *3*, 1–20.

Zald, M. N., Morrill, C., & Rao, H. (2005). The impact of social movements on organizations: Environment and responses. In G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Social movements and organization theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Zell, D. (2001). The market-driven business school: Has the pendulum swung too far? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *10*, 324–348.

Zell, D. (2005). Pressure for relevance at top-tier business schools. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *14*(3), 271–274.

Zizek, S. (1992). *Enjoy your symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and out*. New York, NY: Routledge.

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Emerald	**Book: DCMS-V002-3610778** **Chapter: 7**	**Please e-mail or fax your responses and any corrections to:** **E-mail:** **Fax:**

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Disk use
Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

☐ Scanning (parts of) your article ☐ Rekeying (parts of) your article

☐ Scanning the artwork

Bibliography
If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

☐ **The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**

☐ ***UNCITED REFERENCES:*** **This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark	Response
AU:1	As per style, the right running head should be of 65 characters. Please check the suggested right running head for correctness.	
AU:2	As per style up to six keywords are allowed. Please check and confirm which ones to retain.	
AU:3	Please provide the following references in the reference list: Hambrick & Chen, 2008;	

	Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Khuruna, 2007; Barley, 2006; Alvesson, Bridgman, & Willmott, 2009; Alvesson & Willmott, 2012; Spicer & Böhm, 2007; Lok & Willmott, 2013; Rowlinson & Hassard, 2011; Zizek, 1992; Elliott & Reynolds, 2002.	
AU:4	Please check the footnote given with the following sentence: "This complex of managerialism, scientism…" did not have any text, therefore it has been deleted.	
AU:5	In the following quoted text "As one reviewer commented…" please provide the closing quotes.	
AU:6	Please check the footnote given with the sentence: "'Structure' is thereby (re)defined post-structurally…" did not have any text, therefore it has been deleted.	
AU:7	Please cite the references under the heading "Uncited References" in the text or should it be deleted from the reference list.	
AU:8	Please provide the location of the publisher in the refs. Davis et al. (2005); Zald et al. (2005).	
AU:9	please provide the author names, article title and page range in the ref. Ephemara (2004).	
AU:10	Please provide the article title in the ref. Srinivasan et al. (2000).