The "Wildly Misappropriated" Work: The Application of Cultural Studies in Business Communication Classrooms

Yifan (Adele) Zhang
S P Jain School of Global Management, Singapore

Cultural studies and business communication did not seem to have anything in common until 2001, when Cynthia Ryan discussed a possibility of integrating cultural studies into business communication education. By focusing on the publications of the Association for Business Communication, this paper tracks the integration of cultural studies into business communication curricula since 2001, following up on Ryan's publication. With a literature review provided to compare business communication scholarship and management education criticism in their different approaches, this paper explains why cultural studies can and should be incorporated into business communication education and how it can be applied.

INTRODUCTION

In 2001, Cynthia Ryan in her article "The Challenge of Inclusion: Reconsidering Alternative Approaches to Teaching and Research" emphasized the significance of diversifying business communication scholarship. One of the possible solutions for diversification she recommended is a cultural studies approach. Imagining future business pedagogy enhanced by the integration of cultural studies, Ryan dismantled the assumed incompatibility of cultural studies and business communication, and argued for the utility of cultural studies in the increasingly complicated marketplace. Given the rapid globalization of business and management education over the past decade, and the increased recognition of the importance of cultural contextual awareness, has Ryan's dream been realized? Recent publications since 2001 in the *International Journal of Business Communication* (*IJBC*; previously the *Journal of Business Communication*, or *JBC*) and *Business & Professional Communication Quarterly* (*BPCQ*; previously *Business Communication Quarterly*, or *BCQ*) may offer a negative answer. In fact, both journals have fulfilled their promise of involving more industry-relevant research, instead of packing their publications with pure academic discussions. But if we look for the application of cultural studies in business communication education, we will be unsurprisingly disappointed. A scan over management education publications other than those on business communication may give us a ray of hope in developing business communication courses by actively involving cultural studies approaches. This paper is to offer a comparative analysis of business communication education and management education in general, a more detailed explanation as to why cultural studies should be integrated into business communication scholarship, and how it can be applied in business communication classrooms.

LITERATURE REVIEW: BUSINESS COMMUNICATION SCHOLARSHIP AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION RESEARCH

Ryan has a reason to be concerned about the ordeal of business communication scholarship. To incorporate cultural studies approaches in the business communication classroom is untraditional. Among various definitions of business communication, Reinsch (1996) defined it as "the scholarly study of the use, adaptation, and creation of languages, symbols, and signs to conduct activities that satisfy human needs and wants by providing goods and services for private profit" (p. 28). Reinsch (1996) vividly depicted the business school as the "putative father" and rhetoric "the putative mother" of business communication (p. 27). His review of the history of business communication scholarship confirms the practicality of business communication—"for private profit"—and its emphasis on composition—"of languages, symbols, and signs" (Reinsch, 1996, p. 28). Reinsch (1996) concluded that business communication must maintain its legacy if it "wishes to retain its place in the business school curriculum" (p. 40).

So it does. The table below shows the distribution of business communication research and teaching topics published by the *IJBC*/*JBC* in the past fifteen years. More than half of the journal's publications consist of business writing. Though the *IJBC*/*JBC* covers business communication education, it mainly contributes to business communication research and practices. The increasing number of publications on observations in corporations in the *IJBC*/*JBC* has signified the shifting trend of business communication research from pedagogy-orientated discussion to more emphasis on its practicality and relevance to the real world business.

TABLE 1
***IJBC*/*JBC* PUBLICATIONS, 2001–2015**

Categories	Articles	Percentage
Rhetorical analysis, composition, persuasion	136	50%
BC curriculum development and pedagogy	39	14%
Strategic communication—internal, interpersonal and group communication	32	12%
Strategic communication—external, CSR	18	7%
Cross-cultural communication	15	6%
Crisis communication	11	4%
Communication behavior, organizational behaviour	10	4%
Social network, media, technology	9	3%
Total	270	100%

Note: The author only examines the literature from the *JBC/IJBC* and the *BPCQ/BCQ* during 2001-2015, since Ryan's 2001 paper on diversifying business communication curricula and research was published. The categorization of the existing literature in these two journals has two concerns. The first concern is that the total numbers of articles surveyed only refer to essays (or "articles" as classified in the *BPCQ/BCQ*) on research and teaching, excluding editorials, book reviews, notifications, or reports on the ABC conferences. The other concern is classification itself. The different categories that divide the two journals' publications into different communication domains are not mutually exclusive. For instance, an essay can be a rhetorical analysis of a digital marketing message. If the focus is mainly on the analysis, this article will be categorized as rhetorical analysis rather than digital communication.

A national survey conducted by Moshiri and Cardon (2014) has also demonstrated that the legacy of business communication education in the US institutions has always been business writing. The *IJBC*/*JBC* publications have proved that for the past four decades "the business communication course provided comprehensive coverage of business writing, moderate coverage of interpersonal communication, and relatively light coverage of speeches and presentations" (Moshiri & Cardon, 2014, p. 313). Upholding a slightly different mission than the *IJBC*/*JBC*, the *BPCQ/BCQ* is devoted to teaching of business communication. The table below shows that more than half of its publications are focused on business communication curriculum development, among which half are on business writing. With 18% of the publications in the *BPCQ/BCQ* on rhetorical analysis of business writings not for the teaching purpose, it's safe to estimate that about half of the journal's publications are contributed to business writing and rhetoric.

TABLE 2
***BPCQ*/*BCQ* PUBLICATIONS, 2001–2015**

Categories	Articles	Percentage
BC curriculum development and pedagogy	359	62%
Rhetorical analysis, composition, persuasion, technology	106	18%
strategic communication—internal, interpersonal communication, cross-cultural communication at work	49	9%
Social media, networking, digital communication	27	5%
strategic communication--corporate communication	18	3%
Communication behavior, organizational behaviour	13	2%
Crisis communication	3	1%
Total	575	100%

However, not all business communication scholars and practitioners adamantly defend the central status of business writing in business communication scholarship. Many argue for the hybrid nature of this field. Shaw (1993) identified the theoretical framework that business communication is built upon, which is "rhetoric theory, communication theory, and management theory" (p. 302). Without undermining the foundation of rhetoric in forging business communication scholarship, Shaw (1993) emphasized "the links among our antecedent disciplines—links that enable us to say something valuable about strategy, systems, and practices" (p. 308). Without exploring or demonstrating these links, Shaw (1993) claimed, the discipline of business communication will endanger itself by trivializing its subject matter. Similarly, Zorn (2002) examined the academic reasons for disciplinary fragmentation in business communication and other disciplines, addressed such unrealistic separation in real business situations, and offered feasible solutions to converge the divergence. Linking different disciplines to expand and extend business communication education and research, a cross-disciplinary approach has proved to be the most feasible, though still difficult, way. In response to frequent requests for convergence, *BCQ* has two issues—June and September 2008—devoted to cross-disciplinary approaches.

Like most publications by *BPCQ*/*BCQ*, these two themed issues focus on pedagogical strategies and practices and observations of such practices. There isn't a clear and consistent definition of "cross-disciplinary" among business communication faculties. Therefore, certain cross-disciplinary experiments may not seem quite "cross-disciplinary" to some faculties. For instance, is a combination of communication and business administration (Krajicek, 2008) cross-disciplinary? Answers to this inquiry will probably be different for business communication faculty from business schools than for those from English departments. Despite its ambiguity, the truth about business administration or management education is that it's cross-disciplinary by nature. Have the themed publications in these two issues spared business communication scholarship from being trivialized as Shaw has wished? This question may be

tricky. But these practices and observations have not identified—or at least, proved to have identified—one important element in Shaw's claim, that is, management theory. The emphasis on sundry delivery methods and explanations is all too well embraced in business communication scholarship, without sufficient involvement or needs of management theory. The reason is quite understandable: Many business communication faculties come from journalism, communication or English departments and have not received business education and/or worked in any private sectors to gain necessary business acumen.

With the same purpose of training business professionals and cultivating managers for the current and future markets, shouldn't business communication education stand in line with the development of management education? One glance at the criticism of management education raised by the contributors to the *Academy of Management Learning & Education* (*AMLE*) will address an alarming disparity between management education and business communication curriculum. While the ABC publications understandably shift their attention from theory to practicality, the *AMLE* has constantly shown great interests in raising pressing issues in management education from a more critical angle. The publications by the US and international contributors to this journal in their observations and criticism of the contemporary management education have extensively utilized critical theories that are more familiar to the US English scholarship. Management faculty has long claimed the contingency of management education on critical pedagogy. Correspondingly, the concept of Critical Management Education (CME) was brought forward and has been reiterated on the agenda of management education development since the 1990s by management scholars, including Henry Mintzberg, Mats Alvesson, Michael Reynolds, Christopher Grey and John Hendry. CME looks for an alternative pedagogical strategy to challenge traditional management education that overemphasizes business functions and analytical approaches to decision making. Defined as "a set of values, conceptual tools and activities aimed at fostering critical reflection, which will enable students to identify the social and political processes shaping the actions of managers" (Duarte, 2010, p. 716), CME perceives managing as a non-neutral pursuit that is imbedded with political, cultural, and social agendas and attributes, and attends to certain *values* and *context* (Grey, 2004).

In pursuit of a critical approach to management education, CME advocates have a surprisingly common interest with cultural studies faculty. Bourdieu (Grey, 2003; Vaara & Fay, 2011), Foucault (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Knight, 2008; Duarte, 2010) and Giroux (Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, 2001) are introduced into organizational behaviour and leadership discussions so as to offer solutions for currently insufficient management training. Concepts that are mainly studied and discussed among cultural critics, such as "identity", "representation", "power", "post-colonialism", frequent CME scholarship. Omnipresent criticism of certain aspects of management education is inquired and argued among the CME scholars.

Many management scholars and companies have raised suspicion about the effectiveness of management education and request its reform in order to suit business needs and increase its actual relevance to business practices, as what has happened to business communication teaching and research. But instead of surrendering to such criticism, CME advocates question the total legitimacy of such a request. Knights (2008) argued,

> We need neither be for nor against relevance, but perpetually aware of its danger insofar as we may be tempted to subordinate our academic independence in exchange for the prospect of securing increased income and status through working for rather than merely with business. Not to protect our independence could delegate to business the power to constitute or transform us into particular kinds of subjects— subjects that no longer question how we have become tied to this or that particular discourse or identity for the very sense of our own meaning, purpose, and reality. In short, this is an argument against becoming attached to or seduced by particular constructions that then lead us to put a closure on other ways of thinking. (pp. 539-540)

Knights' argument not only freed management education from concentration on its utility but also can liberate business communication teaching from a growing emphasis on its own practicality. Should management education be purely practical and relevant to daily business, what's the point of management *education*?, Mintzberg (2004) asked. Nothing is more realistic, practical and relevant than a real job itself (Mintzberg, 2004). Mintzberg (2004) in his most frequently read criticism of management education held a protest against demands for hands-on, practical education. He claimed that education should be "hands-*off*…It has to provide something different—conceptual ideas that are quite literally *un*realistic and *im*practical…People learn when they *suspend* their *disbeliefs*, to entertain provocative ideas that can reshape their thinking. That is what education is all about" (Mintzberg, 2004, p. 38; italics original).

CME scholars also tend to expand the interdisciplinary spectrum of management education. Dehler, Welsh, and Lewis (2001) are among the earliest American CME advocates to embrace cultural studies concepts into their argument. The co-authors utilized Henry Giroux's critical pedagogy and tailored it to management education. Utilizing critical pedagogy, CME aims to transform business students into independent thinkers and "active knowledge producers" (Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, 2001, p. 505) rather than simplistic message receivers. Furthermore, they revealed an interesting disparity between US management scholars and their European counterparts: Compared to the European scholars, the US scholars in management education were and remain confined to "a shoot-the-messenger hegemony" (Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, 2001, p. 494). As a result, even when conventional management education practices and pedagogies fail to address the current business situations, critics who challenge such conventions will risk committing "cultural suicide" (Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, 2001, p. 494). The authors' observation of management education—and extendedly business communication education—is still not out of date. Though American cultural studies has taken its dominance in the cultural studies domain, it has failed to penetrate its homeland market-centric management education while its European "rival" has succeeded in this competition.

Grey (2004) also pointed out such difference among business schools across the Atlantic. Comparing the US with Europe, he noticed that CME has mostly arisen and been extensively discussed in Europe but resumed little presence in the US. However, the US has founded most prestigious business schools and established an elite status for and in management education, which makes transformation even more unnecessary. If so, why does the US management education need transformation despite its elite and dominant status in this field? It's because the business schools simply cannot ignore the fact that companies are looking for employees with critical thinking skills. In a survey conducted by the American Management Association, 62 percent of 768 managers and executives said that "their employees are average, or below average, in their communication skills, as well as creativity (61 percent), collaboration (52 percent), and critical thinking (49 percent)" (AMA survey, 2013, p.1). It means that the traditional management education, that is, to embrace "an instrumental logic in organizational relations" (Grey, 2004, p. 182), has to update and transform itself constantly in order to keep up with the fast pace of change in the global market.

Dehler *et. al.* (2001) offered three critical themes for classroom delivery that can enhance critical thinking training: "de-centering power in the classroom, challenging disciplinary boundaries, and taking up issues in a genuinely problematizing way" (p. 502). Hendry and his respondents, Case (2006) and Örtenblad (2006), on the other hand, unorthodoxly gave their hope to the humanities for transforming management education. Hendry (2006) argued that the importance of humanities education to future managers is to develop a new managerial identity that can cope with a new corporation "postbureaucratic" era. This new era of management requires managers of every level in the organization function as leaders, which is "an identity that empowers them to manage: to exercise judgement, to reconcile interests, and to build and lead communities of trust" (Hendry, 2006, p. 278). Though Case and Örtenblad have found uncertainty in Hendry's argument, they both agree on the significance of involving the humanities in management education.

Nonetheless, apart from the apparent incomparability between humanities education and business education, the difficulty of such integration lies in the fact that management education is essentially more about practicality and utility than about critical thinking. Grey (2002) examined the function of the

business school since its inception, that is, "socializing managers and legitimating management" instead of promoting "economic and technical effectiveness" (p. 509). The "deliberate plan" to "raise the social status of business managers relative to established professional groups" (Grey, 2002, p. 503) has cast management education as "a form of elite reproduction although part of its claim to value is anti-elitism" (p. 504). The danger of such elitization, institutionalization, and fundamentalization leads to its failure to address to stakeholders other than business executives, including public servants, entrepreneurs, policy makers (Grey, 2004), and people who work across borders. CME therefore is designed to counter such failure. Transformation is painful: It requires profound self-cognition and criticism of the existing system, in other words, a re-evaluation and hence deconstruction of such a system. Humanities education, CME scholars believe, will help managers "attend to interpersonal relations, communication, conflicts, feelings, politics, and the like" (Grey, 2004, p. 182). The very nature of humanities education that inquires power relationships, dismantles prescribed perceptions, and subscribes to non-linear thinking will assist managers in handling complicated business environments instead of reducing such complications to a simplified transaction procedure. CME criticizes the legitimacy of self-claimed apolitical, neutral management education and invites humanities education to a cross-disciplinary operation.

The CME faculty is not alone in promoting critical education. Many business communication scholars have joined them in this effort through communication perspectives. However, business communication scholars seem to use the concept "critical" or "critical thinking" all too randomly[1]. Therefore, when Bloch and Spataro (2014) quoted that over 75% of surveyed business leaders would like management education to put more emphasis on "critical thinking, complex problem solving, and written and oral communication" (p. 250), they also identified a problem in nourishing critical thinking. For Bloch and Spataro, what business schools have been doing is the mere cultivation of critical thinking *skills* whereas what the schools need to recognize is the cultivation of critical thinking *dispositions* that emerge from cultures of critical thinking. They argue that critical thinking is an ability that entails identifying the overwhelmingly instinctual assumptions conveniently imbedded in cognitive biases, which have well-established social and cultural contexts. Consequently, business majors with critical thinking dispositions should be able to "[r]ecognize and evaluate assumptions in their own and others' thinking"; "[m]inimize cognitive biases in their thinking and decision making"; and "[e]mbrace curiosity as a mindset" (Bloch & Spataro, 2014, p. 254).

The purpose of cultural studies is precisely to challenge culturally-bred assumptions and criticize subjective social and cultural interpretations and representations that have always been taken for granted.

THE "ORDINARY" CULTURAL STUDIES AND ITS APPLICATION

Cultural studies is infamous because of its leftist politics. Cultural studies scholars define this field as "an interlocking set of leftist intellectual and political practices" (Rodman, 2014, p. 39). However, the goal of a cultural studies approach is not to succumb to a leftist, radical cultural studies agenda. Rather, it's to discover an alternative to the American-centric management education and decentralize the ethnic business practice, though "the US cultural studies wields a powerful influence over cultural studies as it's practiced elsewhere" (Rodman, 2014, xvi). After all, we don't want to scare students away and rouse students' rejection at the beginning of the course as some CME faculties have experienced. Even CME critics who try to blend liberal education into elitist management education caution courageous CME practitioners to "instil in a more modest way critical questioning in our students' minds" with "a degree of subtlety" (Grey, 2002, p. 506).

The rising political attention to the Asia-Pacific region, where China is playing an increasingly significant role, re-located the once marginalized discourse of cultural studies that "has always been far closer in spirit to socialism and Marxism than to supply-side economics or free-market capitalism" (Rodman, 2014, p. 44). The critique of racism and imperialism in cultural studies will better prepare business students for the global business environment than any other ethnocentric education agendas. But "a litany of or tirade against the defects of global capitalism" (Grey, 2002, p. 506) is not something management education is looking for. There is a difference between what is taught and how it is taught.

There is also a fundamental difference between business students and humanities students. The essential differences between humanities and management educations stand behind Ryan's claim to "de-politicize" cultural studies by removing "strict Marxism" from cultural studies approaches (2001, p. 258).

What makes cultural studies discussions relevant to business communication education is the fact that cultural studies is actually quite "ordinary" (Williams, 1958) and should be able to "intervene productively in the 'real world' contexts where it most hopes to make a difference" (Rodman, 2010, 156), though the ordinariness of cultural studies is never obvious due to the complexity and jargons of cultural studies and university faculty's dominance in this field. The language of cultural studies is certainly not populist. The list of names of cultural studies scholars—Pierre Bourdieu, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak, Timothy Brennan, Hannah Arendt, Stuart Hall, Judith Butler, and Raymond Williams—produces a sense of isolation and separation from today's business. Instead, if anything, cultural studies has earned its fame for anti-capitalism, which explains why Rodman (2014) considers the popularity of Dick Hebdige's *Subculture* (1979) among major UK and US advertising firms "wildly misappropriated" (p. 56). When applying the sophisticated and sometimes tangled concepts of cultural studies to the business communication classroom, the instructor should translate the recondite cultural studies language into plain, transparent business language in order to, on one hand, maintain the clarity rule of business communication and, on the other, navigate potential rejection from business students.

The most common place to apply cultural studies in business communication classrooms is cross-cultural communication. For example, Edward Said's theory and argument of orientalism can be discussed among students who have an interest in the emerging economy of Asia. Orientalism, according to Said (1979), is "a considerable dimension of modern political-intellectual culture, and as such has less to do with the Orient than it does with 'our' world" (p. 12). The concept of orientalism raises the question as to whether the representation of the East imagined by the West in the latter's own cultural, social, and political spheres actually reflects the reality of the former. A consideration of this cultural studies argument will help business students understand the international business environment in a less biased manner and reduce cultural conflicts in management when doing business in Asia. Films that portray the East by Western and Eastern filmmakers can be presented in contrast. However, when the interpretation is open to the students, it should not be led to believe that Eastern filmmakers present the East in its true color while the Western films portray the East in a distorted way. Discussions of such contrast should be left to the students with the instructor's inquiring questions instead of manoeuvring statements. The purpose of discussions is to teach students to examine and inquire the same subject, representation, scenario and even business culture from different angles and encourage self-reflection.

Post-colonial critique like orientalism elevates sensitivity in management education to the self-claimed neutrality of values and context, though this kind of "elevation" will not come easily. Joy and Poonamallee (2013) have extensively examined the possibility and significance of including post-colonialism in management education and cross-cultural communication curricula, especially from the perspective of non-Western students. The authors' research and observation also imply an obstacle in applying cultural studies to business communication classrooms. Students are motivated by pragmatic goals "of getting credentials and economic returns" rather than idealistic goals of "acquiring knowledge" (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013, pp. 405-406). The integration of cultural studies into management education and business communication education doesn't seem to address the pragmatic goals. This expectation works no better for non-Western students, or maybe even worse, because non-Western students "may come in with internalized notions of the superiority of Western management knowledge and deficiency of that in their home countries", though students with prior work experience differ from those with no exposure to "context-specific nature of management" (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013, p. 406).

Joy and Poonamallee's warning has offered incredible value in interacting with non-Western students in the business classroom. However, there is one flaw in their observations. Non-Western students who come to the US for the "superior" US education often find the US portrayal of non-Western cultures untrue and sometimes offensive. A superficial and erroneous cultural presentation occurs to many cross-cultural communication and international business textbooks (Tipton, 2008). Tipton (2008) has requested more accurate cultural presentations in international business courses in order to facilitate "'deep'

learning that moves beyond knowledge and skill acquisition" (p. 19). Even though non-Western students study in the US for pragmatic reasons, false cultural representations will only undermine the credibility of its international business education. Cultural studies approaches will actually facilitate inquiries about inaccurate cultural presentations and representations more profoundly, avoid false cultural stereotyping, and thus can be crucial in understanding international business and the global market.

The shifting global economic force is the macroeconomic factor that makes cultural studies approaches viable and necessary. The global economic power game is changing rapidly. A rising number of emerging markets jointly assert themselves as the new driving force of the world's economy (Ciravegna, Fitzgerald, & Kundu, 2013). Though the US remains the leading power, Europe's economic power is waning. The uprising middle class in Asia has resulted in a record high of international students in the US (Witherell & Calyton, 2014), which proves Joy and Poonamallee's observation of the privilege status of the Western education in Asian students' perception. Meanwhile, more and more international students, unlike their predecessors who decided to stay in the West upon graduation, choose to go back to their home countries to advance their careers (Maclay, 2009). The shifting economic and subsequently political powers between the East and the West will lead to a different expectation of education. As more and more US universities have to cope with the increasing number of international students and cultural differences that come along with such students, an ethnocentric mindset needs to be addressed and catechized, not mentioning that the business schools in the US are also facing more fierce competition from their counterparts in Asia and Europe. When networking is one of the most important reasons for students to choose business schools (Kitroeff & Rodkin, 2014; Blackburn, 2011), doesn't an accessible network within their chosen job market sound more valuable to them?

Globalized business practice can be also examined through a cultural studies lens. Argument about the positives and negatives of globalization never ceased to influence business behaviour. For instance, free trade practice was established to maintain sustainable economy and to prohibit forced labor. A positive product of globalization itself, such practice is also meant to counterbalance the negative side of globalization—neo-colonial exploitation. The same consequence applies to education as well. Criticizing the pseudo-diversifying process of globalization in education, Costea (1999) claimed that "globalization appeals to mainstream business education because it offers a way to talking about the world…that reinforces the traditional view of work organizations as homogeneous matrices within which human beings are treated…as subjects of a universal minimalist economic rationality" (p. 310). Business communication faculty can encourage students to raise debate about the double-edged sword of such economic phenomena and thus evoke active thinking in critical business issues.

Discussions over social, economic and political phenomena as well as management conflicts can utilize cultural studies concepts. Neo-colonialism or neo-imperialism has caused social unrest in emerging markets and developing countries. Compared to simplistic, static and often inaccurate exotic cultural stereotyping, critical analyses of cultural and social issues are not only interesting for students to engage themselves in deep learning but also useful for them to explore for potential marketing campaigns. Gender issues can as well lead to heated discussions among students who come from different cultural, social and religious backgrounds. What business communication faculty, especially those who come from the humanities background, should concern about when covering these topics from a cultural studies approach is their inclination towards negativity and severe criticism of capitalism, exploitation, racism, gender inequality, poverty and business. The ultimate goal of business and management is indeed to find solutions and/or reap benefits, not to criticize.

CONCLUSION

Cultural studies, due to its ordinary subjects of study, can be a useful tool for business communication faculty to expand their research domains and to incorporate into their cultivation of critical thinking dispositions. While "the tourist aspects of culture" (Varner, 2001, p. 105) are more ubiquitous and more exotic for students to remember (p. 101), and it's more distressful to overcome "the self-reference criterion" (p. 106) through debate over cultural and social phenomena, the changing economic and

political forces will eventually cause the convenient cultural stereotyping to backfire. Cultural studies can facilitate a major breakthrough in students' thinking patterns that are deeply culturally imbedded. Business communication education should keep up with the development of management education by looking for the common ground and exploring its own strength.

ENDNOTE

1. When reviewing *BPCQ/BCQ*, the author searched "critical thinking" as the subject term. The result generated 42 out of 1,280 publications in all categories since the journal's establishment in 1996. The audience at the author's presentation at the ABC conference responded that critical thinking training was mandatory in many schools' policies and they taught all their students critical thinking. However, research on critical thinking teaching in the ABC publications appears to be insufficient and invisible to a great extent, which is another topic worth discussion but is not covered in this paper.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, J. (2013). Business languages for intercultural and international business communication: A Canadian case study. *Business Communication Quarterly, 76* (1), 28-50.

AMA survey says companies looking for employees with more critical skills. (2013). *Report on Salary Surveys, 20*(3), 1.

Blackburn, G. (2011). Which Master of Business Administration (MBA)? Factors influencing prospective students' choice of MBA programme - an empirical study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 33*(5), 473-483.

Blasco, M. (2009). Cultural pragmatists? Student perspectives on learning culture at a business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 8*(2), 174-187.

Bloch, J., & Spataro, S. (2014). Cultivating critical-thinking dispositions throughout the business curriculum. *Business & Professional Communication Quarterly, 77*(3), 249-265.

Brannen, T. R. (1970). A dean's perception of business communications. *Journal of Business Communication, 7*(4), 35-38.

Briam, C. (2010). Outsourced: Using a comedy film to teach intercultural communication. *Business Communication Quarterly, 73*(4), 383-398.

Cant, A. G. (2004). Internationalizing the business curriculum: Developing intercultural competence. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 177-182.

Case, P. (2006). Management education and the philosophical life: A response to John Henry. *Management Learning, 37*(3), 283-289.

Ciravegna, L., Fitzgerald, R., & Kundu, S. (2013). *Operating in emerging markets: A guide to management and strategy in the new international economy*. FT Press.

Clinebell, S. K., & Clinebell, J. M. (2008). The tension in business education between academic rigor and real-world relevance: The role of executive professors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(1), 99-107.

Conrad, D., & Newberry, R. (2012). Identification and instruction of important business communication skills for graduate business education. *Journal of Education for Business, 87*(2), 112-120.

Costea, B. (1999). International MBAs and globalisation: Celebration or end of diversity? *Human Resource Development International, 2*(4), 309-311.

Crosling, G., Edwards, R., & Schroder, B. (2008). Internationalizing the curriculum: the implementation experience in a faculty of business and economics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 30*(2), 107-121.

Dehler, G. E., Welsh, M. A., & Lewis, M. W. (2001). Critical pedagogy in the "new paradigm". *Management Learning, 32*(4), 493-511.

Duarte, F. (2010). Teaching organizational power and politics through a critical pedagogical approach. *Journal of Management and Organization, 16*(5), 715-726.

Gerfen, R. C. (1963). The changing world of the teacher. *Journal of Business Communication, 1*(1), 3-13.
Grey, C. (2002). What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education. *Journal of Management Education, 26*(5), 496-511.
Grey, C. (2004). Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3*(2), 178-186.
Hendry, J. (2006). Educating managers for post-bureaucracy: The role of the humanities. *Management Learning, 37*(3), 267-281.
Jameson, D. A. (2007). Reconceptualizing cultural identity and its role in intercultural business communication. *Journal of Business Communication, 44*(3), 199-235.
Joy, S., & Poonamallee, L. (2013). Cross-cultural teaching in globalized management classrooms: Time to move from functionalist to postcolonial approaches? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12*(3), 396-413.
Keating, R., & Byles, C. (1991). Internationalizing the business school curriculum: Perspectives on successful implementation. *Journal of Education for Business, 67*(1), 12-17.
Keithley, E. M., Schmidt, W., & Shedlin, A. J. (1965). Preparing tomorrow's managers. *Journal of Business Communication, 2*(2), 1-19.
Kitroeff, N., & Rodkin, J. (2014). Is an MBA worth it? Return on investment at top schools. *Bloomberg.Com*, 1.
Krajicek, J. (2008). Effective communication is "hitched to everything in the (business) universe". *Business Communication Quarterly, 71*(3), 369-373.
Knights, D. (2008). Myopic rhetorics: Reflecting epistemologically and ethically on the demand for relevance in organizational and management research. *Academy Of Management Learning & Education, 7*(4), 537-552.
Lauring, J. (2011). Intercultural organizational communication: The social organizing of interaction in international encounters. *Journal of Business Communication, 48*(3), 231-255.
Locker, K. O. (1998). The role of the association for business communication in shaping business communication as an academic discipline. *Journal of Business Communication, 35*(1), 14-49.
Lueg, K., & Lueg, R. (2015). Why do students choose English as a medium of instruction? A Bourdieusian perspective on the study strategies of non-native English speakers. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *14*(1), 5-30.
Maclay, K. (March 19, 2009). U.S. economy spurs foreign students to return home, study says. *UC Berkeley News*. Retrieved from http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2009/03/19_foreign.shtml
Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
Mockler, R. J. (2002). Using the arts to acquire and enhance management skills. *Journal of Management Education, 26*(5), 574-585.
Moshiri, F., & Cardon, P. (2014). The state of business communication classes: A national survey. *Business & Professional Communication Quarterly, 77*(3), 312-329.
Örtenblad, A. (2006). Education everyone in humanities for both post-bureaucracy and bureaucracy: A response to John Hendry. *Management Learning, 37*(3), 291-294.
Pomerenke, P. J. (2001). Challenges for ABC members in 2000. *Journal of Business Communication*, *38*(1), 5-13.
Porte, M. (1963). Needed research in business writing. *Journal of Business Communication*, *1*(1), 23-28.
Praetzel, G. D. (1999). Pedagogical recommendations for internationalizing the undergraduate business curriculum. *International Advances in Economic Research, 5*(1), 137-146.
Rainey, B. G. (1972). Professors and executives appraise business communication education. *Journal of Business Communication, 9*(4), 19-23.
Reinsch, L. N., Jr. (1996). Business communication: Present, past, and future. *Management Communication Quarterly: McQ, 10*(1), 27-49.

Reinsch, L. (1991, Fall91). Editorial: What is business communication? *Journal of Business Communication*, *28*(4), 305-310.
Rodman, G. (2010). Cultural studies is ordinary. In: Grossberg, L, Horak, R. and Seidl, M. (eds). *About Raymond Williams*. London: Routledge, pp. 153–164.
Rodman, G. (2014). *Why cultural studies?* John Wiley & Sons.
Rogers, P. S. (1999). Internationalism, technological Innovation, and new associations: Bringing change to business communication research and teaching. *Business Communication Quarterly, 62*(4), 108-113.
Rogers, P. S. (2001). Convergence and commonality challenge business communication research. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*(1), 14-23.
Rogers, P. S., & Wong, I. H. (2005). The MBA in Singapore. *Business Communication Quarterly, 68*(2), 180-196.
Ryan, C. (2001). The challenge of inclusion: Reconsidering alternative approaches to teaching and research. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*(3), 256-260.
Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
Shaw, G. (1993). The shape of our field: Business communication as a hybrid discipline. *Journal of Business Communication, 30*(3), 297-313.
Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations, 56*(10), 1163-1193.
Thomas, G. F. (2001). Forging our own path: Building synergy from opposing forces. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*(1), 24-28.
Tipton, F. B. (2008). "Thumbs-up is a rude gesture in Australia": The presentation of cultural in international business textbooks. *Critical Perspectives on International Business, 4*(1), 7-24.
Ulijn, J. (2000). Innovation and international business communication: Can European research help to increase the validity and reliability for our business and teaching practice? *Journal of Business Communication, 37*(2), 173-187.
Vaara, E., & Faÿ, E. (2011). How Can a Bourdieusian perspective aid analysis of MBA education? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(1), 27-39.
Varner, I. I., & Valentine, D. (2001). Teaching intercultural management communication: Where are we? Where do we go? *Business Communication Quarterly, 64*(1), 99-111.
Von Glinow, M. A., Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. *Academy of Management Review, 29*(4), 578-592.
Wardrope, W. J. (2001). "Challenge" is a positive word: Embracing the interdisciplinary nature of business communication. *Journal of Business Communication*, 38(3), 242-247.
Williams, R. (1958). Culture is ordinary. *Resources of hope: Culture, democracy, socialism*. London: Verso, pp. 3-14.
Witte, A. (2014). Serious games: A seminar map for international business schools. *Business & Professional Communication Quarterly*, 77(1), 31-49.
Witherell, S. & Clayton, E. (November 11, 2014). Open doors 2014: International students in the United States and study abroad by American students are at all-time high. *The Institute of International Education*. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2014/2014-11-17-Open-Doors-Data
Zorn, T. E. (2002). Converging within divergence: Overcoming the disciplinary fragmentation in business communication, organizational communication, and public relations. *Business Communication Quarterly, 65*(2), 44-53.