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Abstract
This paper uses an exploration of management education images and artefacts, to provoke questions regarding the significance and impact of an institution’s visual imprint on individuals’ understandings of the opportunities offered by a management/business education. We use a visual semiotic analysis to analyse two business school home pages and consider the socio-cultural significance of specific images portrayed using concepts of capital (Bourdieu 1986) and social imaginaries (Taylor, 2004). We note a privileging of the individual and the promotion of the cultural and social capital that individual is promised but and a lack of wider organisational structures which provides and supports such acquisition.

Introduction
This paper focuses on what is arguably one of the neglected ‘senses’ in organisational learning research, namely the visual. Through an exploration of management education images and artefacts, this paper seeks to provoke questions regarding the significance and impact of an institution’s visual imprint on individuals’ understandings of the opportunities offered by a management/business education.

The dearth of studies that take account of the impact of visual artefacts - photos, logos, images, etc.- on shaping individual and organisational learning requires an inter-disciplinary approach. We are therefore positioning this paper very much as a
thought piece, intended to prepare the ground for further theoretical and empirical work. As such, one aim of this paper is to encourage management/business schools to become more reflexive in relation to the wider socio-cultural significance of their visual presentation and to suggest that this task is not one which should be left solely to the marketing or external relations functions. Following suggestions in relation to the phenomenon of branding by Kärreman and Rylander (2008), a further aim is to interpret/consider ways in which visual imagery is an attempt to communicate specific values and, correspondingly, an exercise in the management of meaning.

In an attempt to practise what we preach we - as academic educators/practitioners - present ongoing research that examines the implications of the visual imprint of management education institutions on organisation stakeholders. We argue that this study is apposite, given the significance placed by institutions on their visual presentation through websites etc., often including the prominent display of accreditation logos (e.g. EQUIS, AMBA, AACSB), alongside the institution’s own logo. Related to the importance of image and brand, this paper also draws on the authors’ ongoing interest in the development and promotion of the MBA by these institutions as an elite pathway (Elliott and Robinson 2007). This attempt to manage and control an institution’s image is we suggest especially problematic given the global reach of websites, which can be accessed from anywhere, at any time by anybody with internet access and are thus subject to a range of interpretations influenced by a myriad of socio-cultural contexts. In an era of professionally-planned communication (Christensen and Cheney, 2000) schools face an additional paradox as they attempt to achieve a unique identity whilst the demands of accreditation bodies render them ever more similar.

An intended contribution of the paper is methodological as we adopt a visual semiotic analysis (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 1990) to interpret the (un)intended consequences of the images that management/business schools adopt. Our initial analysis is a study of the front page of two institutions’ websites of which we will ask questions including: what information is privileged, and what images are present? We then contrast these pages with the MBA pages embedded in the sites. In considering the websites as communication tools that attempt to manage meaning we interpret the values that are emphasised and position them as a social process. This conceptual
positioning, we argue, enables an appreciation of the ways in which the values associated with the visual presentation of/by management/business schools suggests certain types of relationships between and within stakeholder groups, including staff, students, funding agencies and business. Having identified what images and information are privileged we enter another cycle of analysis in which we draw on what we call the aesthetic literatures, e.g. marketing (Karreman and Rylander 2008) and architecture (Dale and Burrell 2003) to interpret the significance of specific images on the websites and to ask questions concerning the sense and effect of the visual on internal and external stakeholders.

In positioning the communicative aspects of the visual as a social process a further intended aim of the paper is therefore to suggest the relevance of the aesthetic in the learning environment. This requires us to draw on literatures that deal specifically with the role of aesthetics in managing meaning and, in for instance the case of literature that considers the significance of physical space and architecture, asks how this influences individual and organisational relationships. For example, how are institutional buildings designed and photographically captured and what does this imply for the way work is managed (cf. Dale and Burrell, 2003), and the politics of social space configured (Bourdieu, 1884, 1986)? What ‘social imaginaries’ (Taylor, 2004) are mobilised by the dress and appearance of individuals featured in website photos and the representations of the buildings in which this learning takes place?

The paper is structured in the following way. Given the degree of scholarly neglect in relation to the impact of the visual imprint of management education, in order to inform our analysis we first review related literature that considers the significance of the aesthetic in organisation studies more broadly and which surfaces significant gaps in emphasis. We then enter our first round of analysis by studying, through a visual semiotic analysis, the opening page of Lancaster University Management School’s and Warwick Business School’s websites. We then contrast these findings with those of the MBA pages. In so doing, we discuss what information is visible, examine how the information is presented, and outline what images the pages contain. We follow this with a second round of analysis that considers the socio-cultural significance of specific images, such as photos of the institutions’ buildings, and interpret what
messages such images might – intentionally or otherwise - communicate about the institutions’ values and purpose to internal and external stakeholders.

This interpretive process is followed by a discussion of the implications of this study for learning in general and organisational learning (as both process and intention) more specifically. What, we ask, do an organisation’s stakeholders learn about an organisation through its associated visual imagery? Does an organisation’s aesthetic configuration (e.g. building layout) and representation impact upon an organisation’s learning and knowledge flows? As a social process the visual has been relatively neglected in the organisation studies/organisational learning fields: yet, as our study implies, the activities of management/business schools cannot sit apart from the impact of visual culture.

**Background and Literature**

The questions posed, the focus identified and the implied direction of this paper indicated above imply, we argue, the need for an exploratory departure from or extension of the mainstream management education and organisational learning literature and an opening up of perspectives relating to visual impact. This, we suggest, will help us to consolidate existing work and to identify the key issues and research foci to take forward to develop this work further. Reference to wider fields in organisation studies and beyond, e.g. marketing (Karreman and Rylander 2008) or architecture (Dale and Burrell 2003), is a means to start to address this call.

What we term ‘aesthetic’ literatures are of relevance here, particularly in terms of their emphasis on the sense and the effect of the visual on internal as well as external users/customers. Work drawn on in this section therefore includes work on the architecture of the workplace, on branding and its effects on both internal and external learning processes, on semiotics, organisational aesthetics and on identification and organisational images. Work which privileges, and focuses in depth on, the impact of the visual using semiotics, and concerned with the social (and historical) implications of interpretation is of particular interest. Specifically, we are interested in how fields, such as branches of marketing and architecture for example, focus on the social processes connected to the visual. Key work is identified to inform and give structure to the development of our own (preliminary) analytical framework. In so doing we are
exploring alternative perspectives and methodologies for approaching our research on the role and importance of the visual in the context laid out above, and developing our own framework through which we conduct a preliminary analysis in subsequent sections.

In the organisational studies literature in recent years there has been increased interest in discourse and organisations (see for example Linsest 2000, Linstead and Westwood 2001) as well as a growing interest in physical spaces and the internal and external (visual) projections of the organisation and its effects on both internal and external stakeholders. (See, for example, Academy of Management Review, special issue 2000 on organisational identity). This has been likened to a type of branding, (Karreman and Rylander 2008), but used in a wider context than generally understood in the mainstream marketing literature.

In addition, there has been growing interest in ‘organizational aesthetics’ (e.g Carr and Hancock 2003), described by Hancock (2005) as a turn in organisation studies towards considering aesthetic knowledge, which has ‘offered a new and somewhat esoteric means of both managing and analysing organisational life’ (Hancock 2005:300). In relation to this, it is also argued that there is a growing pressure on contemporary organisations ‘to focus attention on the symbolic dimensions of their activities’ (Karreman and Rylander 2008:103).

Organisational aesthetics
Organisational aesthetics can refer to many aspects of an organisation’s visual imprint including ‘the form of packaging, logos, trade names, business cards, company uniforms, buildings, advertisements and other corporate elements that that have the potential of providing aesthetic gratification’ (Schmitt et al. 1995:83 in Hancock 2005:33). But it can also, in a broader sense, refer to the presentation of individuals not only through uniforms and other organisationally controlled forms of individual presentation but also through what Bixler and Rice (1997) refer to as the ‘New Professional Image’, which is dedicated ‘to explaining the significance of the aesthetics of self-presentation in all its forms to budding executives hoping to have career building impact within their workplaces and beyond’ (Hancock 2005:33).
Issues of power and consumption and their connection to organisational aesthetics are also significant in this context. Writing from a critical management studies perspective, Dale and Burrell (2003) argue that there needs to be much more awareness of:

‘the significance of the built environment and the ways in which management is involved in the building of power, the building of consumption, the building of manufacture and the building of administration.’

Rather than being interested solely in the building of buildings as such, Dale and Burrell (2003) state that they are interested in ‘the building of the social through buildings’ (our emphasis) (Dale and Burrell 2003:162) and also argue that the often taken-for-granted day-to-day experiences of ‘issues of space, building and design’, need to be incorporated into our understanding of alienation and identity’ within organisations (Dale and Burrell 2003:173).

Hancock (2005: 34), having summarised these literatures on organisational aesthetics, concludes that:

‘what such literature alludes to is the broader realization that organizational aesthetics represents an appropriate site of managerial intervention and manipulation and, as such, has emerged as a legitimate realm for the pursuit of particularized agendas and the management of both organizationally and socially efficacious regimes of meaning and action’.

Similarly to Hancock (ibid) we want to consider ‘aestheticization processes per se’ rather than other literatures that tend to look at how aesthetics provide a different way to look at organizational life.

We are seeking, as Hancock remarks of other studies (e.g. Dale and Burrell (2003), Kersten and Gilardi (2003), to consider the ways in which aestheticized environments are ‘enmeshed within structured regimes of meaning – that is the aesthetic production of meanings that are capable of serving the ideological requirements of the organization’ (Kersten and Gilardi 2003: 39).

As our work draws primarily on websites which rely heavily on the use and positioning of photographs to convey meaning and attract and guide the reader, work
relating to the cultural and semiotic impact of photography is also of importance in guiding the development of this study. For example, Sontag (in Evans and Hall, 1999: 82) argues that ‘The photographic exploration and duplication of the world fragments continuities and feeds the pieces into an interminable dossier, thereby providing possibilities of control that could not even be dreamed of under the earlier system of recording information: writing’. Sontag continues: ‘In the form of photographic images, things and events are put to new uses, assigned new meanings, which go beyond the distinctions between the beautiful and the ugly, the true and the false, the useful and the useless, good taste and bad’ (Ibid: 91).

As Bourdieu argues, photography, although it presents an appearance of naturalness, of presenting ‘objective reality’, in fact selects and represents and therefore allows us to discern through the choice of image and positioning of the photograph ‘the categories and canons of the traditional vision of the world’ (Bourdieu 1990 p164). We therefore want to link the work on organizational aesthetics with Bourdieu’s theory of capital and in particular we want to look at ways in which forms of capital (social, cultural and economic, as understood by Bourdieu 1986) are represented as desirable (what Taylor calls ‘social imaginaries’) and at the institutions (e.g. universities) through which these forms of capital are acquired.

What methodologies can be employed for researching ‘organizational aesthetics’?

Our intention in this paper is to begin a semiotically-driven analysis of two management/business school websites as well as the schools’ associated material artefacts. In positioning the communicative aspects of the visual as a social process a further intended aim of the paper is to suggest the relevance of the aesthetic in the learning environment. Although there has been an increasing interest in organization aesthetics in recent years - perhaps as a consequence of organizations’ recognition of the power of image and the ‘general aestheticization of many aspects of life’ (Gabriel, 2005: 15) - we can find no explicit reference to the significance of the visual in relation to organisational learning. Yet, as Hancock (2005) argues, a semiotic analysis of the aesthetics of organisational life offers us an alternative way of understanding organizations as we ‘decode’ how meaning is aestheticized. A semiotic analysis does not then ‘take the rhetoric of aesthetics at face value, but rather
subjects it to a critical analysis that is designed to expose its internal workings and to evaluate the pervasiveness of its constituted meaning’ (p. 46).

Hancock further argues that a semiotically-driven analysis can uncover how, because of their aesthetic qualities, ‘artefacts function as what Gell (1992) describes as *technologies of enchantment*; that is of the ways in which particular material artefacts can be understood as media that are aesthetically inscribed with meaning and directed towards ‘securing the acquiescence of individuals in the network of internationalities in which they are enmeshed’ (Gell, 1992: 43, cited in Hancock, 2005:30). A further advantage of a semiotic approach is the insights it provides ‘into the ways in which dominant regimes of meaning are produced, reproduced and communicated both within and outwith the organizational domain’ (Hancock, 2005: 31), which can only be rendered effective if we accept that ‘aesthetic enchantment’ is a social phenomenon and therefore ‘bound up in a complex web of socio-historically constituted experiences’ (ibid). It offers, in other words, analytical tools to examine images and to discover *how they mean* (Williamson, 1978: 17, emphasis in original) in relation to wider systems of meaning (Rose, 2007).

In order to investigate the public projections of the two management/business schools we take several of the institutions’ images in the public domain and pass them through several cycles of hermeneutic analysis (Thompson, 1981; Ricoeur, 1981) including a) our own feeling and impressions, b) a visual semiotic interpretative framework (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 1996) and c) finally through the use of a theoretical framework consisting of some of the concepts relating to education and the politics of social space.

Our adoption of a broadly hermeneutic approach arises from our intention to use the analysis as a way to ask questions. As Jewitt and Oyama (2007: 136) point out

‘social semiotics is not an end in itself. It is meant as a tool for use in critical research. It only becomes meaningful once we begin to use its resources to ask questions’.

Although described as a functionalist tool in terms of its consideration of visual resources as being developed to undertake certain kinds of semiotic work, this approach nevertheless subjects the rhetoric of aesthetics to a ‘critical analysis that is
designed to expose its internal workings and to evaluate the pervasiveness of its constituted meaning’ (Hancock 2005: 46).

The visual semiotic method we apply here draws on work by Kress and Van Leeuwen (1996), who in turn draw on Halliday’s (1978) identification of three main kinds of semiotic work: the ideational metafunction; the inter-personal metafunction, and the textual metafunction. Extending this approach to images, Kress and Van Leeuwen (1996) adopt a different terminology preferring ‘representational’ to ‘ideational’; ‘interactive’ rather than ‘inter-personal’, and ‘compositional’ instead of ‘textual’ (Jewitt and Oyama, 2007). They argue that any one image not only represents the world, but it also is involved in some interaction and constitutes some kind of text (an advertisement, a painting etc.). Visual semiotics has therefore been described as ‘the study of the ways in which visual images produce social meaning’ (Scollon and Scollon 2003: 217). Kress and Van Leeuwen’s visual grammar (1996, 2001) focuses on four main semiotic systems: represented participants; modality; composition; interactive participants.

Borrowing the framework of Scollon and Scollon (2003:84), drawn from Kress and Van Leeuwen, the following themes are explored in this study, namely:
- the representation of real world images
- the problem of how real world images index the real world in which they are placed
- the problem of how social actors index these images which are so abundant, constructing ongoing social performances as part of the social situation front. (Scollon and Scollon 2003:84)

The study
As previously stated, in seeking an appropriate methodology for analysing the use of visual imagery on business school websites through an organisational learning lens we apply a visual semiotic framework to the home pages of two leading UK business schools (Warwick and Lancaster). The Schools were chosen due to their parity in terms of prestige and reputation both in the UK and further afield.

A first viewing of the Schools’ home web pages indicates some obvious similarities between the two sites. First of all, both home pages privilege people, particularly
images of just one person, or focusing in on one person from a group (the value of individualism). The individuals pictured are young and casually dressed, a mixture of races and genders (representing the contemporary corporate values of diversity and inclusiveness), with the implication, from their age and their positioning on the School page, that those represented are students. In some cases, at the bottom of the picture, the title of the degree scheme is mentioned alongside the individual’s name to confirm that they are in fact students. In addition, some of the pictures are ‘speaking’ in that for each face there is a quote or sound bite summarising their experience of the course or at the school - a kind of ‘synthetic personalization’ in which the viewer is positioned as interlocutor (Fairclough 1992:98). But, as the analysis below will demonstrate, the semiotics of the photo itself will also speak in perhaps slightly different ways to those of the attached text/sound bite. The photos are posed (see Bourdieu 1999), the individuals are mainly pictured in profile or are slightly out of focus. They are decontextualised from their background, which is often blurred or nondescript. The buildings where this experience takes place are not clearly shown.

One interesting feature of these pages is that both websites are constantly changing and so the images one sees at any particular time varies (although in some cases the text remains the same). A world of variety and constant change is evoked. This, although frustrating for the present purpose, is interesting in terms of the variety of messages and semiotic meanings being portrayed, so far example, the two present authors, on-line at the same moment in different places, were seeing different images on the same site.

There are also some significant differences between the two pages, including the amount of text used, the positioning of the visual images and the way in which logos and badges are displayed. We now discuss each of these in turn.

**Warwick Business School (WBS) (accessed 01.04.08)**

At the top left-hand side of the home page there are the business school logo and the blurred images of three people – presumably students - in casual clothes walking towards the viewer. This image, in its lack of focus, suggests people about to emerge from a mist at which time the observer will see them clearly – and perhaps become one of them (they appear to be walking on grass, with a blue sky behind them). The
first time this page was accessed, the main body of the page was dominated by the single image of a young woman in left profile, looking thoughtful or smiling reflectively (a similar picture of a young man in profile with an enigmatic smile is to be found on the ‘about WBS page’). There is little text surrounding this, mainly just a list of links. On a second viewing (several hours later), this image had been replaced by that of the Dean as a top news item as he had been appointed to head both ABS and AACSB.

On a third visit, the home page featured a photo - taken from above – that looked down on a woman dressed in red reading a newspaper. She had a badge on as if she were attending a conference - but her role was not made clear from the surrounding text, which seemed disconnected from the image - and indeed at a later viewing the same text was accompanied by a picture of a different woman wearing a pink shirt in a front-facing shot.

Five different accreditation logos in full colour are very clearly displayed at the bottom right hand-side of the home page. Above these logos there is a changing box which shows the front covers of recent books published by the WBS faculty. The symbolic and intellectual/cultural capital of this school is therefore being made very clear. There is a lot of free, white space on the page with very little text, although there are many hyperlinks to other pages.

The distance of the viewer from each of the photos described above is close, suggesting intimacy. However, although the pictures of the young women were taken straight-on or looking down (a sign of inferior status), the picture of the Dean is taken from slightly below looking up and he is looking down slightly, thus suggesting his organizationally superior status.

**Lancaster University Management School (LUMS) (accessed 1.04.08)**

LUMS’s home page is loaded with several different boxes of text providing different information. When accessed for the first time, at the top of the home page there was a constantly changing photo box with photos of approximately ten different students (and texts/narrations of their experiences). When accessed the second time, the moving box contained pictures from a ‘meet the employer event’ in which four
revolving ‘action shot snaps’ showed (non-defined) people interacting. The individuals in the photos were nevertheless carefully positioned in front of the banners of several well-known graduate employers, including Price Waterhouse Coopers, BAE systems, Ernst and Young and BT. These banners can be seen clearly and are not obscured in any way. The implication here is on the successful student journey in which the individual students acquire the capital to be potential employees of these ‘big name’ companies. However, there is a contradictory message here in the ‘churn’ of students as represented – the institution endures, while the individual students and their stories appear and fade away and are replaced.

The accreditation logos for the school are in grey (which could be interpreted as down-playing their significance) and are somewhat obscured at the bottom right-hand corner under the text box. The current school news and events section, and the right hand-side of the page also contain several images relating to speakers from the world of business and so on and the Financial Times’ logo, thus demonstrating by association the school’s symbolic capital in the world of finance and business.

**Discussion: Preliminary semiotic analysis**

Our preliminary semiotic analysis of the websites can be summarised as follows.
- Represented participants: These are mainly young, healthy-looking, privileged individuals, generally represented in single images as individuals rather than as groups of people interacting. They are isolated individuals, not contextually socialized, not represented actively as studying, but are ‘being students’ as an identity. They do however, in some cases, appear and then fade away to be replaced by another individual, suggesting the constant churn of students in the institution.
- Modality: natural colouration/representation. We note the bright-coloured clothes, e.g. red and pinks, worn by the represented individuals (making them stand out as individuals), but also the blurred and ‘ghostly’ images (coming to invite the spectator into the institution).
- Composition: the place for real and new information. In the home pages there is very little contextualisation – the focus is on the individual person as ‘student’ not on their environment. Again, there is no representation of the School as a place of learning. The spectator is faced with individuals whose lifestyles s/he might wish to emulate (social capital seems to be primary here).
- Interactive participants: relationships with the viewer. The individuals are often represented face-on and in a large image promoting intimacy with the viewer (synthetic personalization), an attempt at familiarly that suggests ‘you could be like me if you came here’.

**Further analysis of the two sites**

Further investigation or drilling down into the pages reveals some differences from the home pages, particularly concerning the use of people, buildings and other artefacts, which are more prevalent than on the home pages. For example, the MBA Images within the two case study institutions are quite similar. We were struck in both cases by the similarity of images of buildings as being decontextualised from the local. We also noticed representations of MBA ‘people’, including students, staff, alumni and sometimes those of uncertain status, which is a difference from the home pages where the dominant representation is of individual students. Perhaps this suggests the socialisation process that the new student will undergo in the School in order to acquire social and cultural capital.

The use on the websites of both institutions of images of the buildings in which the MBA takes place is also indicative. In both cases (both are green campus universities) the buildings are largely decontextualised from their actual rural settings and could evoke any modern city, e.g., New York, Shanghai or Kuala Lumpur. This process represents the symbolic power of the institution (the School, the MBA) as delocalised, suggesting a homogenised, global world of business that is embodied in the buildings. The ways in which the pictures are taken is also interesting: they are both taken from below looking up, thus suggesting aspiration, something to aspire to but not yet obtained (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 1990) and something that has some symbolic power over you (the observer). One is taken from the front, suggesting maximum involvement with this image/concept and the other from a side angle, suggesting again an uneven power relationship (Jewitt and Oyama, 2001). Both buildings are foregrounded, with no background or context (as noted above). The use of sunset or sunrise on one photo is fascinating and gives a rather dreamlike/surreal image. The buildings evoke an imaginary of exclusivity, superiority and a sense of entitlement and present the universities as urban business environments, rather than in their rural settings.
As on the home pages where the emphasis was on young people (students) the people depicted on the websites are also significant, particularly in terms of their homogeneity. We discuss two images in turn. Firstly there is the image from LUMS’s website which we have called ‘talking heads’. This shows two white, middle-aged, middle-class men in functional business attire, in what appears to be conversation, although neither seems to be talking. We find this image rather staid and it is unclear who these people are and what their connection to the MBA is. We know, in fact, that these are two members of staff of the business school, one being the former MBA director. However, we do not feel they are being depicted as staff members, but rather that this is some sort of simulation, a simulation of what is however less clear, but seems to be connected to the acquisition of social capital (belonging to a group), and symbolic capital (wearing of business attire).

A second image of interest here is from WBS’s website, which appears several times on several pages, ‘Life at WBS’, ‘Campus Life’, as a sort of letter-head in the top right-hand corner in sepia, a slightly ghostly or dreamlike representation (see http://www.wbs.ac.uk/students/mba/live/campus-life.cfm). This image represents three white males on a racing yacht, conveying messages of competition, privilege, leisure, distance. Again, there is the message of something the observer, positioned as a potential student, can aspire to; a simulation of a ‘desirable’ lifestyle that although still distant and unclear, might be attainable (see Elliott and Robinson 2007 for more discussion of use of visual imagery and the MBA).

**Discussion: Implications and Contributions**

In this paper we have tried to show how to research and make sense of the visual: ‘what a semiotic approach to the analysis of organisational aesthetics provides us with is a means of engaging with and decoding or “uncovering” the aestheticization of meaning, and, thus, an alternative and potentially critical way of knowing organization’ (Hancock 2008: 46). Our methodological contribution lies in applying an approach/testing the ground and in demonstrating how these literatures that deal with the aesthetic have relevance in the organisational context.
Semiotics, however, is ‘not everyone’s cup of tea …it is often accused of being both highly subjective and grounded unnecessarily in the discourse and ontological attitudes of an objectivist science’ (Hancock 2008:45). Of course, semiotic approaches raise issues of interpretation. And also of the role of the aesthetic in the creation of institutional identity – how intentional is it? We need to go behind the scenes to consider production and also look at consumption. But nevertheless these representations are aesthetic and strategic – they are the aestheticization of commercial strategies and we can interrogate them in the context of the institutions and the world they are preparing their students for (the social imaginary).

We hope that we have also contributed to raising awareness of a neglected sense and to show its inherent social processes. So what does this paper tell us about how the Schools see themselves, their potential students, the world as social imaginary? We can learn something from the stakeholders and social processes that are present and absent from these representations. The institution is hierarchical. The Dean is represented. We meet ‘big business’. Some academic staff are represented, but are not identified as such. There are no images of support staff, cleaners, etc. and the wider organisation and the employees within it are hardly acknowledged.

Finally, what does this mean for the way that learning is represented? There are no images on these websites that represent the process of learning or of learning as a process. From a semiotic perspective, we have an introductory ‘meet the individuals’ and ‘come and join us’ page before we move into the delocalised ‘MBA world’. The spectator is positioned as a potential student, not yet part of the social community of the School, but there are individuals already there who might provide social capital. The School itself is presented as a way of acquiring a student lifestyle and then a corporate lifestyle. Its cultural capital is foregrounded, but the institution itself is delocalised and its learning processes are elided.
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