1

Past, Present and Future Perspectives of Management Learning, Education and Development

Steven J. Armstrong and Cynthia V. Fukami

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

The scholarship of management teaching and learning is increasingly being recognized as a field in its own right. Postgraduate courses in management learning are being offered in some of the most prestigious business schools around the world. The *Journal of Management Education*, founded in 1976 to serve as a forum for the improvement of management education in both classroom and corporate settings, continues to prosper, as does *Management Learning*, founded in 1978 to provide a forum for the understanding of learning in management and organizations. The US Academy of Management, regarded by many as the premier scholarly society in the discipline of management, has a division (Management Education and Development)

devoted to the field. Its membership, drawn from more than 40 nations, has increased by more than 75 per cent over the past ten years. The journal *Academy of Management Learning and Education* (AMLE) was launched in 2002 to sit alongside its other prestigious journals to address the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The time is now right to present an account of the 'state of the art' in management learning, education and development (MLED), to map out where the discipline is going, and to identify what are the key debates and issues that concern management educators. This *Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development* (MLED) has therefore joined the series of Sage Handbooks that are recognised as benchmark volumes in their field in order to fulfil these important requirements. The book consists of original

chapters by leading international scholars in the field from around the globe. A key dynamic of the handbook is a retrospective and prospective overview of the discipline, a critical assessment of past and present theory that also looks to the future. The handbook emphasizes the theoretical diversity within MLED by examining the integrity and intellectual coherence of the discipline, while also looking at resonances within and between its key components.

The focus of the handbook is on the education and development of managers, which will necessarily embrace theoretical aspects of individual and collective learning, the delivery of formal management education, and the facilitation of management development in educational and non-educational contexts. The interdisciplinary nature of the field is reflected in the contributions whose aims are to analyse, promote, and critique the role of MLED to management understanding.

Each chapter offers a comprehensive, critical overview of aspects of the field, a discussion of key debates and research, and a review of the emerging agenda in the topic area. Topics include the application of learning theories, theoretical advances about effective instructional and evaluation methods, innovations in the use of technology, both in the classroom and in virtual learning environments, and ways of developing practising managers in the context of lifelong learning.

Management is a practice that has to blend a good deal of experience with a certain amount of insight and some analysis (Mintzberg, 2004). It is not too difficult to imagine how analytical skills can be formally taught. It *is* difficult to imagine, however, how insight or the outcomes of management experience can be formally taught; and it is easier to imagine how they can derive from a developmental process. Herein lies the need for the use of two terms – 'management education' and 'management development' – and it is important to differentiate between these processes. Within this perspective, 'management education' is taken to imply formal learning which takes place under the auspices of academic institutions within credit-bearing courses to enhance managers' analytic and critical skills. This type of learning is usually provided in organized, time-bounded and structured programmes. Such programmes sometimes emphasize the scientific aspects of management, but they are often criticized for spoon-feeding analysis and technique, and for being rather static in nature, emphasizing memory and repetition and being somewhat divorced from managerial reality. In contrast, informal learning, which is more closely associated with 'management development', is believed by some to offer a more effective approach by emphasizing on-the-job learning that occurs experientially in culturally embedded ways, situated in communities of practice within work-based organizations. Such learning is believed to result in the acquisition of tacit or procedural knowledge contributing to the art and craft of management, whereas formal education is believed to result in the acquisition of explicit or declarative knowledge. The former is believed to be more closely associated with successful managers.

Formal and informal learning approaches, however, should not be treated as being mutually exclusive. Instead, they should be regarded as being complementary and necessary components in the overall process of management learning. With this in mind, this handbook seeks to explore a variety of challenging approaches to the many diverse forms of management learning, linking new ideas and developments as a way of advancing both theory and practice. It seeks to identify and examine best practices in university-based management education programmes, and training and development processes in corporate, consultancy and independent college settings. The handbook, which is designed to appeal to academics, researchers, educators, programme directors, deans of business schools, advanced postgraduate students and practitioners in corporate education, is presented in three main parts. Part I covers theoretical aspects of knowledge acquisition in the context of management learning. It draws on other disciplinary fields

such as philosophy, education, psychology and sociology, as well as organization theory, with a commitment to broadening and deepening our knowledge and understanding of the most relevant management theory. Part II is concerned with using theory to improve practice and promote ways of enhancing learning effectiveness in formal settings. The chapters in Part II explore a variety of learning and teaching phenomena, including potential use of the arts, cognitive styles and learning strategies, course design, technology in the classroom, distance learning, mentoring frameworks, culture and diversity issues, assessment and accreditation, problem and project based learning, team learning, and importantly, the research-teaching nexus. Part III is concerned with exploring non-credit based management development through a variety of approaches and concepts, including reflexive practice, action learning, development of competencies, leadership development, coaching and mentoring, preparation of global business leaders, and communities of practice. Part III finishes with a chapter that considers ways of assessing and accrediting these non-formal learning approaches. The handbook ends on a provocative note with the concluding chapter from James O'Toole that considers future perspectives of management learning, education and development in light of what has been presented in preceding chapters.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Although there has been dramatic growth in the provision of management education and development programmes over the past century, there have also been increasing doubts over the relevance (Grey, 2004; Pfeffer and Fong, 2002) and effectiveness (Mintzberg, 2004) of their educational products. It has even been suggested that the field is on the verge of a paradigm shift (Whetten et al. Chapter 13 volume) evidenced by the number of radical business school reforms being conducted around the world. To shed further light on this debate it is helpful

to consider the origins and history of business schools in general and management education in particular.

According to Engwall (2007) while there were early attempts to introduce economic disciplines into universities in Europe in the 18th century (e.g. Frankfurt-an-der-oder, Rinteln and Halle in Germany, 1727 and Uppsala, Sweden, 1741) the first notable institutions for academic business education began to appear in the middle of the 19th century as shown in Table 1.1.

Business colleges were also being founded in other parts of the world around this time, such as Tokyo (1887), Osaka (1901) and Kobe (1902) in Japan and also in India (1913). In the UK it was not until The British Institute of Management (founded in 1948) assembled a committee to address aspects of management education (Ivory et al., 2006) that interests began to accelerate (Tiratsoo, 1998). However, business education really began to gain momentum in the UK in the early 1960s following the Robbins Report in 1963 which called for two postgraduate business schools to be established. Shortly afterwards, a centre for business education was created at Warwick University and then two new business schools were founded within the universities of Manchester and London in 1965. By the 1970s, management education was being provided by 237 different institutions in the UK (Tiratsoo, 1998), and by the 1990s UK business schools brought in more than £400 million a year (Crainer and Dearlove, 1999) to the nation's economy. Engwall (2007) reports a similar proliferation of business schools across northern, central and eastern Europe and notes that the American model has played a dominant role in their development. For a more complete discussion of the history of management education, refer to Engwall (2007), Engwall and Zamagni (1998), and Warner (1997).

The roots of many of these business schools (despite others appearing in Europe at the same time, such as HEC in Paris and Handelshochschulen in Germany) can be traced back to the United States and

Table 1.1   Institutions for Academic Business Education: Europe and United States

1851	University of Louisiana (US)
1852	University of Wisconsin (US); Institut Superieur de Commerce de l'Etat, Antwerp, Belgium; Institut Superieur de Commerce Saint Ignace, Antwerp, Belgium
1854	Ecole Superieure de Commerce, Paris, France
1856	Wiener Handelsakademie, Austria
1866	Ecole Superieure de Commerce, Mulhouse, France
1867	Scuola Superiore di Commercio, Venice, Italy
1869	Washington & Lee University, US
1871	Le Havre, France; Sciences Politiques, Paris, France
1872	Lyon, France; Marseille, France
1874	Bordeaux, France
1881	Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, Paris, France; Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania
1884	Genoa, Italy
1886	Bari, Italy
1892	Lille, France
1895	London School of Economics, England; Rouen, France
1896	Nancy, France
1897	Montpellier, France
1898	Aachen, Germany; Leipzig, Germany; St Gallen, Switzerland; Vienna, Austria; University of California (US); University of Chicago (US)
1900	Budapest, Hungary; Dijon, France; Nantes, France; Amos Tuck School, Dartmouth (US); New York University (US)
1901	Cologne, Germany; Frankfurt, Germany
1902	Birmingham University, England; Bocconi, Milan, Italy
1903	Brussels, Belgium
1904	Manchester University, England
1905	Toulouse, France
1906	Berlin, Germany; Rome, Italy; Turin, Italy
1908	Mannheim, Germany; University College Dublin, Ireland; Columbia University (US); Harvard Business School (US)
1909	Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden
1910	Munich, Germany
1911	Finnish Business School, Helsinki, Finland
1913	Rotterdam, Neitherland

Source: Adapted from: Engwall and Zamagni (1998)

in particular to the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania when a Bachelor's degree in Business was initiated in 1881 by Joseph Wharton, an American businessman. Believed to be the first of the prominent business schools, it was founded, somewhat ironically, as we will demonstrate later, on the basis of his criticisms of the 'learning by doing' approach common in colleges at that time. Wharton favoured a more structured and theoretical approach to management education (Sass, 1982). Wharton's criticisms were to be echoed nearly 80 years later in two landmark studies which were to change the face of management education. The first Master's degree in Business Administration (MBA) appeared at Dartmouth College's Tuck School of Business in the US in 1902. This school was established in 1900 by Edward Tuck, an international financier and philanthropist (Friga et al., 2003), at a time when there was explosive growth in commerce and industry. In 1908, the Harvard Business School launched its first MBA and Stanford followed suit in 1925. By 1915, there were approximately 40 business schools in the US and a year later the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, otherwise known as the AACSB, became the accrediting agency. The number of business schools then increased in the US five-fold to nearly 200 by 1925. Interestingly, most business professors at that time were either practising or retired corporate managers who focused on sharing lessons learned in the workplace (Friga et al., 2003).

This became known as the *trade school* approach to management education and drew major criticisms such as the one by sociologist Thorsten Veblen in 1918 cited in Engwall (2007: 11) as saying 'A college of commerce belongs in the corporation of learning no more than a department of athletics'. Nevertheless, this *trade school* approach continued through the first half of the 20th century until massive reforms took place aimed at making business schools more academic and research oriented, like many other academic programmes at universities (Schmotter, 1998). Major driving forces behind these reforms were two landmark studies in the 1950s commissioned by the Ford Foundation (Gordon and Howell, 1959) and the Carnegie Corporation (Pierson, 1959) to review the state of management education. By today's standards, the Ford Foundation alone dedicated more than 250 million dollars

to this effort (Friga et al., 2003). Essentially both of these studies argued that to give business schools more respectable academic underpinnings, they needed to shift their strategies to be more research focused and less vocational (Schlossman and Wechsler, 1998). Both reports called for the careful recruitment of staff whose credentials should include academic research. This gave rise to more rational, analytical decision-making approaches as the key to management education (Bach, 1959). The professionalization of management teaching that ensued brought about the domination of business functions such as finance, marketing, law, management science, and so on, but interestingly, not *management per se*. These reforms encouraged a scientific model of management education (Bennis and O'Toole, 2005). The strategies and structures of business schools today, both in the US (Mintzberg, 2004) and in Europe (Ivory et al., 2006), are almost identical to those established in the 1950s as a result of those two landmark studies.

Following these reforms, most leading universities now treat business schools as seriously as other long-standing schools. Their focus has switched from being vocational trade schools to being schools which conduct rigorous scientific research and adopt scientific principles to underpin the management education process. Some have argued, however, that the pendulum has swung too far from the trade school paradigm and that business schools have become too academic (Porter and McKibbin, 1988) and that it is now necessary to strike a balance between scientific rigour and practical relevance (Bennis and O'Toole, 2005: 98). In their *Harvard Business Review* article entitled 'How business schools lost their way', Bennis and O'Toole argue that this scientific model is predicated on the false assumption that business and management studies are an academic discipline like chemistry or physics when they should be viewed as a profession like medicine or law schools. In their pursuit to educate practitioners and to create knowledge through research, these schools deliberately engage with the outside world.

Faculty members are expected to be first rate scholars, but not to produce studies at arm's length from actual practice which is so often the case with business schools. They argue that business school professors know a lot about academic publishing, but few have ever worked in a real business. This contrasts sharply with medical schools, for example, where members of teaching faculty are often practising doctors. Bennis and O'Toole argue that no business school curricula reform will work until the scientific model is replaced by a more appropriate one rooted in the requirements of a profession – where the focus shifts towards integrating knowledge and practice. This controversy over academic rigour versus practical relevance of the learning attained in business schools has been widely discussed over the past two decades. We will now consider some of the major thrusts of those debates.

Perceptions of the present state of management education and development

According to Chia (2005), the reforms which resulted in the domination of specialized business functions and the adoption of this scientific approach to problem solving have led to a functional 'silo type' disciplinary mentality (e.g. Marketing, Finance, HRM, Operations, etc.). Whereas some have argued that undergraduate programmes should continue to benefit from the depth and breadth of specialized learning (Campbell et al., 2006), others have argued persuasively for an integrated curriculum that breaks down the silos between functional subjects (Linder and Smith, 1992; Fukami et al., 1996; Michaelsen, 1999), especially for postgraduate programmes geared towards middle and upper level executives. Mintzberg (2004: 32) eloquently captures the consequence of the silo disciplinary mentality by asserting that, 'As businesses work valiantly to bust down the walls between their silos, business schools work valiantly to reinforce them'. He goes on to argue that these phenomena

which characterize the curriculum lead to the passive ingestion of 'inert' ideas that pass for management education. In an address made at Cambridge University in 1912, Sir Alfred North Whitehead, mathematician and Professor of Philosophy of Science and Philosophy of Education said that, 'Above all things, we must be aware of "inert" ideas, that is to say ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilised, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations. Education with inert ideas is not only useless; it is above all things, harmful – Corruptio optimi, pessima'. Whitehead made similar assertions at a later address given to Harvard University Business School in 1928.

Despite consistent calls for change spanning more than a quarter of a century, some have argued that management education is still in a parlous state (Grey, 2004) and that the explosive growth it has witnessed has, paradoxically, been accompanied by a crisis of confidence (Armstrong and Sadler-Smith, in press). This is manifested in debates about the direction of business and management education (Quinn Trank and Rynes, 2003), its effectiveness (Mintzberg, 2004) and serious doubts about the relevance of its educational product because 'neither possessing an MBA degree or grades earned in courses correlate with career success' (Pfeffer and Fong, 2002: 78). This is despite the undoubted huge commercial successes of business schools. Even more damning is evidence which suggest that engineering graduates are more likely to be managing others than management graduates, five years after graduation (CEML Report, 2002).

It has also been suggested that these major problems associated with management education arose following the reforms of the 1950s discussed above, when business schools were encouraged to place more emphasis on teaching students sets of analytical tools (Mintzberg, 2004). Some believe that these approaches led to students having the false perception that management problems can be defined as neat technical packages (Raelin, 1995). What to do with

the knowledge obtained from our educational experiences is often left out of the picture. Our graduates know a lot, but can't do anything (Fukami, 2007). One study reported that 73 per cent of the surveyed MBA programme graduates indicated that they made little use of what they had learned in the classroom on their first assignments as managers (McCall Jr et al., 1988). Some excellent companies, such as Southwest Airlines, do not recruit at leading business schools, and avoid hiring MBAs (Pfeffer and Sutton, 1999). Bennis and O'Toole (2005: 96) also criticize business schools for being too focused on 'scientific' research, hiring professors with limited real-world experience, and therefore graduating students who are ill-equipped to wrangle with complex, unquantifiable issues – 'in other words, the stuff of management'. Further problems arise from claims that business school research does not influence management practice either (Starkey and Madan, 2001; Pfeffer and Fong, 2002), calling into question the professional relevance of management scholarship. Problems deepen still further as other leading thinkers in the field, such as Donaldson (2002), identifies contradictions between theories and management education, and Goshal (2005), who called for better theorizing because bad management theories are destroying good management practice. Some have advocated the need for more radical challenges to prevailing mindsets through the contribution of critical management education (Grey, 2004) or through a marriage of critical management education and action-based learning as a way of innovating on the interplay of informal and formal learning (Reynolds and Vince, 2004). The proof of whether these ideas can be reasonably transformed into useful action, however, is questionable (Bailey, 2004). The problems reported here were eloquently captured by Starkey and Tempest (2005: x) who suggested that 'the future of business schools is in doubt because its research and teaching missions are compromised – perhaps fatally'. As noted by Grey (2002), most would agree that a trained doctor or engineer has superior technical expertise and proficiency

than someone without such training, and their professional credentials give them a more secure legal status. The impact of management education on equipping people to become better managers, however, is much more ambiguous and, lacking the same professional credentials as doctors, managers have diminished expert status in the eyes of the law.

However, laws, regulations, and policies have been shown to be relatively expensive and inefficient methods for promoting responsible conduct. One way to encourage responsible behaviour is to create a profession. But as O'Toole (Chapter 29 this volume) reminds us, 'whilst the founders of the early business schools such as Wharton, Tuck, and Dartmouth were public spirited men with the intent of turning management into a respected 'calling' that *hope* died shortly after World War II'. Today, for reasons highlighted by Khurana (2007) management isn't a profession. Sociologists have identified four common aspects across professions: a common body of knowledge; a system for certifying that individuals possess such knowledge before being licensed or allowed to practice; a commitment to use specialized knowledge for the public good; and a code of ethics with provisions for monitoring individual compliance with the code and a system of sanctions for enforcing it (Khurana et al., 2005). When we compare business management to more traditional professions, such as medicine or engineering, and apply these four aspects, we can see that management is found wanting. There is no solid common body of knowledge able to account for much of the social environment of business. There is neither a formal educational requirement nor a system of examination and licensing for aspiring members. An MBA is not a requirement for becoming a manager. Business managers are not universally committed to the public good, and finally, are not governed by a shared normative code (Khurana et al., 2005). Is it impossible to understand the unethical behaviour we have recently observed among our business leaders?

Thus, the investment of billions of dollars in business education around the world clearly has not fully paid off. The mere possession of a quantity of knowledge has not resulted in leaders who make good judgements. In higher education in general, and in business schools in particular, we have focused on disseminating information and knowledge and have neglected the ability of our graduates to translate theory into practice (Fukami, 2007). Is there hope for the future?

SCHOLARSHIP IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

There is hope for reversing the trend of the impotence of management education and it derives from the concept of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL). Simply put, SOTL recognizes that teaching is an integral part of faculty scholarship. In other words, rather than thinking about teaching as the price to be paid to do research, SOTL considers teaching to be an important part of the job of the professor. SOTL was introduced largely through the work of Ernest Boyer, then President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in his book, *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990). Boyer argued that the role of the university professor was broader than the traditional tripartite model of research, teaching and service. He proposed an alternative model that identified four separate but overlapping functions: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of discovery involves our traditional view of research, and refers to scholarly work that creates disciplinary knowledge through hypotheses testing and theory generation. The scholarship of integration relates to merging knowledge across disciplines, and the scholarship of application relates to applying disciplinary knowledge to solving real problems. The scholarship of teaching refers to the dissemination of disciplinary knowledge.

Although Boyer's work was directed toward higher education in general, it certainly addresses some of the dilemmas of management education outlined above. Graduates of business education programmes, either formal or informal, must be exposed to the most current body of knowledge in the various business disciplines, must be able to see the relationships across the various business disciplines and to understand how these various areas interact with an organization, and they must be able to solve important problems with this knowledge. Finally, our graduates will be more able to accomplish these critical goals if their faculty have concentrated on their learning as a similarly critical goal.

Business schools are particularly suited to SOTL because of the fundamental synergy between the substance of our disciplines and the substance of teaching. Using the disciplinary field of management as an example, we are a discipline in which *how* we teach, and the tools we use, most closely mirror important aspects of *what* we teach (Frost and Fukami, 1997). In short, the field of management is about understanding human behaviour in organizations as well as understanding the organizations themselves. Our classrooms can be thought of as organizations, and, as such, provide a real-time laboratory in which to illustrate, experiment with, but more importantly to model, most of our important disciplinary concepts. This observation is not lost on our students, who often recognize the parallels between the content we are delivering on effective management, and the process their professors use to manage their classroom and departments, interact with peers, and conduct their personal lives (Billimoria and Fukami, 2002). Not to be sensitive to this connection would be a lost opportunity to develop, and to model, excellent practice. Thus, it will be critical for management educators to focus on both the content and process of our curricula.

Through his model of scholarship, Boyer elevated the status of teaching by recognizing that there is a set of problems inherent in teaching that are worth pursuing as an ongoing intellectual quest. And since this is an intellectual quest, we can use the same intellectual process we follow in our disciplinary work to improve our teaching and our students' learning. In other words, to use the term 'scholarship' toward our teaching implies that we apply the scientific process, and standards for evaluating our work in teaching, as we apply in our disciplinary research. Intellectual rigour is just as important to teaching as it is to our disciplinary research.

By a number of accounts, SOTL is on the rise (Schmidt-Wilk and Fukami, in press). There are required courses on teaching in doctoral programmes, there are sessions on teaching in doctoral consortia at professional conferences, there is the previously mentioned rise in membership of the Management Education and Development division of the Academy of Management, and there are abundant peer-reviewed outlets in which to publish SOTL. Given this platform, let us cast our eyes to the future.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND CHALLENGES

It is clear that business schools have been under a sustained attack, and for a variety of good reasons. More relevant management research has been called for because of the gap between rigorous academic research and its application in the world of the practising manager (Starkey and Madan, 2001). More relevant teaching approaches designed to attend to the needs of managers have also been called for – for more than 30 years (e.g. Argyris and Schön, 1974). Despite this, the long and vocal chorus of scepticism about the value of business schools shows no sign of abating (Grey, 2004). Nor do prospects for the future seem good (O'Toole, Chapter 29 this volume; Gioia and Corley, 2002). So, the six million dollar question is – what should we be doing differently? Let us first of all focus on the medium term.

Regarding teaching and learning, Mintzberg (2004) asserts that students learn the wrong

things in the wrong ways. Some argue that this is due to the separation of learning from practise, leading to people being able to talk about practise rather than being competent practitioners (Armstrong, 2005). Chia (Chapter 2 this volume) suggests that controversies like these bring into focus the kind of knowledge that we teach, emphasizing that a crucial aspect that has not been sufficiently addressed is the nature of knowledge and knowing generally associated with MLED. He suggests that the form of knowledge taught in business schools is 'primarily that of *episteme* and *techné*; precise, linguistically explicit and verifiable forms of knowledge that emphasize logic, causality, meaning and representation'. Relying solely on this explicit representational form of knowledge in the education and development of managers is a mistake.

Management is more art than a science and effective managing happens where art (emphasizing insight), science (emphasizing analysis) and craft (emphasizing experience) meet (Mintzberg, 2004). It involves 'becoming aware, attending to, sorting out, and prioritizing an inherently messy, fluxing, chaotic world of competing demands that are placed on a manager's attention' (Chia, 2005: 1092). Managing is more an acquired coping capability than a science; more a set of skilled practices than a profession; more a phenomenon of method than a field of study. Dealing with a fuzzy chaotic world devoid of any sort of order, which Chia argues is so akin to managers' daily experiences, is where the components of tacit knowledge referred to as *phronesis* and *metis*, become crucial in the MLED process. This is the sort of knowledge that people do not know they have (Forsythe et al., 1998), cannot be understood through direct articulation or introspection (Cooper and Sawaf, 1996; Morgan, 1986), is personal, profound, non-scientific and generated in the intimacy of lived experience (Baumard, 1999). Development of tacit knowledge in business schools is neglected at the expense of focusing too much on disseminating explicit knowledge and codified information (Fukami, 2007).

Knowing what to do is not enough, we need to help facilitate the conversion of knowledge into action (Pfeffer and Sutton, 1999).

Empirical studies have demonstrated significant correlations between tacit knowledge and managerial performance and success (Sternberg et al., 2000) and that tacit knowledge is what differentiates experts from novices (Armstrong and Mahmud, 2008; Nestor-Baker, 1999). The over-arching question, however, is if tacit knowledge is what distinguishes successful managers from others, how do we facilitate its acquisition? Some have argued for more innovative approaches to teaching, learning and assessment that require a radical andrological shift from tutor-driven teaching to near total participation and engagement of the learner – where students take significantly more responsibility for their own learning, and where there are higher levels of participation in social practice (Armstrong, 2007). Institutionalizing such approaches in the face of the existing teaching paradigm, however, remains a significant challenge. But the alternative is to continue to provide formal learning in organized, time-limited, and structured ways, emphasizing the acquisition of content, and analysis and technique. The consequences are that we will continue to produce management graduates who display analytic detachment to the detriment of insight (Hayes and Albernathy, 1980) – and who engage in too much of a scientific approach to problem solving and managing (Mintzberg, 2004).

In the short-to-medium term then, we can consider doing different things to bring the management learner back to centre stage, and this handbook is designed to do just that. In an extensive review of the management education literature, Korpiaho et al. (2007) suggested that a fruitful conception of management education should not only resolve the tactical *how* issues, but should also address the political *what* and the moral *why* issues. They identified three categories of management education which they called *traditional*, *revised*, and *alternative* forms. The first two of these are concerned with

the mastering of scientific knowledge aimed at educating managers to succeed in their work. The *alternative* form suggests new, alternative goals for management education, 'namely the education of responsible citizens by means of service-learning, of critically reflective practitioners by means of action-based learning or politically conscious and active professionals by means of critical management education' (p. 12). This handbook captures some useful innovations and insights from a group of scholars dedicated to the improvement of management learning in order to redress some of the ailments of business schools discussed earlier and that also fit well with Korpiaho et al.'s *alternative* modes of learning. Some are based around 'action learning', 'experiential learning', 'collaborative learning', 'ethics and learning', 'critical management education', or 'problem based' learning approaches. As one example of their potential utility, problem based courses start with problems rather than with the exposition of disciplinary knowledge. Learning consists of real problems and groups work through projects with assistance from tutors or even work-based mentors. The learner poses the questions and discovers potential answers at the risk of making mistakes. Tacit knowledge is acquired through exposure and interaction within a work environment. Incorporating work-based problem scenarios into our curricula where tutors and work-based mentors are involved would not only enhance the learning process through the acquisition of managerial tacit knowledge but would also be helpful for developing relationships between business schools and businesses, and for bridging the relevance gap between research and practice.

If short-to-medium term strategies are to focus on doing different things, then longer-term strategies need to focus on doing things differently in order to bring about effective long-term reforms. More radical thinkers like Mintzberg (2004) have argued that it is time to break down the silos and put old paradigms out to pasture. Most business school curricula remain compartmentalized by discipline such as marketing, finance, operations management and so on, following the reforms of the 1950s. This might just have been sensible when careers were characterized by vertical advancement in a single field, within a functionally divided bureaucracy. However, careers now cross boundaries of function, organization, industry, cultures and political borders. Some have therefore argued that management education should change accordingly by re-designing it in such a way that it is organized around the key constituencies that a manager needs to engage in order to be effective. Some schools are already beginning to take bold steps towards a more integrated curriculum (e.g. Yale Management School) by completely dismantling their previous offerings. Unless more schools begin to question the very purpose of their enterprises and the relevance of their educational product then we can continue to see the staggering statistics which led to Bennis and O'Toole's (2005) assertions that we currently fail to impart useful management skills, fail to install norms of ethical behaviour, fail to prepare leaders, and fail to lead our graduates into good management careers.

Institutional inertia theory, however, suggests that universities will be slow to change given internal politics and past successes. The overall consensus is that change will come slowly, particularly given the massive infrastructure and incentive programmes currently in place. However, according to Lyman Porter the comfortable period for business schools since the end of the Second World War is over. Almost none of the casual practices, procedures and assumptions about what we should be doing and how we should be providing education are likely to survive the next two decades (Porter, 2000). In the closing chapter of this handbook, however, O'Toole considers the most probable future scenario for business schools and suggests that the future still looks rather grim. He argues that the diversity of viewpoints and perspectives expressed in this handbook, for example, represents a perfect reflection of the fragmentation that exists in the field of

management education; that deans of business schools need to change the assumption that good researchers equal good teachers and adopt a pluralistic model of professorial excellence; that decision makers need to address the question of what managers need to know, what skills they will need to possess to be successful in the future, and to mirror changes in the corporate world. He does not believe that there are any quick fixes for the problems with business schools but concludes that 'it avails no one to improve the delivery of a poor product'. Although he concedes that there is general agreement that the current dominant mode of management education is not working, there is also no agreement on what should replace it. Without agreement on the 'what', there can never be closure on the 'how', which leads to his forecast: '*Faute de mieux*, pluralism will be the wave of the future'.

Having considered some of the past, present, and future perspectives and challenges of management learning, education and development, we will now share with you the birth and subsequent development of the present handbook. We trust you will agree that it has undergone a rigorous process and will hopefully inspire future work in this crucially important field.

CHARTING THE JOURNEY OF THE HANDBOOK'S DEVELOPMENT

Phase 1

In May 2006 at the European Academy of Management meeting in Munich, Germany, Steve Armstrong was approached by an editor from Sage Publications (Kiren Shoman) and asked whether he would be interested in contributing to the series of Sage Handbooks that are recognized as benchmark volumes in their field. The subject would be management education and development. As someone who had spent several years in management positions in industry, then several more years in management education, and who was soon to become Division Chair and President of

the Management Education and Development Division of the Academy of Management, this conversation sparked immediate interest. Through his contacts in the Academy of Management it wasn't long before Steve identified an equally interested person in the US, Cindi Fukami. On 7 August 2005, the three of us (now four – including Maya) met at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii, to discuss the development of a formal proposal and to agree on timescales. The seeds were now sown.

Phase 2

To help develop the proposal we reviewed the entire contents of the four major journals in Business/Management Education: *Academy of Management Learning and Education*; *Management Learning*; *Journal of Management Education*; *Journal of Management Development*. Additionally, we reviewed the previous ten years' titles of all papers, symposia and professional development workshop activities accepted by the Management Education and Development Division at the Academy of Management's annual meetings. We also referred to a previous review article from the field (Bilimoria and Fukami, 2002). This process enabled the editors to identify major themes, and names of leading authors associated with those themes. Outcomes of this process culminated in a detailed proposal in November 2005 and also led to the present structure of this handbook. The proposal was reviewed by six referees selected by the volume's editors which led to a further revision prior to formally submitting it to Sage Publications in January 2006 for their consideration. In March 2006 we received detailed reviews from 14 anonymous reviewers selected by Sage and the proposal was revised, resubmitted and then formally accepted by Sage in April 2006.

Phase 3

An editorial board was assembled during May 2006 comprising members from Australia,

New Zealand, USA, Scandinavia, Mainland Europe and Japan. A formal contract was issued by Sage on 14 June 2006. Potential authors were approached to contribute to the handbook over the summer of 2006 and by October we had agreement from all of the present authors and the writing of chapters was initiated. We were now set to try to achieve a manuscript submission date of 30 November 2007. A significant number of draft chapters were received by July 2007 and the remainder arrived by September. All chapters were blind reviewed by at least two reviewers, and in some cases, three or four. Revised versions of the chapters began to arrive in October 2007 and the final ones were received by February/March 2008. Approximately 15 per cent of revised chapters went through a second review and revision cycle. The final manuscript was submitted to Sage on 31 March except for Chapters 1 and 29 which followed shortly afterwards. We will now turn to a brief description of the contents of the handbook.

OVERVIEW OF PART I

Part I of the handbook covers theoretical aspects underpinning knowledge acquisition in the context of management learning. Areas covered include: the nature of knowledge and knowing; experiential learning theory; theory of distributed cognition in the context of collective learning; reflection, reflective practice and organizing reflection beyond the reflective practitioner; critical management education; development and use of collaborative learning approaches and designs; ethics pedagogy and its inclusion in business school curricula; and lastly a consideration of the implications of the pervasiveness of emotion in organizations from the point of view of learning and education, with an emphasis on the role of emotions and emotional intelligence training in leadership programmes.

Part I begins with a chapter (2) by Robert Chia that explores the nature of 'knowledge' and 'knowing' in the context of management learning, education and development.

Current controversies regarding the role of business schools revolve around the twin pillars of 'academic rigour' and the need for 'practical relevance' of the learning attained. Within this debate, this author brings into focus the kind of knowledge taught in business schools and argues that relying solely on explicit representational forms of knowledge emphasizing logic and causality (i.e. *episteme and techné*) in the education and development of management is a mistake. Instead, business schools should focus more on practical wisdom (*phronesis*) that leads to abilities in interpreting and adapting knowledge in a particular context, and other forms of practical knowing such as cunning intelligence (*métis*) that combines flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, resourcefulness and various other skills acquired through experience. This leads us naturally into the next chapter which focuses on a theory of acquiring new knowledge from experience.

Experiential learning theory (ELT) has been widely used in management learning research and practice for almost four decades. Drawing on the work of prominent 20th century scholars who gave experience a central role in their theories of human learning, ELT has led to the development of a dynamic, holistic model of the process of learning based on a learning cycle. The process is driven by the resolution of the dual dialectics of concrete experience-abstract conceptualization and active experimentation-reflective observation. Each is regarded as a dimension of cognitive growth. The experience-abstraction dimension represents how one prefers to grasp experiences and the action-reflection dimension represents how one prefers to transform experiences. New knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming these experiences. Chapter 3, by Alice and David Kolb, reviews current research and demonstrates how the key concepts from ELT can be used to examine management as a learning process operating at the level of the individual, the team and the organization and how they can also serve as useful tools for improving management learning, education and development.

Effective learning and knowledge creation in a management context often depends on rapid and effective learning at the organizational level. Some suggest that organizations learn only through individuals who learn, arguing that individual level cognitive constructs can be applied through the concept of collective mental models. Others favour a multi-level perspective, linking individual, group, and organization, or wider social perspectives to provide a more multi-faceted picture of organization learning. In Chapter 4, Gabriele Lakomski proposes a conception of learning for both the individual and the collective that is able to answer many of the difficulties traditionally raised about this distinction in the management/organizational learning and knowledge management literatures. This conception derives from contemporary explanations of human information processing, developed in contemporary cognitive neuroscience. Referred to as the theory of distributed cognition, this account acknowledges the social and contextual features of human cognition and opens up exciting research agendas that promise a healthy return on investment in our quest for a theory of collective learning that allows us to recast the traditional understanding of knowledge transfer – which is argued here to fall into place as a feature characteristic of all learning.

Reflection in learning, particularly when learning from experience, has become established as one of the key building blocks at the core of management and organizational learning theory. In Chapter 5 the theme of reflection in learning is introduced by Russ Vince and Michael Reynolds as a process which is bound up in a continuous relationship between reflection and action, where new knowledge is created through the transformation of experience (Kolb, 1984), and where the mind increases knowledge of itself and its workings. As the authors remind us, this relationship between reflection and action has inspired the two most well-known conceptual models in management learning known as Kolb's Learning Cycle (Chapter 3, this volume) and Schön's Reflective Practitioner.

However, the authors propose that we should be thinking beyond the reflective practitioners and highlight four perspectives that help us shift our understanding. These perspectives are referred to as *critical reflection, public reflection, productive reflection, and organizing reflection*. These are discussed in terms of their implications for theory and practice and each is exemplified with a concrete reference to a study as a way of situating discourse into practice.

In response to our earlier concerns about the crisis of confidence and chorus of scepticism surrounding management education, it has been suggested that some answers may come from Critical Management Education (CME). CME is a body of educational practice arising from the research tradition known as Critical Management Studies (CMS) and some say that it offers the kind of radical challenge to prevailing mindsets that is needed (Grey, 2004). While recognizing the many challenges facing it, in Chapter 6 David Boje and Khadija Al Arkoubi provide a historical overview of CME, drawing from its philosophical grounds reflected in critical theory, proposing a closer alliance of critical theory and critical pedagogy, and explicating tenets of CME before offering some ideas on how they can be translated into practice. The chapter identifies five major challenges of CME and offers suggestions on how these may be faced in order to open doors to a different practice of education.

Related to critical management education is the development of the theory of collaborative learning which is examined by Vivien Hodgson in Chapter 7. Its origins are linked to the advent and introduction of the concept of the learning community before exploring more current interests associated with collaborative learning in communities of practice. Underlying theoretical perspectives of collaborative approaches to learning are discussed in relation to claims that they are based on social processes of interaction which assume learning will be more effective as a result of dialogue and discussion with peers and others. The chapter also emphasizes the importance and relevance that collaborative

learning approaches are believed to have for developing critical thinking and problem solving. In addition to providing a critical review of some of the key ideas and issues that are considered relevant when adopting such approaches, the chapter also identifies key areas for consideration when using collaborative approaches.

One of the more troubling aspects of recent business practice has been the lack of ethics and integrity observed in various high-profile companies such as Enron and Tyco. The apparent lack of ethical decision making in these and other companies has led, as we discussed earlier in this chapter, to criticism of business schools for not emphasizing the importance of integrity in preparing students for business careers. This is the focus of Chapter 8 where Charles Fornaciari and Kathy Lund-Dean review a broad base of literature from eight different streams and conclude that ethics can in fact be taught, and taught effectively. After making that case, they move on to providing explicit advice for adopting ethics pedagogy, which engages students in active learning. They conclude their chapter with ideas on how to address the continuing global debates on how to effectively include ethics in business school curricula.

Part I ends with Chapter 9 with Neal Ashkanasy, Marie Dasborough and Kaylene Ascough discussing the implications of the pervasiveness of emotions in organizations from the point of view of learning and education, with an emphasis on the role of emotions and emotional intelligence training in leadership programmes. The chapter contains a substantial review of the emotions and emotional intelligence literature, appropriately defining fundamental constructs and identifying some of the main issues in the field. The authors also include a useful review of how scholars have considered the role of emotions in the process of leadership. Issues surrounding emotional intelligence teaching are discussed together with how emotional skills may assist in the development of organizational leadership skills. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of emotions and emotional intelligence

for management learning and education and directions for future development.

OVERVIEW OF PART II

Part II covers opportunities for success in management education scholarship in a formal, credit-bearing classroom situation. The chapter topics in Part II reflect a very wide range of both traditional and innovative issues relating to the classroom (whether actual or virtual), including the use of visual, creative and performing arts, technology, distance learning, learning-centred course design, diversity, cognitive styles, teams, and problem-based and project-based learning. In addition, Part II contains material on issues beyond the classroom, such as mentoring Ph.D. students, assessment and accreditation, and the nexus between research and teaching.

Part II begins with a chapter by Joan Gallos (10) on the potential uses of the arts in management teaching and learning, which invites readers to explore the many options for using the arts in the classroom. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part is based on four assertions about the use of visual, creative and performing arts in teaching and learning: that they provide a rich, multi-cultural, and time-tested pedagogy, that they offer unique avenues for learning about complex behaviour in organizations, that they engender an openness and engagement in the learning process essential for deep understanding, and that they foster creativity and complex skills development. The second part of the chapter provides suggestions and caveats for effectively using the arts in management learning. In an interesting twist, the advice is tailored to career stages, from newcomers to seasoned veterans. Gallos concludes her chapter with the conclusion that arts-based pedagogy is well placed to develop the leaders of the future – leaders who will need hope and imagination.

Chapter 11, by T. Grandon Gill, focuses on one of the most intriguing trends of the last ten years, namely the use and preponderance of technology in teaching and learning.

In this chapter, Gill reflects on the impact of technology on teaching and learning goals. The range of technology discussed by Gill is extensive – ranging from presentation tools to simulations, to clickers, to cell phones, to table PCs. Predictions for the future suggest that more and more classroom technology tools will be developed, and that our future students will be from a virtual generation. Yet, in his conclusion, Gill notes that technology will not replace sound course design. In fact, the use of technology increases the need for sound course design. He concludes by offering a caveat that, to be effective, technology needs to be overtly linked to instructional objectives.

Closely related to the issue of technology in the classroom is the idea that students may no longer sit in a traditional classroom to learn. Many universities around the world are now delivering courses through online technologies. Chapter 12, by J. B. Arbaugh and S. S. Warell, provides a discussion of the state of the art of distance learning and web-based instruction. This review provides a summary of the research identifying the characteristics of online learning that will be most likely to result in positive learning outcomes. The authors find that, of all the factors studied, the behaviours of the participants are the strongest predictors of a successful online course. Arbaugh and Warell conclude their chapter with suggestions for future research on online management education and learning.

The next chapter (13) by David Whetten, Travis Johnson and Lynn Sorenson, is directed toward the shift of attention from 'teaching' to 'learning'. In order to adjust to this shift, they propose an approach to learning-centred course design. Based on principles of adult learning, this process includes significant learning objectives, developmental learning assignments, and engaging learning activities. Students learn best when they are working toward significant learning goals, not comprehension, when course requirements are aligned with learning goals rather than rote memory and recall, and when they are engaged in the process of learning. The authors offer a number of suggestions for accomplishing each of these three ends, and finish with a discussion of the importance of both the teacher and the student in the learning process.

Chapter 14, by Gerald Ferris, Pamela Perrewé, and Ronald Buckley, is focused on an overlooked but equally important aspect of teaching and learning, namely, the role of mentoring Ph.D. students. Ironically, most of the emphasis on teaching and learning is directed toward undergraduate and Master's level education. Ideas and suggestions on developing doctoral students are largely ignored by the literature. This chapter aims to fill that gap by exploring literatures on apprenticeship and mentoring, looking at both sides of the relationship: student and professor. The authors build a stage model of doctoral student development, and offer recommendations for effective activities in each stage. They conclude that the future of management teaching and learning is dependent on the effective mentoring of doctoral students.

Another important topic in Part II is incorporating diversity into management education. This is the topic of Chapter 15, by Myrtle Bell, Mustafa Özbilgin and Mine Karataş-Özkan. The authors recognize that pressures created by demographic trends and our global economy, as well as by individual and collective efforts to end discrimination, have combined to produce an interest in effectively managing diversity. Despite attempts to regulate diversity through legislation, discrimination still exists, and thus diversity is an important aspect for lifelong learning in management. The authors do a masterful job of outlining the complexities of how we learn about diversity, both in our lives and in our educational institutions, and offer concrete suggestions for effective diversity learning.

The next chapter (16), by Eugene Sadler-Smith, focuses on cognitive styles and learning strategies. Cognitive styles may be used effectively in the management classroom because they can affect appropriate learning strategies for the student, instructional design for the instructor, and the overall effectiveness

of the learning process. Moreover, awareness of cognitive styles suggests that *how* students learn may be as important as *what* they learn. Lifelong learning is thus likely to be enhanced if students practise the necessary skills to learn continuously. Following his review and critique of the current state of research on cognitive styles, Sadler-Smith offers a duplex model of cognitive style, acknowledging both the analytical and intuitive modes of processing information. He concludes his chapter with the implications of the duplex model for management learning and education.

One of the most important recent trends in management education has been the use of teams in the classroom. Whether used to enrich students' understanding, or to build the skill of working within teams to prepare students' for future careers, it is easy to conclude that business students will not graduate from school without significant experience in teamwork. However, it is probably fair to say that just being put in a team does not build team skills, and so it is important for instructors to manage teams effectively in the classroom. This is the topic of Chapter 17, where Larry Michaelsen, Tim Peterson and Michael Sweet present a model of Team-Based Learning, an 'intensive and extensive' approach to using teams in the classroom. Their chapter gives an overview of team-based learning, the four defining principles of team-based learning, and a map for implementing team-based learning.

One of the promising ways to increase relevance in the classroom is to use problem-based and project-based learning approaches. This is the topic of Chapter 18, by Robert DeFillippi and Richard Milter. Based on several streams of learning theory, problem- and project-based learning allows students the opportunity to put theoretical knowledge into action, which increases the effectiveness of learning. DeFillippi and Milter present best practices of both approaches, including advice on how to implement these strategies into the classroom. Despite their promise, the use of problem- and project-based learning does present challenges, and the authors

discuss a number of these. They conclude by encouraging the increased use of these techniques for effective management learning.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, accrediting bodies have had a significant influence on the content and process of management learning in formal contexts. Currently, accrediting bodies have started to increase pressure for assurance of learning of our students. For a number of reasons, colleges and universities have been somewhat reluctant to participate in assessment activities. Chapter 19, by Robert Rubin and Kathryn Martell, addresses this critical topic. In particular, Rubin and Martell offer both clear interpretation and guidance on current AACSB requirements and helpful advice about best practices in assessment of assurance of learning. Included in their chapter is a table that classifies common assessment learning outcomes.

Part II ends with a particularly provocative chapter (20) by Roy Lewicki and James Bailey on the relationship between research and teaching. Over the years, there has been much speculation, and prognostication, but little research on the relationship between two of the more important activities of faculty in higher education. Lewicki and Bailey provide a systematic examination of this question and explore the assumptions that underlie this relationship. They identify tensions and compatibilities between research and teaching, and suggest that institutional pressures from our definitions of scholarship and from our traditional reward systems, serve to perpetuate a tension between these two activities. They conclude by calling for cultural change in management education so that research and teaching can effectively co-exist.

OVERVIEW OF PART III

Part III explores important aspects of management development in a non-credit based learning context. Areas covered include: the importance of reflexivity in management learning; action learning and related

modalities that conceive of practice as having its own epistemology; competency development related to effective managers and leaders; best practices and theoretical and empirical advances in leadership development; applications, benefits and efficacy of coaching and mentoring as forms of development intervention in organizations; interaction learning models that allow managers to learn cultures 'on the fly' when engaging in multicultural assignments and interactions; a proposition to reverse the concept of a community of practice to practices of a community leading to a wider understanding of practice-based studies; and lastly a consideration of assessment, accreditation and quality certification schemes associated with non-formal management development in the context of recurrent and lifelong learning.

Part III begins with a chapter (21) by Ann Cunliffe that explores the meaning of reflexivity, why it is important to managers and management learning, and how reflexive practice can be encouraged and supported. Being self-reflexive is about questioning our ways of thinking, being, relating and acting. Personal reflexivity involves reflecting on ways in which one's beliefs, values, interests, experiences and social identities shape the world around us. It is also about seeking to understand how we relate and act with others as a way of shaping our social realities. It is about questioning how we make sense of our surroundings and stimuli, and examining how we can act responsibly and ethically. Reflexivity is argued to be a cornerstone for ethical and responsive management. Social constructionist and deconstructionist approaches to reflexivity are explored in this chapter, but irrespective of one's orientation, the author makes very clear why reflexive practice is fundamentally and crucially important to both management practice and the process of management learning.

The next chapter (22) by Joe Raelin focuses on a cluster of strategies that are located within an emerging tradition in management development that sees practice as having its own epistemology. Where learning is generated from human interaction arising from engagement in real-world work problems, and concurrent reflection on experience can expand and create knowledge as well as improving practice. The author traces the roots of action learning to the work of Dewey (1897) and Lewin (1946) before providing a detailed account of its principles and advantages arising from engagement in solution of real-world work problems. As well as leading to performance improvements, advantages include an estimated return on investment of between 5 and 25 times its cost, a likelihood of adding to an organization's institutional memory, knowledge transfer across generations of employees, or even a shift in organizational culture. Following a detailed exposition of action learning, including a discussion of outcomes, design of action learning projects, and the use of learning teams as a primary vehicle for providing collective reflection, the author then turns to other principal action modalities. These include action research, action science, developmental action inquiry, co-operative inquiry, critical action learning, and global action learning where it is demonstrated that the experience of working with a global cross-cultural team can present participants with critical lessons in intercultural competence.

Competencies are defined as 'the underlying characteristics of a person that lead to or cause effective and outstanding performance' (Boyatzis, 1982). Important competencies fall into the three clusters of: cognitive intelligence competencies; emotional intelligence competencies; and social intelligence competencies. Although various combinations of these competencies have been shown to predict effectiveness in leadership and management throughout the world, there has been a dearth of longitudinal research into the effectiveness of trying to develop them.

In Chapter 23, Richard Boyatzis argues that the competencies related to outstanding leaders, managers and professionals can be developed in adults, but it is not easy. He then draws on more than 20 years of data to show that whereas an MBA education or management training can help people

develop these competencies, we cannot use the typical lecture and discussion methods with their focus on knowledge acquisition only. Nor can we use the 'data dump and run' approach typical of assessment and feedback processes in training. Instead, a more holistic approach is needed, and the change process that seems to work most effectively draws on 'Intentional Change Theory' from a complexity perspective (Boyatzis, 2006).

In Chapter 24 George Hrivnak, Rebecca Reichard and Ron Riggio review some of the major theoretical and empirical advances in leadership development. These are compared with the dominant trends and best practices of leadership development in organizations in an attempt to identify points of congruence and disconnect. Building on this foundation of current understanding the authors then offer an alternative approach to leadership development by providing a model which does not offer a specific set of methodologies or instructional tools *per se*, but rather a framework to incorporate the various modalities in a thoughtful, goal-driven, and comprehensive approach designed to achieve specific, measurable, individual and organizational objectives. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future efforts to advance relevant research, to focus the teaching of leadership in the university classroom, and to improve the efficacy of current and future leadership development programmes in practice.

Coaching and mentoring are increasingly being recognized as crucially important instruments for promoting learning and development and for raising management competencies in many large and medium sized organizations. In Chapter 25, David Clutterbuck explores the origins, applications, benefits and efficacy of coaching and mentoring as forms of development intervention in organizations. Differences between coaching and mentoring and formal versus informal systems are defined. Benefits are considered for the four categories of beneficiary: organization, learner, mentor/coach, and line manager. The evolution of coaching and mentoring relationships is also discussed around

the five stages of initiation, goal setting, progress making, winding up, and moving on. Other areas of importance that are covered include core competencies of coaching and mentoring; team coaching; virtual coaching and mentoring; effective coaching and mentoring programmes; creating a coaching and mentoring culture; measuring the impact of coaching and mentoring; and the role of standards and professional bodies.

As today's business environment becomes increasingly global, experts have advocated that managers cultivate a global mindset. However, in today's rapidly changing, multicultural business environment managers are often required to interact with multiple cultures with little time to immerse themselves in the foreign context. In Chapter 26, Kathryn Aten, Luciara Nardon, and Richard Steers consider the role of management development in preparing global business leaders for dealing with these challenges. It is argued that traditional immersion methods of developing cross-cultural knowledge are insufficient and that managers operating in a multi-cultural environment require a more efficient path that allows them to learn cultures 'on the fly' in the course of (rather than prior to) engaging in multicultural assignments and interactions. As a potential solution to the dilemma, the authors present an intercultural interaction learning model. Implications of the model for management development are then discussed before identifying the skills required for learning cultures 'on the fly', and offering examples of experiential exercises to develop those skills. Some perspectives of learning are viewed as social processes embedded in everyday routines and interactions within the surrounding contexts. One example includes the theory of situated learning (Brown et al., 1989; Lave and Wenger, 1991), which emphasizes the interaction between individual learning, practice and everyday work tasks. A second example is the theory of communities of practice (Brown and Duguid, 1992; Wenger, 1999) which stresses the term community and social relationships around the learner.

In Chapter 27 Silvia Gherardi provides a historical trajectory of the concept of communities of practice, originally born within a predominantly anthropological literature, but now firmly rooted in management studies. The chapter then discusses a literature that proposes a reversal of the concept, from community of practice to practices of a community, leading to a wider understanding of practice-based studies. The reversal is more than a play on words and shifts attention to how practical knowledge is enabled in situated contexts of action.

Chapter 28, by Lichia Yiu and Raymond Saner, focuses on assessment and accreditation of non-formal management education and development programmes. Although there have been major criticisms of business schools for failing to educate and develop true managers, the growing field of non-formal management education has eluded the critical eye of scholars and researchers. This is despite the fact that the field has grown in size without adequate quality assessments and almost without any form of accreditation systems. This chapter provides a resource for those interested in this under-researched and under-published field by closely examining these issues, identifying various assessment tools, questioning whether management training institutions should be subject to quality certification schemes, and raising various sets of questions that beg further inquiry and answers.

The handbook's concluding chapter by James O'Toole offers us a future perspective of management education. Its author looks through the distorted lens of the present and trains his telescope on the most probable scenario for business schools of the future. To help with this, a focus is established on the traditional American MBA which has the longest history, the most available information, and is the model for most formal business school programmes around the world. Drawing on a range of criticisms, including those from business school deans, O'Toole observes that their concerns appear mutually consistent, indicating that the chances of them all being right is rather high.

At the core of all their arguments is a call for the reconceptualization and redefinition of the very purpose of management education.

In search of what needs to be done, O'Toole then combs through the articles in this handbook concluding that while thoughtful readers will find something that is personally useful to fit every interest and bias, they will also find something that is idiosyncratically upsetting. He refers to the diversity of viewpoints and perspectives in the handbook which he believes represents a perfect reflection of the fragmentation that exists in the field of management education. He then moves on to argue that the central problem of management education is the corrosive impact of 1950s managerialism, 1970s management science, and 1990s investment capitalism driving out the original purpose of business schools which was to create a true profession of management with the higher purpose of public service similar to the law, medicine, or even theology professions. We are reminded that the agent of change was the Ford Foundation which used its significant financial leverage to bring about radical curricular reforms which led to a decline in the importance of teaching and a greater emphasis being placed on publishing discipline-based research in 'A' grade journals. O'Toole argues this has had a devastating impact on the quality of teaching and he calls for a pluralistic model of professorial excellence as one way of improving the quality of business school offerings. Boyer's (1990) vision of scholarship is recommended as one model for advancement.

The role of assessment and accreditation of business schools is also presented as a corrosive element which is preventing much needed advancement. With no equivalent to professional associations such as those representing legal and medical professions, its nearest equivalent is the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). This is reckoned by O'Toole to be a misguided and poor substitute with an over-emphasis on rigour of assessment where the trivial is quantified and the more important hard-to-measure aspects are ignored. He floats

the idea that the AACSB could accredit schools that use the best assessment methods, while decertifying those that concentrate their resources on doing the right things for their stakeholder – this is especially ironic when one considers the full definition of the AACSB acronym. He goes on to argue that it would make more sense to measure what graduates have retained from their educational experience, what aspects they use in their careers, or how business school education affects later executive behaviours. A clear disjuncture is articulated between what AACSB assesses and the true metrics of learning.

Having teased out some important problems, O'Toole then turns his attention to the apparent lack of purpose of business schools and regards this as *the* major problem. Accepting that the content of this handbook offers great ideas that may enhance learning, he makes the important point that many of its authors are concerned about *how* to teach when there is little agreement about *what* to teach. For example, what does it mean to be an educated manager?; what is the purpose of the MBA degree?; what is the essential core content of an MBA curriculum? He does acknowledge, however, that the handbook is about management learning and not about curricular reform and concedes that its authors are quite right to have focused on alternative modes of learning within the existing dominant paradigm. In the longer term a radical paradigm shift is needed where business school decision makers rethink their assumptions about the marriage of 'the why', 'the what' and 'the how' of management education. If they know 'the why' O'Toole argues that they will have the essential guidance to choose 'the how' – method following vision, not vice versa. But so far, there is little evidence that deans are willing to break with established norms and take control of their own destiny by creating bold and innovative programmes. Instead, they do little other than to tinker at the margins with what everyone else is doing, which merely attempts to improve the delivery of a poor product.

O'Toole concludes that whereas there is general agreement that the dominant mode of management education isn't working, there is no agreement on *what* should replace it. There can therefore be no closure on the *how*, which leads him to feel that there is no single future of management education but, instead, a plurality of futures.

With that said, we offer this handbook as a state of the current affairs of this discipline, as we initially set out to do. It is our firm hope that others will find these collected chapters compelling, and will set out to address the many needs that are outlined for the future. For two things appear to us to be certain: students will continue to enter our formal and informal management education programmes, and the world will continue to need their wisdom. For them, we continue our quest.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. and Schön, D. (1974) *Theory in Practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Armstrong, S.J. and Sadler-Smith, E. (in press) 'Learning on demand, at your own pace, in rapid bite-sized-chunks: The future shape of management development?' *Academy of Management Learning and Education.*

Armstrong, S.J. (2005) 'Postgraduate management education in the UK: Lessons from or lessons for the US model?', *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 4 (2): 229–35.

Armstrong, S.J. (2007) 'Re-thinking management education: From cognition, to action, to learning', *Research Memorandum* (75), The Business School, University of Hull, Hull, UK.

Armstrong, S.J. and Mahmud, A. (2008) 'Experiential learning and the acquisition of managerial tacit knowledge', *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 7 (3): 189–208.

Bach, G.L. (1959) 'Managerial decision making as an organizing concept', in F.C. Pierson (ed.) *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programmes in Business Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bailey, J. (2004) 'Arranging marriages between theoretical positions', *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 3 (4): 440–1.

Baumard, P. (1999) *Tacit Knowledge in Organizations.* London: Sage Publications.

Bennis W.G. and O'Toole, J. (2005) 'How business schools lost their way', *Harvard Business Review*, May: 96–104.

Bilimoria, Diana and Fukami, Cynthia (2002) 'The scholarship of teaching and learning in the management sciences', in Mary Taylor Huber and Sherwyn P. Morreale (eds), *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Exploring Common Ground*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, pp. 125–42.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1982) *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Boyatzis, R.E. (2006) 'Intentional change theory from a complexity perspective', *Journal of Management Development*, 25 (7): 607–23.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Campbell, N.D., Heriot, K.C. and Finney, R.Z. (2006) 'In defence of silos: An argument against the integrative undergraduate business curriculum', *Journal of Management Education*, 30 (2): 316–32.

CEML (2002) *Management and Leadership Abilities: An analysis of texts, testimony and practice*. London: Council for Excellence in Management and Leadership.

Chia, R. (2005) 'The aim of management education: Reflections on Mintzberg's managers not MBAs', *Organization Studies*, 26 (7): 1090–2.

Cooper, R. and Sawaf, A. (1996) *Executive EQ: Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organizations*. New York: Grossett/Putnam.

Crainer, S. and Dearlove, D. (1999). *Gravy Training: Inside the Business of Business Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Donaldson, L. (2002) 'Damned by our own theories: Contradictions between theories and management education', *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1 (1): 96–106.

Engwall, L. (2007) 'The anatomy of management education', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 23 (1): 4–35.

Engwall, L. and Zamagni, V. (1998) *Management Education in Historical Perspective*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Forsythe, G., Hedlund, J. Snook, S., Horvath, J., Williams, W., Bullis, R., Dennis, M. and Sternberg, R. (1998) 'Construct validation of tacit knowledge for military leadership', Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, San Diego, California, April 13–17, 1998. Available: http://www.aera.net/divisions/i/home/ForsythePaper.pdf

Friga, P.N., Bettis, R.A. and Sullivan, R.S. (2003) 'Changes in graduate management education and new business school strategies in the 21st century', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2 (3): 233–49.

Frost, Peter J. and Fukami, Cynthia V. (1997) 'Teaching effectiveness in the organizational sciences: Recognizing and enhancing the scholarship of teaching', *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 1271–81.

Fukami, C.V. (2007) 'Can wisdom be taught?' in E.H. Kessler and J.R. Bailey, *Handbook of Organizational Wisdom*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, forthcoming.

Fukami, C.V., Clouse, M.L., Howard, C.T., McGowan, R.P., Mullins, J.W., Silver, W.S., Sorensen, J.E., Watkins, T.L. and Wittmer, D.P. (1996) 'The road less travelled: The joys and sorrows of transdisciplinary team teaching', *Journal of Management Education*, 20: 409–10.

Gioia, D. and Corley, K.G. (2002) 'Being good versus looking good: business school rankings and the circean transformation from substance to image', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1 (1): 107–20.

Gordon, R.A. and Howell, J.E. (1959) *Higher Education for Business*. New York: Columbia University Press.

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): 178–86.

Goshal, S. (2005) 'Bad management theories are destroying good management practice', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4: 75–91.

Hayes, R.H. and Albernathy, W.J. (1980) 'Managing our way to economic decline', *Harvard Business Review*, July–August, 67–77.

Ivory, C., Miskell, P., Shipton, H., White, A., Moeslein, K. and Neely, A. (2006) 'UK business schools: Historical contexts and future scenarios', Summary Report from an EBK/AIM Management Research Forum, Advanced Institute of Management Research: London.

Khurana, R., Nohria, N. and Penrice, D. (2005) 'Management as a profession', in Jay W. Lorsch, Leslie Berlowitz and Andy Zelleke (eds), *Restoring Trust in American Business*, produced by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences and published by The MIT Press.

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 University Press.

Kolb, D. (1984) *Experimental Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Korpiaho, K., Paivio, H. and Rasanen, K. (2007) 'Anglo-American forms of management education: A practice-theoretical perspective', *Scandinavian Management Journal,* 23 (1): 36–65.

Linder, J. and Smith, H. (1992 September/October) 'The complex case of management education', *Harvard Business Review,* 16–33.

McCall, Jr, Morgan, W., Lombardo, M.M. and Morrison, A.M. (1988) *The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Book.

Michaelsen, L. (1999) 'Integrating the core business curriculum: An experienced based solution', *Selections,* 15 (2): 9–17.

Mintzberg, H. (2004) *Managers Not MBAs. A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development.* San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organization.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Nestor-Baker, N. (1999) 'Tacit knowledge in the superintendency: An exploratory analysis', (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). University Microfilms International Dissertation Services, AAT 9941397.

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

Pfeffer, J. and Sutton, R.I. (1999) 'Knowing what to do is not enough: Turning knowledge into action', *California Management Review,* 42: 83–108.

Pierson, F.P. (1959) *The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programmes in Business Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Porter, L. (2000) 'Observations on business education', *Selections,* 16 (2): 29–30.

Porter, L. and McKibbin, L.E. (1988) *Management Education and Development: Drift or Thrust in the 21st Century?* New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Raelin, J. (1995) 'Reformulating management education: Professional education, action learning, and beyond', *Selections,* Graduate Management Admissions Council, Autumn, 20–31.

Reynolds, M. and Vince, R. (2004) 'Critical management education and action-based learning: Synergies and contradictions', *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 3 (4): 442–56.

Sass, S.A. (1982) *The Pragmatic Imagination: A History of the Wharton School, 1881–1981.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schmidt-Wilk, Jane and Fukami, Cynthia (in press) 'In search of balance between relevance and rigor', in Charles Wankel and Robert DeFillippi (eds), *Being and Becoming a Management Education Scholar,* Volume 7, *Research in Management Education and Development Series.*

Schlossman, S.M. and Wechsler, H. (1998) 'The new look: The Ford foundation and the revolution in business education', *Selections:* The magazine of the graduate management admission council, 14 (3): 8–28.

Schmotter, J.W. (1998) 'An interview with Dean B. Joseph White', *Selections,* 14 (2): 22–6.

Starkey, K. and Madan, P. (2001) 'Bridging the relevance gap: Aligning stakeholders in the future of management research', *British Journal of Management,* 12: 3–26.

Starkey, K., Tempest, S. (2005) 'The future of the business school: Knowledge, challenges and opportunities', *Human Relations,* 58 (1): 61–82.

Sternberg, R.J., Forsythe, G.B., Hedland, J., Horvath, J.A., Wagner, R.K., Williams, W.M., Snook, S. and Grigorenko, E.L. (2000) *Practical Intelligence in Everyday Life.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tiratsoo, N. (1998) 'What you need is a Harvard: The American influence on British management education', in T. Gourvish and N. Tiratsoo (eds), *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education, 1945–1960,* Manchester University Press, Manchester, UK.

Warner, M. (1997) 'Industrialisation, management education and training systems: A comparative analysis', in M. Warner (ed.), *Comparative Management: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management,* Vol. 1: 106–27. London: Routledge, North American Management.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929) *The Aims of Education and Other Essays.* Macmillan: New York.