

MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Issues in Theory, Research, and Practice

Edited by

Richard D. Freedman, Cary L. Cooper,
Stephen A. Stumpf



Management Education

Issues in Theory, Research, and Practice

Edited by

Richard D. Freedman
New York University

Cary L. Cooper
University of Manchester, England

Stephen A. Stumpf
New York University



JOHN WILEY & SONS

Chichester · New York · Brisbane · Toronto · Singapore

Copyright © 1982 by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, nor transmitted, nor translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data:

Main entry under title:

Management education.

Includes index.

1. Management — Study and teaching — Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Freedman, Richard D. II. Cooper, Cary L. III. Stumpf, Stephen A.

HD30.4.M35 658'.007 81-14666

ISBN 0 471 10078 1

AACR2

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data:

Management education.

1. Management — Study and teaching

I. Freedman, Richard D.

II. Cooper, Cary L.

III. Stumpf, Stephen A.

658'.007 HD20

ISBN 0 471 10078 1

Phototypeset by Dobbie Typesetting Service, Plymouth, Devon, England and printed by Page Bros. (Norwich) Limited

List of Contributors

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| ALLAN R. COHEN | <i>Carter Professor of Organizational Behavior
Whittemore School of Business and Economics
University of New Hampshire</i> |
| CARY L. COOPER | <i>Professor of Organizational Psychology and
Head of the Department of Management
Sciences
The University of Manchester Institute of
Science and Technology</i> |
| RICHARD D. FREEDMAN | <i>Professor of Management and Organiza-
tional Behavior
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University</i> |
| WILLIAM D. GUTH | <i>Professor and Chairperson of Management
and Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University</i> |
| FRANCINE S. HALL | <i>Assistant Professor of Organizational Be-
havior
Whittemore School of Business and Econ-
omics
University of New Hampshire</i> |
| ROBERT J. HOUSE | <i>Shell Professor of Organizational Behavior
Faculty of Management Studies
University of Toronto</i> |

CRAIG C. LUNDBERG

*Dean and Professor of Organizational Behavior
School of Management
State University of New York at Binghamton*

ALAN D. MEYER

*Assistant Professor of Organizations
School of Business Administration
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

RAYMOND E. MILES

*Professor of Business Administration
College of Business Administration
University of California, Berkeley*

RANDALL S. SCHULER

*Associate Professor of Human Behavior in Organizations
College of Business and Public Administration
University of Maryland*

CHARLES C. SNOW

*Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior
College of Business Administration
The Pennsylvania State University*

EUGENE F. STONE

*Associate Professor of Management and Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University*

STEPHEN A. STUMPF

*Associate Professor of Management and Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University*

GEORGE H. WESTACOTT

*Associate Dean and Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior
School of Management
State University of New York at Binghamton*

ELIZABETH A. ZUBRITZKY

*Assistant Professor of Human Behavior in Organizations
College of Business and Public Administration
University of Maryland*

Table of Contents

Preface	ix
Part I Introduction	
1 Management Education: Its Theory, Research and Practice . . . <i>Richard D. Freedman and Stephen A. Stumpf</i>	3
Part II Theory	
2 Experiential Learning: A Social Learning Theory Analysis . . . <i>Robert J. House</i>	23
3 A Theory of Management Learning: Its Implications for Management Education <i>Cary L. Cooper</i>	45
Part III Research	
4 Enhancing Instructional Practice: Toward a Model for Self- research <i>Craig C. Lundberg and George H. Westacott</i>	59
5 Research Design: Issues in Studies Assessing the Effects of Management Education <i>Eugene F. Stone</i>	87
Part IV Practice	
6 The Teaching of Organizational Behavior <i>Allan R. Cohen</i>	135
7 Teaching Corporate Strategy <i>William D. Guth</i>	155

8	Teaching Organization Theory	175
	<i>Alan D. Meyer, Charles C. Snow, and Raymond E. Miles</i>	
9	Developing and Managing Careers: A Teaching Perspective . . .	211
	<i>Francine S. Hall</i>	
10	Personnel and Human Resource Management Research, Prac- tice and Teaching: An Applied Approach	235
	<i>Randall S. Schuler and Elizabeth A. Zubritzky</i>	
	Index	269

Part I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

*Management Education:
Its Theory, Research and Practice*

Richard D. Freedman and Stephen A. Stumpf

New York University

Management education in schools of business and public administration has received less attention than other aspects of the study of management. Theory and research abound in areas such as organizational behavior and management science to the benefit of their practice; however, theory and research in management education is seriously lacking (Freedman and Stumpf, 1979). The utility of management education for developing practitioners remains more an article of faith than an empirical fact. Little is known about the process that underlies the education of managers. Research has emphasized the development of techniques and instruments that often are of questionable validity or not generalizable beyond the sites in which they were developed (Freedman and Stumpf, 1979). Furthermore, the criteria generally used in the research often are immediate measures of student satisfaction. Such measures have dubious linkages to more relevant, distal measures of managerial behavior. This may explain why those who study managerial effectiveness often do not consider management education as a determinant of managerial performance (see, for example, Campbell *et al.*, 1970). While management education generally plays a significant role in college programs, its usefulness remains a matter of conjecture.

A recent increased interest in management education may redress some of these problems. For example, the activities of the Organizational Behavior Teaching Society, such as its annual meeting and its journal *Exchange*, explore issues in management education teaching and research, enhance the dialog in the field, and provide outlets for those interested in educational issues. It also identifies a growing cadre of people who have a concern with improving management education.

The purpose of this book is to help to develop an information network among those who teach management in order to increase the involvement of

management scholars in management education. We recognize that the nature and degree of interest in the field varies considerably. Some may be interested in improving their own teaching; others may wish to make important contributions to the development of the field of management education. This book is structured to address both types of issues. However, we hope that as scholars become more inquisitive about their own teaching that they may also come to be more interested in issues that can be generalized to other scholars in other institutions.

We focus on three primary areas of concern: theory, research, and practice. A vital field of management education must be strong in all three areas. Good theory is needed to develop good research; good research is needed to enhance theory and to develop sound practice.

Theory building in management education should have three thrusts. First, it should provide an explanation of the underlying process by which management education can contribute to later management performance. Such theory is required to provide an intellectual rationale for management education. Second, it should offer an explanation of how different pedagogies facilitate the underlying educational process so that the appropriate pedagogy is linked to appropriate goals. Theories should be constructed to provide researchers with conceptual frameworks and hypotheses that generate research which subsequently enhances knowledge. Third, there is a need for theoretical consideration of more philosophical issues. Management education scholars should be concerned with those managerial behaviors, though not necessarily related to success in management, that enhance the practical and social utility of management. Social responsibility is one example. We must be aware of changes and trends that suggest the need for new knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities that may be required by future managers. However, it seems that a better understanding of the first two theoretical issues would enhance our ability to develop insights about the third. We do not think management education theory can go far so long as it remains primarily speculative in nature.

The second focus of the book is management education research. Management education research should be concerned with two issues: the development of knowledge in management education, and the improvement of individual teaching performance. Both are necessary elements of the field; however, their purposes and methods are often confused to the detriment of both areas. The first type of research concerns the development of knowledge that can be generalized across individuals, classes, and sites. This is the type of research that is appropriate for scholarly journals. This research may vary from the development and validation of pedagogic devices or course evaluation systems to testing relationships suggested by management education theory.

Research designed to improve individual teaching performance is often not generalizable, and one may argue that it is not research in the traditional sense. Nonetheless, it is a critical aspect of interest in the field of management education. The purpose of this research concerns those activities that individual faculty members or departments can do within their own institutions to improve their performance. In many respects each time we conduct a class or a course we engage in a field study. We all are, or should be, learning from these experiences. The issues involved in how we can better learn from our experience and effort to improve our teaching is important on its own terms. Unfortunately, our review of the management education research literature identified many examples of research that are not generalizable (Freedman and Stumpf, 1979). While the flaws in the research can often be attributed to poor methodology, it is our conclusion that much of this research was not designed to be generalized. Rather, it often represents the authors' report of research that was conducted for internal development purposes. While such efforts may represent useful pilot studies, they rarely belong in the research literature.

The third aspect of management education addressed is the appropriate design and delivery of subject matter. Ideally, the process and content of instruction should be based on sound theory and research. In the absence of such theory and research, we must do the best that we can in the context of what we know. This suggests the importance of self-directed research; our teaching should have a heuristic aspect to it.

The three areas mentioned above define a broad domain. One must consider the content variance in the functional aspects of management to appreciate its ramifications for practice. For example, teaching organizational behavior is rather different than teaching corporate strategy and policy. It is impossible for any one volume to provide thorough coverage of the issues. Therefore, we have included a sample of important aspects of each area. We believe that these contributions identify issues that merit greater consideration, provide the basis for self-development, and/or provide a basis for the development of the field. Our purpose is not to provide definitive answers to the issues in each area, but to suggest direction, to generate interest, and to develop wider participation in management education. The current need is for questions, controversy, and action.

We trust that readers will use the book as a basis for them to see how they can combine their particular interests in management with those of management education. A better understanding of management education will not only have the primary salutary outcome of improving our programs and teaching; but, more importantly, lead to a better practice of management.

The following sections integrate the contributions which make up the book into the perspective of the framework indicated above.

THEORY IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Theory development in management education is needed to evolve a systematic program of research that can significantly enhance the field. Of prime importance in such theoretical development is an understanding of what we wish to produce. As will be discussed later, selecting attainable preferred outcomes is not obvious. Theory should also explain how pedagogy facilitates the educational process. Finally, the role of management education in the manager development process needs to be elaborated, for management education is undoubtedly a broader subject than what we do in management classrooms.

Our review of the management education literature included 25 papers that were theoretic in nature (Freedman and Stumpf, 1979). Unfortunately, few of these papers were responsive to the above needs, and they have not been successful in providing a framework for conducting research. All too often they represent vehicles for the unsupported normative speculations of their authors. Although they often advocate or criticize specific techniques such as cases or experiential exercises, they are generally based on global arguments and have made little effort to develop integrated models that suggest circumstances when various approaches to education are effective. The outcomes of such theory are suggested in teaching such subjects as organizational behavior. Cohen's chapter in this book illustrates the problem. A large number of potential goals and methods confront the professor who must choose among them. Certainly better theory and research could help the professor rely on more than his or her own background and intuition to address management education issues.

Another factor that contributes to the problems we face is that to a great extent we have been working in a vacuum. Educational problems in management are a subset of educational problems in general. A vast literature on education exists in other areas such as education psychology. While this literature is not always relevant, it often helps to provide a framework for studying management education. This is illustrated by Stone's chapter on research methodology. Stone indicates how methods often developed in educational psychology may be applied to management education. Another type of illustration is seen in House's chapter on experiential learning. House adapts social learning theory into a framework that explains how experiential learning should be conducted. Why should management educators attempt to reinvent the wheel, often in a cruder form, when much is available for us to apply to our problems?

There are a large number of needs that should be addressed in management education. More attention has been devoted to developing new methods and normative arguments than to the underlying problems that we face. We identify below areas that merit more consideration.

The well-educated manager

Before an appropriate educational program can be developed, we must consider the outcomes that we wish to produce. Most of our efforts have been directed towards specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes with little consideration of the general end. It is as if we hope that specific educational inoculations somehow add up to the total—the well-educated manager. To a great extent the view of the well-educated manager that prevails today was formulated a generation ago and has received little reconsideration. This view was in reaction to the vocationalism that characterized much of early business education. The implicit goal of vocationalism was to prepare students for their first job rather than for a career in business. The most widely known articulation of this issue was produced by Gordon and Howell (1959). Their views led to a restructuring of business education in the United States, including greater emphasis on the liberal arts in undergraduate business education, consideration of ethical issues, and courses to develop general problem-solving skills.

It seems as if many of these views have been codified in business education by accrediting agencies, in particular the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), through such forms as Common Body of Knowledge requirements. Some examples of such requirements include: courses in the legal and economic aspects of business including ethical matters; an understanding of the basic concepts and applications of subjects such as quantitative methods, accounting, and organizational behavior; and, the study of organizations operating under conditions of uncertainty.

Even though this orientation is supposed to produce a well-educated manager, much of what happens within the approach remains vocational in nature. In discussing the issue of the relevance of management education, House (1975) indicates that there are still strong but misplaced pressures to provide short-run practical relevance. According to House, the professional role should emphasize the teaching of broadly generalizable principles and practices, since a vocational, or concrete orientation is not widely applicable and is rapidly obsolescent. He argues against the 'prevailing truth' in management education that there is a specific set of skills that are critical for managerial success. What he believes are required are problem-solving skills (intellectual in nature) and social skills (interpersonal in nature). Thus, one view of the purpose of managerial education is to develop those skills and abilities that are widely applicable in organizations regardless of one's hierarchical level in management or one's functional responsibilities.

We do not only deal with knowledge and skill in education, we also transmit values to our students. Cohen discusses some issues around the dilemmas this creates. Thomas (1977) also argues that management education is not an objective, value-free transmission of knowledge and skills. He demonstrates,

through conflict management, how values play an important role in the classroom suggesting that a realistic approach to value issues is more beneficial to students than absolutistic approaches.

These views are based upon what managers must contend with throughout their careers. They paint a picture of a broadly educated individual with appropriate values who is skilled in problem-solving and interpersonal relations. Yet the drive towards vocationalism remains strong as the perusal of many curricula will verify. We suggest two major reasons for this phenomenon. One resides in our students who often view relevance in terms of the concreteness and usefulness of the subject matter, an issue that we will discuss later in this chapter. The second resides in ourselves. In many areas of management and business we have developed technologies that can be directly applied. In general, these technologies are easier for us to communicate because they relate more directly to what we do in our research and consulting. They probably also satisfy our needs to fulfil our students' demands for relevance.

Another approach to defining the needs of managers centers around our growing understanding of what managers actually do. This approach to management education may permit more explicit criteria for measuring success. If we agree about what managers do and the skills that underlie those activities, then we could design an educational process to develop those skills and a measurement system to evaluate our progress on these goals in terms of individual courses and overall programs. Mintzberg's (1973) work, as one example, is widely recognized. He posits a set of activities around interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles that are viewed as generic to management. A natural question that arises is how our courses are directed at developing student performance in those roles.

If the job content and work roles approach is shown to be valid, one could go further into the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that underlie performance in those roles. The research done on assessment centers may offer some promise in this area. While assessment centers have primarily been used for selection purposes, they also have potential for management education theory development. In this instance we are not concerned with the direct potential of assessment centers for instructing students or giving them self-insight, although that potential exists (Boehm and Hoyle, 1977; Freedman and Stumpf, 1981; Slivinski and Bourgeois, 1977; Van Maanen, Schein, and Bailyn, 1977). Rather we are concerned with how the abilities measured in assessment centers relate to managerial progression (see, for example, Bray and Grant, 1966; Bray, Campbell, and Grant, 1974). To the extent that we understand which variables differentiate success in management, we can orient our programs toward those variables. Variables that have been shown to relate to success include interpersonal skills (including leadership, assertiveness,

awareness of the social environment, and flexibility), personal skills (such as self-objectivity, oral and written communications, resistance to stress, and range of interests), and administrative skills (such as organizing and planning, decision-making, and decisiveness). These skills are consistent both with the views articulated by Gordon and Howell (1959) and House (1975); they tend not to be vocational in nature. When seen in this context, one wonders how, or whether, many of these underlying abilities are enhanced in our programs.

A *caveat* is in order; the validity of assessment centers even for selection purposes is a matter of controversy with some researchers reporting positive findings (e.g., Bray, Campbell, and Grant, 1974; Howard, 1974; Huck, 1973); while others have questioned their validity (e.g., Klimoski and Strickland, 1977; Hinrichs, 1978). Even assuming the validity of assessment centers, one may question the role of management education in enhancing these abilities. For example, some abilities such as resistance to stress seem to relate to basic characteristics of individuals; they may be better used as criteria for admission decisions than aspects of an educational program.

We are not advocating the use of concepts derived from assessment center research, Mintzberg's work, or any other particular orientation as *the* model for management education programs. Rather, we believe that the management education theory literature could better incorporate the growing knowledge developed in the field of management. Theoreticians must make an effort to develop more useful models of what we want to accomplish in management education. Such approaches should enable us to develop more meaningful criteria for what we have to accomplish in our efforts. Criteria such as student satisfaction and instructor perceptions that tend to be what we generally use to evaluate the efficacy of our courses and programs are too limited.

The domain of management education

It is apparent that management education is considerably broader than what occurs or should occur in departments of management. What then is the domain of management courses in the education of managers? For example, while managers must be able to communicate well, it should be questioned whether management educators have a primary role in achieving this goal. In fact, it is questionable whether we have the primary role in developing many of the knowledge and skills indicated by Gordon and Howell (1959), the AACSB, or the approaches mentioned in the preceding section. What we do should constitute one element of an integrated educational process. Management education in management departments needs to be clearly differentiated from other aspects of education in general and business education in particular.

In addressing these questions, one not only notes wide variation in management departments across business schools, but frequently a lack of role clarity within schools of business. One way of conceptualizing the problem is

to define the domain of management education as that subject matter included within the divisional structure of the Academy of Management. However, the divisions, with exceptions such as the Management Education and Development Division, are generally more comprehensible when viewed in terms of research and functional aspects of management than in pedagogical terms. Using the Academy's domain as the domain of management education begs the question as to why personnel management is more relevant to management education than, for example, marketing or financial management which are not included in the Academy's domain.

The domain of management education both across and within schools of business often appears to be the arbitrary outcome of historic and political processes rather than a theoretic conception of a particular function in the overall task of educating managers. Some schools give the impression that their orientation to management education is so basic and all-encompassing that they describe themselves as schools of management rather than schools of business. Alternatively, a functional orientation is so pervasive in some institutions that the subject of management is limited to a few courses in a specified department.

One way to help clarify the roles of management educators is to distinguish the underlying functions of management education. Two diverse roles are apparent. One relates to those activities that are aspects of the job of all managers, and the other relates to those aspects of business that reflect the functional nature of organizations. In the latter sense we find the term management used within most departments of schools of business, e.g., marketing management, production management, managerial accounting, personnel or human resources management, and so on. The other set of activities more directly speak to the issues that most would describe as generally managerial in nature and follow more directly from variables that can be derived from studies of what managers do and the underlying abilities required to do them, e.g., leadership and other interpersonal skills. If this distinction prevailed then management departments would be engaged in the latter aspects of management education and functional departments would be engaged in the former. Yet, the domain of most management departments is complicated by the fact that a number of functional specialties are often taught within management departments, e.g., personnel/human resources management or production management.

Operationally the subject matter of management is often difficult to distinguish from functional subject matter. Furthermore, many management educators have greater allegiance to functional than managerial matters. If management is not a discrete subject, but simply an aspect of all functional specialties that can be taught within them, then there is little need for a management department. The primary rationale for management as a subject area, therefore, must rest upon the presumption that it offers something that