

Journal of Management Education Special Issue

Call for Papers

INTEGRATING LIBERAL LEARNING, HUMANITIES AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION: PUTTING THE CARNEGIE REPORT INTO PRACTICE

Guest Editors

Matt Statler, NYU Stern School of Business
Pierre Guillet de Monthoux, Copenhagen Business School

The Carnegie Foundation for Advancement in Higher Education has recently published a report, *Rethinking Undergraduate Business Education: Liberal Learning for the Profession* (Colby et al, 2011). Positioned within a broader debate about the purpose of undergraduate education, the report makes a case for the integration of “liberal learning” and “humanities” with management and business studies as a way to enable students to address the major crises and challenges that shape the contemporary landscape. The purpose of this special issue is to provide management educators with a forum in which to discuss concretely and pragmatically how such integration can be accomplished. How, for instance, can lessons learned in philosophical seminars, historical archives, and art studios improve the quality of management education?

The history of the academic discipline of business education, dating from its origins in the 1880’s at the University of Pennsylvania, has been meticulously traced (see Khurana, 2007 and O’Connor, 2011). Over the course of this history, the role of normative, practical knowledge has progressively been eclipsed by value-free, scientific knowledge, culminating with the neoclassical notion that all human social interactions may be understood objectively and in the aggregate as market forces. Within this paradigm, many business students are taught to understand themselves ideally as self-interested rational actors, and to frame moral obligations and responsibilities as inefficiencies. But as the Carnegie authors note, “the current troubles of the world economy...may stem in no small part from blind trust in an exclusively economic view of business and the world” (29). Viewed in the context of recent debates about the social purpose of business education (e.g., Bennis & O’Toole, 2005; Datar, Garvin & Cullen, 2010; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Podolny, 2009), this trend may now be reversing. Indeed, the Carnegie report suggests that the future of management education should involve a double-helix integration of professional training with the concepts and pedagogies associated with the humanities. In this sense, business school students may not only learn techniques that are instrumentally useful for the creation of economic value, but they may additionally reflect critically on the meaning and purpose of economic value creation, as well as their own identity as managers in a changing societal landscape.

Of course, the concepts and pedagogies associated with the “humanities” and “arts” are not some homogenous and undifferentiated mass that can be sprinkled in discrete quantities across an otherwise purely instrumental curriculum. In turn, organizational theory has evolved as a multidisciplinary patchwork that grows as it expands its knowledge of organizational life as it integrates additional research disciplines (Zald, 1996). The theoretical foundations for the

possible integration of the humanities and management education are currently shifting (e.g., Viswanathan, 2012; Karakas, 2011; Gabriel & Connell, 2010), and the institutional contexts for such integration are also in flux (Maloni et al, 2012; Nesteruk, 2011; Chew & McInnis-Bowers, 2004; Bobko & Tejada, 2000). These recent research contributions suggest that, at a practical level, for management educators seeking to integrate concepts and pedagogical techniques from the humanities, it makes a huge difference which concepts and which techniques are chosen. In this light, although the Carnegie report presents a richly detailed account of the classroom pedagogies, curriculum designs, and institutional frameworks observed within a sampling of US-based undergraduate business programs, the question of *how* to integrate disciplines such as philosophy, history and the fine arts into management education remains wide open for empirical as well as conceptual research.

In this light, this special issue aims to:

- Identify pedagogies that integrate the humanities with professional business and management education;
- Rigorously chart the diversity of theoretical assumptions and practical approaches available to management educators who draw on the various humanities disciplines;
- Discuss how such pedagogical approaches take shape within the institutional dynamics, discourses, and material constraints that arise within university settings;
- Situate the integration of the humanities and business training within the broader context of global trends in organizational practice.

By pursuing these aims, contributors will extend and reflect critically on the Carnegie report, exploring how its recommendations can be implemented practically in various contexts.

We seek submissions across the five types that the Journal of Management Education normally publishes: research articles, domain reviews, essays, teaching innovations, and resource reviews. Submissions should be original, not submitted to or published in any other sources, and no more than 30 pages long, including references, figures, tables, appendices, and so on. Please submit documents as Word or RTF files and follow JME submission guidelines that are available online at

http://www.sagepub.com/journalsProdDesc.nav?ct_p=manuscriptSubmission&prodId=Journal200931

Prospective authors and potential reviewers are invited to contact either editor about this special issue. Submission deadline is **16 July 2013**, but early submissions are encouraged.

Matt Statler
NYU Stern School of Business

Pierre Guillet de Monthoux
Copenhagen Business School

References

- Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(5), 96-104.
- Bobko, P., & Tejada, M. J. (2000). Liberal arts and management education: Re-emphasizing the link for the 21st century. *Journal of the Academy of Business Education*, Fall.
- Chew, E. B., & McInnis-Bowers, C. (2004). Blending liberal arts and business education. *Liberal Education*, 90(1), 56-65.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Sullivan, B., & Dolle, J. (2011). *Rethinking Undergraduate Business Education: Liberal Learning for the Profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P. G. (2010). *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Gabriel, Y., & Connell, N. A. (2010). Co-creating stories: Collaborative experiments in storytelling. *Management Learning*, 41(5), 507-523.
- Karakas, F. (2011). Positive Management Education: Creating Creative Minds, Passionate Hearts, and Kindred Spirits, *Journal of Management Education*. 35(2), 198-226
- Khurana, R. 2007. *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(1), 78-95.
- Maloni, M., Smith, S., & Napshin, S. (2012). A Methodology for Building Faculty Support for the United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3), 312-336.
- Nesteruk, J. (2012). Business Teaching, Liberal Learning, and the Moral Transformation of Business Education. *Organization Management Journal*, 9(2), 114-119
- O'Connor, E. (2011). *Creating New Knowledge in Management: Appropriating the Field's Lost Foundations*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Podolny, J. M. (2009). The buck stops (and starts) at business school. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(6), 62-67.
- Viswanathan, M. (2012). Curricular Innovations on Sustainability and Subsistence Marketplaces: Philosophical, Substantive, and Methodological Orientations. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3), 389-427
- Zald, M. (1996). More Fragmentation? Unfinished Business in Linking the Social Sciences and the Humanities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 251-261.