



# Page Proof Instructions and Queries

**Journal Title:** Journal of Management Education

**Article Number:** 779421

Thank you for choosing to publish with us. This is your final opportunity to ensure your article will be accurate at publication. Please review your proof carefully and respond to the queries using the circled tools in the image below, which are available by clicking “**Comment**” from the right-side menu in Adobe Reader DC.\*

Please use *only* the tools circled in the image, as edits via other tools/methods can be lost during file conversion. For comments, questions, or formatting requests, please use . Please do *not* use comment bubbles/sticky notes .



\*If you do not see these tools, please ensure you have opened this file with **Adobe Reader DC**, available for free at [get.adobe.com/reader](http://get.adobe.com/reader) or by going to Help > Check for Updates within other versions of Reader. For more detailed instructions, please see [us.sagepub.com/ReaderXProofs](http://us.sagepub.com/ReaderXProofs).

No.	Query
	Please confirm that all author information, including names, affiliations, sequence, and contact details, is correct.
	Please review the entire document for typographical errors, mathematical errors, and any other necessary corrections; check headings, tables, and figures.
	Please confirm you have reviewed this proof to your satisfaction and understand this is your final opportunity for review prior to publication.
	Please confirm that the Funding and Conflict of Interest statements are accurate.

# Management Education in Turbulent Times

Journal of Management Education

1–18

© The Author(s) 2018

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1052562918779421

journals.sagepub.com/home/jme



**Lisa Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Paul Hibbert<sup>2</sup>, Katy Mason<sup>3</sup>,  
and Christine Rivers<sup>4</sup>**

## Abstract

This special section was initiated by members of the British Academy of Management's *Management Knowledge and Education* project. *Management Knowledge and Education* is an academy-wide initiative, launched in 2014 to advance the creation and circulation of innovative and transformative research that deepens and broadens our understanding of management knowledge, knowing, education, and learning. For our members, in common with the authors of the *Journal of Management Education*, the sites of inquiry are varied, range from traditional classroom settings to collaborative organizational contexts for learning. Many of the innovations taking place in these varied contexts are responses to the turbulent and rapidly changing management environments. Our aim then is to support our community in striving to understand management learning and education *however and wherever it happens* in these turbulent times, and support responsive adaptation and innovation.

## Keywords

future of management education research, scholarship of teaching and learning, reflexivity, teaching and learning

---

<sup>1</sup>Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK

<sup>2</sup>University of St Andrews, Fife, UK

<sup>3</sup>Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster, UK

<sup>4</sup>University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, UK

## Corresponding Author:

Lisa Anderson, Management School, British Academy of Management, Liverpool University, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK.

Email: l.anderson@liverpool.ac.uk

## Introduction

This special section was initiated and curated by us, as members of the British Academy of Management's *Management Knowledge and Education* (MKE) project. MKE is an academy-wide initiative, launched in 2014 to advance the creation and circulation of innovative and transformative research that deepens and broadens our understanding of management knowledge, knowing, education, and learning. MKE sets out a framework to support both theory-driven and phenomenon-driven research within and across the wide variety of setting where knowledge generation, learning, and management education unfolds. For our members, in common with the authors of the *Journal of Management Education*, the sites of inquiry are varied, ranging anything from the traditional classroom and lecture theatre (cf. Durant, Carlon, & Downs, 2016; Dyer & Hurd, 2016) to organizational setting where researcher-practitioner working spaces generate insights through action-oriented, collaborative research (cf. Cunliffe & Scaratti, 2017; Radaelli, Guerci, Cirella, & Shani, 2014). Interests extend to educational and learning encounters in virtual and digital spaces, and the use and assemblages of new technologies, forms of expertise, and capabilities that are generating new learning experiences (Arbaugh, 2000; Martins & Kellermanns, 2004). Many of these innovations are responses to the turbulent and rapidly changing management environments that our students and management learners are encountering (e.g., see Hibbert, 2012; S. L. Wright & Katz, 2016), which contrasts sharply with the speed and time it often takes to learn and generate transformative insight (Lund Dean & Forray, 2018). Our aim then is to support our community in striving to understand management learning and education *however and wherever it happens* in these turbulent times.

## Turbulent Times in the Higher Education Context for Business Schools

*Turbulence: A state of Conflict or Confusion (Oxford English Dictionary, 2018)*

The timing of the MKE initiative is no accident. It emerges in a context of critical commentaries concerning the higher education (HE) landscape which are proving unsettling for many institutions.<sup>1</sup> In the United States and United Kingdom, in particular there are increasing political concerns about the cost of HE, and who accesses, pays for, and profits from it. These concerns have led some commentators to question the relevance of skill sets developed in universities, the power of these skill sets to open up job opportunities for

graduates, and the capabilities of HE institutions to support workplace transition (Craig, 2017). In the United Kingdom, these types of concerns have already resulted in a new regulatory framework. On April 27, 2017, the United Kingdom passed the Higher Education and Research Act, creating an Office for Students with a responsibility to further develop the regulatory framework to deal with such issues.<sup>2</sup> For some, the very value of management education is in question, for others the value is much clearer (Bennis & O'Toole, 2005).

In the context of this debate, in a recent article in *Times Higher Education* (Cameron, 2017), the Vice Chancellor of Aston University urges us to rethink the role of business and management schools within universities and argues that we can no longer afford to view business schools as a “cash cow.” Drawing on trends observed at United Kingdom and Australian HE institutions, Cameron argues that the value of business schools lies in the impact and engagement that business and management academics generate with extrainstitutional agencies and actors:

... greater recognition of research impact beyond its academic impact . . . is a natural strength for business schools and their engagement with business often opens the doors for engagement from other disciplines in the university. (Cameron, 2017)

Developing links between business and management schools through what is often referred to as the “real-world engagement” or “knowledge exchange” activities is becoming critical as these external stakeholders are increasingly recognized as not just the beneficiaries of HE provision but increasingly as cocreators of valued management knowledge, theory, and practice (Beech, MacIntosh, & MacLean, 2010). Knowledge exchange is also an important consideration for most research funding agencies. In the Knowledge Exchange and Research Council institutes report (Hughes, Hughes, Bullock, & Kitson, 2016), for example, 70% of the 600 respondents surveyed reported engagement with external organizations, with 40% of respondents spending at least 10% of their time engaged in knowledge exchange activities. On average, staff reported spending 8% of their work time on engagement in knowledge exchange activities with external organizations.<sup>3</sup> While these findings extend beyond the field of management, they act as a useful benchmark for our field as a key concern here is commercialization, economization, and capitalizations of scientific knowledge—all central areas of expertise within the management field. The criticality of funding for the engagement and impact program and to the rethinking of what management education might look like, and how and where management

education might happen in the future, is further amplified in the U.K. context by Brexit. Brexit threatens to remove important streams of research and engagement funding from the U.K. HE sector. As Angus Laing (2017), Dean, Lancaster University Business School observed in the HE forum Wonkhe:<sup>4</sup>

Business schools have been successful in securing funding to support SME development from the private sector, whether in the form of bank funding such as the Goldman Sachs 10000 small businesses programme, or in the form of BAE Systems support for innovation in their SME supply chain. However, such funding cannot support the wider range of business support activities which business schools are distinctively well placed to delivery.

We argue that the impact agenda offers new opportunities for management education: new opportunities to consider *how and where* management education and learning can be best situated, offering opportunities to develop innovative forms of learning that speak to both the turbulent environment of HE and the inextricably linked turbulent business environment, of which management education is so much a part. What was the time considered by some as a shocking argument, Bennis and O'Toole (2005) claim that for a while Business Schools have been on the wrong track. For them, the "crisis" in management education can be traced to a dramatic shift in the culture of business schools:

During the past several decades, many leading business schools have quietly adopted an inappropriate—and ultimately self-defeating—model of academic excellence. Instead of measuring themselves in terms of the competence of their graduates, or by how well their faculties understand important drivers of business performance, they measure themselves almost solely by the rigor of their scientific research. They have adopted a model of science that uses abstract financial and economic analysis, statistical multiple regressions, and laboratory psychology. Some of the research produced is excellent, but because so little of it is grounded in actual business practices, the focus of graduate business education has become increasingly circumscribed—and less and less relevant to practitioners. (p. 96)

An outcome of this shift has been the need to persuade a jury of sophisticated peers (McCloskey, 1983) of the merits of a scholarly publication at the expense of making research accessible to managers. Today, few practicing managers find management research presented in a form that they find useful (Markides, 2011). In a recent special issue on "Impact and Management Research" in the *British Journal of Management*, MacIntosh et al. (2017) argue that the field of management would make serious gains by seeking to

explore and exploit the integrated nature of education, practice, research, and scholarship, and that our field has much to learn from other disciplines such as art, education, and nursing where practice, research, and scholarship are more overtly interwoven. In the same special issue (Anderson, Ellwood, & Coleman, 2017), question the way the “gap” between researchers and practitioners is understood and show how a more equal relationship (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014) can be created through “relational management education.” Their approach builds a community of inquirers by reassembling the various actors and activities in and associated with business schools: publication, researcher–educators, teachers of full- and part-time students, future and current practitioners, and executive educationalists and consultancies. The crucial factor is that all such activities are undertaken in a scholarly fashion—that is, that they foster critical thinking rather than technical or instrumental training or application of ideas. The focus then becomes the cocreation of ideas, the challenging of existing ideas and practices and a willingness to disrupt and experience discomfort while learning. Such approaches are opening up opportunities for us to generate new understandings about what management practitioners do with the theories and management tools we equip them with, how they come to work out what is worth doing and what is valuable to them and their work (Mason, Kjellberg, & Hagberg, 2014).

A key challenge for our community is therefore in making knowledge exchange and collaboration connections work well for educators, learners, and their respective institutions and organizations. But this is less than straightforward. Evans and Plewa (2016) discuss the challenges that Australian business schools have faced in attempting to do this, evidencing their claim with the Australia’s poor performance at 72nd in the world “Innovation Efficiency Ratio” rankings: a measure comparing innovation inputs to outputs. In a survey of 850 academics in South Australia, Evans and Plewa (2016) found that 33% of respondents said that engaging with end users is difficult, that they do not have relevant skills, or personal contacts or that it would detract them from undertaking other research. It seems that while academics do want to engage, they need more institutional support to enable them to do so. One such example of this can be found in the University of Surrey’s Centre for Management Learning that aims to bring academia and practice closer together.

In many ways, the MKE initiative is a reaction to this changing and turbulent environment. The British Academy of Management and the MKE initiative, in particular, has become concerned with how these concerns are being discussed and addressed in different forums. It is also a response to calls from our community for learned societies to have a louder voice in shaping the policy debates, unfolding understanding of scholarship in policy making and non-HE arenas, and critically, to support and celebrate the innovations and

improvements the practice of management education so often generates. By arguing that these three elements—policy, scholarship, and practice of management education—are mutually reinforcing rather than operating in isolation, we think our community has much to gain and is well positioned to influence a holistic, cohesive, and coordinated effort to make progress. We argue that by exploring the relationships between social and economic value, we can develop, more effectively, management education that works for the varied stakeholders that constitute our management communities. We have explored, earlier, some of the tensions within those relationships, and we acknowledge that a sense of dissonance can also allow genuine innovation to be achieved in ways that also justify effort and investment in better management scholarship and education (cf. Stark, 2009).

This special section represents an intervention to take a first innovative step on our journey: to encourage and develop scholarship that both reflects and influences the turbulent policy and practice contexts in the field of management education. Paying due regard to the breadth of those contexts, we are delighted that BAM's international membership is reflected in this special section on *Management Education in Turbulent Times*.

## **Turbulent Times in the Broader Socioeconomic Context**

We introduced this special section by considering what turbulence means for the HE sector and for the business and management field in particular. Yet the idea for this special section came about in late 2016 at a time of unanticipated political schisms and following a series of world events that presented themselves as unsettling juxtapositions—and widely addressed in the media through a business and management practice lens. This lens repeatedly illustrated the inseparability of social and economic values. In multiple politic arenas, extreme views became popular and were legitimized through the ballot box, leading to divisions in opinion that were characterized by acrimony and recrimination; the election of Donald Trump and the United Kingdom's Brexit vote have dramatically changed Western politics and are raising questions about the world order and global trade. In the preceding year, a modern diaspora in the shape of the Syrian refugee crisis saw sunbathers on Greek beaches witnessing the arrival, in dinghies, of desperate families trying to find safe haven from the murderous conditions of their homeland. The divide between the world's richest and poorest people continued to grow to the extent that it now takes 4 days for the chief executive of one of the world's five largest fashion retailers to earn as much as a Bangladeshi garment worker will earn in his or her lifetime (Oxfam International, 2017).

Despite reports in 2017 that a global recession was likely, the economic forecast now appears to be more optimistic (Behraves, 2018) and the threats of a repeat of the financial crisis of 10 years ago have dissipated. However, there are still questions about the neoliberalist and free market capitalist model on which this growth is based, in particular, how it affects the weakest members of society and its role in engendering extreme political views because of its potential to create turbulence and shocks such as those of 2008 (see Bridgman et al., this issue). As the wider backdrop to all of this, our natural environment is no longer stable, with climate change cited as the biggest threat faced by the world with its attendant economic and social implications (WWF, 2018).

These political, economic, social, and environmental conditions all have a significant impact on organizations and on managers in particular. In the period of development of the papers in this section, there have been numerous high-profile events that have made many of us question whether organizations are managed in the way we might have once thought. For example, Facebook users who benignly and unknowingly offered up their personal details have learned that their data may have been harvested to target voters in the 2016 U.S. presidential election and possibly in the referendum that led to Brexit (Greenfield, 2018); the #MeToo movement has exposed widespread sexual harassment in Hollywood and beyond and there are accounts of aid workers sexually abusing children in the aftermath of the earthquakes in Haiti (Dearden, 2018). These events, along with many others, have raised questions about the way in which work is defined, how it should be conducted and the power relationships that underpin it.

In the midst of what appears to be a moral crisis, companies are under pressure to manage the triple bottom line and justify corporate behavior by evaluating environmental, social, and governance performance (Elkington, 1997; Tamimi & Sebastianelli, 2017). Hahn, Preuss, Pinkse, and Figge (2014, p. 466) suggest that organizations need “to address multiple desirable but conflicting economic, environmental and social outcomes at firm and societal levels that operate in different time frames and follow different logic.” This in turn creates a number of tensions for managers charged with corporate sustainability that emanate from having to make choices between business and values, long-term and short-term goals (Carollo & Guerci, 2018). Managers at every level and in every discipline have always dealt with a certain degree of messiness but as we look forward to the third decade of the 21st century, this messiness is overlaid with a stronger sense of unpredictability (Roberts, 2000; Van Bueren, Klijn, & Koppenjan, 2003). This means that managers are likely to be dealing with “wicked,” intractable and ill-defined issues and problems as a matter of course, in an environment that is characterized by conflict and confusion, in other words, turbulence.



## The Role of Management Educators

The question we posed as a starting point for this special section was as follows: *As educators, what should we be doing, and helping future managers learn how to do, to deal with turbulent times?* We have argued that business schools and management educators are in a unique position to influence current and future managers to both respond to and initiate change in the face of societal change because it manifests itself strongly in organizational life. Managers' actions and the values that underpin them have become increasingly pivotal in the everyday work of colleagues and the long-term futures of colleagues and stakeholders. In 2016, the British Academy of Management, in conjunction with the Higher Education Academy (now named Advance HE), carried out a study asking management education practitioners how they understood the challenges they faced in the future (Bulman, 2015; Mason, 2016). The findings were published in a White Paper, "Innovating Learning and Teaching for Excellence in Management" (Mason, 2016). Many of the issues raised in that report have been discussed above; but one of the more surprising findings was that respondents told us that those publishing in the management education area are often not recognized by their institutions as key contributors to the field. In response, this special issue demonstrates and celebrates the dexterity and creativity inherent in the scholarship of management education. It recognizes the plurality of approaches that are potentially useful for addressing the contemporary challenges and criticisms of management education and we think it illustrates the valuable contributions of scholars in field, dealing with contemporary management practice issues. We highlighted three approaches in particular.

### *Using Management Theories to Characterize and Understand the Nature of Turbulence*

Recent research approaches to characterizing and addressing turbulence include work that is focused on industry turbulence and contingency theory (Karim, Carroll, & Long, 2016), environmental uncertainty, and responses to it, based on resource dependency (Bogers, Boyd, & Hollensen, 2015), and exploration of how interorganizational and intraorganizational networks provide resilience and a basis for organizational innovation in crisis circumstances (Lundberg, Andresen, & Törnroos, 2016). We see value in management educationalists taking up these kinds of research in the classroom as part of conventional management education classes. Understanding the different forms that turbulence takes, the strategies and approaches managers have adopted to overcome challenges and seek out and create innovative

opportunities for collective action in times of turbulence seems particularly pertinent to the demands made on and for reflexive managers, who are able to learn from, react to and quickly reassemble new, productive futures.

### *Developing New Curricula, Content, and Educational Processes to Fit the Changing Times*

Management educators have already given some thought to the content and processes, in and out of the classroom, that are appropriate for changing times. Interesting recent examples include reexamination of the case method and the legitimacy of business schools (Bridgman, Cummings, & McLaughlin, 2016), integrating sustainability issues and study abroad experiences in the curriculum to develop global awareness, responsible managers (Pesonen, 2003; Sroufe, Sivasubramaniam, Ramos, & Saiia, 2015; Viswanathan, 2012), developing management classes around emerging educational approaches such as threshold concepts (Burch, Burch, Bradley, & Heller, 2015; Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2015; A. L. Wright & Gilmore, 2012; Yip & Raelin, 2012), and employing critical approaches that challenge the status quo (Kark, Preser, & Zion-Waldoks, 2016).

### *Developing Adaptive, Reflexive Approaches to Support Personal Resilience and Flexibility*

There may be a need for both students and educators to develop resilience in turbulent times, but resilience can take many forms. Practically, organizational and personal resilience are argued to be related, and rely on “soft skills” as well as adequate resources to enable change (Richtnér & Löfsten, 2014). However, there needs to be some concern for how this feeds into moral decision making if our responses to turbulence are not to involve a “race to the bottom.” Ethical resilience builds on critically reflexive understandings of the existential, relational, and moral character of leadership and management (Cunliffe, 2004, 2016), so that one is aware of the need to change while remaining aware of the consequences and effects of change on others. Focusing these insights more clearly on management education may require developments of critical pedagogies and multidisciplinary approaches, especially if we expect students to be adaptive and creative in the face of complex challenges and, perhaps, also agents of *positive* social change (Dehler, 2009; Welsh & Dehler, 2013).

Inherent in all three of these approaches (and in the articles that are included in the special section) is the notion that business schools should consider the ways in which managers engage with knowledge to develop new

ways of framing wicked, complex, and perplexing problems (Dewey, 1938). Complex situations require managers to develop “complicated understanding” to increase the variety of ways in which situations can be understood (Bartunek, Gordon, & Weathersby, 1983). However, recent moves in the university sector in the United Kingdom, most markedly, the introduction of student fees and the introduction of league tables of everything remotely measurable in HE, has resulted in “consumers” of HE being encouraged and led to expect that the main purpose of studying for a degree is to command a higher salary on completion than would have been possible without the qualification. This had led to an increasing marketization of the management classroom, where knowledge is viewed as a commodity that will produce a positive return on investment, rather than the outcome of the development of scholar-practitioners who approach their work with insight, good judgment, and an orientation to problematizing before problem fixing. This is another of those unsettling juxtapositions that we alluded to earlier, and one that affects management educators on a daily basis.

We are particularly keen in this issue to emphasize the centrality of a situated and critical view of knowledge in learning about business and management. Knowledge understood this way is not just a problem-solving tool or commodity, but as an evolving resource; as learners are “struck” (Cunliffe, 2002, p. 42) by changes in contexts, they develop the skills of judgment and resilience that allow knowledge to be reconfigured, reframed, and reconceptualized. This is the kind of knowledge and associated reflexive learning approach that managers require in a world that changes quickly, in surprising and sometimes shocking ways. We summarize the potential ways in which this reflexive learning approach can be developed in response, in Table 1, after which we introduce the contributions to this special section.

As we indicate in Table 1, the articles in this special section overlap—to some degree—with the contributory processes that can lead to responsive and resilient management education in times characterized by political, socioeconomic, and technological turbulence. We now go on to introduce those articles in more detail.

## **The Articles in This Special Section**

Bridgman, McLaughlin, and Cummings present a way of using the case method underpinned by principles of critical management education and drawing on arguments that question the legitimacy of management education that is almost universally based on a neoliberal worldview. In particular, they discuss how the case method, “the dominant mode of management education for a century” with its narrow focus on solving problems, can continue to be

**Table 1.** A Framework for Reflexive Learning in Turbulent Times.

	Aspects of turbulent environments		
	Political	Social–economic	Scientific–technological
<i>Developing responsive and resilient management education</i>			
Characterizing turbulent contexts (see Günther, Hillmann, Duchek, & Meyr, this issue)	Explore the plausibility of extreme social movements	Consider alternative paradigms and ethical failures	Use future scoping and imagination
Developing new educational content (see Bridgman, McLaughlin, & Cummings, this issue)	Situate evolving ideas in their (ideological) history	Link economic and social factors within an ethical framework	Ground theory specifically but enable use speculatively
Innovation in curriculum development and delivery (see Schumacher & Mayer, this issue)	Encourage collaborative and informed student engagement	Situate student engagement in a responsible business model/ framework	Enable a creative design approach to problem framing and solving
Outcomes: Situating adaptive and reflexive personal learning	Enable students to be informed knowledgeable agents	Engage students critically in the analysis of business contexts	Empower student creativity as a means of responsive resilience

meaningful when the capitalist structure that dictates the way in which firms operate is under scrutiny. They propose a reflexive role for theory as a means of enabling learners to appreciate a range of views and to understand the broader context of management work. They argue that theory should play a greater role than simply providing a tool for problem solving. They explain how they have used theoretical tools from sociology, political economy, law, and industrial relations to unpack the complex relationship between business and society and to offer a set of “conceptual lenses” to work on complex cases. In the conclusion, the article points to the need to fundamentally rethink the relationship between business and society and to reexamine the role of business schools in order “to seize the window of opportunity that turbulent times present.” The use of theories from outside mainstream management writing provides an opportunity for learners to construct new frames

of reference and to question the underlying economic, political, and social structures within which organizations and managers operate.

Günther, Hillmann, Duchek, and Meyr's contribution addresses the manager's role in creating organizational resilience in times of turbulence. They argue that strategic management education teaches outdated frameworks that do not equip managers to deal with the complex environment in which they operate and that they need to develop personal resilience in the face of such challenges. They also stress that managers must learn to deal with uncertainty and complexity, to think creatively and become critically reflexive managers. They describe an intervention in which they help MBA students acquire the knowledge and skills required in effective scenario planning using a case-based method and experiential learning. However, one group had received input on scenario planning while another, control group had not. They recorded the interactions of both on video in order to analyze group processes and outcomes and found that the group that understood how to use scenario planning had a clear vision of their aims and experienced less intragroup conflict than the group that did not. They were also more creative, acknowledged ambiguity, and became "strategic bricoleurs." As in Bridgman et al.'s article, Gunther et al. also show how theoretically informed questions, in this case underpinned by knowledge of scenario planning, can help strategic decision making and lead to greater insight. Furthermore, they also show how theory and its clear positioning in pedagogical design can develop relevant competencies.

Schumacher and Mayer also construct a model for teaching around a particular theory. They argue that design thinking helps students prepare work in turbulent contexts and that its use also creates opportunities for innovation. They offer a conceptual paper with detailed accounts and illustrations of how they teach the core principles of design thinking. Their perspective on turbulence proposes that it is due to technological innovations, business model changes, and shifting consumer habits that require managers to be able to solve problems and to move from what they call a traditional *decision-making* attitude to a *design-creating* attitude. They also build on Bicen and Johnson's (2015) work in lean manufacturing and innovation which offers the idea of managers working as bricoleurs with scarce resources and relying on market feedback to solve wicked problems. The article draws on a very current literature to explain the generative potential of design thinking in encouraging students to frame problems as though they were designers and offer two ways of teaching design thinking; an introductory session covering *Design Thinking in One Hour* and a 2½-day exercise, all with examples from their own practice and based on a set of teachable principles.

## Conclusion

Our two main conclusions are that (a) we have only scratched the surface of our special section theme and (b) further wide-ranging and collaborative work will be necessary in order to continue to develop management education to support responsiveness and resilience in turbulent times that show little sign of stabilizing. Bearing in mind, the importance we place on further collaboration, it is important to acknowledge the collaborative context of our won endeavor. Accordingly, we would like to thank the contributors to this special section, for helping us open up an initial conversation about how management education can respond to turbulent times. It is perhaps symptomatic of these turbulent times that there were 18 further contributions that did not make it to the special section, some of which took a broader position and others that were at a more exploratory stage of development than our editorial timelines could accommodate. Nevertheless, we hope that all those developing contributions will find their place in the right part of the debate in due course, and we are grateful for the challenges they already contributed to our thinking. In addition, we recognize that useful innovation often builds on solid foundations; in this case, the long and continuing history of leadership in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning that underpins the prominence of the *Journal of Management Education*. So, above all, we are grateful to the editors-in-chief of the journal for providing a home for our conversation, and for their support in helping us bring it to a (temporary!) conclusion.

## Authors' Note

This article is part of the Special Issue "Management Education in Turbulent Times."

## Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Notes

1. See <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/role-business-schools-within-universities>
2. On June 23, 2017, Sir Michael Barber, incoming chair of the new Office for Students, gave his inaugural speech at universities of the United Kingdom. The

Office for Students is the new regulator for HE in England and it is due to be established formally from April 2018. In the context of the recently passed Higher Education and Research Act 2017, the HE sector in United Kingdom will be as the “jewel in the nation’s crown.” Read the speech online (<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/news/Documents/sir-michael-barber-speech-uuk-june-2017.pdf>) or see video online (<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/news/Pages/sir-michael-barber-speech-uuk-june-2017.aspx>).

3. The National Centre for Universities and Business (NCUB) is an independent and not-for-profit membership organization that promotes, develops, and supports university-business collaboration across the United Kingdom. The National Centre’s Council is constituted from senior business leaders and Vice to review and make recommendations on the United Kingdom’s long-term skills, graduate talent, and innovation needs, to deliver collaborative thinking on the big issues of sustainable growth and industrial strategy, and strengthen understanding with government and policy makers through high-level networking. See <http://ncub.co.uk/reports/knowledge-exchange-and-research-council-institutes.html>
4. Founded in 2011, Wonkhe “is the home of higher education wonks”: those who work in and around universities and anyone interested and engaged in HE policy, people, and politics. Their mission is to improve policy making in HE and provide a platform for the new or previously unheard voices and perspectives in the sector (<https://wonkhe.com/about-us/>).

## References

- Anderson, L., Ellwood, P., & Coleman, C. (2017). The impactful academic: Relational management education as an intervention for impact. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 14-28. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12202
- Arbaugh, J. B. (2000). Virtual classroom characteristics and student satisfaction with Internet-based MBA courses. *Journal of Management Education*, 24, 32-54.
- Bartunek, J. M., Gordon, J. R., & Weathersby, R. P. (1983). Developing “complicated” understanding in administrators. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 273-284.
- Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. (2014). Academics and practitioners are alike and unlike: The paradoxes of academic-practitioner relationships. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1181-1201. doi:10.1177/0149206314529160
- Beech, N., MacIntosh, R., & MacLean, D. (2010). Dialogues between academics and practitioners: The role of generative dialogic encounters. *Organization Studies*, 31, 1341-1367.
- Behraves, N. (2018). *What to expect for the global economy in 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/what-expect-economy-2018-nariman-behraves/>
- Bennis, W. G., & O’Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(5), 96-104.
- Bicen, P., & Johnson, W. H. (2015). Radical innovation with limited resources in high-turbulent markets: The role of lean innovation capability. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 24, 278-299.

- Bogers, M., Boyd, B., & Hollensen, S. (2015). Managing turbulence: Business model development in a family-owned airline. *California Management Review*, 58(1), 41-64.
- Bridgman, T., Cummings, S., & McLaughlin, C. (2016). Restating the case: How revisiting the development of the case method can help us think differently about the future of the business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15, 724-741.
- Bulman, S. (2015). *Teaching and learning in the disciplines*. Retrieved from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/teaching-and-learning-disciplines>
- Burch, G. F., Burch, J. J., Bradley, T. P., & Heller, N. A. (2015). Identifying and overcoming threshold concepts and conceptions: Introducing a conception-focused curriculum to course design. *Journal of Management Education*, 39, 476-496.
- Cameron, A. (2017). *The role of business school within universities*. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/role-business-schools-within-universities#survey-answer>
- Carollo, L., & Guerci, M. (2018). "Activists in a suit": Paradoxes and metaphors in sustainability managers' identity work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 249-268.
- Craig, R. (2017). *The top 10 higher education issues we all agree on*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ryanrcraig/2017/01/20/the-top-10-higher-education-issues-we-all-agree-on/#1af9f601fa87>
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2002). Reflexive dialogical practice in management learning. *Management Learning*, 33, 35-61. doi:10.1177/1350507602331002
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2004). On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management Education*, 28, 407-426.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2016). "On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner" Redux: What does it mean to be reflexive? *Journal of Management Education*, 40, 740-746.
- Cunliffe, A. L., & Scaratti, G. (2017). Embedding impact in engaged research: Developing socially useful knowledge through dialogical sensemaking. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 29-44. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12204
- Lund Dean, K., & Forray, J. M. (2018). Slow down, you move too fast. . . . *Journal of Management Education*, 42, 315-318. doi:10.1177/1052562918768645
- Dearden, L. (2018). *Oxfam was told of aid workers raping and sexually exploiting children in Haiti a decade ago: CEO sent 2008 report warning of rape, assault and exploitation on "significant scale" in Haiti*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/oxfam-latest-sex-scandal-prostitution-rape-children-haiti-warned-2008-save-the-children-a8214781.html>
- Dehler, G. E. (2009). Prospects and possibilities of critical management education: Critical beings and a pedagogy of critical action. *Management Learning*, 40, 31-49.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Durant, R. A., Carlon, D. M., & Downs, A. (2016). The efficiency challenge: Creating a transformative learning experience in a principles of management course. *Journal of Management Education*, 41, 852-872. doi:10.1177/1052562916682789
- Dyer, S. L., & Hurd, F. (2016). "What's going on?" Developing reflexivity in the management classroom: From surface to deep learning and everything in between.



- Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15, 287-303. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0104
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Gabriola Island, British Columbia, Canada: New Society.
- Evans, D., & Plewa, C. (2016). *Academics do want to engage with business, but need more support*. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/academics-do-want-to-engage-with-business-but-need-more-support-62902>
- Greenfield, P. (2018, April 2). The Cambridge analytica files: The story so far. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/26/the-cambridge-analytica-files-the-story-so-far>
- Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability: Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 463-487.
- Hibbert, P. (2012). Approaching reflexivity through reflection: Issues for critical management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 37, 803-827. doi: 10.1177/1052562912467757
- Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. (2015). Responsible management: Engaging moral reflexive practice through threshold concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127, 177-188.
- Hughes, A., Hughes, R., Bullock, A., & Kitson, M. (2016). *Knowledge exchange and research council institutes*. Retrieved from [http://www.ncub.co.uk/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&category\\_slug=reports&alias=451-ncub-survey-of-academics-report-4&Itemid=2728](http://www.ncub.co.uk/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&category_slug=reports&alias=451-ncub-survey-of-academics-report-4&Itemid=2728)
- Karim, S., Carroll, T. N., & Long, C. P. (2016). Delaying change: Examining how industry and managerial turbulence impact structural realignment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 791-817.
- Kark, R., Preser, R., & Zion-Waldoks, T. (2016). From a politics of dilemmas to a politics of paradoxes: Feminism, pedagogy, and women's leadership for social change. *Journal of Management Education*, 40, 293-320.
- Laing, A. (2017). *Business schools are feeling the Brexit heat*. Retrieved from <https://wonkhe.com/blogs/analysis-business-schools-feeling-brexit-heat/>
- Lundberg, H., Andresen, E., & Törnroos, J.-Å. (2016). Understanding network emergence after turbulent industrial relocation: A Swedish biorefinery initiative. *European Management Journal*, 34, 475-483.
- MacIntosh, R., Beech, N., Bartunek, J., Mason, K., Cooke, B., & Denyer, D. (2017). Impact and management research: Exploring relationships between temporality, dialogue, reflexivity and praxis. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 3-13. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12207
- Markides, C. (2011). Crossing the chasm: How to convert relevant research into managerially useful research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47, 121-134.
- Martins, L. L., & Kellermanns, F. W. (2004). A model of business school students' acceptance of a web-based course management system. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3, 7-26.
- Mason, K. (2016). *Innovating learning and teaching for excellence in management*. Retrieved from <https://www.bam.ac.uk/sites/bam.ac.uk/files/White%20>

- Paper%20092016\_Innovating%20Learning%20%20and%20Teaching%20for%20Excellence%20in%20Management.pdf
- Mason, K., Kjellberg, H., & Hagberg, J. (2014). Exploring the performativity of marketing: Theories, practices and devices. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31, 1-15. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2014.982932
- McCloskey, D. N. (1983). The rhetoric of economics. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 21, 481-517.
- Oxfam International. (2017). *An economy for the 99%*. Retrieved from [https://d1tn-3vj7xz9fdh.cloudfront.net/s3fs-public/file\\_attachments/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-en.pdf](https://d1tn-3vj7xz9fdh.cloudfront.net/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-en.pdf)
- Oxford English Dictionary*. (2018). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Pesonen, H.-L. (2003). Challenges of integrating environmental sustainability issues into business school curriculum: A case study from the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. *Journal of Management Education*, 27, 158-171.
- Radaelli, G., Guerici, M., Cirella, S., & Shani, A. B. (2014). Intervention research as management research in practice: Learning from a case in the fashion design industry. *British Journal of Management*, 25, 335-351. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2012.00844.x
- Richtnér, A., & Löfsten, H. (2014). Managing in turbulence: How the capacity for resilience influences creativity. *R&D Management*, 44, 137-151.
- Roberts, N. (2000). Wicked problems and network approaches to resolution. *International Public Management Review*, 1, 1-19.
- Sroufe, R., Sivasubramaniam, N., Ramos, D., & Saiia, D. (2015). Aligning the PRME: How study abroad nurtures responsible leadership. *Journal of Management Education*, 39, 244-275.
- Stark, D. (2009). *The sense of dissonance: Accounts of worth in economic life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tamimi, N., & Sebastianelli, R. (2017). Transparency among S&P 500 companies: An analysis of ESG disclosure scores. *Management Decision*, 55, 1660-1680.
- Van Bueren, E. M., Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. (2003). Dealing with wicked problems in networks: Analyzing an environmental debate from a network perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13, 193-212.
- Viswanathan, M. (2012). Curricular innovations on sustainability and subsistence marketplaces: Philosophical, substantive, and methodological orientations. *Journal of Management Education*, 36, 389-427.
- Welsh, M. A., & Dehler, G. E. (2013). Combining critical reflection and design thinking to develop integrative learners. *Journal of Management Education*, 37, 771-802.
- Wright, A. L., & Gilmore, A. (2012). Threshold concepts and conceptions: Student learning in introductory management courses. *Journal of Management Education*, 36, 614-635.
- Wright, S. L., & Katz, J. A. (2016). Protecting student intellectual property in the entrepreneurial classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, 40, 152-169. doi:10.1177/1052562915622665

- WWF. (2018). *Climate change*. Retrieved from [https://www.wwf.org.uk/what-we-do/area-of-work/climate-change-and-energy?pc=ARG001001&pc=ARG001002&gclid=CjwKCAjw75HWBRAwEiwAdzefxG5gOLkHQhqRD7Stu9vxKcUbxIjRzXSg5wEyYx3loT4DzPETa1V5BoCJHUQAvD\\_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds](https://www.wwf.org.uk/what-we-do/area-of-work/climate-change-and-energy?pc=ARG001001&pc=ARG001002&gclid=CjwKCAjw75HWBRAwEiwAdzefxG5gOLkHQhqRD7Stu9vxKcUbxIjRzXSg5wEyYx3loT4DzPETa1V5BoCJHUQAvD_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds) WWF-UK
- Yip, J., & Raelin, J. A. (2012). Threshold concepts and modalities for teaching leadership practice. *Management Learning*, 43, 333-354.