RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT LEARNING & EDUCATION
unConference

2020 Research in Management Learning and Education (RMLE) Unconference

Held at The University of Canterbury in Christchurch, NZ

PROCEEDINGS

<u>Conference Chairs:</u>

Professor Emma Bell, The Open University
Dr. Maribel Blasco, Copenhagen Business School
Dr. Todd Bridgman, Victoria University
Professor Kathy Lund Dean, Gustavus Adolphus College
Professor Jeanie Forray, Western New England University
Dr. George Hrivnak, Bond University
Professor David Jones, Northumbria University
Professor Amy L. Kenworthy, Bond University
Dr. Sarah Wright, University of Canterbury

Note: Included QIC document contributions were accepted based on a double-blind peer review process.

ISBN: 978-0-9804585-9-6

Overview

Research discussions shouldn't have to rise from the ashes of recycled rhetoric and boring presentations prepared months in advance. Interactions about research should be exciting, organic, and engaging. For those who are interested in being generators of innovative, cutting-edge research in management education or those who have questions related to research in management education that are not addressed through traditional conference or workshop forums our 2020 Research in Management Learning and Education (RMLE) Unconference was the place to be.

Unlike traditional conference formats that involve fixed agendas, established streams, and planned presentations, our RMLE Unconferences are organic and participant-driven. The fundamental goal of the RMLE Unconference is to bring together interested, passionate, and knowledgeable people to create a forum where they can share, learn, engage, question, contribute, discuss and debate about issues they deem to be important. Each participant is a contributor and all interactions take place in a flexible and highly interactive format (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unconference for more information).

During the 2020 RMLE Unconference at The University of Canterbury, our goals were to:

- Share ideas about key research areas participants are interested in,
- Find answers and "paths forward" regarding current research questions or concerns,
- Learn from others about their experiences with research project design, development and publication processes,
- Consider issues that are emerging through recent research and publication,
- Meet and network in an intimate and informal setting with other faculty members interested in management education research, and
- Interact with numerous board members and/or editors of the *Journal of Management Education* (JME) and *Management Learning* (ML).

In terms of scope, the domain for this RMLE Unconference was the same as the seven previous events which included management teaching, learning, education, and the contexts within which these occur. As a result, the included submissions focused on a diversity of issues related to the business of management education (whether that be in universities, consulting agencies, or other organizations) as well as the processes and outcomes of management education.

The submissions included in these proceedings are called "Questions, Ideas, and Concerns" (QIC) documents. The QICs were written as free-flowing thoughts which encapsulate any questions, ideas, and concerns participants have with respect to research in management education. The content of this year's QICs was varied and rich, resulting in the following relatively large initial discussion group clusters. These assigned groups applied to our first discussion session only, after that we encouraged participants to electively and organically shift/morph/adapt the groups based on their experiences and what they heard during the reporting back sessions. As expected, through the course of a few discussion rounds, new idea- and project-specific discussion groups were formed.

The initial discussion group clusters for this year's event were:

- Group "Bunjy" – Encouraging, cultivating, and enabling institutional change starting at the faculty level
- Group "Egg Beater" – Creating fun, engaging, and yet safe spaces to maximize student learning
- Group "Referee Whistle" – Exploring knowledge, trust, and engagement in teaching and learning practices

Participant Contributors

We had 24 participant contributors coming to the 2020 RMLE Unconference from 20 universities and one professional institute located across eight countries on five continents. The countries represented by our contributors included Australia, Canada, France, Israel, New Zealand, Philippines, United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

The tertiary institutions and organizations represented included the Amazing People Institute, Bond University, De La Salle University Manila, Deakin University, EM Strasbourg Business School (University of Strasbourg), Gustavus Adolphus College, Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Mississippi State University – Meridian, Newcastle Business School, The University of Auckland, University of Calgary, University of Canterbury, University of Chester, University of Louisville, University of San Francisco, University of Surrey (Surrey Business School), University of Technology Sydney, University of the Incarnate Word, Victoria University of Wellington, Waikato University and Western New England University.

Event (Un)Structure

As this was an Unconference, there were only two formal presentations - a welcome and a summary – each facilitated by members of the conference chair group listed above (also see the "Unconference (Un)structure" at the end of this document). The minimalist formality of the event's structure is based on its underlying ethos. The bulk of the RMLE Unconference is designed to be 100% driven by the people who are there.

Beyond reading the QICs in this document, the only preparation that was asked of participant contributors prior to the Unconference was to bring energy and enthusiasm, a collaborative mindset, and an open-mindedness to going wherever our time together took us. Unconferences are uncomplicated. They are about knowledge generation via a minimally-structured, highly-engaging, and participant-driven format. The outcomes speak for themselves.

Expected Outcomes

The outcomes from any Unconference are various in nature and organic in terms of growth. The 2020 RMLE Unconference was no exception. We look forward to hearing from our participant contributors as they navigate forward on their initiatives and projects, both independently and collaboratively with the knowledge, passion, and excitement that was generated during this event.

A Special Thank You

As with each of our previous RMLE Unconferences, we would like to thank our ongoing partner organizations, the *Journal of Management Education*, the *Management Learning* journal & Bond University as well as the incredible team of people who sit on our RMLE Unconference management board. This year, we would also like to send a special thank you to the team at the University of Canterbury, with a particularly large "thank you" to Sarah Wright for helping to organise everything onsite. Without our institutional and individual supporters, and our engaging and engaged participants, there wouldn't be an RMLE Unconference.

Discussion Group “Bungy”

Encouraging, cultivating, and enabling institutional change starting at the faculty level

Peggy Hedges
David Jones
Kevin Lo
Adam Pervez
Christine Rivers
Shankar Sankaran
Benito Teehankee

Shifting Business School Thought

Peggy Hedges
Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, Canada
hedges@.ucalgary.ca

"Business schools are no longer relevant in the age of automation" Pat Chapman-Pincher, January 10, 2016, Financial Times opinion. https://www.ft.com/content/bffcc032-a34d-11e5-8d70-42b68cfae6e4

"For the most part, today's business schools are busy teaching and researching 20th century management principles and, in effect, leading the parade towards yesterday" Steve Denning, May 27, 2018. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2018/05/27/why-todays-business-schools-teach-yesterdays-expertise/#3827c7f6488b

In an earlier QIC I'd queried when disruption in business schools would happen. I'd like to continue this conversation from the viewpoint of whether or not business schools can transform themselves through practicing what they preach – business thinking requires broad thinking and team effort, not siloed thinking. Teaching and researching management principles that were suitable for yesterday's businesses may still be important for the behemoth company that provides durable goods but in the past few years there has been a push by many university or college based STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) programs to develop their own business principles courses to deliver to their students. Are business schools being purposefully left out of that conversation? If so, why?

The world is changing around us. Are we like a number of businesses who know there is AI but aren't sure of its full applications? Do we have the capacity to teach and research the management and strategic application of AI? Do we need to become more inter and cross-disciplinary so that we can become more nimble in shifting teaching and research to address the challenges presented in the rapidly changing business world? What would that look like, how would it be measured, how would it be valued? As Collinson (n.d.) notes "a large and perhaps growing proportion of academic papers…are irrelevant – literally useless – in any real business context" and "a wide range of non-academic experts, practitioners, consultants and journalists – some credible and some not so – are challenging this hegemony." We understand various types of expertise but how can we begin to value them

Anne Trumbore (2019) provides some suggestions on how business schools will need to adapt their practices, but will they be able to make those changes when faced with an accreditation processes that guarantees "glacial" (Denning, 2018) change to curriculum.

Collinson, Simon. n.d. Are business schools fit for the future? Chartered Association of Business Schools https://charteredabs.org/business-schools-fit-future/

Irani, Zahir. January 24, 2018. The university of the future will be interdisciplinary. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2018/jan/24/the-university-of-the-future-will-be-interdisciplinary

Trumdore, Anne. March 19, 2019. AASCB Blog. The business case for business schools in 2039. https://www.aacsb.edu/blog/2019/march/the-business-case-for-business-schools-in-2039

Management Educators and Complexity Mindset? – Contradiction or Compatibility?

Christine Rivers
Surrey Business School, University of Surrey
c.rivers@surrey.ac.uk

You might ask why should management educators need a complex mindset? They hardly have to solve complex problems or do they? Before answering that question let's explore what a complex mindset is. Nason (2017) outlines the necessity of a complexity mindset in today's fast paced world. He refers to the complexity mindset as a mindset that accepts that complexity exists, that complexity needs to be managed not solved and as such dealt with differently in comparison to complicated problems and that a complexity mindset needs to embrace the opportunities, challenges and limitations of control. However, a complexity mindset is also a creative, imaginative and analytical mindset that requires flexibility.

Thinking about the responsibilities and role profiles for Directors of Studies, Programme Leaders and senior management team in business schools, complexity is always present and yet there seems a level of paralysis in regard to managing complex problems efficiently. Such complex problems could include dealing with group work matters, assessment and feedback issues, effectiveness of blended learning, progression, attainment and retention to name a few. All of these problems involve dealing with people to some extent and at different levels and maybe that's what makes it complex. Academics are often characterised as not being "people management" people but critical thinkers, so how would a change in mindset – from critical to complex thinkers – affect our working environment?

I would like to explore this conundrum with management educators, discuss the following questions and dive deeper into understanding what such a shift would mean: What capacity building frameworks would be useful to support that change in thinking and mindset? How could we measure the readiness of a complexity mindset and what could that indicate in terms of readiness to take on senior responsibilities? If a complexity mindset might be adopted how would that transform attitude towards change, would academics be more open to change and would change in business schools be therefore managed quicker or more effective or would it have the opposite effect?

References:

Nason, R. (2017). It is not complicated – The art and science of complexity in business, Rotman UTP Publishing.

Unmasking spatial concealment within academic working lives

David R. Jones
Newcastle Business School
david9.jones@northumbria.ac.uk

I would like to explore the issue of spatial concealment within academics working lives. Following on from discussions on slow, restorative spaces in RMLE 2018, one aspect of our discussion we did not explore in depth, but was much evident, was how we all concealed, as much as we reveal of our own counter-performative restorative spaces. This concealment was due to managerialist pressures to enact or to appear to enact fast, micro-managed, performative work.

By unmasking what, when, how and where we conceal, we open up a conversation of why we do this. It highlights the weaknesses of managerialist practices and points towards possible alternative individual, collective and institutional spatial futures. For example, could such a dialogue open up possibilities of new forms of organisational development and support to foster greater aesthetic sensibility amongst academics. Could discussing spatial concealment also highlight new ways we as academics can engage various university actors, including students, as well. This also has significant implications for understanding concerns over the zeitgeist of open office spaces, management through metrics and the mask of sustainability and well-being initiatives offering only piecemeal, tick-box commitment to gaining accreditation’s and rising up league tables.

Finally, such sharing of spatial concealment stories has implications beyond academia. I recently held a workshop for part-time MBA students, from many different sectors and levels, around this theme. I was struck at the common need for multiple restorative spaces across sectors, the amount of time and effort spent in such spaces and the need to conceal them from not only managers but from peers as well.

A Topic of Interest:
Cultivating compassion and empathy among faculty towards students

Kevin D. Lo
University of San Francisco
kdlo@usfca.edu

Adam J. Pervez
Mississippi State University
apervez@meridian.msstate.edu

We have an important topic that we would like to bring for discussion at RMLE 2020 related to the mental health of students. In an empirical study conducted by the authors, rates of depression and anxiety among management doctoral students in the United States were 50% and 56% respectively. The US national average rates of depression and anxiety are 8.1% and 19.1% respectively. Given these alarming results, we feel that doctoral programs must be more engaged in the mental health and well-being of their students.

While our initial work in this area focuses on doctoral students, we feel that the QICs we have generated are also applicable to undergraduate as well as other post-graduate teaching. We, therefore, wonder the following:

Questions:
1) Are these statistics from the US similar to those in other countries?
2) How are individual faculty addressing issues of students' mental health?
3) How are academic programs addressing issues of students' mental health?
4) What kind of systemic support at the institutional level exists to address issues around student mental health?
5) How can we all cultivate more compassion and empathy for students to enhance their learning experiences and preserve their mental health?

Ideas:
1) We are looking for ideas around developing healthy students in our classes and programs. What are other people doing in this area?
2) We are interested in studying these phenomena related to mental health (as well as other topics such as health and well-being, engagement, impostor syndrome, and burnout among graduate students) more broadly and cross-culturally.

Concerns:
1) We have seen an increase in the past 5 years of students, primarily undergraduates, who are registered with Student Disability Services (SDS) with documented disabilities often stemming from mental illnesses.
2) What are the deleterious effects on student mental health by perpetuating the same methods of teaching and learning that we have for decades?
3) What long-term damage might we be inadvertently doing to students who sit in our classrooms and, in the case of doctoral students, become teachers themselves?

Enabling a Culture of Change Agency in a Business School in Support of Humanistic Change Leadership Pedagogy for MBAs

Benito Teehankee
De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines
benito.teehankee@dlsu.edu.ph

Business schools were originally intended to form young men to be socially responsive business leaders. Throughout the 20th century, this original purpose gave way to a more technically and financially focused purpose for business education, reflecting the dominant view among business leaders generally. As a result, critics have implicated business schools and their graduates in scandals such as Enron and the Global Financial Crisis. A recent critique has been Parker's (2018) "Shut Down the Business School".

Last August, the Business Roundtable (BRT) — the influential US-based association of US CEOs — announced that it is moving away from prioritizing shareholders and is now committing to all stakeholders of the corporation. The BRT declared: "Each of our stakeholders is essential. We commit to deliver value to all of them, for the future success of our companies, our communities and our country." This is an opportunity for business schools to help in mapping a way forward for a more multi-stakeholder responsive business and training the business leaders who can help in the transformation of business towards stakeholder responsiveness.

In the past decade, hundreds of business schools have joined the United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRiME) network which calls for a return to business education for social value creation and sustainability. De La Salle University joined PRiME in 2008 to support the main purpose of "develop[ing] the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy." Our MBA program introduced insider action research as an approach to training students to become humanistic change leaders in their organizations. The biggest teaching challenges have involved the threshold concepts and related skills around reflection on deep-seated assumptions about organizational realities and engaging in highly-charged dialogue for collaborative change.

Beyond the curriculum and pedagogy, PRiME calls on business schools to "understand that our own organizational practices should serve as example of the values and attitudes we convey to our students." Thus, it becomes problematic for faculty and students alike to envision and enact humanistic change in organizations without the active modeling of the business school environment itself. The challenge I face is engaging faculty to initiate positive changes in their own contexts in the academic workplace, especially regarding issues which affect faculty welfare. Faculty perceive that they are constrained from doing this by academic silos, publication pressures and hierarchical structures.

Thus, the main issues I am dealing with as a management educator with responsibility for our MBA insider action research program are:

1. How can we improve our teaching of reflective and collaborative change leadership among MBAs?
2. How can faculty across the MBA program be enabled to support transformative learning for MBAs so that students will accept and commit to their role as humanistic change leaders?
3. How can we engage faculty in becoming change leaders themselves in order to strengthen our business school culture towards supporting students in their development as change leaders?

References

Bagley, C.E., Sulkowski, A.J., Nelson, J. S., Waddock, S. & Shrivastava, P. 2019. A Path to Developing More Insightful Business School Graduates: A Systems-Based, Experiential Approach to

Integrating Law, Strategy, and Sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education.* http://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2018.0036

Coghlan, D. & Cagney, A. G. (2013). 'Multisensory Holistic Immersion': A Method of Insider Inquiry Skills as a Threshold Concept. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://journal.aldinhe.ac.uk/index.php/jldhe/article/view/136/135

Coghlan, D. & Shani, A. (2008). Insider action research: the dynamics of developing new capabilities. In Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. *The SAGE handbook of action research* (pp. 643-655). : SAGE Publications Ltd

Nielsen, R. (1990) Dialogic leadership as ethics action (praxis) method. *Journal of Business Ethics, 9*(10), 765–783.

Parker, M. (2018). *Shut down the business school: What's wrong with management education.* London: Pluto Press.

Teehankee, B. (2018). Critical realist action research and humanistic management education. *Humanistic Management Journal, 3(*1), 1-20.

Trevino, L.K. & McCabe, D. (1994). Meta-learning about business ethics: Building honorable business school communities. *Journal of Business Ethics, 13*, 405. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00881449

Getting Project Managers and Researchers Ready for Technological Disruption: Improving their Project Management Technology Quotient (PMTQ).

Shankar Sankaran
University of Technology Sydney, Australia
shankar.sankaran@uts.edu.au

I have been teaching project management since 1999 at two universities in Australia. I also teach it overseas at a university in China. I teach both MBA students learning about project management as well as students taking postgraduate programs in project management. I have also worked as a real project manager in industry for several years before I joined academia. I am also an action researcher.

Recently professional bodies of project management such as the Project Management Institute (PMI), Association for Project Management (UK) and the International Project Management Association have been urging both project management practitioners and educators to prepare for technological disruption that will change the nature of the profession and people practicing it.

The Pulse of the Profession Report 2019 published by PMI is suggesting that project managers need to measure their Project Management Technology Quotient (PMTQ) which is a person's ability to 'adapt, manage and integrate technology based on the needs of the organization or the project at hand'. It is also being promoted as a 'must-have', make-or break;' skill set.

In my own research I have been advocating the concept Organizational Project Management which is an overarching concept looking at the integration of all project-related activities in an organization. Organizational Project Management is relevant to all managers in an organization whether they manage projects or not as projects are being considered tools through which an organization's strategy is delivered rather than to deliver individual projects at a tactical level.

I was recently commissioned to write an article about the impact of artificial intelligence on project managers. I am aware of the promises made of artificial intelligence and its capacity to transform the world in the 70's and '80s which did not materialise. But catching up with AI's advances for my article I can now see that, this time around, AI and data science have the potential to change the nature of work of project managers. These managers have to keep pace with technology disruption and learn how to manage people and intelligent agents together to manage projects in the future. How do we prepare them for that?

This raises the following questions for me. I will be happy to work with others, using action research, to answer these. I am also happy to be not limited to the project management field.

1. How do we prepare managers of the future to cope with digital disruption?
2. How can we do that while we ourselves do not know what path digital disruption will take?
3. In what ways should we management researchers to carry out research involving digital disruption? What new research approaches may be required?

Discussion Group "Egg Beater"

Creating fun, engaging, and yet safe spaces to maximize student learning

Olga Bourachnikova
Mary Brydon-Miller
Jeanie Forray
Victor Friedman
Kathy Lund Dean
Caroline Merdinger-Rumpler
Alfredo Oritz
Tony Wall
Sarah Wright

The Tension Between Autonomy and Guidance:
Finding the Balance in an Entrepreneurship Education Program

Caroline Merdinger-Rumpler
caroline.merdinger@em-strasbourg.eu
Olga Bourachnikova
oab@unistra.fr
Didier Wehrli
didier.wehrli@em-strasbourg.eu

EM Strasbourg Business School, University of Strasbourg

As pedagogues of a three-year bachelor degree program delivered by the business school of the University of Strasbourg, we would like to share a central and critical concern we face dealing with the tension between student autonomy and the pedagogical structure.

Launched in 2011, this program is based upon action learning (Revans, 1982) and team learning (Senge, 1990), inspired by the Finnish Team Academy Entrepreneurship Program (Leinonen et al, 2004). The specificity of this approach can be summarized in three points:

- The learning goals and the means deployed to achieve them are defined individually by the students themselves, with the help of a tutor. The students are engaged in real life projects, interacting with a variety of stakeholders (clients, suppliers, competitors, financers).
- Every student is part of a team of 15 members, meeting twice a week for reflexion sessions. The tutor's role is to ensure that students learn from each other's experiences. Except those reflexion sessions, there is no other mandatory course in this program.

Having experienced this program for 8 years, we face several concerns, particularly those dealing with program design in order to favour student's skills and autonomy. In addition to our observations, we have conducted qualitative semi-directive interviews with both students and alumni.

The concerns we would like to address are the following:

First, we observe that graduate students reach high levels of soft skills (interpersonal communication skills, emotional intelligence, leadership, teamwork abilities) and are aware of it. Regarding hardskills, we notice that there is a great heterogeneity both in the kinds of skills developed (marketing, design, sales, finances...) and in the levels of expertise achieved by the graduates. In addition, even for those who develop high levels of technical skills, it seems that they aren't always aware of it and don't systematically feel competent in those fields.

Second, we observe that our program design conveys a lot of freedom to the students: they choose their projects, their learning goals, their team mates, the books to read… and they are free to schedule their time as they want. It seems that this freedom is on the one hand much appreciated, but on the other hand it is a real challenge to manage it in a satisfactory and effective way. We notice that this is particularly true in the first year, less in the second and third years. It helps enabling students to develop a great sense of autonomy. The question is "at what psychological price?" in regard to cognitive dissonance.

In order to enhance the technical skills, it seems for us that we should plan mandatory sessions (courses delivered by experts of the field, missions in organisations…). We assume that this could help the students not only to develop their hard skills, but also to reduce their stress. What we don't know is how this pedagogical transformation might impact the development of students' autonomy by reducing their freedom. We would like to address and discuss the question of the pedagogical design that could help to develop and maintain both skills (soft and hard) and autonomy.

References

Revans, R. W. (1982). The origin and growth of action learning. Brickley, UK : Chartwell-Bratt. / Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Senge, P. 1990. The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Leinonen, Niina, Partanen, Timo & Palviainen, Petri (2004). Team Academy: a true story of a community that learns by doing. PS-KustannusOy. Jyväskylä.

"Playful ambiguity for adaptive capacity"

Tony Wall, Vicky Evans and Ann Hindley
International Centre for Thriving, University of Chester, Chester UK
t.wall@chester.ac.uk

The need for managers to develop adaptive capacities is now widely documented; it not only enables the potential for organisations to flex in relation to environmental shocks, but it can be a protective factor for stress for the manager and employees more broadly (Ogden et al, 2006; Tökkäri, 2015; Kinder et al, 2019). There are various experiential, simulation, problem based, and live-realtime educational strategies that might promote aspects of adaptive capacity (Hurst et al, 2018; Bosomworth & Gaillard 2019 – in press). For some of these, ambiguity can play a role in navigating or negotiating the task; for example, not knowing how competitors may respond to a strategic move in a simulation task, or not knowing whether or how new group members will deliver their respective tasks for a group task (Wall et al, 2019). Such ambiguities are not necessarily valued or appreciated by students given the potential impact on their individual academic achievement (Wall and Perrin, 2015). Indeed, the "serious play" concept itself is "a practice characterised by the paradox of intentionality" (Statler et al, 2011: 236).

This QIC pushes the intellectual and practical ambition of how far and in what ways ambiguity can feature as an intentional instructional design principle in developing adaptive capacities. For example, whereas many educational approaches may introduce ambiguity in the process of delivering a task (the pedagogic scaffold), many approaches do not introduce it around what the task actually is. Here, 'the task as scaffold' might be replaced by 'serious play as scaffold' whereas a particular mindset or attitudinal frame provides the behavioural coordinates for engagement in educational activity (Spraggon and Bodolica, 2018). This QIC therefore aims to explore playful ambiguity for adaptive capacity, and specifically asks: How can we create the conditions to foster and maintain the paradox of serious play (such as subjectively 'safe' spaces), especially set against contexts where learners can be instrumental in their learning? The QIC ultimately aims to pull together examples as well as developing new ideas to be tested in practice.

References

Bosomworth, K. & Gaillard, E. (2019 – in press) Engaging with uncertainty and ambiguity through participatory 'Adaptive Pathways' approaches: scoping the literature. *Environmental Research Letters*. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab3095.

Hurst D., Azevedo A., & Hawranik P. (2018) Building Adaptive Capacity in Online Graduate Management Education. In: Khare A. & Hurst D. (eds) On the Line. Springer, Cham

Kinder, T., Stenvall, J., & Memon, A. (2019). Play at work, learning and innovation. Public Management Review, 21(3), 376-399. doi:10.1080/14719037.2018.1487578

Ogden, P., Minton, K. & Pain, C. (2006). Trauma and the body. New York: W.W.Norton & Company.

Spraggon, M., & Bodolica, V. (2018). A practice-based framework for understanding (informal) play as practice phenomena in organizations. Journal of Management & Organization, 24(6), 846-869. doi:10.1017/jmo.2018.30

Statler, M., Heracleous, L., & Jacobs, C. D. (2011). Serious play as a practice of paradox. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 47(2), 236-256.

Tökkäri, V. (2015). Organizational play: Within and beyond managing. Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 10(2), 86-104. doi:10.1108/QROM-11-2013-1181.

Wall, T. & Perrin, D. (2015) Žižek: A Žižekian Gaze at Education, London, Springer.

Wall, T., Clough, D., Österlind, E., & Hindley, A. (2019) Conjuring a 'Spirit' for Sustainability: A Review of the Socio-Materialist Effects of Provocative Pedagogies. In: Leal Filho W., Consorte McCrea A. (eds) Sustainability and the Humanities. Springer, Cham.

The Value of Getting Lost

Victor J. Friedman, Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Israel (victorf@yvc.ac.il)
Mary Brydon-Miller, University of Louiseville, Kentucky, USA (mary.brydon-miller@louisville.edu)
Alfredo Ortiz, University of the Incarnate Word, Texas, USA (alortiz1@uiwtx.edu)
Michal Razer, Oranim Academic College of Education, Israel (michal_r@oranim.ac.il)
Izabel Ramadan, Oranim Academic College of Education, Israel (izabel.ramadan@gmail.com)

At the unconference we wish to inquire into "getting lost" as a skill for management learners and educators. Some of our most profound learning experiences involve getting lost – periods when we are not sure where we are, where we are going, what to do, or how to do it. Reaching the "point of maximum confusion" is often a key turning point in developing new understandings, ideas, or skills.

By getting lost we mean (1) letting go of what we already know, (2) doing things before we really know how to do them, and (3) experiencing uncertainty and doubt as a step towards new knowing. In their work on organizational learning, Argyris and Schon (1996) studied how professionals deal with "situations in which conflict, obscurity or confusion blocks action" (Argyris & Schon, 1996, 31-32). They found that people facing intractable problems employ control-oriented reasoning and action (Model 1) that gets them into deeper trouble. In the face of doubt and uncertainty people tend to think and act as if they know (Argyris and Schon, 1974).

Drawing on the work of Dewey (1938), they proposed an alternative, mode of reasoning and action (Model 2) for dealing with uncertainty based on inquiry, which they defined as "the intertwining of thought and action that proceeds from doubt to the resolution of doubt" (Argyris & Schon, 1996, 11). Inquiry begins by embracing doubt and uncertainty – i.e. not knowing – so that we can truly explore and discover new ideas or new ways of thinking, which we then test out in practice.

People tend to avoid "not knowing"– at least in school and professional situations. From earliest childhood, people are rewarded for knowing and punished for not knowing. Therefore, we suggest that managers and other professionals *need to learn how to get lost* (Solnit, 2017), particularly when developing skills such as organizational analysis, dialogue, reflective practice, conflict engagement, qualitative research, and action research.

As educators and action researchers, we try to design "spaces of learning" (Friedman et al, 2015) in which people can get lost while at the same time ensuring them that they will "never get lost alone". Our role, is "being with students" (Ramsey & Fitzgibbons, 2005) on their journey from doubt to the resolution of doubt. This role also requires a willingness get lost ourselves while possessing the confidence that I will find my way and that significant learning will emerge (Case, 2015).

Teaching people how to get lost is a challenge because it goes against normative approaches to management education. At the Unconference we would like to discuss, test, and develop out this idea of getting lost: Does it make sense? Do others have similar experiences in learning? Does it apply to all learners? What kinds of learning/knowledge does it apply to? What is the emotional experience of getting lost? How can we better facilitate getting lost? Is there value in getting lost alone? How can we make getting lost legitimate when it is seen as inefficient?

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. 1974. *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D.A. 1978. *Organizational learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. 1996. *Organizational learning II*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Case, J. (2015). Emergent interactions: rethinking the relationship between learning and teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(6), 625-635.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: the theory of inquiry*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Friedman, V. Sykes, I., Lapidot-Lefler, N. & Haj, N. (2016). Social space as a generative image for dialogic organization development. In D. Noumair & Shani, A. B. (Rami), (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development,* Volume 24. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publications.

Ramsey, V.J. and Fitzgibbons, D.E. (2005). Being in the classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, 29(2), 333-356.https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562904271144

Solnit, R. (2017). *A field guide to getting lost.* Edinburgh: Cannongate Publshers.

Wait, Don't Tell me That!

Kathy Lund Dean
Gustavus Adolphus College, USA
lunddean@gustavus.edu

Jeanie Forray
Western New England University, USA
jforray@wne.edu

Sarah Wright
University of Canterbury, New Zealand
sarah.wright@canterbury.ac.nz

Student self-disclosure, or the sharing of personal information with peers or educators, can be an integral part of the management education classroom and assessment repertoire. Often an aspect of reflection work associated with any variety of developmental learning opportunities, self-disclosure offers the students the opportunity to process their learning as a means to integrate classroom learning with personal experience (e.g., Cunliffe, 2016). Reflective writing provides a pathway for students to engage in a critical examination of classroom material and apply theory into everyday life (Hibbert, 2013). Self-disclosure might offer a powerful learning experience but instructors may not expect or be prepared for students' disclosures of personal experiences that involve harm, antisocial behaviours, or illegal/proscribed behaviours. Examples of this may include a student confessing to aggressive sexual advances toward a fellow team member in a group dynamics course, a student disclosing academic dishonesty in another course, or a student re-considering their response to a discrimination episode they witnessed. Such disclosures, while authentic and meaningful, can create challenges for both the student and the educator as unintended outcomes from a learning experience that are confessional or therapeutic, and for which educators are rarely trained to manage effectively. Incorporating intimate information in a reflection or learning assignment may also raise issues of role boundaries and the use of assessment that includes potentially damaging student information.

Over the past year, the *Journal of Management Education* has published specially themed articles exploring the shadow side of experiential learning, within which student self-disclosure is an issue (e.g., Clancy & Vince, 2019; Wright, Hibbert, Strong, & Edwards, 2018). The JME initiative was created to begin to remedy the almost complete silence in the literature exploring potentially difficult or damaging outcomes from experiential learning practice. This QIC continues a conversation grounded in ethical uncertainty – as educators, how do we respond when students report illegal, immoral or discriminatory behaviour in their reflective writing? While there are situations for which educators are mandated to report, such as in the U.S. with Title IX and sexual assault, and most institutions have ethics codes that require staff and students to report breaches, such as plagiarism. Even in those situations, breaching confidentiality promised to students and reporting the criminal, discriminatory or unethical behaviour will most certainly impact trust and future learning. Alternatively, by not signalling that difficult self-disclosures are OK, students may respond with only cursory or superficial information in their reflection work. How does the nature of pedagogical caring, relational learning, and the instructor–student relationship affect our reaction and response to potentially damming self-disclosures (Hawk, 2017)?

Sensitive disclosures present both professional and personal challenges to the educator. In other professions such as psychology, there is some guidance as to what educators should do, e.g. APA Ethical Principles for Psychologists and Code of Conduct. However, students do voluntarily disclose many types of immoral experiences. As such, students' classroom and/or written disclosures can sometimes blind-side unwitting educators. How should we handle this ethically, professionally, and transparently?

References

Clancy, A., & Vince, R. (2019). “If I Want to Feel My Feelings, I’ll See a Bloody Shrink”: Learning From the Shadow Side of Experiential Learning. *Journal of Management Education, 43*(2), 174-184. doi:10.1177/1052562918817931

Cunliffe, A. L. (2016). Republication of “On Becoming a Critically Reflexive Practitioner”. *Journal of Management Education, 40*(6), 747-768.

Hawk, T. F. (2017). Getting to Know Your Students and an Educational Ethic of Care. *Journal of Management Education, 41*(5), 669-686. doi:10.1177/1052562917716488

Hibbert, P. (2013). Approaching Reflexivity Through Reflection: Issues for Critical Management Education. *Journal of Management Education, 37*(6), 803-827. doi:10.1177/1052562912467757

Wright, A., Hibbert, P., Strong, R., & Edwards, M. (2018). Exposing Practical, Psychological, and Pedagogical Shadow Sides of Experiential Learning. *Journal of Management Education, 42*(6), 761-771. doi:10.1177/1052562918802327

Discussion Group "Referee's Whistle"

Exploring knowledge, trust, and engagement in teaching and learning practices

Todd Bridgman
Michael Cohen
Suzette Dyer
Charles Margerison
Tim Rogers
James Sun

Bringing 'Experts' into the Management Classroom: Looking Beyond Traditional Corporate Visitors to Improve Student Engagement and Outcomes

Fiona Hurd (fiona.hurd@aut.ac.nz)
Auckland University of Technology

Suzette Dyer (sdyer@waikato.ac.nz)
University of Waikato

Heather Lowery-Kappes (heather.lowery-kappes@waikato.ac.nz)
University of Waikato

An overarching issue that continues to engage us as management researchers and practitioners is how can we challenge ourselves, within the context of high teaching workloads, to look beyond the traditional models of industry engagement in curriculum design?

As management educators, we are often encouraged by institutional leaders, and colleagues, to include external corporate experts in to the classroom experience. Further, this is often one way to embed a degree of authenticity within the seemingly detached classroom context – and one requiring relatively little in terms of curriculum change for the educator. Some may even suggest this is the 'easy' option. Indeed, as part of a Career Management and Development course, embedded in a HRM major, we have invited a series of corporate guests to discuss their personal career trajectories and the career opportunities within their respective organisations. Although these high profile corporate figures provided inspirational stories, and slotted easily within the course structure, their presentations did not seem to connect with student experience nor facilitate their deeper understanding of personal or organisational career management and development that we were seeking. This disconnect led us to the conclusion that our teaching practice, and our particular use of corporate 'experts', was ineffective, especially in terms of bringing career theory to life for our Human Resource Management students.

Our reflexive account informed our exploration of new ways to provide authentic learning experiences for our students with the aim of developing deeper connections between career theory and practice. As part of this exploration, we maintained our strong commitment to include 'expert' guest visitors in the lectures. However, given the disconnect between student experience and the high-flier corporate guest visitor stories, we were confronted with the need to ask ourselves: What constitutes an 'expert'? Is expertise only found in the external, corporate world? Are their internal on-campus experts available? How do we engage with 'experts' to facilitate authentic learning experiences?
To answer the first question, we recognised that we are experts in career management and development theory and in designing authentic learning experiences. We also recognised that we are not experts in career management and development practice, nor were the external corporate experts that we had traditionally invited to speak in our class. Thus, we realized that our course was missing the knowledge and expertise offered by a Career Practitioner. To answer the second and third questions, we set out to find a Careers Practitioner who would be willing and able to work with us to help bring career theory and practice alive for students. This exploration led us to look inwards to the expertise already available through the on-campus Career Development Services.

Through collaboration between the course convenors and the on-campus Careers Development Services, have re-designed the curriculum to facilitate student understanding of career theory in practice. The outcome of this collaboration the creation of three experiential learning exercises and accompanying assessments to bring alive some of the techniques required to manage career. These three assessments have been collected since 2015, and form the basis of an ongoing research project analysing the effect of the course redesign on careers education.

Reflexively, our collaboration and engagement with on-campus careers expertise has resulted in an enhanced curriculum design that has been crucial to facilitating an authentic learning experience for our students. Moreover, our collaboration raises a number of questions as this relates to defining who is (or is not) an appropriate expert and where to find them. Our work also draws attention to thinking about how we can engage our internal on-campus experts more fruitfully within curriculum design. It is these, and many other questions that we would like to explore with other management educators at the 2020 un-conference.

Teaching ideas relevant to managing and organizing within a historical context

Todd Bridgman
Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Todd.bridgman@vuw.ac.nz

I've been teaching introductory courses in management and organisational behaviour for 20 years but it's only recently that I've read the original works of well-known management ideas that feature regularly in textbooks – such as Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Lewin's change-as-three-steps model, McGregor's theory X and Y, the Hawthorne experiments etc.

I've been surprised and concerned to discover there is often little resemblance between the original idea and what students are presented with in textbooks. So, not only did Maslow not create the pyramid, the criticisms textbooks routinely make of his model were anticipated by Maslow in his original 1943 article, with him cautioning that these would be misinterpretations of his theory. What started as a quite complex theory of human motivation has become a simplistic model that looks great in PowerPoint and is easy for students to remember, but it is not what Maslow intended.

There are many reasons why that happens, but I'd like to focus on a recurring pattern of ideas getting stripped of the historical context in which they emerged to be packaged into mainstream textbooks as part of a manager's 'toolkit'. So, Maslow's hierarchy of needs becomes a tool that managers can use to increase the motivation of their workers. If students read Maslow in the original, they would realize that he was writing about human needs, not organizational needs. He was not writing a guide for managers in organizations, but about people as individuals and how societies diminish individual creativity. His work was about freedom of inquiry and expression, which were among the necessary preconditions Maslow stated for the satisfaction of human needs. There is much we can learn about managing and organizing beyond the pyramid.

It's probably unrealistic to expect first year undergraduates to read Maslow in the original, but I do think management textbooks could to a better job of teaching ideas within their historical context. A good place to start would be with the Hawthorne experiments. Management textbooks usually cover in depth what was happening within the four walls of the Hawthorne factory – they present it as the most significant management idea to emerge from the 1920s and 1930s – yet what is curious is most textbooks say very little about what life was like in America at this time. The sharp deflationary recession of 1919-20 provoked widespread industrial unrest. The final years of the Hawthorne experiments took place during the stock market crash of 1929 which led to wage cuts, increased working hours, work intensification, threats of dismissal and other exploitative labor practices had become widespread, with unemployment reaching 25 percent.

Having a deeper understanding of the past is important today, where we face challenges following the Global Financial Crisis, that have parallels with the years following the economic crises faced a century ago. Back then, as now, serious questions were being asked about the social responsibilities of business. There is much we can learn from understanding the context and debates of the past that could inform our understanding of the relationship between business and society today.

References

Bridgman, T., Cummings, S., & Ballard, J. (2019). Who built Maslow's pyramid? A history of the creation of management studies' most famous symbol and its implications for management education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education.* 18(1): 81-98.

Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., Hassard, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2017) *A New History of Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maslow, A. H. 1943. A theory of human motivation. ***Psychological Review,*** 50(4): 370-396.

The Impact of Author's Nationality on Practitioners' Attitudes towards Management Knowledge

James Sun
The University of Auckland Business School
james.sun@auckland.ac.nz

Sunghoon Kim
The University of Sydney Business School
Sunghoon.kim@sydney.edu.au

As management education continues to globalize, interest has risen in the way management knowledge is produced and distributed. The major concern in the literature is arguably the excessive influence of "made in the USA" branding in the management knowledge market. Some worry that the persisting North American dominance in management knowledge production may stifle a generation of knowledge with wider indigenous applicability (e.g., Nicolls-Nixon et al., 2011; Tsui, 2007).

Our research questions, ideas and concerns mainly related to understanding about the functioning of the globalized management knowledge market by focusing on its consumption pattern in China. We are concerned with the way Chinese participants of management education evaluate the value of management knowledge as well as their attitude towards learning more about that knowledge. In particular, we investigate whether Chinese executives respond to the same management knowledge differently depending on the nationality of the authors of the knowledge.

Our concerns are mainly about the applicability of US-made management knowledge in other societies, especially those conventionally regarded as culturally different from US or other Western countries, such as China, Korea. We are interested in exploring the role of the authors of an article in influencing the readers' attitude towards the knowledge that article delivers.

Specifically, our questions focus on to what extent the nationality of author(s) of an article would impact the judgment of the readers about the 1) importance of the topics; 2) usefulness of the knowledge presented by the article; 3) willingness to learn more about this knowledge by either reading a full article/book, or attending an executive training programme.

We are also interested in cross-cultural comparisons about these questions. Are these relationships applicable to other cultures? What about US and Middle East? What about US and Australia, New Zealand, and other English speaking countries?

It would be interesting to discuss and debate the "country of origin" effect in management knowledge learning and teaching.

Simulation as a basis for management research and education?

Tim Rogers
University of South Australia
tim.rogers@unisa.edu.au

Simulation in management research is certainly not a new idea: Zimbardo's 1973 Stanford 'prison' experiment, for example, has had an enduring influence on social psychology and management studies. Nevertheless, simulation has for some time been marginalised as a research approach. To a large extent this was the result of the rise of what came to be seen as the 'common-sense' version of the application of the scientific method to the social sciences that was summarised in Campbell and Stanley's seminal (1966) text *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. This approach was almost always partnered with the Fisherian statistical commitment to significance testing, set somewhat arbitrarily at the 0.05 level of probability.

The main countervailing force in management research has been the case study, where a rich, ethnographic account of a key event, or a biographical account of a significant person, is thought to capture some of the myriad 'real world' contingencies, vicissitudes, and intangibles that the experimental setup necessarily excludes.

Together, the experiment and the case-study, the quantitative and the qualitative, have been the prime informers of management education. Management textbooks, for example, routinely switch between relaying summaries of experimental research relating to a particular theory (say Vroom's expectancy theory of motivation) and presenting case studies that are meant to illustrate its application.

There are several reasons to think that this might be a good time to revisit the assumptions of these practices, their implications for management education, and the potential of simulations to do a better job of bridging theory and practice and informing management learning:

1. The Fisherian commitment to significance as the key arbiter of scientific acceptance has been under sustained attack since the mid 90s. Replacing this with effect size, as is usually recommended, is not all that helpful in many instances. For example, in the field of self-esteem, no research in a 28 year period accounted for even 10% of the variance in the target variable (Scheff, 2011). In these circumstances, it is unsurprising that the replication wars are shredding the foundations of many theories. Textbooks haven't yet worked out that their content is built on epistemic sand.
2. The philosophy of science has shifted ground considerably in the last 40 years. Quite apart from sceptical approaches such as the 'strong programme' in the sociology of science, there are realist and critical realist approaches that are sympathetic to the idea of scientific progress and the potential of experiments but can more readily accommodate agent reasons and social structures as causes.
3. There are already existing bodies of simulation research that are consistent with these realist philosophies of science and can inform experiential learning: system dynamics has uncovered human cognitive liabilities in supply-chain simulations (e.g. Sterman, 2000); Oshrey's long-form roleplay simulations revealed the patterned responses of a system's uppers, middles, and bottoms (e.g. Oshry, 1999); and Argyris's interpersonal role-plays found universal theories-in-use that undermine organisational learning (e.g. Argyris, 1982), to name a few.

Despite the promise, it is an open question as to how simulation research and education can get a foothold in an academy that appears to be hermetically sealed off from alternative practices.

References

Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning and action: Individual and organizational*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Oshry, B. (1999). *Leading Systems: Lessons From the Power Lab*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers

Scheff, T. J. (2011). The catastrophe of scientism in social/behavioral science. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, *40*(3), 264–268.

Sterman, J. D. (2000). *Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world*. Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill

What are the Ways to Lead Independent Professionals?
Action Learning Issues for Discussion

Charles Margerison
Amazing People Worldwide
charlesauthor2@icloud.com

Having been a founding entrepreneur of two successful business education organizations (Emerald Publications and Team Management Systems), I have experienced the advantages and disadvantages of the traditional shareholder / management / employee roles and relationships.

The action learning gained has led me to initiate a new organization under the framework of the Amazing World Trust. This organization does not have employees. All those who contribute to the creation and distribution of the educational resources for schools are engaged via consulting contracts. These individuals and groups are, therefore, managing their own business. Instead of employment contracts there are project contracts between legal entities.

This leadership issue is already a major one in all organizations from the small company supplier to the international conglomerates, and especially in public services such as the health and education industries. As an entrepreneur I contract the services of independent professionals, most of whom are leaders in their own businesses. In addition, we have part time teachers working on projects who also work in schools two days a week. They offer their services on a sole trader, or family company basis, to our organization. We have musicians working under their artistic company contributing on a project by project basis. Also, we have technical professionals developing web sites, via company to company contracts. In addition, we have legal and accounting professionals providing advice under contracts.

The management issues and challenges are interesting. Coordination of independent suppliers, who have many competing client priorities, to meet business our business objectives requires many skills. Lateral external management is more important than internal hierarchical employee management. Agreeing contract briefs and budgets, and managing those, replaces internal job descriptions and personal appraisals of employee performance.

Stemming from our work above, there are a number of questions I would like to discuss with others at the Unconference that include, but are not restricted to:

- under what business conditions can this business model succeed or fail?
- how we train people to work within such a structure?
- what does successful coordination mean?
- what are the best ways to achieve the business objectives?
- how best can we manage the legal issues?
- what are the management education implications?

In summary, I am very interested in hearing views and perspectives related to the above based on action learning from other participants.

Trust Me, I'm a Doctor[*]

Michael Cohen
Department of Management, Deakin University
michael.cohen@deakin.edu.au

The role of trust in relation to business education, and especially with respect to andragogy, has been largely ignored (Conklin, 2013; Forrest & Peterson, 2006). This submission seeks to encourage conversations to discover the issues related to the causes, effects, and remedies when students lack faith in the academic process. Some suggestions for discussion are included below.

Mature-age students undertaking business studies are often time-constrained and need to make difficult decisions in the face of uncertain outcomes - the lack of trust/faith in the learning outcome of a particular unit/assignment can seriously diminish the effort that such a student is prepared to commit to a particular task. In addition, the emphasis on Active/Task-based learning (Auster & Wylie, 2006) brings an even greater proportion of students into a situation in which trust in the teacher/lecturer is an important precondition for learning to take place.

Causes of a lack of trust: In general, this results from students' inability to *initially* judge the value or relevancy of an arduous learning task to their own professional practice. Some particular circumstances include;

1. Threshold concepts (Meyer, 2006) - the value of new knowledge of this type is, by definition, opaque.

2. Assignment of core units that seem to be irrelevant to the students' needs/aspirations - results in "conscripts" who would prefer to not be in the class at all.

3. Students who have applied for exemption from a subject/unit based on past professional experience and are refused - feelings of resentment and that the lecturer does not truly appreciate their acquired skill set, and that the class has nothing real to offer.

4. Previous inferior learning experiences can prejudice expectations of the outcome that is expected in the current task - especially poor assessment and feedback in prior work (Cohen & Billsberry, 2014).

Effects of a lack of trust: The cost of baulking is often sufficient to maintain the current unit enrolment. Students may however;

1. Settle for a "pass" and direct efforts elsewhere.

2. Become resentful and passively disrupt the class.

3. Submit poor course evaluations.

[*] This was the title of a BBC Two television programme that ran from 1996 to 1999 in the UK. The programme was a response to systemic problems in the NHS and encouraged viewers to, as much as possible, be responsible for their own health.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TrustMe,I%27maDoctor(TVseries)

Remedies for a lack of trust: There seem to be two worthwhile approaches;

1. Reduce *uncertainty* of the usefulness of the outcomes of the learning process. This could include;

   1.1 Demonstrating outcomes in actual case studies (e.g. as is done in physical sciences) before starting the learning process.
   1.2 Posit class problems that require the learning outcomes to achieve superior resolution.
   1.3 …

2. Increase *trust* in the teacher [Servant leadership? (Dierendonck, 2011)];
   2.1 Dissemination of reputation, past achievements, etc.
   2.2 Demeanour, presentation style, …
   2.3 …

Points for discussion:

A. How can we assess the level of trust in the classroom?
B. To what extent is the lack of trust an important element in amount of work that students are prepared to contribute?
C. Given the short duration of a single term, what strategies are available to increase the level of trust in the class?

References

Auster, E. R., & Wylie, K. K. (2006). CREATING ACTIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM: A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH. *Journal of Management Education*, *30*(2), 333–353.

Cohen, M., & Billsberry, J. (2014). The use of marking rubrics in management education: Issues of deconstruction and andragogy. *Journal of Management Education*, *38*(3), 352–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562914525757

Conklin, T. A. (2013). Making It Personal The Importance of Student Experience in Creating Autonomy-Supportive Classrooms for Millennial Learners. *Journal of Management Education*, *37*(4), 499–538. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562912456296

Dierendonck, D. van. (2011). Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1228–1261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462

Forrest, S. P., & Peterson, T. O. (2006). It's Called Andragogy. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*(1), 113–122.

Meyer, J. (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge*. London; New York: Routledge.

RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT LEARNING & EDUCATION

unConference

RMLE Unconference (Un)schedule - Tuesday, January 28, 2020

TIME	ACTIVITIES	LOCATION
8:30am – 9:00am	Event sign-in, meet and greet and refreshments in the University of Canterbury Business School which is in the Meremere Building on University Drive (see campus map). Our main space there will be in Room 526.	Registration will be on the 5th floor of the Business School outside of Room 526
9:00 – 9:30am	Welcome to the University of Canterbury and the RMLE Unconference:	UC Business School Room 526
9:30 – 11:00am	Group Discussions: Session 1	Discussion spaces (break out rooms and open spaces)
11:00 - 11:15am	Morning Tea Refreshments Available	Outside of Room 526
11:15am – 12:15pm	Idea Sharing: Record and Review of Session 1	UC Business School Room 526
12:15 – 1:45pm	Working Lunch in Discussion Groups: Session 2	Served outside of Room 526
1:45 – 2:45pm	Idea Sharing: Record and Review of Session 2	UC Business School Room 526
2:45 – 4:45pm	Group Discussions: Session 3 (afternoon tea refreshments available at 3:45pm)	Discussion spaces
4:45 – 5:45pm	Idea Sharing: Record and Review of Session 3	UC Business School Room 526
6:00 – 8:30pm	Working Dinner for all participants (Unconference Group Discussion, Session 4) to be held at the absolutely stunning Mona Vale restaurant which is an iconic destination in Christchurch and not far from the University. See www.monavale.co.nz	We will provide transportation to the restaurant from the university and back again

RMLE Unconference (Un)schedule

Wednesday, January 29, 2020

TIME	ACTIVITIES	LOCATION
8:30 – 8:45am	Excitement Resurgence & Tea/Coffee refreshments	Outside of Room 526
8:45 – 9:00am	Welcome to Day 2: Let's Jump Back In!	UC Business School Room 526
9:00 – 11:00am	Unconference Group Discussion: Session 5 Time to Refine Ideas and Create Action Plans	Discussion spaces
11:00-11:15	Morning Tea Refreshments Available	Outside of Room 526
11:15 – 12:15pm	Idea Sharing: Record and Review of Session 5 and Action Plan Begin Emergence	UC Business School Room 526
12:30 – 3:00pm	Lunch is served and conversations continue	Served outside of Room 526
3:00-3:15pm	Afternoon Tea Refreshments Available	Outside of Room 526
3:15-4:45pm	Final Sharing of Ideas, Action Plans, and Overall Impressions: Wrapping Up Our Two Amazing Days Together	UC Business School Room 526

A special "thank you" to our ongoing partner organizations, the *Journal of Management Education*, *Management Learning*, and Bond University, and to the truly wonderful organizing team of faculty and staff at this year's host institution, The University of Canterbury. Thank you!