Innovating in Pedagogical Processes

MOBTS 2022 PDW Proposal

Abstract

This Professional Development Workshop will address the following questions:

- What are the competencies needed for innovating pedagogically?

- How do we, as faculty, develop those competencies?

- How do doctoral programs enhance the competencies of students to innovate pedagogically?

- How do we tap into the creative potential of our students to help us innovate pedagogically?

Keywords: Innovating, Process, Management Competencies, Transmissive Teaching Philosophy, Transactive Teaching Philosophy, Transformative Teaching Philosophy.

Introduction

The choice of pedagogical processes, the "how," is highly related to the choices of "what is taught." If the intention is to teach "theory" and analytic knowledge, their memorization, and their use, that is, the "what" of teaching and learning, then the current dominance of the lecture method, the "how," serves an acceptable though rather ineffective purpose. Even there, however, lecturing offers plenty of opportunities for innovating (Bligh, 1998; Bain, 2004). On the other hand, if the major intention is to teach and develop the competencies for leading, the wider arena of managing, and the even wider domain of organizing across all types of organizations (Parker,

1

2018), then the relationship between the "what" and the "how" has a much different and more critical character for innovating.

Mintzberg (1973) offers the ongoing and active processes of relating, leading, conflict resolving, information processing, decision-making under ambiguity, resource allocating, entrepreneuring, and introspecting as critical managing competencies. One could also add such process-relational and organizing competencies as communicating, self-regulating, negotiating, critical thinking, mediating, politicking, situation defining, opportunity taking, problem solving, coaching, mentoring, inquiring, questioning, and imagining as competencies, enabling those who manage and organize to think and act flexibly and creatively with what they know explicitly and implicitly in an ever-changing environment. As relational processes, each of these competencies then becomes an ongoing focus of continual development, never achieving a final state of perfection. It is the effective "doing" that really matters. Business schools, their programs, their faculty, and the competencies of the faculty fall far short of "what" they should be doing, "how," and the focus of innovating. This issue clearly opens up the extensive literature that critiques the "what" and the "how" of business schools and their faculty. There are a number of specific critiques that emerge from a comprehensive review of over eighty articles and twenty books from 1945 to the present (*inter alia*, Livingston, 1971; Mintzberg, 1973, 2004; Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2007; Rubin & Dierdorff, 2009; Datar, Gavin, & Cullen, 2010; Klikaueer, 2013; Parker, 2018) that address a long list of critiques. The four most relevant here are:

- The curriculum content is misaligned with the actual managing process.
- The theories/models taught are misaligned with the actual managing process.
- The pedagogy is misaligned with the actual processes of learning managing.
- The faculty have little or no actual managing experience.

These four critiques address only "managing" in for profit organizations, so the list is even more critical when considering "organizing" in the broadest sense.

The two most recent and comprehensive reviews of innovating (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Garud, Tuerschter, & Van de Ven, 2013) view innovating as a relational process. As such, we should draw on the process-relational ontology of Alfred North Whitehead (Whitehead, 1929/1978; Whitehead, 1929) and those who have built on his ontology (*inter alia*, Hosinski, 1993; Oliver & Gershman, 1989; Allan, 2012). And all of the competencies previously mentioned, such as leading (e.g., Wood & Dibbin, 2015), managing and organizing (e.g., Hernes & Maitlis, 2012), and innovating (e.g., Sergeeva & Trifolova, 2018) can all be viewed as relational processes.

With regard to innovating, imagining (Alexander, 1990; Byrne, 2005; Bluedorn & Standifer, 2006) and creating (Robinson, 2001; Amabile, 1983, 1989, 1996; Amabile & Kramer, 2011) are integral to the process of innovating..

Cognitive apprenticeship (Collins, 2006; Dennen, Burner, & Driscoll, 2008; Matsuo & Tsukube; 2020) and scaffolded learning (Palinscar, 1986; Rosenshine & Meister, 1992; Reiser, 2004; Pea, 2004; Puntambekar & Hubscher, 2005; van de Pol, Volman, & Beishuizen, 2010; Holmes, Day, Park, Bonn, & Roll, 2014) are two relational processes to teaching and learning that offer opportunities for pedagogical innovating in developing competencies. Mirci (2021) lists three streams of teaching philosophies that have a high degree of relevance for the "what" and the "how" with respect to pedagogical innovating (See table below).

Table 1 Various Names Given to the Different Philosophical Paradigms of Education

Transmissive: Traditional	Transactive: Progressive	Transformative: Social Reconstructionism
Dominant Paradigm		Liberatory Education
Dominating Paradigm	Social Reforming Paradigm	Liberating Paradigm
Didactic Paradigm	Interactive Paradigm	Critical Paradigm
Banking Model	Inquiry/Experiential	Problem-Posing Model
Behaviorist	Constructivist	Social Constructivist
Essentialist	Pragmatist	Critical Theory / Critical Reflection
Factory-Model	Apprenticeship-Model	Social Transformation-Model
Industrial-Model	Developmental-Model	[Appreciative Inquiry]
Efficiency-Model	Social Reform-Model	
Curriculum-Centered	Learner-Centered	Societal Problem-Centered
Standardized: (single curricular source – "official")	Wholistic / Contextualized: (four curricula sources - interests of students, interests of teachers, "official," and daily events)	Systemic / Historical Consciousness: (curricular sources – societal problems, daily events, narrative histories, historical documents)
Back-to-Basics		[Situation defining]
Conventional / Customary		[Opportunity posing]

[] items were added by the presenters.

Presenter 1 uses a blend of the middle and right columns. Presenter 2 is mainly teaching in the left and middle columns, but wants to move to the right column.

The transmissive philosophy has negative consequences for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Innovation: It creates a deficit model where learners are defined by what they don't know rather than what they do know. The focus is on test scores rather than authentic assessment, on the "what" rather than the "how" and the "why." It avoids developing the competencies that comprise the domain of leading, managing, and organizing by substituting demonstrations of factual, analytic, and theoretical knowledge. Students may have these skills but have not had the opportunity to demonstrate them in class. Case discussions with right and wrong answers also do not solve the problem.

Learning Objectives

Participants will gain experience with the following processes:

1. Inventorying existing knowledge of the group on pedagogical innovating.

2. Extending participants range of choices to be innovative in their choices of pedagogy.

3. Modeling pedagogical innovating in the session to demonstrate one way to engage students as participants in the process.

Engagement

Participants will engage in a series of activities and discussions.

Takeaway

Participants and facilitators will learn from each other's experiences at innovating pedagogy.

Session Schedule:

Time	Activity	Details	Outcome
0:00 – 0:10	Introductions	Short ice breaker	Build community and relationships
0:10-0:20	Inventory of existing knowledge	White board exercise in shared Jamboard (online sticky wall)	Model "Funds of Knowledge" approach by recognizing the skills and competencies already in the group.
0:20-0:30	Paired interviews to learn pain points for innovating pedagogy.	Tell me about your process for designing a course and planning a class. How do you get ideas now? What do you like about your current ways of innovating? What would having an innovative pedagogy look like?	Demonstrate Ethic of Care through inquiry, empathy, identification of pains and gains.
0:30-0:50	Brainstorm sources for innovating pedagogy	On the basis of the first two activities, discuss how we would look for solutions to the challenges to	Model brainstorming based on existing knowledge and unmet needs to develop appropriate

		innovating raised by the group.	collaborative innovating processes.
0:40-0:50	Conversation about philosophies of teaching and learning.	Present the table above. Discuss among the group where their practice and intentions fall.	Add a framework that helps guide innovating practices by revealing assumptions and biases.
0:50 – 0:60	Closing Reflection	Brief round robin for comments	Review accomplishments.

References

Alexander, T.M. (1990). Pragmatic imagination. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 26(3): 325-348.

Allan, G. (2012). *Modes of learning: Whitehead's metaphysics and the stages of education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Amabile, T.M. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Amabile, T.M. (1989). *Growing up creative*. New York: Crown.

Amabile, T.M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Amabile, T.M. & Kramer, S.J. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity in work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bligh, D. (1998). *What's the use of lectures?* Exeter, UK: Intellect.

Bluedorn, A.C. & Standifer, R.L. (2006). Time and the temporal imagination. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5(2): 196-206.

Byrne, R.M.J. (2005). *The rational imagination: How people create alternatives to reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, A. (2006). Cognitive apprenticeship. In Sawyer, R.K. (Ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 47-60.

Crossan, M.M. & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6): 1154-1191.

Datar, S.M., Garvin, D.A., & Cullen, P.G. (2010). *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Dennen, V.P., Burner, K.J., & Driscoll, S.M.P. (Eds.) (2008). The cognitive apprenticeship model in educational practice. *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*, V.3: 425-439. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Garud, R., Tuertscher, P, & Van de Ven, A.H. (2013). Perspectives on innovation processes. *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1): 773-817.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(1): 75-113.

Holmes, N.G., Day, J., Park, A.H.K., Bonn, D.A., & Roll, J. (2014). Making the failure more productive: Scaffolding the invention process to improve inquiry behaviors and outcomes in invention activities. *Instructional Science*, 42(4): 523-538.

Hosinski, T. E. (1993). *Stubborn fact and creative advance: An introduction to the metaphysics of Alfred North Whitehead*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.

Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Klikauer, T. (2013). *Managerialism: A critique of an ideology*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Livingston, S. (1971). The myth of the well-educated manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 49(1): 79-89.

Matsuo, M. & Tsukube, T. (2020). A review of cognitive apprenticeship in educational research: Application for management education. *International Journal of Management Education*, 18(3): 100417.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBA's: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and managing development*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Mirci, P. S. (2021). Chapter 1: The Inward Journey: Adult Transformative Learning, Positionality and Intersectionality, Self-Knowledge, and Capital—Economic, Social, and Cultural. In *Politics Revealed: Critical Consciousness and Conflicting Education Paradigms*. In press.

Oliver, D.W. & Gershman, K.W. (1989). *Education, modernity, and fractured meaning; Toward a process theory of teaching and learning*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Palinscar, A.M. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 21(1&2): 71-98.

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

Pea, R.D. (2004). The social and technological dimensions of scaffolding and related theoretical concepts of learning, education, and human activity. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 13(3): 423-451.

Puntambekar, S. & Hubscher, R. (2005). Tools for scaffolding students in complex learning environments. *Educational Psychologist*, 40(1): 1-12.

Reiser, B.J. (2004). Scaffolding complex learning: The mechanisms of structuring and problematizing student work. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 13(3): 273-304.

Robinson, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. West Essex, UK: Capstone.

Rosenshine, B. & Meister, C. (1992). The use of scaffolds for teaching higher-level cognitive strategies. *Educational Leadership*, April 1992: 26-33.

Rubin, R.S. & Dierdorff, E.C. (2009). How relevant is the MBA? Assessing the alignment of required MBA curricula and required managerial competencies. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(2): 208-224.

Sergeeva, N. & Trifolova, A. (2018). The role of storytelling in the innovation process. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 27(4): 489-498.

van de Pol, J., Volman, M. & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher-student interactions: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(?): 271-296.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: The Free Press.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929/1978). *Process and reality*. New York: The Free Press.

Wood, M. & Dibben, N.R. (2015). Leadership as relational process. *Process Studies*, 44(1): 24-47.