Provocations from the Journal of Management Education (JME) Vault

Abstract (100 words)

Turbulence in the higher education context means there remains a continued need to rethink what the management education field might look like (Anderson, Hibbert, Mason, & Rivers, 2018). The use of history is one approach leveraged to challenge foundations of the management education field (McLaren et al., 2021). Approaching the Journal of Management Education's (JME) fiftieth anniversary, this roundtable revisits the JME vaults to present provocations on taken-for-granted assumptions in Management Education. Controversial ideas and perspectives by Harvey (1979; 1984) and Vaill (1979) serve as prompts for participant debate on bedrocks of classroom pedagogy around student learning and cheating.

Keywords

Learning, data analytics, cheating

Introduction.

An overriding feature of many modern calamities is the failure to question taken-for-granted assumptions on which practices are based. In the wake of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC), Management Educators have been encouraged to revisit many of the bedrock beliefs and assumptions of our profession (Anderson et al., 2018). Yet many shibboleths still hold. Prominent views include that teachers are responsible for what others learn, and that student cheating must be prevented. This roundtable delves into the JME archives to present alternative perspectives on these issues, intended to challenge underlying assumptions of participants, including Course Coordinators and Program Directors. Following a session of debate and provocation, participants will be drawn to reconsider, reaffirm, or reject their beliefs on these topics, thereby removing their taken-for-granted nature and promoting reflexivity in teaching practice.

Theoretical Foundation/Teaching Implications.

The historical turn in Management Education has provided a wealth of opportunity for reconsidering practices and resources fundamental to teaching such as the case study (Bridgman, Cummings & McLaughlin, 2016), and the textbook (Cummings, Bridgman, Hassard, & Rowlinson, 2017). As JME approaches its fiftieth year, its archives provide a wealth of historical material useful for contributing to debates on the future of teaching. In particular, a return to early editions of the journal provides a rich vault of material which problematizes many of the taken for granted assumptions of current day management education.

This roundtable breakout room leverages JME vault articles to reconsider two widely held assumptions in management education: (1) that teachers are responsible for what others learn, and (2) that student cheating must be prevented.

The first proposition, that teachers are responsible for what others learn, is a well-established undercurrent in management education literature. A rich vein of literature establishes that educators are responsible for motivating student interest (McEvoy, 2011; Rupert & Hoption, 2021), and expanding the knowledge and practice of developing people (Allen, 2020). Increasingly, faculty are also encouraged to leverage data analytics for identifying students' learning gaps and predict their risk of failure (Azevedo & Azevedo, 2021).

The assumption that teachers are responsible for what others learn is contradicted by Jerry Harvey (1979) in the JME article *Learning To Not Teach*. In outlining what is essentially his teaching philosophy, Harvey sets out a polemic that Management Education is about learning, not teaching. "As a Professor, I don't take responsibility for what others learn. I do take responsibility for what I learn, though. In fact, my basic goal in class is for me to learn something new. What others learn, if anything is up to them. I'm always pleased to help them learn something new if they want to, but I won't be responsible for what they learn or whether they learn it" (Harvey, 1979: 19). Harvey then goes on to express bemusement at colleagues being worried about their student evaluations or getting "depressed if students don't perform well in their classes" (Harvey, 1979: 19).

The consequences of taking responsibility for what others learn are outlined by Vaill (1979) in the article *Cookbooks, Auctions, and Claptrap Cocoons*. Here, Vaill bemoans the failure of management educators to invent "exercises and foster events where the learner is encouraged to experiment with his or her own behavior" (Vaill, 1979: 5). Instead, Vaill is critical of educators for too frequently developing exercises which "generate the behavior we have unilaterally decided we want learners to look at," thereby "progressively cut[ting] off from the beauty and mysteries of the person" (Vaill, 1979: 6). By teaching students only about what we have deemed important, Management Educators limit students to knowledge

of the latest "2x2 matrix" and failing to equip them for performing well in organisations by developing an interest in understanding of "how Man [sic] is doing" (Vaill, 1979:6).

The second proposition to be explored in the roundtable, that we should prevent student cheating, is perhaps even more sacredly held than the first on teachers being responsible for what students learn. Eury and Trevino (2019) outline the detection of student plagiarism as essential to maintaining a Business School culture of "honor and integrity", and Hrivnak (2019) outlines the case that good assessment design will work to prevent forms of academic dishonesty.

A controversial take on student plagiarism is presented by Jerry Harvey (1984) in the JME article *Encouraging Students to Cheat*. In this provocation, Harvey outlines what he sees as his own "ethical responsibility to encourage students in my classes to cheat" (Harvey, 1984: 1). In this piece, Harvey makes the case for students informally working together on individual assignments. In cracking down on students presenting anything other than purely their own work, Harvey argues that Management Education demonises the virtue of altruism, "the constructive and instinctually gratifying service to others," and the practice of synergy and teamwork of how work is really performed in the workplace (Harvey, 1984: 3). Harvey's solution is to redefine cheating as "the failure to assist others on assessment if they request it" and is reinforced by his class syllabus where he claims to "frown on cheating. In fact, I go blind with rage if I catch anyone cheating" (Harvey, 1984: 6).

Understanding that much learning happens via conversations (Baker, 2004), this roundtable session aims to leverage Harvey's (1979; 1984) and Vaill's (1979) works from the JME archives for kick-starting conversations in areas which may otherwise be considered 'undiscussables' to encourage deep learning and new insights. The objective for the session is for participants to understand student responsibility and student cheating are not closed

topics. Scholars will be exposed to perspectives on these two topics which run counter to much received wisdom. The intention is not that participants will change their perspective on these matters (though some of them might), but that by shining light on these topics, underlying beliefs and assumptions of management educators will no longer remain taken-for-granted. This can then serve as the basis for a more reflexive classroom practice.

Session Description.

The roundtable is proposed for 60 minutes. This provides opportunity to consider two widely held assumptions in management education: (1) that teachers are responsible for what others learn, and (2) that student cheating must be prevented. This includes the following steps:

- Step 1: The case for student responsibility in learning (25 minutes)

- Step 2: The case for student cheating (25 minutes)

- Step 3: Final thoughts and reflections (5 minutes)

Further detail on these steps is presented below.

Step 1: The case for student responsibility in learning (25 minutes)

The session starts with offering a hypothetical on data analytics and student learning. Participants are presented with a scenario are asked to identify which student they would support in a situation where data analytics has identified two students at risk of failing, and where the teacher only has resources to assist one of them. The intention of the scenario is to facilitate participant discussion and lead as a segue into the works of Harvey (1979) and Vaill (1979).

Following this, participants are provided with a synopsis of the provocations on student responsibilities in learning, as offered by Harvey (1979) and Vaill (1979). The

facilitator will then provide an update for the modern context by providing an overview of how the modern classroom might look if adopting Harvey and Vaill's perspectives on student learning. Possible implications include taking a step back from the use of data analytics, educator acceptance of a higher risk of student failure, and potential impacts on student health and wellbeing of greater freedom and responsibility in learning.

Step 2: The case for student cheating (25 minutes)

The session starts with offering a hypothetical on student cheating. Participants are presented with a scenario are asked to identify which student they would penalise for cheating in a situation where plagiarism software has identified two students with possible breaches of academic misconduct, and where the teacher only has resources to pursue one of them. The intention of the scenario is to facilitate participant discussion and lead as a segue into the work of Harvey (1984).

Following this, participants are provided with a synopsis of the provocations on student cheating, as offered by Harvey (1984). Following this is an update for the modern context, where the facilitator introduces an overview of how the modern classroom might look if adopting Harvey's perspective on student cheating. Possible implications include enabling more informal opportunities for student collaboration, establishing tasks that encourage student synergy rather than competition, and potential impacts on essay mills of greater student cohort altruism.

Step 3: Final Thoughts and Reflections (10 Minutes)

To complete the roundtable, participants will be encouraged to reflect on their taken-for-granted assumptions around student learning and cheating. In particular, they will be encouraged to engage with the vision of the classroom provided in steps 1 and 2 by the facilitator around how the classroom might look if Harvey and Vaill's views on student

learning and cheating were implemented. Participants will discuss whether they have reconsidered, reaffirmed, or rejected their beliefs on these topics. In particular, discussion will be facilitated on how participants' future teaching practice might be impacted by reflexive examination of their taken-for-granted assumptions around issues of student learning and teaching.

References

Allen, S.J., (2020). On the Cutting Edge or the Chopping Block? Fostering a Digital Mindset and Tech Literacy in Business Management Education. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.44(3): 362-393.

Azevedo, A., & Azevedo, J.M., (2021). Learning Analytics: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Literature Over the Last Decade. International Journal of Educational Research. Vol.2.

Baker A. C. (2004). Seizing the moment: Talking about the "undiscussables". Journal of Management Education, 28(6), 693–706.

https://doiorg.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/10.1177/1052562903252661

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 and Education*. Vol.15(4): 724-741.

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

Eury, J.L., & Trevino, L.K., (2019). Building a Culture of Honor and Integrity in a Business School. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.43(5): 484-508.

Harvey, J.B., (1979). Learning To Not Teach. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.4(2). 19-21.

Harvey, J.B., (1984). Encouraging Students to Cheat: One Thought on the Difference Between Teaching Ethics and Teaching Ethically. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.9(2): 1-13.

Hrivnak, G.A., (2019). The Increasing Importance of Curriculum Design and its Implications for Management Educators. *Journal of Management Education*, Vol.43(3): 271-280.

McEvoy, G.M., (2011). Increasing Intrinsic Motivation to Learn in Organizational Behavior Classes. *Journal of Management Education*. 35(4): 468-503.

McLaren, P.G., Bridgman, T., Cummings, S., Lubinski, C., O'Connor, E., Spender, J-C., Direpos, G., (2021). From the Editors: New Times, New Histories of the Business School. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. Vol.20(3): 293-299.

Rupert, B., & Hoption, C., (2021). Grade Expectations: When 100% isn't good enough. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.45(4): 535-557.

Vaill, P.B., (1979). Cookbooks, Auctions, and Claptrap Cocoons: A Commentary on the Field of Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Management Education*. Vol.4(1): 3-6.