

2015 Presidential Address

OUR TEACHING MISSION

PAUL S. ADLER

University of Southern California

In this address I want to talk—and get us all talking more—about our teaching mission and about our role as educators. Some of us were drawn to academia by a passion for teaching, but many of us, including me, were drawn more by the opportunity for research. Now there is a lot of concern in the Academy community that our research is not adequately addressing the needs of practitioners and other stakeholders, and may not even be living up to our own self-proclaimed standards of rigor. I am delighted to see this discussion engaged. However, I do not think questions about our research should preempt questions about teaching, which is, after all, the main means by which we scholars affect the real world.

So I have two main goals in this address. First, I want to celebrate our role as educators. As management scholars and members of the Academy of Management, we should celebrate the wonderful care, innovation, and thoughtfulness that our community invests in teaching and in learning to become more effective teachers. Second, I want to catalyze discussion about the challenges and opportunities that we face as management educators. In teaching we encounter challenges that are just as serious, if not more so, as those we face in research. But we also have opportunities that are just as exciting.

CELEBRATING OUR TEACHING

Of our three main roles of research, teaching, and service, it is teaching that consumes the bulk of our professional time, except perhaps for a minority among us who focus on research and an even smaller minority who have moved into primarily service and administrative roles. Indeed,

teaching is one of the core roles of our professional identity, and education one of our profession's core values. (I should note in passing that some people contrast teaching and educating, where teaching is imparting facts and educating is sparking the student's own curiosity. Unless otherwise noted, I use the two terms interchangeably since the two are intertwined parts of our job.)

As Duane Ireland (2015) reminded us in his presidential address last year, Ernest Boyer, in his 1990 book *Scholarship Reconsidered*, identified four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. He made a passionate and compelling argument for the importance of the fourth—teaching—type of scholarship.

There are several reasons for giving such importance to teaching. I would start with teaching's genuinely sacred dimension. This sacred quality was brought home to me when I was looking for an image of teaching to use in this presentation; I found on the internet a trove of images (under "teaching," and "teaching classrooms") that evoked surprisingly powerful emotions for me, as I realized how ritualized and universal the task of teaching is.

The teaching profession is a very old one, going back to the emergence of complex social structures and the introduction of writing. Teaching began as a specialized occupation when societies became conscious of a precious cultural heritage that they wanted to communicate to subsequent generations. As a result, teaching has always had a sacred quality to it. Respect for teachers—admittedly, not a universal phenomenon—is a function not only of teachers' power and authority but also of a special status that teachers enjoy as vehicles for this cultural transmission.

Even though as management educators our subject matter is typically rather more mundane, we, too, have a function with a sacred dimension. So we should remind ourselves of the number of lives we touch through teaching. Consider the number of people who have read even one of our research publications; for most us that number is far smaller

This is a lightly edited version of the president's speech at the Academy of Management's annual meeting in Vancouver on August 9, 2015. I would like to acknowledge the generous help in preparing it that I received from Tom Cummings, Mary Ann Glynn, Duane Ireland, Tom Kochan, Anita McGahan, Raza Mir, Nandini Rajagopalan, Debra Shapiro, and Jim Walsh.

than the number of students we have taught for entire semesters. Reflect, too, on the notes of appreciation you have received from students about the difference you have made in their lives.

We should also celebrate the influx of students into business management programs. Both undergraduate and graduate programs continue to grow at a rapid rate around the world (see Table 1 for data on the United States). Even if we might legitimately question whether this growth should come at the expense of other areas of study, the growth in numbers (as distinct from share) is good news, not just because it means more jobs for our colleagues and Ph.D. students but also because it reflects and contributes to the growing sophistication of business management. The quality of management in a firm or region has an important effect on economic growth and on the quality of people's lives, both at work and beyond (Bloom, Genakos, Sadun, & Van Reenen, 2012).

And even if, in capitalist economies, business management is the source of many of our economic, social, and environmental woes, that should not obscure the fact that alongside these negative aspects, managers' work also has an important—indeed vital—productive and positive side. And, finally, even if we have criticisms of undergraduate and graduate business curricula—I return to these shortly—and even if the MBA degree itself may have become something of a fetish, this should not obscure the fact that our work as management educators fulfills an honorable and important role in expanding our students' productive capabilities and helping them understand their roles as managers.

Against Cynicism

I differ, in this assertion, from that wonderful critic of capitalism, Thorsten Veblen. In *A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*, originally published in 1918, Veblen argued:

No gain comes to the community at large from increasing the business proficiency of any number of its young men. There are already much too many of these businessmen, much too astute and proficient in their calling, for the common good. A higher average business efficiency simply raises activity and avidity in business to a higher average pitch of skill and fervour, with very little other material result than a redistribution of ownership; since business is occupied with the competitive wealth, not with its production. It is only by a euphemistic metaphor that

TABLE 1
Degrees Conferred by Postsecondary Institutions in the United States

Degrees	Years	
	1970–1971	2012–2013
Total bachelor's degrees conferred	839,730	1,840,164
Of which: Business	115,396	360,823
	13.7%	19.6%
Total master's degrees conferred	235,564	751,751
Of which: Business	26,490	188,625
	11.2%	25.1%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.

we are accustomed to speak of the businessmen as producers of goods. Gains due to such efficiency are differential gains only. They are a differential as against other businessmen on the one hand, and as against the rest of the community on the other hand. The work of the College of Commerce, accordingly, is a peculiarly futile line of endeavour for any public institution, in that it serves neither the intellectual advancement nor the material welfare of the community (Veblen, 2015: 208).

Veblen's view is sharply put, but a similar view subtends much of the common hostility to the proliferation of MBAs. I wonder if a similar suspicion encourages doubts about self-worth among some of us, too.

I think Veblen is being polemically one sided. He sees "businessmen" only in their exploitative and unproductive role. To be sure, in a capitalist enterprise, as distinct from a cooperative one, this role is inescapable. As Veblen argued, in any capitalist enterprise there is a whole range of activities that add nothing to society's welfare but, rather, simply buttress exploitation within the firm and redistribute wealth from one firm to another. Alongside this unproductive role, however, managers (some more than others, it is true) also play a productive role, in coordinating large-scale complex undertakings, developing better ways of satisfying social needs, and identifying new needs.

In sum, the work of managers in capitalist enterprises has both productive and unproductive aspects (Adler, 2012). Providing education opportunities to people aiming to play this role may therefore leave us ambivalent, but as educators we can fulfill a critical role if we expand our students' productive capabilities while helping them understand the complexity and ambiguity of management's roles.

Given all this, it is gratifying to see that teaching figures so prominently among the Academy's activities. We have a Management Education Division with nearly 2,000 members. We have a specialized journal—the *Academy of Management Learning & Education (AMLE)*—and it is thriving. Many of our divisions offer professional development workshops devoted to teaching, and many offer web pages with extensive teaching resources. The Academy and several of our divisions honor teaching with specific educator awards. And two years ago we launched a conference-within-the-conference—the Teaching and Learning Conference (TLC). Some 150 people attended the first one in 2013, 350 in 2014, and over 450 in Vancouver this year. So I offer my thanks—we should all offer our thanks—to the hundreds of volunteers in the Academy who lead and manage this great portfolio of activities.

Now let us turn to the challenges and opportunities that we face as management educators. I want to talk about them moving in turn from the highest to lowest levels of aggregation: first, at the global and societal level, the changing context of business; second, at the institutional field level, the changing institutional situation of universities and business schools; and third, at the organizational level, what we can do at the Academy of Management to respond to this changing societal and institutional context.

THE GLOBAL AND SOCIETAL CONTEXT

Humanity today is at an unusual juncture. On the one hand, in the past few decades there have been massive, unprecedented improvements in the living conditions of hundreds of millions of people. On the other hand, the vast bulk of this improvement stems from just one country's success—China. And alongside that improvement, an extraordinary number of people still suffer terrible deprivation and degradation. One billion people live on less than U.S. \$1.25 a day. Moreover, accelerating environmental crises threaten humanity as a whole and the poor most gravely.

The negative side of this ledger is no longer seen as an acceptable, inevitable price to pay for the positive side. As people become aware of the technological capabilities available to humanity today and of the vast inequalities of wealth and income, public opinion around the world is increasingly scandalized by our collective inability to assure a decent life for everyone. Given this

growing repugnance at the chasm between what is and what could and should be, it is increasingly clear that “business as usual” is no longer an option, nor even a plausible scenario, for the coming decades.

This accelerating transformation of the broader global and societal landscape has deep implications for business as an institution, and therefore for us as management educators. Let's unpack those implications.

The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals and the Resulting Management Challenges

We can start with one expression of the world's repugnance at the current state of the globe—the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. The UN will shortly adopt these 17 major goals and 169 specific targets under them as a guide to future international development efforts. (They are to replace the Millennium Development Goals when they expire at the end of 2015.) These goals are as follows:

1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere.
2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture.
3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.
4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.
5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.
6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all.
7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all.
8. Promote sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth; full and productive employment; and decent work for all.
9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization, and foster innovation.
10. Reduce inequality within and among countries.
11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.
12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns.
13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts.
14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas, and marine resources for sustainable development.
15. Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems; sustainably manage forests; combat desertification; halt and

reverse land degradation; and halt biodiversity loss.

16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels.
17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

Consider the scale of these goals, and consider, too, the mounting political and social pressure to make progress toward them, and to do so rapidly. Next consider the impact on business of this pressure. Communities, consumers, and social movements are increasingly demanding changes in business conduct, and they are pushing governments to force those changes onto business through regulation and other authoritative means.

Now some of these goals might provide profitable opportunities for some businesses—for example, for firms that can sell at the bottom of the pyramid or those that specialize in solar energy. And some of these goals will provide excellent targets for innovative social enterprises. At the same time, however, many of these seventeen goals represent a direct threat to many other businesses' growth and profits. To take just one example, some 80 percent of the world's proven reserves of fossil fuel will need to be left in the ground, abandoned as "stranded assets" and written off corporate balance sheets, if we are going to have any chance at all of limiting global warming to 2 degrees Celsius (Anderson, 2012). That's the increase in average surface temperatures that the climate scientists tell us marks the threshold between "dangerous" and "extremely dangerous" for our pattern of life as we know it. The challenges on the economic, social, and political fronts are just as serious and just as urgent.

These challenges pose business problems that are unprecedented in their complexity, uncertainty, and contentiousness. They will therefore profoundly reshape the practice of management as reflected in the domains of all our Academy divisions and interest groups. Let me list just a few:

- In strategy, firms will need to develop clearer nonmarket strategies and integrate them more rigorously with their market strategies. And they will need to do this amid greater uncertainty about the future state of markets, regulation, and profit prospects and greater pressure from a diverse range of stakeholders for a broader assortment of outcomes.
- In their internal organization, firms will need to create new functional roles and

departments, new internal processes, new sourcing practices, and new strategy forums and processes.

- In their everyday organizational behavior, a growing proportion of managers and employees will need to interact with other actors outside the firm—both within and outside the business sector—and do that around issues that are more ambiguous and more contentious.
- In firms' HR policies, diversity will become an increasingly strategic issue. Pay policies will come under increasing strain. Firms will be held to higher standards regarding a broader range of human rights concerns.
- In their choice of technologies, firms will be pressured to become far more environmentally responsible—to decarbonize their products and processes, to radically reduce their use of fresh water, to take responsibility for the chemicals they use and for recycling their products.

Overall, change—momentous change—is coming, and it is coming fast.

The Resulting Education Challenges

Inevitably, these challenges of sustainable development will flow through to management education. Our students, both as managers and as citizens, will need to find their footing in this new context, and it is our job to prepare them. To fulfill this mission, we will need to change the content and mix of courses in the business curriculum. Alongside the traditional business disciplines, students will need a better understanding of history, politics, sociology, and economics. They will need stronger research skills and greater facility with a broader range of data types.

More fundamentally, perhaps, our students will need deeper critical thinking skills. As I just argued, it is not obvious how firms can or should respond to these sustainable development challenges, since these challenges certainly do not all translate easily—and some do not translate at all—into improved business performance. So our students will be involved in debates within their firms, advocating for one or another response by the firm to these challenges. And they will also be involved as citizens, in their lives outside work, where they will be called on to take positions on issues of public policy relative to business's sustainable development responsibilities.

Our teaching needs to equip our students to engage effectively in these debates within and beyond the workplace. This, in turn, calls for

a new skill mix in the curriculum, giving greater weight to critical thinking, negotiation, environmental and cultural sensitivity, and so forth. This also calls for new action skills, since leadership in this new context will be far more distributed and virtues like courage more critical.

I also put to you that our pedagogical approaches will need to evolve. One key challenge for us will be to learn how to “teach the debates.” Most of us are more comfortable imparting well-established knowledge than developing students’ capability to deal with such debates. But we will need to learn, because the business community will be drawn deeper into these debates—and our scholarly community too.

At one end of the spectrum, some scholars in our community are excited by the wonderful opportunities they see for businesses to thrive and profit by helping address these sustainable development goals. Returning to the examples I cited earlier, think “bottom of the pyramid” (Pralhad & Hammond, 2002), for example, or “green to gold” (Esty & Winston, 2009). In the middle of the spectrum, we find management scholars who are skeptical that all the sustainable development goals can be met this way, but are nevertheless excited by the possibility that at least some of them can be met by thinking more creatively as social entrepreneurs and by creating financially self-sustaining social enterprises. And at the other end of the spectrum, many argue that it is a daydream to imagine that business can be the vehicle for meeting most of these goals, if only because so many of the underlying problems are created in the first place as the by-product of normal business operations. These skeptics look to government or social movements rather than to business to drive change (Vogel, 2007). On this view, the best we can hope for is that enlightened businesses not stand in the way of the real forces of positive change.

Taking up the emerging challenges of management education does not require us to take a position on these deep issues. On the contrary, I submit that the most effective approach, and the most responsible one, would be to teach the debate among them. First, then, we need to help our students develop stronger critical thinking skills so they can reason their way through such complex and contentious issues to get to robust action plans. Second, we need to help our students develop new skills that enable them to act courageously in advancing controversial ideas—skills

like the ones targeted in Mary Gentile’s “Giving Voice to Values” program, for example (Gentile, 2010). Third, we need to open the walls of the classroom in new directions. Our students need to learn to interact effectively with constituencies and individuals with very different values and priorities. We need to stop relying so much on case studies written exclusively from the business executive’s point of view. And, fourth, our teaching styles need to evolve. The traditional “sage on the stage” model of pedagogy may work well enough as a way to get students to master well-structured analytic and algorithmic techniques. But when the skills involved have these critical thinking and courageous action components, we need more “guide on the side” types of teaching—more dialogical and experiential (King, 1993). I began by saying that I would use the terms teaching and education interchangeably, but here it is useful to differentiate them again, to say we cannot fulfill our purpose as business schools if we only teach and do not also educate.

That’s why I’m so impressed by several initiatives already underway to help us meet these challenges. I would highlight just one example: the Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) program launched in 2007. PRME was developed by UN Global Compact with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, the European Foundation for Management Development, the Aspen Institute Business and Society Program, the European Academy of Business in Society, the Globally Responsible Leadership Initiative, and Net Impact. Some 600 institutions now participate across some 80 countries.

I am delighted to see that so many of our members are playing key roles in this initiative and many others like it, and delighted to see that these are being evaluated in articles in *AMLE*. I am eager to see the Academy host more discussion and debate on the best ways to move forward (I return to this matter below).

OUR INSTITUTIONAL FIELD

Let us now turn now to the second level of analysis: the changing institutional field of universities and business schools. And let us begin by taking the measure of the external forces shaping this field. Here the main trend is very clear: growing pressure for more accountability and ever less autonomy for universities.

Most of us work in business schools that are attached to universities, and in many countries that link to the university has given us a very welcome institutional umbrella, allowing us to work with considerable autonomy from both state control and market profitability pressures. However, multiple forces are arrayed today to challenge our traditional autonomy in setting teaching and research priorities, at least here in North America and some European countries. Universities are no longer oases at a comfortable distance from the hurly-burly of modern societies' economic and political life.

Challenges to Autonomy

I see at least three forces challenging that autonomy. First, university research and education are ever more central to the economic success of industries, regions, and individuals. So our external stakeholders are becoming far less willing to leave universities to chart their own course. Second, in many countries economic pressures have been pushing fiscally strapped governments to reduce funding for universities. So university administrators have had to attend more systematically to sources of funding. And, third, in some cases there is an ideological factor at work, where the powers that be feel threatened by the independence of thought cultivated in universities.

Under these conditions it is urgent, I believe, that, as scholars and educators, we take the initiative, rather than reacting defensively. We need to work with colleagues in other business school departments and elsewhere in the university to articulate a more viable vision of the role of the university—one that avoids unsustainable claims to total independence but also resists abject dependence on key sources of funding. We need to articulate a new civic-minded form of interdependence between university and society.

In business schools more specifically, I suggest that we may need to change our governance structures—to "open our governance," as this year's meeting theme puts it. Our schools are often guided by advisory boards composed of senior business executives and wealthy potential donors. Given the intensifying sustainable development challenges discussed above, it seems urgent that we open our schools' governance to a broader range of stakeholders representing a wider array of community and social forces.

The Corporate University

This struggle to define the new place of the university in society is all the more urgent because a default location has already been assigned to us—as marketplace competitors. Universities increasingly function under a corporatized, market logic (Aronowitz, 2000; *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 2016). One way that transformation expresses itself is as a drift toward greater employment instability and insecurity and the demolition of tenure as an institution in many of the countries that have it. This trend represents a dangerous attack on academic freedom, not just in the domain of research but also in what we teach and how (Kezar & Maxey, 2013).

In order to better understand our evolving profession, the Academy's Board of Governors recently commissioned a survey by a team led by Maria Kraimer (Greco, Kraimer, Seibert, & Sargent, 2015; Kraimer, Seibert, Sargent, Greco, & Nielsen, 2015). I argued earlier that we should celebrate the growth in the number of students in business programs, but this survey also revealed the darker sides of that growth, when institutions, especially those under financial pressure, are not equipped to deal with it. Many of our members around the world reported that university administrators, worried about the financial bottom line, were demanding larger class sizes and increasing teaching loads, and pushing faculty into distance learning programs without adequate support. These pressures generate stressful role overload for many of our colleagues and a degraded educational experience for the students. That was particularly true for our non-tenure-track colleagues, with many adjunct or part-time faculty reporting particularly harsh employment conditions. Numerous respondents noted that this overload intensified as they fought to keep their material current with the changing world and research.

These financial pressures have also led many universities to admit students with weaker prior preparation and with less interest in learning as a value. On the one hand, we should celebrate the opening of tertiary and postgraduate education opportunities to a broader range of students. On the other hand, if the university is broadening its mission, faculty resources must be adjusted to accommodate that shift.

Our Status Hierarchy

Looking critically at our institutional context, it is clear that we must also contend with

challenges that come from within our faculty ranks. I would highlight in particular the damaging effect of the status hierarchy that elevates research over teaching, especially in the more research-intensive universities. As Ernest Boyer noted in 1990, teaching is given ever less consideration in the norms, values, and promotion and reward systems of our research-intensive universities.

That would be less of a problem for the wider population of business schools were it not for the fact that it is these same research-intensive universities that produce the Ph.D. graduates who then go on to work in the broader field of higher education. The negative spillovers are double. First, our research-intensive universities often socialize these Ph.D. students into seeing their teaching role as secondary to their professional identity as researchers. Second, these universities rarely include in their Ph.D. programs any serious training on how to teach or on the underlying pedagogical theories.

A Looming Crisis?

In sum, our institutions will need to change if we are going to honor our educational values and fulfill the teaching mission of our business schools. How well positioned are we today to meet this challenge? I can only speak to the U.S. situation, but the situation here is dire.

Studies have shown that business majors spend less time preparing for class than students in any other field; they have the weakest gains during the first two years of college on tests of writing and reasoning skills. And when business students take the GMAT (the entry examination for MBA programs), they score significantly lower than students in every other major (Arum & Roksa, 2011). The MBA level is not much better. Many of our colleagues have voiced criticisms of the limited cognitive skills acquired in MBA programs and of the materialistic values that are reinforced there (see, for example, Mintzberg, 2004, and Pfeffer & Fong, 2002).

Even if we allow that the undergraduate and MBA degrees were never designed for the leisurely pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, and that the business degree is essentially about enhancing our students' career prospects, it is clear that we must do a much better job equipping these students with the knowledge and skills they need to lead happy and productive lives. Complacency is not warranted. Although it might seem that the MBA program in graduate education is

comfortably institutionalized, the case of U.S. law schools is sobering, with law school enrollments collapsing by 20 percent in the past five years.

New Technologies

Apart from these pressures on our autonomy and our priorities, we also face a host of new technologies that affect our teaching. Many of these technologies—such as instant voting clickers, web-based systems for students to submit work electronically, and web platforms for class dialogue—fit nicely into the traditional university and business school models of teaching. Other technologies seem to point to the possibility of more radical disruption of that model—most notably MOOCs (massive open online courses). How much of that potential impact will materialize remains to be seen. And the nature of that impact is as yet unclear, at least to me.

On the one hand, these new technologies might bring higher-education opportunities to a greater—perhaps far greater—proportion of the population in a form that is logistically and economically more accessible. Even if this turns out to radically disrupt our work as educators, a sense of civic responsibility obliges us, I submit, to embrace rather than resist this possibility, at least insofar as it offers genuinely valuable educational and development opportunities to our fellow citizens.

On the other hand, we should, as professional educators, be the guardians of the quality of these new opportunities. There are many unscrupulous con men out there ready to exploit the eagerness of others to acquire knowledge or to earn a professionally relevant diploma. Rumor has it that some of these con men may even have wormed their way into the senior ranks of administration in some of our universities.

OUR ORGANIZATION

Let me turn now to the third question: How can we, at the Academy of Management, work together to respond to this changing societal and institutional context? What can we do at the Academy to help our members deal with the challenges and capitalize on the opportunities we face?

Organizational Challenges in the Academy

Teaching has been addressed only rarely by my predecessors in their presidential addresses.

I think it's useful to consider why. I do so with some trepidation, because I fear the main reason for this gap is that our status system reflects the broader institutional context I described earlier in privileging research over teaching—and this is very sensitive territory.

Status means relative standing, relative prestige. Talking about it touches sensitive nerves, first, because status is fundamentally hierarchical, elevating some people or activities over others. In the face of status, it does not work simply to say, "We need to value everyone of every status," because the whole point of status is to elevate some above others. Status touches sensitive nerves, second, because it is not only a matter of individual judgment but a social fact as well, a collective valuation, one that exists independently of any individual personal preferences. We may be able to join forces to change the status criteria or the ranking on a given criterion, so a status hierarchy is not immutable, but at any given time, status hierarchies confront us as objective social facts.

As things stand today, in most of the countries represented in the Academy, there is a status hierarchy that elevates research over teaching, research-intensive schools over teaching-intensive schools, and scholars who excel at research over scholars who excel at teaching. There are some exceptions—in the United States we might cite Harvard Business School and Darden as exceptions—but arguably they are exceptions that prove the rule.

These status hierarchies weigh painfully on many of us, as reported in the 2005 report by the Academy's Diversity & Inclusion Theme Committee. Some of us started doctoral training giving priority to our research aspirations and then found ourselves, a few years later, working in schools that gave us little time for research because teaching was the institutional priority. And the resulting emotions are even more roiled when these same teaching-oriented schools, in their pressing search for their own status and the associated revenues, start increasing pressure on their faculty to deliver research publications without lightening commensurately the teaching load. Others among us started out wanting above all to be teachers, perhaps with little interest in generating our own research but animated by genuine interest in the research output of others and by a great passion to spark interest and insight among students; unfortunately, many such colleagues have had to deal with the constant frustration of being

surrounded by peers and others who devalue this commitment.

To my eyes—and I know many of you feel similarly—this is all rather silly and terribly sad, because it is abundantly clear that our field cannot thrive without high quality in both research and teaching. So this status hierarchy is fundamentally counterproductive. But its silliness does not make it any less real. This status difference affects the life of the Academy, as it does most of our peer associations. And it sets up a strategic challenge for us here as a professional association.

Our Strategic Challenge

Let me explain how I see the strategic challenge posed by this status hierarchy and how I think we can respond to it.

First, the challenge. If we reserved all our honors and efforts for research, teaching-oriented members would feel alienated, and the Academy would lose its relevance among our teaching-oriented colleagues and schools. Conversely, if we were to push teaching to the forefront of our work at the Academy, we would risk losing credibility with high-status colleagues and institutions. At the limit, if the Academy reserved all its honors for and devoted all its efforts to teaching, there is little doubt that many of our highly visible researchers would pull back, and little doubt that the standing of the Academy at the research-intensive schools would suffer, even though, of course, teaching still matters to these scholars and schools.

Beyond membership, we can think of this as two "market segments" with different needs and resources. Can the Academy compete successfully in both of them? Can we provide high-quality service to members in both teaching and research? To use the term suggested by Duane Ireland in his presidential address last year, can we provide a compelling "value proposition" to both segments at the same time? These are important issues for the Academy, if only because other professional associations and other activities compete for our members' time and attention.

What does business strategy theory tell us about this question? One line of thinking would have us choose between these segments and focus on one or the other. The logic of this perspective is that if we try to work in both segments, we risk being mediocre in both. Mixing together

teaching-oriented and research-oriented members risks leaving everyone frustrated and no one very happy. The Academy would “fall between two chairs”; it would suffer from a blurred cross-category identity. In some professional associations this has led to a straightforward focus on the researcher segment; others focus on the teaching segment. This line of thinking would have us prioritize one segment and accept that we cannot provide much value for the other.

Our approach at the Academy has been to reject this either/or choice and to aim for what strategy scholars might call “ambidexterity” (Lavie, Stettner, & Tushman, 2010)—to be the association of choice if you want to create cutting-edge research *and/or* if you want to access deep teaching expertise and innovative educational techniques. Those of you familiar with this concept will recall that there are several approaches to achieving ambidexterity; we are pursuing them all.

First, we create specialized “lines of business” that focus primarily on teaching alongside those that focus primarily on research. We have *AMLE* alongside our other journals, and we have the TLC alongside the relatively research-oriented main annual conference program, for example. Second, within each of these lines of business, we have subunits that focus on the other side. Within the TLC, for example, we have sessions that focus on research about the psychology of learning. And most of our divisions and interest groups, even though they are defined by their research foci, offer teaching-oriented professional development workshops. We help stimulate those efforts through the work of the Management Education & Development Division and the Teaching Theme Committee. Many divisions have rich online division resources. And the Academy and several divisions have educator awards. Finally, in our shared Academy culture, we aspire to recognize the importance of ambidexterity in each of us as individual scholars. We reserve special respect for those who excel in both teaching and research.

I think everything I have said up to now suggests that we can, and we must, meet this ambidexterity challenge. The future of management both as a field of research and as a field of teaching depends critically on the cross-fertilization of those two fields of activity. As a profession, we survive only if we cultivate both research that provides insight into the nature of the real world of management and organizations and teaching

where the content of what we teach and our pedagogical approaches are based on rigorous research rather than “tricks of the trade” and anecdotal data.

The Academy will therefore provide a more compelling value proposition—an exciting and effective scholarly association for us all—if we mobilize our members’ efforts and our association’s resources to meet both our teaching and our research needs.

Moving Ahead

I began this address by celebrating the range of activities the Academy already offers in support of our teaching roles. Let me conclude by suggesting some ways we can move even further ahead.

First, we hope to further energize teaching-oriented activities within the Academy. We hope to see *AMLE* further develop its audience and continue on its remarkable trajectory. We are investing in new digital publishing tools to add richness to *AMLE* as well as to our other journals. The *Academy of Management Discoveries* is leading the way in using new technologies in publishing, but all our journals will be following close behind.

We hope we can do more to bring our members’ teaching innovations to the attention of the business community and the general public. We have done a great job getting hundreds of stories into the business and general media about our research accomplishments. I hope we can find a way to publicize similarly some of our community’s wonderful teaching innovations.

We hope to energize further our divisions’ efforts to support teaching, with upgraded websites that carry richer teaching resources. We have a cross-divisional volunteer group—the Teaching Theme Committee—that works across the whole Academy to stimulate and coordinate teaching-related efforts, and we are exploring ways in which this committee might link up with volunteer representatives from all the interested divisions and interest groups to push that work forward.

We are hoping to build the TLC into a bigger and even richer program. We would like to see this conference become not only the home for leading-edge thinking in teaching and learning research and practice but also a place where our members can find mentors in the art of teaching. And we hope to offer similar teaching-oriented

conferences outside North America, helping our members wherever they are across the globe to convene around their teaching interests. Indeed, we will shortly announce a new program of smaller Academy conferences, to be offered in different regions around the world and at different times of the year. Some will be focused more on research, some more on teaching, and most will address both.

Second, we plan to reach out to teaching-focused colleagues. We hope that through the TLC and other activities we can make the Academy a more valuable and enriching experience for colleagues in more teaching-oriented schools. Some of these colleagues have lost interest in the Academy because we have not been offering enough value to them in their teaching roles.

We want to reach out, too, to growing numbers of part-time instructors in less secure employment conditions. These colleagues may not ever have thought of joining the Academy. We want to explore how the Academy could offer more value to them. Perhaps we can help them with ways to keep abreast of research, as well as with information about jobs or with opportunities for advanced skill development.

Finally, we want to empower our members to act as progressive change agents in the institutions in which they work. Our 2010 Strategic Plan made a commitment to build a research capability aimed at better understanding the changing state of our profession as management scholars. The goal here is to mobilize our members' collective intelligence to provide us all with more insight into the changing context of our work and into the various creative ways that we have found to respond to the new challenges and new opportunities and, by making all this available, to empower you as individuals and groups to forge your own responses. The Careers Survey led by Marie Kraimer was a first initiative of this kind. We plan to undertake other such investigations into the changing conditions of our profession.

IN CONCLUSION: HONOR THE MANAGEMENT EDUCATOR

All these initiatives depend crucially on the breadth and depth of our members' volunteer efforts. The Academy as a formal organization has little capability of its own with which to deliver these results. It is only an institutional shell that facilitates our members' efforts.

So let me give the last word to some of these volunteers, members of the Teaching Theme Committee and TLC organizing team: Chris Hannah, Claudia Ferrante, and Toni Ungaretti. In preparing for this address, I asked for their thoughts on the status of teaching in the Academy today. They responded with some comments that seem to me to capture both the challenge and exciting opportunities for us:

Each year at the TLC and Teaching Theme Committee sessions we hear stories from participants of successful engagement and improved learning in members' classrooms. We see faculty energized by the opportunity to learn and share from and with each other. We see people from all divisions, regions, and member nations discovering or making connections thanks to a common desire to improve their practice. . . . Despite this evidence of demand and need, the sad part of this story is that each year we hear from young members that they must hide from their deans or advisors that they want to attend a teaching-focused conference. . . . What have we learned so far? We have some amazingly creative and dedicated teachers in the Academy. The desire to improve our practice warrants our attention and leadership. At the TLC closing last year, one young doctoral participant spoke eloquently about the richness of her experiences during the day. She explained that this was the first opportunity in her studies to actually engage with faculty in meaningful dialogues about teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

- Academy of Management Diversity & Inclusion Theme Committee. 2005. *State of inclusion in the Academy: Summary report of key findings*. Available at http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/About_AOM/Governance/2014_DITC_AOM_Report_Summary.pdf.
- Adler, P. S. 2012. The sociological ambivalence of bureaucracy: From Weber via Gouldner to Marx. *Organization Science*, 23: 244–266.
- Anderson, K. 2012. Climate change going beyond dangerous—Brutal numbers and tenuous hope. *Development Dialogue*, 61: 16–39.
- Aronowitz, S. 2000. *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Arum, R., & Roksa, J. 2011. *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bloom, N., Genakos, C., Sadun, R., & Van Reenen, J. 2012. Management practices across firms and countries. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(1): 12–33.
- Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- Esty, D., & Winston, A. 2009. **Green to gold: How smart companies use environmental strategy to innovate, create value, and build competitive advantage.** Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Gentile, M. C. 2010. **Giving voice to values.** New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Greco, L. M., Kraimer, M., Seibert, S., & Sargent, L. D. 2015. **Career shocks, obstacles, and professional identification among academics.** Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Ireland, D. 2015. Presidential address: Our Academy, our future. *Academy of Management Review*, 40: 151–162.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. 2013. The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship*, 21(3): 15–21.
- King, A. 1993. From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College Teaching*, 41(1): 30–35.
- Kraimer, M., Seibert, S., Sargent, L., Greco, L., & Nielsen, J. 2015. **Career obstacles, shocks, and facilitators of professional identification and occupational satisfaction among Academy of Management academic members: Stage 2 study feedback report to the Academy of Management.** Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of Management.
- Lavie, D., Stettner, U., & Tushman, M. 2010. Exploration and exploitation within and across organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4: 109–155.
- Mintzberg, H. 2004. **Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development.** San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. 2002. The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1: 78–95.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. 2002. Serving the world's poor, profitably. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(9): 48–59.
- Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. 2016. Volume 46: The university under pressure (edited by E. P. Berman & C. Paradeise).
- Veblen, T. 2015. **The higher learning in America. The annotated edition: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men.** Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Vogel, D. 2007. **The market for virtue: The potential and limits of corporate social responsibility.** Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.