**Paradoxical Framing for Business Education:**

**Making the Case for the Raw Case Method of Learning**

**Introduction**

In the wake of the recent global financial crisis, Starkey and Tempest (2009, p. 576) write, “Business schools need to develop a different way of knowing and shaping the world, grounded in a different language and a new narrative to re-legitimize their role at a time when conventional wisdom has led to carnage on Wall Street and in all the world's other major business centers. It is time to remake the case that management is as much an art as a science and to look to the arts and humanities for lessons to guide us through our current difficult times. In the search for technical competence, which has, in our current business crisis, proved misleading, the business school community have lost their ability to think critically about what they do.”

Critiques of business education range from its gap with practice (e.g. Mintzberg, 2005) to research which is irrelevant to practice (e.g. Cameron, 2017; Bennis and O’Toole, 2005) or even dangerous to practice (e.g. Ghoshal, 2005; Pfeffer & Fong, 2004; Starkey & Tempest, 2009); and from the creation and persistence of academic silos both within the business school (e.g. Podolny, 2009) and across disciplines outside the business school – notably liberal arts (e.g. Chew and McInnis-Bowers, 2004 ) to the failure to foster critical and reflexive thinking in its graduates (e.g. Hibbert and Cunliffe, 2015). Despite such criticism the business school curriculum and its pedagogical underpinnings, predominantly case study often accompanied by subject matter lectures, has changed little since the 2008 financial crisis, nor indeed since the establishment of Harvard Business School (HBS) in 1908 and introduction of case method learning that followed shortly thereafter. Heeding to society’s call for change, business programs have for the last decade or so introduced new courses to address sustainability, responsibility, and ethics (SRE) issues. Nevertheless, for too many programs, the dominant focus, almost from inception, has been on isolated subjects taught primarily through lectures in theoretical settings whereas SRE issues rarely emerge as isolated problems. They are not neatly separated so that they can be enacted, communicated, and managed one by one. Neither do they appear independent of other strategic or operational problems that managers are often faced with.

The urgency of today’s multiple global problems, such as climate change, global inequality, and collapsing wild fish stocks, coupled with the push for business education to integrate the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG), has pressed the emergence of complex systems architecture on professional education like no time in the past. In this article we propose the “raw case” pedagogy to accompany a new business school curriculum that moves beyond considering the “role of business in society” to embrace business as part of a wider society, as envisioned by the HBS pioneers of business education[[1]](#footnote-1) and resurrected and reinvigorated by an increasing number of scholars (e.g. Starkey and Tempest, 2009; Bridgeman, Cummings & McLaughlin, 2016).

**What Is Raw Case?**

Yale School of Management which is among the pioneers of the raw case approach describes the raw case as follows:

 *“Rather than boiling a complex situation down to a 10-page narrative and a single decision point, raw cases present you with extensive data about a real situation, often including video interviews with some of the key actors. By design, the case contains more information than you can digest on your own, so you’ll work in small teams to sift through data, news reports, and interviews, and then build your analysis.”*

The raw case learning requires students or managers alike to scan vast quantities of information and survey a much wider variety of domain knowledge that in many instances lies outside traditional business functions, in order to make sense of a complex issue. It is essentially a pedagogical process that embraces a paradoxical cognitive perspective on complex problems (Hahn, Preuss, Pinkse, and Figge, 2014; Smith et al. 2012) and demands a dissimilar learning process from that of business case studies. Unlike typical sustainable business case cognition, the paradoxical frame cannot provide guidance as to which sustainability issue or stakeholder to prioritize. Instead, it prompts gathering of more diverse information on a nexus of sustainability issues – that is, information related to economic, environmental, political, social, and technological aspects, irrespective of immediate financial implications – and of opinions held by a wider range of stakeholders (Hahn et al., 2014, p. 470), before problems are defined, options generated and decisions made. Using the raw case method to address complex issues thus allows for solutions/recommendations that fall outside a business-centric result to allow for scenarios that include hybrid organizational forms (Smith et al., 2012). For example, the paradoxical frame considers public/private engagement and would regard regulation as a part of the solution rather than a threat/risk to be mitigated. The raw case pedagogy requires analysis but with an emphasis on synthesis and is thus integral to reinventing business education as an institution that embraces our networked and cognitive world system (Lorange & Thomas, 2016).

**HBS Case Studies and Business-case Cognitive Framework**

HBS cases still dominate business school pedagogy to this day. The widely accepted notion of a management case study is that it is a narrative account of actual management situations replete with contextual information to help inform an examination of the situation (e.g. surrounding events, financial statements, or management opinions), and yet neither obvious resolution nor analysis is offered (Daniels, 2011; Lundberg, C., Rainsford, P., Shay, J., & Young, C., 2001; Carlson & Schodt, 1995). Students read, analyze, and then discuss the case in class with the objective of deciding on a course of actions among alternative recommendations pertinent to a resolution of the situation. The professor guides the discussion, using Socratic Dialogue to pit one student against another, asks challenging and sometimes provocative questions, and prods the class to reach conclusions that are consistent with or well supported by management literature (Daniels, 2011; Garner, 2000).

Hahn et al. (2014) consider that individuals trained in traditional business school methods, which combine lecture and such well-defined cases, view complex problems from a business-case cognitive framework that “…*focus(es) on environmental and social aspects that align with economic objects and, thus, interpret sustainability issues univalently as either positive or negative for their business; hence they adopt a pragmatic stand on sustainability issues with a propensity to pursue narrow but workable responses along existing routines and solutions*” (P. 464). This cognitive framework facilitates the business case for social responsibility since it requires that engagement with social and environmental issues must add financial value, hence the inherent ambiguities of complex problems can be confidently ignored if financial value is not maximized. The business case framework is conducive to effectively reducing the information landscape circling the wicked problem. Most often, relevant information means business related, which in many ways reduce the complexity of the issue for the manager while significantly diminishing the actual vast number of information sources and viewpoints that could otherwise be considered. Ideally, the reduced information set is quantitative. Armed with a business-case cognitive framework, Hahn et al. (2014) illustrate this proposition with reference to the 2006 Stern Review on climate change. In their view the Stern Review received managerial attention because it attached financial costs and opportunities to the complex issues of climate change. Business responded by seeking and securing opportunities to reduce GHG emissions that could result in cost-savings to the firm while promoting climate change initiatives. However, most managers could not look beyond this single, simple, quantifiable objective. In the auto sector, for example, electric car development became the next big innovation to moderate industry impact on global warming. Did they (do they) see the intricacies and inter-connectedness of wicked problems though? Electric cars, powered by lithium batteries require cobalt to make them run and currently 60% of the world supply of cobalt comes from the conflict-ridden Congo where child labor in the cobalt mines is rampant. What of the impact of electric cars on oil producers and refineries? What does the shift to non-combustion engines imply for political stability in the Middle East?[[2]](#footnote-2) Consequently, the narrow business case perspective in addressing climate change will exacerbate a host of other complex problems facing society today.

We simply seem incapable of discarding teaching techniques and systems of knowledge creation (predominantly academic research) that are increasingly irrelevant to the global complex problems. The dominant business school pedagogy most often revolves around the case method of teaching that was borrowed from law case pedagogy invented by Christopher Columbus Langdell, in 1871. Wallace Donham, the second dean of the Harvard Business School (1919-1942) and a graduate of Harvard Law School advocated for use of the case method of teaching at HBS and provided funding for a broader program of case writing, built around real business issues and management decisions yet to be made (Daniels, 2011). Most accounts of the development of business education and attendant pedagogy portray a linear evolution of business teaching, research and practice from Donham’s time to present day (Bridgeman, et al., 2016). By the 1950s, largely due to stinging critiques of business faculty’s scholarly productivity by the Carnegie and Ford Foundations, focus pivoted to research intensive activities to gain academic respectability accompanied by a standardized business curriculum and the decoupling of management research from practice (Mintzberg, 2005). Khurana (2007) charges that such focus on abstract and intellectually appealing management theory actually changed how the practice of management was to be conducted. Largely separated from practice, scholarly inquiry produced theories of the firm (Coase (1960) and Williamson’s (1975) transactions cost approach developed in the sixties and seventies and Jensen & Meckling’s (1976) agency theory of the firm that went largely unquestioned for many years. Some management scholars have publically voiced their criticism of such positive, theory laden, analytic approach to business studies which in their view produced practitioners with a weak moral compass (e.g. Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2007; Pfeffer & Fong, 2004).

Bridgman, McLaughlin and Cummings (2018) argue that business school teaching and research have been the primary vehicles of disseminating a neo-liberal world view that produces managers unable to engage in “critical reflexivity” thus perpetuating business as usual. The business-case lens that is instilled by traditional business school education has enabled managers to greatly simplify complexity and provided well-established tools to address these problems that in fact can lead to false confidence in having controlled for myriad risks. Thomas (2017) calls for business schools to develop more holistic management education models to produce responsible, authentic leaders by rebalancing the relationship between business schools and business, government and society, with business schools reasserting their influence and focus in the education process to satisfy the diverse interests of their stakeholders. However, implementing educational processes that can accomplish this goal has met with very limited success, which we think is due to the continued emphasis on the primacy of the organization – the firm, the mindset that has been instilled in business school students (future practitioners) and a dearth of critical thinking and reflexive thought as an integral part of management learning.

This explains why responsible management, although appears in most business school curricula, is in many cases a “bolted on” feature rather than “built-in” (Snelson-Powell et al., 2016). Despite the excellence of the individual faculties, programs, and schools, this has created and sustained silos and a mostly abstract approach to learning that does not meet the needs for present and future responsible management innovations. In our view, a disconnect developed when the emphasis on business education began to focus exclusively on only very narrowly defined “business problems”. Such “linear evolution” from the wide-spread adoption of HBS cases in the 1930s continues to present day where case method teaching still dominates the business school curriculum. This traditional business-case paradigm has infused the way we think about and teach the role of business in addressing society’s wicked problems. In brief, if business is to participate in the resolution of complex global problems with other actors (government, NGOs), then the simple view of risk/costs associated with global threats and the economic benefit accruing to the private sector (the traditional business case model) must be expanded. The problem with a business-case approach in addressing complex global problems is due to the approach being too “business-centric” (Bridgeman, McLaughlin & Cummings, 2018). The solution to complex problems must go hand in hand with private sector, government, and NGO activities to produce organizational solutions ranging from the classic for-profit enterprise to hybrid organizations such as benefit corporations, social enterprises, and non-profit arms of for-profit entities and vice versa. These solutions, however, are not achievable if managers are trained solely with a business-case lens.

While the decades of the 2000s onward seem to have solidified opposition to the status quo in both business education and management practice, our profession has been mostly quiet as to how a new business education can be delivered. Past experience with addition of stakeholder considerations and broadened to critical management inquiry have mostly failed to produce managers who are problem solvers beyond a myopic business perspective. We argue that business teaching must include knowledge co-creation through supporting strong analytics and diversity of philosophical and cognitive perspectives. The knowledge produced in association with management education requires innovative pedagogy that draws upon not only analytics and insights from the traditional business studies landscape but also incorporates diverse stakeholder values into the decision-making processes. We believe that the raw case approach does more than simply bolt on sustainability issues or serve as a “bridge” between business and liberal arts, rather our experience has shown us that the raw-case pedagogy embeds sustainability and critical thinking into the educational experience and embraces ambiguity.

**Raw-case Studies and Paradoxical Cognitive Framework**

Complex problems embedded in raw cases come with a high degree of ambiguity and require that managers juggle multiple tensions and pursue strategies that result in financial and extra-financial goals placed squarely in conflict. A paradoxical cognitive framework (Hahn et al.; 2014) enables managers to scan enormous quantities of information relevant to financial goals and sustainability issues. Unlike the simplistic business case frame that often leads to discarding strategies prematurely when through simplified analysis they are found irrelevant to firm value enhancement, the paradoxical cognitive framework demands acceptance of these tensions. Managers with such cognition view their organizations as inherently more complex than do managers with a business case lens. On the other hand, a paradoxical framework offers no guidance on prioritization of issues, which may lead managers to pursue numerous rabbit holes of little importance to the complex issue at hand. This may cause much stress to managers, but the silver lining is the recognition, development, and leverage of managerial cognitive powers, often pejoratively labeled under the business-case lens as “heuristics” or worse “biases”. Roos (2014) argues that business education needs the second Renaissance for a humanistic return to experience, practice, and the cultivation of judgment and practical wisdom in managers, which are essential to a new synthesis and a new integration of knowledge that already exists but currently lies scattered and incoherent in scientific management’s half-empty glasses.

Our raw-case teaching experience includes an intensive two-week, 45-hour course that has been taught four times for our entering MBA students, using one raw case study throughout the course, plus a competition practicum taught several times that has placed our students in several raw-case competitions. Based on this experience we find that raw case studies possess a set of characteristics not shared by their traditional counterparts.

Raw cases exist on the Web and present students with extensive and sometimes real-time data about a complex management situation, in stark contrast to the linear and static organization of traditional case study information. Raw cases may comprise hundreds of web pages related to the management situation along with data in their raw formats, such as company reports, industry reports, charts and figures, spreadsheets, audios and videos, and social media. These web-based resources may be loosely organized under a hierarchy of webpages, which hardly presents a necessary or dominant organizing structure. In extreme cases, the entire web is the case site. On the other hand, and simultaneously, a raw case study demands specific management decisions, in spite of lacking a narrative of the management situation or more likely the presence of a myriad of them.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 Unlike traditional case studies that can typically be completed in one or two class sessions, one raw case study may consume an entire course over a whole academic term or several weeks as an intensive course. The multifaceted teaching objectives may include application of certain concepts, tools or models, as well as an emphasis on development of an understanding or insight, which is consistent with those of traditional case studies. The difference is that the opportunities for teaching a specific concept, tool or model are not necessarily obvious or even intended in raw case studies. In raw case studies the *problem* is paramount. Raw cases are distinctly complex, demand a dissimilar learning process, and often require a much wider variety of domain knowledge that in many instances lies outside traditional business functions.

A typical raw case study gives students a specific assignment without any specific recommendation of concepts, frameworks, or methods necessary for completing the assignment satisfactorily. Instead, they need to search and discover useful ones and apply them to define and solve the case problems. The large number of case items and the heterogeneity and interconnectivity among them often lead students to multitudes of possible concepts, perspectives, frameworks, and tools. It is impossible for any individual student to cover the many “rabbit holes,” let alone dig into them. This requires students to adopt problem solving approaches that are not common in traditional case studies. The approach of individual explorations quickly followed by intensive sharing of findings in the class, a form of crowdsourcing, is popular throughout the raw case study in defining problems, generating alternative solutions to the problems, and choosing analyses to be conducted.[[4]](#footnote-4)

To complete the case study assignment well, students need to be open to new data to validate a perspective or temporal decision based on the initial information. They may also seek new data required to form the initial perspective or decision. As the number of items grow, heterogeneity and interconnectivity increase as does the problem complexity. For example, the AXA: Creating New CR Metrics case, developed by the Yale School of Management, contains hundreds of pages of industry reports, company documents, and third-party analyses, along with a few dozens of videos from several minutes to a couple of hours in length. Overwhelming as it is, the case website does not cover much industry or country information, which students may quickly discover indispensable. Yet a discussion of materiality of any metric needs to be based on a good understanding or formulation of the company strategies across its business lines and geographies. Likewise, corporate responsibility is socially situated. The students must grasp the complexity of the AXA businesses across the globe to build a good understanding or design of the linkage across the company’s multiple bottom lines. The raw case complexity is purposeful. It replicates the complexity of the nexuses of management challenges and solutions. Raw case study simulates how effective managers discover, access and synthesize information in the real world. It does not rely on a predetermined set of reports, and it is not linear and one-off.

Like in traditional case studies, students take the responsibility of identifying and framing the key problems. To do so effectively in raw case studies, however, they need to process the massive amount of information presented in the case, as well as explore potentially useful information outside the case. Invariably they are forced to search and demand orientations. This is when and where they may find useful knowledge across different domains in guiding their exploratory journey or controlling the project scope. For example, there are several non-mutually exclusive approaches to explore the AXA raw case. Some students see it as a marketing problem to develop corporate responsibility metrics for outcomes that can be effectively communicated to build relationships with new customers and strengthen relationships with existing ones. Some view the case from a corporate risk management angle, which looks into the company exposure to the environmental, social, and governance risks. Some others ask whether the company should drastically change its strategic focus from developed economies to emerging markets. Still others, who focus on the asset management business of AXA, lean toward framing the case problem as an impact investment opportunity. The need for exploratory studies across different domains may emerge early and strong in a raw case study. Most traditional case studies are placed in a discipline distinct course and rely on a single instructor that does not satisfy the need for cross-disciplinary exploratory studies. As most course instructors in higher education are experts in one to a very small number of knowledge or functional domains, their mindsets are trained and fixated in a specific way that may inadvertently become barriers to complex problem solving. Raw case studies demand faculty to break through the traditional silos in teaching. At our school and Yale SOM, raw cases are team-taught by faculty from different disciplines, both within and from outside the business school.

The cross-disciplinary, cross-domain and multi-faculty requirement redefines the role of raw case study instructor. Currie, Davies, and Ferlie (2016) argue that management education is entering a third phase where business education (and by extension management practice) must confront, adapt to, and, importantly, participate in the mitigation of complex global issues – the mastery of which demands interdisciplinary collaboration. Thus, a broad range of faculty expertise is required to deliver a raw case based course, hence also the need for the lead instructor to coordinate its multi-instructor delivery. The lead instructor orchestrates a broad exploration of the case by encouraging big-picture thinking and engaging multiple faculty members. Besides motivating student participation, the instructor stays alert to assertions with disciplinary biases, directs attention to areas not yet covered, observes learning interests from students, curates lessons from participating faculty, and fosters problem-driven learning and faculty-student interactions. The lead instructor of a raw case study also serves as a role model for unbounded curiosity toward new concepts, perspectives or methods, ample tolerance for ambiguity, a balanced approach to decision making informed by analysis and instinct, and a keen sense of mixing learning and assignment-specific tasks.

Similar to traditional case studies, students assume the role of a manager with specific analytical and decision-making tasks. For students new to raw case studies, the initial experience can be both overwhelming (volumes of information and complexity of the case) and personal (specific assignment). The learning environment is much more like a hospital operating room with a real patient or a setting for cognitive apprenticeship than a typical classroom (Williams, 1992). In addition to facts, procedures, and concepts necessary to solving problems, students feel the desire to learn “tricks of the trade” that experienced problem solvers use to deal with the problems at hand more efficiently or with an unexpected strong outcome. They are more sensitive to the cost and benefit of learning about a certain theory or tool, driven overtly by assignment completion in time. They want to control what they learn and how they learn. They also pay more attention to ways of organizing a high performance team. Students in raw case studies do not just assume the role of a manager. They behave like one in a difficult environment characterized by high performance pressure, actively searching for not only a solution to the problem but also strategies to learn faster and manage the team better.

 One way to summarize the unique characteristics of raw case studies is to compare them with those of the traditional case studies and subject-matter lectures (Daniels, 2011; Ronstadt, 1993). Table 1 characterizes these three general approaches to learning in business schools in four aspects, problem complexity, the need for cross-disciplinary learning, the need for experimental and heuristics problem-solving strategies, and the need for the instructor role as curator of knowledge domains and orchestrator for knowledge transfer among students and faculty.

-----------------------------------------

Insert Table 1 about here

------------------------------------------

Normally, subject-specific lectures do not include case studies other than those that are short structured vignettes used to illustrate a concept or theory or describe a simple problem for students to solve. There is little room for differences of opinion or need for judgment. Instructors alone prepare and deliver the one-way knowledge transfer. Case studies involve more complex problems that may lack an apparent focus and contain a moderate number of heterogeneous and interrelated decision factors. The proximity to a real-world situation entails knowledge from more than one domain to be applied to problem solving. But students need not explore beyond the written case or the knowledge domain suggested in the course syllabus or associated readings. Although differences of opinion often exist and student judgment is needed in case studies, it is not necessary for traditional case study instructors to expand their role beyond facilitating classroom discussions. Raw case studies, however, deal with “wicked” problems that are buried under an apparently straightforward project assignment and hidden among multitudes of heterogeneous, interconnected and dynamic items. These items require a broad and diverse knowledge base for students to understand and leverage in analysis. However, a mastery of the knowledge domains is often not sufficient. Students need to experiment with the concepts, frameworks and methods to decide their appropriateness and practical value to actual problem solving. The compressed timeframe for heavy information processing and decision making often demands that students make quick judgement calls based on an integration of analysis and instinct, through which effective experiment-based or heuristics-based problem solving strategies may be learned. These strategies are practical methods that do not guaranteed optimal or perfect solutions, but may produce sufficient solutions for the immediate goals. Raw case instructors need to expand their role further beyond facilitating classroom discussions. They orchestrate knowledge domain experts, often faculty across various disciplines, and curate short on-demand lectures, demonstrations and discussions with a sharp sense of balancing student project needs and knowledge attainment.

**Raw-case Studies and the Future of Business Education**

We conclude from our experience that raw case studies not only provide rich context to engage students and experts for effective cognitive apprenticeship, especially the paradoxical kind closely relevant to complex problem solving, but also allow for ample opportunities for scientific and functional learning. The key differences exist where students are more motivated to learn theories, tools, and scientific evidences when they are closely relevant to the case assignment and where they are more demanding for the efficiencies of these on-demand lectures. We also find students grow more comfortable with intractable conflict through actively learning and accepting the differences and experimenting with integration, abilities that underlie paradoxical leadership (Smith et al., 2012). While raw case studies as a pedagogical approach to management learning may become a promising complement to lecture teaching and traditional case studies, it is important to see the new approach beyond the pedagogy lens. We and our colleagues have experienced several profound changes from developing and delivering raw case studies. The profundities matter only when they are consistent with the emerging aspirations of management educators and the promising trends for better management education. Riel and Martin (2015) call for the redesign of our education infrastructure to enable continued economic prosperity. The redesigned infrastructure should allow an education program to achieve its goals more efficiently and effectively through better allocation of educational resources and by drawing people inside and outside the course, curriculum, or institution to advance teaching and research. Our experience illustrates that raw case studies may start the conversation among the faculty about such a redesign. Faculty have gained useful insights for improving courses, program curricula, and the assurance of learning system. There is also a visible change in faculty hiring priorities. Cross-disciplinary teaching and collaboration among multiple faculty have increased and are achieved more easily, which is vital to the success of the renewed business curriculum (Currie, Davies & Ferlie, 2016; Starkey, Hatchuel & Tempest, 2004).

These attributes are important to 21st century business education. Boston Consulting Group’s corporate vitality study[[5]](#footnote-5) emphasizes five forward-looking considerations in ranking the Global Fortune Future 50, three of which are intimately relevant to our discussion above. They are: (i) a strategy balance between short-term exploitation and long-term exploration, (ii) a culture promoting cognitive diversity and competition of ideas, and (iii) willingness and ability to challenge incumbent approaches and beliefs. Moreover, we think the raw-case approach to learning encourages synthesis that is key to solution development for a better future. Today’s prolific and rapid innovations are characterized as combinatorial and re-combinatorial (McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2014) and attributed to cross-disciplinary collaborations. Business schools should be catalysts for innovation and co-creators of knowledge[[6]](#footnote-6). They should connect disciplines, and convene and partner at the intersection of academia and practice to reveal new insights. For too many programs, the dominant curricula focus continues to rest on isolated subjects that are taught primarily through lectures in theoretical settings. To bridge the innovation-education gap, a global change to promote transformative professional education is needed to harness flows of real-world problems that stimulate creative solutions and innovations that drive positive impact for the greater good, and educational content that empowers the future innovators through team teaching and mentoring. Raw case studies are an effective platform for designing and executing these transformative activities.

**REFERENCES**

Arbib, J., and T. Seba. 2017. *Rethinking Transportation 2020–2030*. A RethinkX Sector Disruption Report. Retrieved from https://www.rethinkx.com/transportation.

Bennis, W. G., & O’Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. ***Harvard***

***Business Review***, *83*, 96-104.

Bocker, F. (1987). Is case teaching more effective than lecture teaching in business administration? An Exploratory analysis. ***Interfaces***, 17, 64-71.

Bridgman, T., Cummings, S., & McLaughlin, C. (2016). Restating the case: How

revisiting the development of the case method can help us think differently about

the future of the business school. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***,

*15*, 724-741.

Bridgman, T., McLaughlin, C. & Cummings, S. (2018). Overcoming the problem with solving business problems: Using theory differently to rejuvenate the case method for turbulent times. ***Journal of Management Education***, 42, 441-460.

Cameron, A. (2017). The role of business schools in universities. Thomas, H. (2017). Rethinking and re-evaluating the purpose of the business school. In D. Bradshaw, (Ed.), ***Rethinking the Business School Fit for the Future***, (pp. 14-15). London: Chartered Association of Business Schools.

Carlson, J.A. & Schodt, D.W. (1995). Beyond the lecture: Case teaching and the learning of economic theory, ***The Journal of Economic Education***, 26, 17-28.

Chew, E.B. & McInnis-Bowers, C. (2004). Blending Liberal Art & Business Education. ***Liberal Education***, 90, 56-63.

Coase, R. (1960). The problem of social cost. ***Journal of Law and Economics*** 3, 1–44.

Daniels, M. (2011). Why HBS developed the case method – and what it’s like today. ***The Knewton Blog***, posted on May 19, 2011.

Currie, G. Davies, J. & Ferlie, E. (2016). A call for university-based business schools to “Lower Their Walls:” Collaborating with other academic departments in pursuit of social value. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 15, 742-755.

Garner, D.D. (2000). Socratic misogyny? – Analyzing feminist criticisms of Socratic teaching in legal education. ***Brigham Young University Law Review***, 2000, 1597-1649.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education,*** 4, 75-91.

Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability:

Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. ***Academy of Management Review***, *39*, 463-487.

Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. (2015). Responsible management: Engaging moral reflexive

practice through threshold concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *127*, 177-188.

Jensen, M.C. & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and Ownership Structure.” ***Journal of Financial Economics,*** 3, 303-360.

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, N.J.: University Press,

Lundberg, C.C., Rainsford, P., Shay, J.P., & Young, C.A. (2001). Teaching business education management writing case studies. ***Journal of Management Education***, 25, 450-463.

McAfee, A. & Brynjolfsson, E. (2014). ***The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Properity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies***, New York: W.W. Norton & Company

Mintzberg, H. (2005). ***Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development****.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers

Podolny, J.M. (2009). The Buck Stops (and Starts) at Business School. ***Harvard Business Review***, 87(6): 62–67.

Pfeffer, J. & Fong C. (2004). The business school business: Some lessons from the US experience. ***Journal of Management Studies,*** 41, 1501-1520.

Ronstadt, R. (1993). ***The Art of Case Analysis: A Guide to the Diagnosis of Business Situations*** (2nd Ed.). London: Lord Publishing.

Riel, J. and Martin, R. (2015). In the know: A call for the redesign of our knowledge infrastructure. ***Harvard Business Review***, Retrieved from https://hbr.org/product/in-the-know-a-call-for-the-redesign-of-our-knowledge-infrastructure/ROT263-PDF-ENG.

Roos, J. (2014). The Renaissance we need in business education. ***Harvard Business*** Review, July.

Smith, W.K., Besharov, M.L., Wessels, A.K., & Chertok, M. (2012). A Paradoxical Leadership Model for Social Entrepreneurs: Challenges, Leadership Skills, and Pedagogical Tools for Managing Social and Commercial Demands. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11, 463-478.

Snelson-Powell, A., Grosvold, J., & Millington, A. (2016). Business school legitimacy and the challenge of sustainability: A fuzzy set analysis of institutional decoupling. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 15, 703-723.

Starkey, K., Hatchuel, A., & Tempest, S. (2004). Rethinking the Business School. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 41(8): 1521-1531.

Starkey, K., Hatchuel, A., & Tempest, S. (2009). The Winter of Our Discontent: The Design Challenge for Business Schools. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 8, 576-586.

Thomas, H. (2017). Rethinking and re-evaluating the purpose of the business school. In D. Bradshaw, (Ed.), ***Rethinking the Business School Fit for the Future***, (pp. 8-9). London: Chartered Association of Business Schools.

Lorange, P., Thomas, H. (2016). Pedagogical advances in business models at business schools – in the age of networks. ***Journal of Management Development***, 35, 889-900.

Williams, S.M. (1992). Putting case-based instruction into context: Examples from legal and medical education. ***Journal of the Learning Sciences***, 2, 367-442.

Williamson, O.E. (1975). ***Markets and Hierarchies***, New York: Free Press.

Yeaple, R. (2012). Is the MBA case method passé? ***Forbes Blogs***, http://www.forbes.com/sites/ronaldyeaple/2012/07/09/isthembacasemethodpasse/

print/

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Raw Case Studies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics | Subject-specific Lectures | Traditional Case Studies | Raw Case Studies |
| Problem complexity | Low | Medium | High |
| Cross-disciplinary learning | Low | Medium | High |
| Experiment, heuristics strategies | Low | Low | High |
| Instructor role as curator and conductor | Low | Low | High |

1. Bridgeman, et al. (2016) present a counter-factual history of the evolution of the business school and business education at HBS. They show, through examination of historical record, that Wallace Donham who was appointed Dean of HBS in 1920, envisioned business education to encompass both business skills and broader societal values. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Arbib and Seba (2017) provide insightful detail into the complexities of the transportation and oil industry in ReThink X. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Economist’s MBA Investment Case Competition is an example of a typical raw case. The 2016 assignment was summarized in one page along with a short video, asking competing business school teams to construct a portfolio of Bitcoin and Ether, the two leading cryptocurrencies, to attain a maximal value in five years. No other information was provided. The entire Internet was the space to wander. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Students also find it useful to learn and apply other complex problem solving processes, such as the OODA loop referring to decision cycles of observe, orient, decide, and act (Wikipedia: OODA loop). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. BCG report titled The Global Landscape of Corporate Vitality, October 18, 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. [www.aacsb.edu/vision/infographic](http://www.aacsb.edu/vision/infographic) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)