World Journal of Business Research
ISSN 2770-9078
Vol. 4, No. 1, 2024
Published by STSL Press

Original Paper

The Business School as a Professional School: What Might Have Been... And Still Might Be Possible

Edward W. Miles[1], Brett P. Matherne[2], Wendy Swenson Roth[1], and Jessica S. Waldrop[1]

[1] Department of Management, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[2] Stetson-Hatcher School of Business, Mercer University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Abstract

Since the mid-20th century, one key story line of the university-based business school has been that a scientific approach to understanding the management knowledge domain will move the discipline forward. While there have been voices asserting that management is a craft—more than solely a science—those voices have not been central or sustained in the story line. This essay describes how that element of the history of the management academic discipline evolved. After that explanation, we propose a different history going forward—that of viewing management as a profession. This lens of a profession has the potential to incorporate both science and craft in a more coherent approach.

Keywords: business schools, professionalization of management, connecting management theory and practice, work-integrated learning, professions, professional schools

Introduction

Mid-20th century soul-searching by US university-based business schools resulted in them moving toward a track of emphasis on a scientific method to advance the discovery of knowledge. However, almost immediately, some voices in the management academic community (e.g., Simon, 1967; Livingston, 1971) began to assert that management was not purely a science, but also contained an element of art or craft. If indeed, management is more than a science, an exclusive scientific approach to unlocking knowledge will be incomplete. Although these voices have been acknowledged, one only has to look to the way management faculty members in a research university are recruited, rewarded, and promoted to see that the past 65 years of business school history has embraced science and marginalized art and craft. How might the next 65 years be different if the discipline of managerial studies embraced both science and craft? The purpose of this essay is to propose the merit of viewing management as a profession; such a perspective has potential to advance beyond the past 65 years of business school history to incorporate the treatment of management as both science and craft.

Mid-20th Century: Science Takes Center Stage

In the early 20th century, university-based professional schools were not always welcomed with open arms throughout the university. For example, Thorstein Veblen (1918) derided the law school as no more belonging in a university than a school of fencing or a school of dancing. Abraham Flexner (1930/1967) was adamant that, if Harvard University wished to be perceived as a credible university, it should divest itself of the Harvard Business School. Flexner also declared that university-based schools of education seemed more designed to scare away intellectual discourse than to attract it.

Innis (1944) concluded that some professional schools were created to co-opt the credibility of the university to serve the political benefit of an occupational domain that was not regarded as a respected profession. Indeed, when Joseph Pulitzer (1904) offered Columbia University $2 million to create a school of journalism (about $65 million in today's value), he as much as admitted that his motive was a desire to establish journalism as a profession rather than to establish a school for an occupation currently viewed by society as a respected profession (Camp, 2012).

In the context of this questioning of the legitimacy of university-based professional schools, US

business schools specifically engaged in a dialog of introspection in the middle of the 20th century. Daniel (1998: 142) cites AACSB meetings from this time period in which business school deans from respected universities (e.g., Columbia, University of Southern California) realized that their standing in the university was not cemented as strongly as might be ideal. The USC Dean stated that business schools "should develop as rapidly as possible a body of recognized standard concepts." The Columbia Dean went further:

> But what are these fundamentals? What qualifications make for competence in the careers for which we train? Frankly, I do not know, and I can think of no one who does. But it is high time we found out.

To admit that one's professional school is based upon a knowledge base that has yet to be articulated and codified is a rather precarious position to hold for a professional school that wishes to be accepted within the university. Discovery of knowledge is valued quite highly within the university, and to say that we are in short supply of it is not an enviable position to defend.

This mid-20th century soul searching by the university-based business school culminated with quite unflattering comprehensive reports issued by the Ford Foundation (Gordon & Howell, 1959) and the Carnegie Foundation (Pierson, 1959). Although prepared independently, the two reports reached similar conclusions. Among those conclusions was the assertion that business schools were not seriously integrated into the research culture of the university. Many faculty members were practitioners who were not trained in research. They had modest ability to read and interpret research. They conducted little serious research and had little desire to do so. As phrased by Gordon and Howell (p. 6), "What passes as the going standard of acceptability among business schools is embarrassingly low, and many schools of business do not meet even these low standards."

One consistent theme of the 1959 reports was that developing a store of scientific knowledge was needed to move business schools forward. As characterized by Pierson (1959: 313):

> The broad purpose of business research may be said to be to *increase the fund of scientific knowledge* [italics added] about the operations of the individual firm. To this end, business schools need to concentrate on developing a body of widely applicable generalizations which have been *scientifically tested* [italics added] and can be used in developing still further knowledge in this area.

March and Simon (1958: 5), contemporaries of the foundation report authors, asserted regarding business "knowledge" of the 1950s, that

> Much of what we know or believe we know about organizations is distilled from common sense and from the practical experience of executives. The great bulk of this wisdom and lore has never been subjected to *the rigorous scrutiny of scientific method* [italics added].

Pierson (p. 313) was concerned that the little research that was being conducted in business schools was "heavily weighted on the side of description" and was not oriented toward establishing broad principles. He held that solely descriptive research "is not research in any serious sense of the term." Serious research includes components of the basic purposes of science which involve explaining and predicting phenomena. He concluded that

> The critical task of business schools…is to *utilize the methods and findings* [italics added] of economics, mathematics-statistics, and psychology-sociology in analyzing the functional aspects of the firm as these functions in turn relate to the management process. (p. 314)

The same thinking was voiced by Gordon and Howell (1959: 381-383), who observed that business school research

> Implies going back to the *foundation disciplines* [italics added] on which the study of business must rest and seeking to develop theories and concepts which may ultimately be useful in the study of business behavior and business problems.

In summary, these scholars are recommending that, if we are to advance what is known about the domains of management and business, research should link to the underlying basic disciplines to build

"scientifically" sound principles. Science encompasses the purposes of describing, explaining, predicting, and (potentially) influencing phenomena; research in business must advance beyond the first one of these.

These scholars viewed "science" as the Rosetta stone, capable of unlocking the intricacies of business and management. This approach certainly had some successes. Augier and March (2011: 231-232) concluded that

> The efforts in economics and decision science were relatively quickly successful and ultimately yielded important results that were recognized as major contributions not only to business but also to the academic disciplines….Forty years later, it is possible to see how the teaching and practice of production management, accounting, and finance were transformed by fundamental research on topics underlying those fields. The teaching and practice of domains of management more closely linked to behavioral sciences have, however, not been similarly transformed….[T]he teaching of topics such as leadership, innovation, and entrepreneurship that might have pointed the way to understanding such phenomena has become instead an echo of an earlier pursuit of "best practice," involving less fundamental research than wisdom extracted…from successful managers and their stories.

One possible interpretation from Augier and March's conclusions is that—while production management, accounting, and finance may well be understood by a scientific approach that returns to the underlying disciplines—management domains rooted in social science may not be as amenable to that type of approach. Could it be that the method by which we have approached the study of these management domains has contributed to these differences in progress? Could it be that the approach of science is missing something? As stated by philosophy of science scholar Tim Lewens (2016: *xv-xvi*),

> The sciences look everywhere, but do they see everything? Will they eventually teach us all that is worth knowing? Or are there alternative forms of understanding that must be arrived at in other ways?...Philosophical questions such as these concern the reach of science, and they help us to understand how the sciences and arts make different kinds of contributions to human knowledge.

Could it be that, while accounting and finance can be captured with a scientific approach, behavioral domains of management are missing something with a similar approach?

In 1896, Professor Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University had a similar concern when he delivered an address as part of the university's sesquicentennial. In that address, he stated that

> We have not given science too big a place in our education, but we have made a perilous mistake in giving it too great a preponderance in method in every other branch of study.

He further clarified:

> No man more heartily admires, more gladly welcomes, more approvingly reckons the gain and the enlightenment that have come to the world through the extraordinary advances in physical science which this great age has witnessed….but I am much mistaken if the scientific spirit of the age is not doing us a great disservice….I have no indictment against what science has done….But [scientists'] work has been so stupendous that all other [scholars] of all other studies have been set staring at their methods, imitating their ways of thought ogling their results.

If we consider the conclusions of Augier and March (2011) in light of the concerns raised by Lewens (2016) and by Wilson (1896), one plausible explanation is that the behavioral domains of management cannot be captured adequately without considering the possibility that a non-trivial element of management involves a component that is beyond the reach of scientific understanding. Once recommendations from the 1959 foundation reports began to be implemented in US business schools, it did not take long for the voices of management scholars to begin to raise this issue. Simon (1967: 15): "Management is an art." Livingston (1971: 84): "management is a highly individualized art." Bailey and Ford (1996: 9): "The practice of management is best taught as craft." Mintzberg, 1996: 66): "Maybe we can recognize good management for what it is…certainly not a science…but a practice, a

craft." Similar observations have continued into the 21st century (e.g., Datar, Garvin, & Cullen, 2010: 79; Grint, 2000; Spender, 2007: 38; Spender, 2016; Witzel, 2017: 329).

In summary, voices have continued to raise the possibility that management cannot be understood sufficiently by viewing it exclusively from the perspective of science. Some of those voices (e.g., Mintzberg, 1996; Spender, 2007) are not even convinced that science captures the most critical elements of management. Perhaps another vantage point would be helpful.

Vantage Point of a Profession

When Joseph Wharton advocated for a university-based business school, his vision

> Drew upon the prestige of science, the professions, and the university itself in arguing that management could be conceived as a science and transformed into a profession on the model of the "high" professions of medicine, law, and divinity, which had all been part of the Western university from its medieval origins. (Khurana & Penrice, 2011: 31-32)

Perhaps the vantage point from which to view management more completely is to consider management as a *profession*[1]. Abbott (1988: 8) described professions as "exclusive occupational groups applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases." Others (e.g., Augier & March, 2011; Khurana, 2007) add another basic element which is that a profession serves the interest of the greater society in which it operates (e.g., as do the professions of medicine, law, and divinity).[2]

In the social constructivism perspective, professions are socially constructed realities that exist because stable social institutions emerge from individual and interactional levels which are externalized beyond the field (Berger & Luckman, 1966). In fact, any body of knowledge that is created at individual and interactional levels and transferred externally (i.e., formal education) creates a socially constructed reality of that field. Socialization into the rules, conventions and traditions of the field are also a necessary component of a socially constructed reality. However, the natural reality can differ from the socially constructed reality. For business schools and the management discipline specifically, emphasis on shareholder wealth achieved a "taken for granted" status as the goal of a firm even though it has been called into question at different points in time (e.g.. Enron crisis, real estate bubble of 2008).

The 1959 foundation reports recommended that business researchers return to the underlying disciplines of business (e.g., mathematics, statistics, psychology, economics) in order to advance the knowledge base of business. A professional is trained in underlying bases of knowledge (e.g., engineers trained in mathematics, physics, and chemistry). However, a professional *also* adds an element of judgment and insight that is abstract, often coming from practice and experience (Torstendahl, 1993). Possessing this store of uncodifiable, tacit knowledge is one central element of a profession (Abbott, 1988; Hughes, 1963; Jackson, 1970).

Pierson (1959: 313) admonished university-based business schools to draw from the underlying disciplines to develop a store of "widely applicable generalizations" that could be used by managers. Another key element in the definition of a profession is that professionals apply their unique blend of objective (e.g., mathematics) and abstract knowledge to specific cases (Abbott, 1988). Application to specific cases would seemingly only be possible when there are such widely applicable generalizations (cf. Bossard & Dewhurst, 1931; Brandeis, 1914; Grey, 2004). Therefore, again, the vantage point of a profession may be useful in viewing the domain of management.

Khurana (2007) recommends that, although he does not view management as a profession, it should aspire to be one. Khurana's reservation is that the attempt to inculcate a sense of a higher calling is a failed initiative—even though it was advocated by Joseph Wharton. He views this as one of the major failings of the current-day, university-based business school, and he views this as a key reason why society should question whether business schools are truly training professionals.

We assert that, in addition to this concern from Khurana, the emphasis on science as the Rosetta stone to unlock the mysteries of management has over-shadowed the role of the business school in training professionals. If indeed, there is an abstract element to the knowledge base of professionals, that element will not be accessed through an exclusive emphasis on science.

Management Faculty in the Business School

If we assume that science is the path to understanding management, then the appropriate business school faculty is composed of researchers trained in the scientific method. If we assume that we are training professionals and that a proportion of professional knowledge is abstract and uncodifiable, then we need a representation of professionals holding some of that abstract knowledge on our faculty. It is interesting to note that journalism schools and law schools count the number of entry-level faculty members who have practiced in the profession and the average years of experience in practice, especially at highly ranked schools (e.g., Newton, 2010). We have seen no evidence that business schools even consider such metrics worthy of capturing or reporting.

Why not? Such metrics are not critical if one assumes that science is the Rosetta stone to move understanding and knowledge forward. Therefore, under this assumption, faculty members trained in science are the party capable of discovery of knowledge that will move our understanding forward. In that regard, experience of having practiced the profession is less central to the discovery of knowledge or articulating what knowledge will be meaningful to trainees in the profession. Also, the socialization within an academic field for a science-based approach begins to reinforce itself through its own practices of education and of hiring and promoting.

A scientific approach de-emphasizes the role of uncodified professional knowledge. However, if a non-trivial proportion of the knowledge managers use falls under this category, the current business school model is not doing its full due diligence in capturing that proportion, dealing with it, educating trainees regarding its importance, or acknowledging its role in a manager's success or failure.[3]

Management is a field interested in increasing human performance in organizations and thus organization performance, however performance is defined. This is vastly different from physical science fields that search for the truths or laws of the physical word. Joan Ernst van Aken argues that management is a profession similar to medicine and engineering where the goal is to create solutions to field problems by practitioners (Huff, Tranfield, & van Aken, 2006).[4] Additionally, Tranfield also warns that the 1950s push to become recognized among other fields as more scientific makes management more fragmented. Fragmentation of fields may create the impression of a weaker field with limited common understanding. In this vein, Huff et al. (2006) argue that management is both a science (tested relationships in specific contexts) and an art (the social awareness, creativity, and intuition from past experiences).

However, we find Tushman's parallel to Stokes' (1997) two-by-two model of business school research on the dimensions of rigor and relevance (Walsh, Tushman, Kimberly, Starbuck, & Ashford, 2007) as most appropriate for describing the swings of the pendulum between relevance and rigor in management research. In this model, basic research to understand universal laws such as in physical sciences is high on rigor but low on relevance. Whereas, applied research is high on relevance, being grounded within the field, but does not adhere as meticulously to the scientific methods of discovery. However, use-inspired basic research is where Tushman sees business schools residing in a best-case scenario. In following Stokes' model, we also see this position changing how and what we teach to become more use-inspired to help with the uncodified components of the management profession. Use-inspired research—and by extension, teaching—is informed from generalized known relationships to help in contextually specific situations for application of those known relationships and the insight of how to adjust to the context.

Since the mid-20th century, the embracing of the scientific model of research dominated management research and hence influenced the teaching within the field. However, as Ghosal (2005) warns, the pendulum may have swung too far in that direction. Perhaps a correction is needed. Although there were calls for the pendulum to swing a little closer to relevance, the increasing demand for the MBA degree created an insulation for many business schools in the 2000 – 2020 timeframe. It seems that the need to become relevant to businesses was muted by the demand for the MBA and other advanced business degrees.

To better understand professions and our emphasis for management to embrace itself as a profession, we will look at two fields regarded as professions to illustrate the porous nature of what constitutes a profession. We initially look at one of the originally identified "high" professional fields—law. We

identify where this field adheres to the conditions of a profession and how it extends beyond a profession's minimal requirements for excellence in applied settings. We will also look at the field of architecture and how it embodies the characteristics of a profession. Finally, we argue that there are exemplars in each of these fields that go beyond meeting the baseline characteristics and set them apart due to their less codifiable skills.

The Model of Law

The model of law is a profession with a generally agreed upon set of parameters that enable it to continue as a recognized profession today. The body of knowledge that lawyers possess includes an abstract component, and it goes beyond the knowledge of the average layperson, The profession creates a societal good for dispute resolution in an orderly manner, and it is self-governing. The socialization within the profession as an identity is an essential hallmark (Anteby, Chan, & Dibenigno, 2016), and many lawyers define themselves more with their occupation than with any particular firm. Therefore, the American Bar Association (ABA) helps to create a social identity for lawyers where social identity is a sense of who a person is based on their group membership (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

The self-governing mechanism occurs through bar associations, purported to protect the public from misdeeds of its members. However, this self-governing mechanism came under intense scrutiny during the Savings and Loan failures of the 1980s when the government stepped in to sue professional firms (Fortney, 2012). However, the power of the legal profession enabled the creation of the Limited Liability Partnership which limits the liability of lawyers within firms and the acts of those under their direct supervision. Critics of business and management have voiced similar types of public concerns but without the benefit of a self-governing mechanism. Many bar reviews of offending lawyers have received criticism for the nature of the review process, and Fortney (2012) refers to the American Bar Association (ABA) as more of a trade group representing lawyers' interests than a professional group committed to client protection. Gordon further states that bar associations in addition to acting as the collective voice for the profession "…are primarily guilds whose aim is to protect and expand monopoly domains …" (2019: 187). Most review processes involve members of the same bar association and bias seems to be difficult to eliminate. The same can be said of medical review boards.

However, do these characteristics of the profession define and prepare lawyers to be effective and proficient in the practice of law? Are there other characteristics that are necessary to become one of the best lawyers in a given specialty area? How important are soft skills in lawyers being identified as top-rated lawyers in their specialty areas? It appears that soft skills, accompanied with the technical knowledge of the field are extremely important. Within workers compensation law, the soft skills of communication and teamwork with compensation boards are critical aspects that lead to success (Lenckus, 2009). The importance of soft skills in law increases with attempts to use artificial intelligence to replace many previously labor-intensive law firm functions. Such decision support systems can be beneficial, but the creativity to identify new ways of approaching an issue and the communication and teamwork skills necessary to implement such a solution is argued to exist only within lawyers (Pasquale, 2019). The importance of these soft skills beyond technical skills received considerable attention in the competency-based approach used in evaluating law firms (Lopes, 2016). However, Lopes (2016) criticizes the competency-based approach for undervaluing critical soft skills of relationships skills, people management, project management, adaptability, and structuring skills. This marriage of technical knowledge and soft skills for success in the practice of law is akin to the approach we propose for business schools.

The Model of Architecture

Many professional schools are built on the bedrock of science. Just as the 1959 foundation reports admonished business schools to go back to the underlying disciplines, other professional schools follow that same approach. Indeed, Simon (1997: 348-349) observed that

> Leading engineering schools…might almost better be described as schools of science than schools of engineering….Similarly, research in leading medical schools has in many ways closer connections with biology and biochemistry than with medical practice….In fact, the pure science emphasis in both strong engineering schools and strong medical schools created

serious concerns about whether the needs of the practicing professionals were being met.

Simon is concerned that a focus on the objective, underlying disciplines results in a question of whether the professional school is placing sufficient attention and research emphasis on the training of professions. This training would include dealing effectively with the uncodified abstract knowledge base that professionals develop and apply to specific cases. Similar concerns have been raised in other professional schools. For example, Langbein (1996: 3) concludes that "The modern American law school now styles itself as a center of scholarship, at which the demands of professional training have been subordinated."

We do not intend to say that the focus on underlying objective disciplines is inappropriate or misguided. We *do intend* to say that, for dimensions of management that are rooted in social science, such an approach is incomplete. A richer understanding of the domain of management would be created if business schools went beyond simply tolerating around the edges the possibility that management encompasses a dimension of uncodifiable abstract knowledge. A different scenario would be to acknowledge and emphasize that dimension of management.

Again, seeing management as a profession is one vantage point from which to accomplish such a shift in emphasis. However, some professions might be more appropriate models than others. We recommend considering the model of architecture.

Architecture not only tolerates the non-scientific element of the profession. *It celebrates that dimension.* Using guild system terminology, a "journeyman" architect can design track houses for suburban sub-divisions. However, the profession celebrates the creative, artistic side of what separates journeyman architects from "masters." Certainly, architectural landmarks such as Joseph Strauss's Golden Gate Bridge, Christopher Wren's Saint Paul's Cathedral, or Antoni Gaudí's La Sagrada Familia required considerable understanding of mathematics and physics. But the artistic element of how each architect combined form and function is what sets each landmark apart.

One of the earliest writers on the topic of architecture was the first century BC Roman architect, Vitruvius. He (translated by Rowland, Howe, & Dewar, 1999) held that a building could be judged based on three qualities—stability, utility, and beauty. The first two of these draw from the objective underlying scientific disciplines; however, the third quality—beauty—clearly draws from something more abstract. To excel in incorporating all three qualities in their work, Vitruvius recommended that architects needed to master a broad span of knowledge bases including drawing, geometry, lighting, history, philosophy, music, theatre, law, and medicine. Indeed, some current-day architects assert that the true master architect aspires to integrate and apply all of these knowledge bases simultaneously. This broad list which covers both science and arts suggests that the tradition of architecture celebrating an abstract, non-scientific component goes back for at least 2000 years.

What Might Be Possible?

What might a historical retrospective of university-based business schools look like 65 years from now (the distance in time we currently stand from the 1959 foundation reports) if business schools celebrated craft rather than tolerating it around the edges in favor of a singular focus on the Rosetta stone of science? We suggest two characteristics that could materialize.

First, a common format of learning a profession (e.g., medicine) has been to learn the objective underlying disciplines through some degree of classroom engagement and then to practice the profession under the watchful eye of a "master" currently practicing in the profession. Such a process inculcates the importance of the abstract, uncodified knowledge base that exists in a profession (cf. Bosk, 1979). Although such a concept is not foreign to university-based business schools (e.g., internships), it has not been incorporated as a necessity for all students nor has it widely been integrated and reiterated throughout the educational experience.

How uncodifiable knowledge can be taught is a common question. The answer to this question is that that knowledge must be experienced with guidance from the field and a mentor for retention. Think of the soft skills that business schools constantly hear are lacking in our graduates from surveys of employers (McGowan, 2019; Strauss, 2016, Wilkie, 2019). These soft skills include critical thinking,

problem solving, leadership and communication skills, and they are not created from only "knowing" the content of these skills. It is in the "doing" of these skills that one develops a similar skill base (Walsh et al., 2007). However, doing these skills with no knowledge of various approaches and theories with little guidance and limited time for reflection is not the best model to develop these skills. Guidance from experienced mentors who understand the content of these skills as well as possess the objectivity to guide students through reflection to recognize best approaches and missteps is critical to developing these skills and leverages the "knowing" of the phenomenon and the experience of "doing" to create these highly demanded soft skills. Therefore, business schools and the field of management must move to a model that incorporates more use-inspired opportunities for students to test and build these skills.

Engineering schools have long promoted internship programs. Evidence from people entering the job market over the past decade (Fuhrmans & Ellis, 2024) indicates that—across many college majors—students who have completed an internship are dramatically less likely to be underemployed. This effect is specifically present for business majors.

Education schools have moved toward such a model. A typical undergraduate student studying elementary education in the United States in 1970 often had only one clinical experience ("student teaching"), and it occurred in the last semester of study. Today, many schools of education get aspiring elementary school teachers into the classroom for clinical experiences throughout their four-year program of study, including their very first semester (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2010; University of Georgia College of Education, 2024).

An example comes from Meredith (personal communication, 2023), a first-year elementary school teacher in Dallas, Texas. She explains that, although she was a first-year teacher, she was not fazed at all when a student became emotional and began to throw furniture in the classroom. In her clinical experiences, she had seen an emotional student throwing furniture, and saw how a seasoned professional teacher responded. Such an immersion in the actual work of the discipline not only imparts the knowledge unlikely to have been codified in a textbook or classroom format, but also increases the confidence in the trainee's ability to apply that abstract knowledge and to operate effectively in the profession.

Second, a clear delineation could be recognized between the objective knowledge—often rooted in the underlying disciplines—and the craft of the profession. When I (first author) was an aspiring musician in the 1970s, many music school students disliked the tedious task of learning to write counterpoint in music theory class. Counterpoint has onerous rules that must be learned in order to write it properly. However, once one understands the rules and why they exist, then one has the creative license to push the boundaries of what is acceptable in one's own craft by merely understanding the conventions and rules. The creative element is only permitted once one understands the rules and their application. Unlike many students, my roommate, Randy, enjoyed writing counterpoint and sometimes did so solely for the creative enjoyment.

Just like the celebrated architects Wren and Gaudí, Randy is the example of the person who has successfully moved from the "science" of his profession to incorporating the "craft" of his profession. Because he has mastered the objective knowledge, he has the license to go beyond science and put his unique "stamp" on his craft. Wren and Gaudí only are able to move to the creative level of masters in the profession if they can first demonstrate mastery of the prerequisite underlying scientific foundations. Perhaps university-based business schools could delineate more explicitly that *once professional trainees learn the objective knowledge base*, they have the "license" to put their unique "stamp" on their craft.

Conclusion

While we agree with Khurana (2007) that university-based business schools are not truly professional schools in every sense of the term "profession," we also agree that they should aspire to be professional schools and to see their mission as more centrally including the task of training professionals. A profession has an element (among others) of abstract, uncodified knowledge (Abbott, 1988). A purely scientific approach to a domain that includes such knowledge cannot unlock all relevant knowledge (cf.

Wilson, 1896). Following the lead of architecture, if the business school would celebrate the craft and art of management rather than marginalize it, we would be in a better position to train professionals. Additionally, clinical experiences that expose trainees to the application of their craft will increase their ability to operate within the profession and their confidence in that ability.

Sixty-five years ago, when university-based business schools responded to the 1959 foundation reports by moving toward more of an emphasis on scientific discovery, that was a very appropriate and beneficial move. In the coming 65 years, we have the opportunity to employ the next logical step in our aspiration to become a profession: recognizing, incorporating, and celebrating the art and craft of a profession.

Notes

[1] A *Harvard Business Review* article (Worsham & Jena, 2019), written by two medical doctors about the medical profession (i.e., without an explicit word about how it might be relevant to business) describes how medical doctors should be applying abstract, tacit knowledge to particular cases rather than purely applying broad scientific principles. Apparently, the *Harvard Business Review* editors would agree with our assertion that viewing business through the lens of a profession has merit.

[2] There have been repeated voices in the past century who assert that business is not a profession (e.g., Ayres, 1925; Barker, 2010; Flexner, 1930/1967; Goodall, 2011; Grey, 2004; Mayer, 1925). One of the primary concerns raised is that business does not have exclusive jurisdiction over the application of a specific and identifiable body of knowledge (e.g., as do attorneys or dentists). These voices are prone to seeing the designation of being a "profession" as dichotomous. Abbott (1988) views the quality of being a profession as continuous. Some occupational domains meet certain criteria more exactly than others. Also, some occupations that society views as professions do not meet all criteria (e.g., nursing does not have exclusive jurisdiction over its knowledge domain) while some occupations that society does not view as a "profession" (e.g. automobile mechanics) meet many of the criteria. Therefore, we accept Abbott's position that the degree to which an occupational domain meets the criteria of being a profession can be discussed meaningfully as a continuous characteristic.

[3] We do not intend to say that business schools are oblivious to the role of uncodified knowledge or to the need to engage with successful businesspeople in order to draw from their store of unique knowledge. For example, featured speakers, executives in residence, and other roles for businesspeople are quite common in 21st century university-based business schools. However, one only has to look at the criteria of faculty members' success, status, tenure standing, and salaries in business schools to see that all four are linked directly to performance in the discovery of knowledge as defined by an empirical, scientific value system. Dealing with abstract, uncodifiable knowledge seems quite inconsistent with the typical scientific criteria for success—not unlike the same challenge in medical schools or many other professional schools. With a reward system that values something else, *sufficient due diligence* in dealing with uncodified professional knowledge will be a challenge.

[4] The Huff, Tranfield, and van Aken (2006) article is published in a "Dialog" format, in which each specific contribution to the "dialog" is specifically attributed and identified to one of the individual co-authors.

References

Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Anteby, M., Chan, C. K., & Dibenigno, J. (2016). Three lenses on occupations and professions in organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *10*(1), 183-244.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 20-39.

Augier, M., & March, J. G. (2011). *The roots, rituals, and rhetorics of change: North American business schools after the Second World War*. Stanford: Stanford Business Books.

Ayres, C. E. (1925, February 4). The college of money changing: II. Is business a profession? *The New*

Republic, *41*, 280-283.

Bailey, J., & Ford, C. (1996). Management as science versus management as practice in postgraduate business education. *Business Strategy Review*, *7*(4), 7-12.

Barker, R. (2010, July-August). No, management is not a profession. *Harvard Business Review*, *88*, 52-60.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor, Doubleday.

Bosk, C. L. (1979). *Forgive and remember: Managing medical failure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bossard, J. H., & Dewhurst, J. F. (1931). *University education for business: A study of existing needs and practices*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brandeis, L. D. (1914). *Business—a profession*. Boston: Small, Maynard, & Company.

Camp, M. (2012). The J-school debate: Is the timing finally right for university journalism programs and the rest of the university community to work together? *The Journal of General Education*, *61*(3), 240-263.

Daniel, C. A. (1998). *MBA: The first century*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Constructing 21st century teacher education. In V. Hill-Jackson, & C. W. Lewis (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong with teacher training and how we can fix it*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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

Flexner, A. (1930/1967). *Universities: American, English, German*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Fortney, S. S. (2012). Law as a profession: Examining the role of accountability. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, *XL*, 177-209.

Fuhrmans, V., & Ellis, L. (2024). Half of college grads are working in jobs that don't use their degrees. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from https://www.wsj.com/lifestyle/careers/college-degree-jobs-unused-440b2abd

Ghosal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *4*(1), 75-91.

Goodall, A. H. (2011). Experts versus managers: A case against professionalizing management education. In W. Amann et al. (Eds.), *Business schools under fire: Humanistic management education as the way forward* (pp. 122-129). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gordon, R. A., & Howell, J. H. (1959). *Higher education for business*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gordon, R. W. (2019). Lawyer, the legal profession & access to justice in the United States: A brief history. *Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, *148*(1), 177-189.

Grey, C. (2004). Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *3*(2), 178-186.

Grint, K. (2000). *The arts of leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huff, A., Tranfield, D., & van Aken, J. E. (2005). Management as a design science mindful of art and surprise, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *15*(4), 413-424.

Hughes, E. C. (1963). Professions. *Daedalus*, *92*(4), 655-668.

Innis, H. A. (1944). A plea for the university tradition. *The Dalhousie Review*, *24*(3), 298-305.

Jackson, J. A. (1970). Professions and professionalism—editorial introduction. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.), *Professions and professionalization* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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: Princeton University Press.

Khurana, R., & Penrice, D. (2011). Business education: The American trajectory. In M. Morsing, & A. S. Rovira (Eds.), *Business schools and their contribution to society* (pp. 3-15). Los Angeles: Sage.

Langbein, J. H. (1996). Scholarly and professional objectives in legal education: American trends and English comparisons. In P. B. H. Birks (Ed.), *Pressing problems in the law, Volume 2: What are law schools for*? Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lenckus, D. (2009). How employers should choose lawyers to defend comp claims. *Business Insurance*, *43*(29), 12.

Lewens, T. (2016). *The meaning of science: An introduction to the philosophy of science*. New York: Basic Books.

Livingston, J. S. (1971, January-February). Myth of the well-educated manager. *Harvard Business Review*, *49*, 79-89.

Lopes, S. (2016). High performers are not superheroes: bridging exclusive and inclusive talent management approaches for law firm sustainability. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, *23*(2), 207-231.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Mayer, J. (1925). Modern business education and research. *The Scientific Monthly*, *20*(3), 257-269.

McGowan, H. (2019). The workforce is calling, higher education, will you answer? *Forbes*. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/heathermcgowan/2019/09/10/the-workforce-is-calling-higher-education-will-you-answer/#b1d8cb96f6f3

Mintzberg, H. (1996, July-August). Musings on management: Ten ideas designed to rile everyone who cares about management. *Harvard Business Review*, *74*, 61-67.

Newton, B. E. (2010). Preaching what they don't practice: Why law school faculties' preoccupations with impractical scholarship and devaluation of practical competencies obstruct reform in the legal academy. *South Carolina Law Review*, *62*, 105-156.

Pasquale, F. (2019). A rule of persons not machines: The limits of legal automation. *The George Washington Law Review*, *87*(1), 1-55.

Pierson, F. C. (1959). *The education of American businessmen: A study of university-college programs in business administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pulitzer, J. (1904). The college of journalism. *North American Review*, *178*(570), 641-680.

Simon, H. A. (1967). The business school: A problem in organizational design. *Journal of Management Studies*, *4*(1), 1-16.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Spender, J. C. (2007). Management as a regulated profession: An essay. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *16*(1), 32-42.

Spender, J. C. (2016, February 23). How management education's past shapes it present. *BizEd*. Retrieved from http://www.bizedmagazine.com/archives/2016/2/features/how-management-education-past-shapes-present

Stokes, D. E. (1997). *Pasteur's quadrant: Basic science and technological innovation*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Strauss, K. (2016). These are the skills bosses say new college grads do not have. *Forbes.com*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/karstenstrauss/2016/05/17/these-are-the-skills-bosses-say-new-college-grads-do-not-have/

Torstendahl, R. (1993). The transformation of professional education in the nineteenth century. In S. Rothblatt, & B. Wittrock (Eds.), *The European and American university since 1800* (pp. 109-141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

University of Georgia College of Education. (2024). *Placements, student teaching, and clinical practice*. https://coe.uga.edu/academics/placements-student-teaching-clinical-practice/

Veblen, T. (1918). *The higher learning in America*. New York: Huebsch.

Vitruvius (1999). *De architectura* (Translated by Rowland, I.D., Howe, T. N., and Dewar, M.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, J. P., Tushman, M. L., Kimberly, J. R., Starbuck, B., & Ashford, S. (2007). On the relationship between research and practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *16*(2), 128-154.

Wilkie, D. (2019). Employers say students aren't learning soft skills in college. *Society of Human Resource Professionals*. Retrieved from http://www.shrm.org/ResourcesandTools/hr-topics/employee-relations/Pages/Students-Arent-Learning-Soft-Skills

Wilson, W. (1896, October 21). *Princeton in the Nation's Service: A Commemorative Address*. http://libwebprod.princeton.edu/mudd-exhibits/wilsonline//indn8nsvc.html

Witzel, M. (2017). *A history of management thought* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Worsham, C., & Jena, A. B. (2019, January 30). The art of evidence-based medicine. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2019/01/the-art-of-evidence-based-medicine