



Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

## **Navigating the Wave of Leadership in Learning Organizations**

Dr. Muhammad Irshad (Corresponding Author)  
Department of Management Sciences University of Chitral  
Email: [mikhaans@gmail.com](mailto:mikhaans@gmail.com)

Dr. Ateeq Ahmad Tariq  
Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Chitral  
Email: [draatariq@uoch.edu.pk](mailto:draatariq@uoch.edu.pk)

Dr. Bilal Ahmed Chishty  
Assistant Professor, Hands Institute of Development Studies, Karachi  
Email: [analyst.chishty@gmail.com](mailto:analyst.chishty@gmail.com)

Dr. Saif Ul Mujhaid Shah  
Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Chitral  
Email: [mujahid.shah@uoch.edu.pk](mailto:mujahid.shah@uoch.edu.pk)

### **Abstract**

This descriptive research study was conducted to examine the prevailing phenomena of leadership coupled with managerial curriculum approach in learning organizations in order to identify the opportunities and highlight the challenges in today fast growing business scenario. This research study is based on comprehensive examination of available literature. A systematic literature review was conducted to trace the conceptual evolution of learning organizations. For this purpose established criteria only to include English version published research work from online databases of Web of Science, Scopus, Science Direct, Ebsco, and Google Scholar on the question in hand. Seminal works emphasizing continuous learning and transformation were highlighted, and the progression of managerial education was analyzed, from its early focus on ethics and soft skills to its current emphasis on sustainability, digital literacy, and experiential learning. Our research reveals the challenges in balancing foundational knowledge with emerging competencies in curriculum design. Latent hostility is evident in maintaining its relevance in rapidly changing and globally interconnected environments. Notable limitations include trade-offs in innovation and the need to cater to demographically diverse groups of students. This review uniquely synthesizes developments at the intersection of leadership development, organizational learning, and curriculum design, offering valuable insights such as agility, adaptability, sustainability, and continuous learning for institutions that nurture talent in modern learning organizations.

Keywords: Leadership Development, Learning Organizations, Managerial Curriculum

### **Introduction**

The contemporary world business environment is characterized by continuous transformation, relentless technological innovations, rapidly changing consumer



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

expectations, and global interconnectedness (Candelon et al., 2021; Harsch & Festing, 2020; Troise et al., 2022; Asfahani, 2024). Organizational agility, adaptability, and commitment to continuous learning are indispensable to success (Miceli et al., 2021; Varmus et al. 2022). The concept of learning organizations, pioneered by scholars such as Senge (1990), emerged in response to these imperatives, emphasizing enterprises in which people perpetually enhance their capabilities to achieve the desired outcomes.

As the discourse on learning organizations progressed in tandem with shifts in the socioeconomic landscape, nurturing talent adept at navigating complexity assumed new importance and relevance for business success (Al Aina & Atan, 2020). This spotlight on human capital also necessitates an evolution in management education and training, leading to innovative curricular design (Li, 2022). Likewise, consumer preferences and expectations are evolving rapidly, especially among younger consumers (Dsouza & Sharma, 2021). Owing to multiple social media platforms and increased global interconnectivity, consumers are more informed, demanding, and less loyal to traditional brands (Wichmann et al., 2022).

Consequently, organizations of all types and sizes must continuously learn about changing consumer behavior and be ready to pivot their products, services, and marketing accordingly (Anderson et al., 2022). In response to these trends, organizational agility, adaptability, and commitment to continuous learning are essential for success (Cheng et al., 2022; Miceli et al., 2021). The concept of learning organizations emerged in response to these imperatives. Pioneered by academics such as Peter Senge (1990), learning organizations emphasize developing an enterprise in which people perpetually enhance their capabilities to innovate, solve problems, and achieve collective outcomes. Learning organizations promote continuous knowledge sharing, training, and upskilling among employees to ingrain lifelong learning into the fabric of the organization (Naqshbandi et al., 2023) creating a workforce capable of adapting to an ever-evolving business landscape. For companies hoping to thrive amidst constant change, becoming a learning organization is mission-critical (Robinson, 2020).

However, research shows that balancing foundational knowledge with emerging competencies challenges curriculum design (ElSayary, 2021; Jamali, 2005; Shill et al., 2023). Moreover, maintaining relevance amidst rapidly evolving, globally interconnected business environments introduces countless novel managerial challenges as misalignment persists between academic offerings and industry needs (Alexander et al., 2020; Al-Jamali, 2021; Ingstrup et al., 2021; Kayyali, 2024). In addition, catering to diverse global student cohorts requires an inclusive, culturally responsive curriculum (Ahmad et al., 2023; Safari et al., 2024; Thind & Yakavenka, 2023).

To develop an improved understanding of the dynamics involved, this research study aims to synthesize the key developments in learning organizations and managerial education. This study explores leadership and design of managerial curricula within learning organizations. Previous research study adopted a narrative approach to synthesize research on the evolution of learning organizations, early managerial education, contemporary curriculum components, pedagogical approaches, challenges/criticisms, and future directions (Asfahani, 2024). However, this research study employed a systematic



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

literature approach to highlight the conceptual evolution of learning organizations, managerial curricula, surface key debates, in order to answer the formulated research question. The study also identified the literature gaps that shape the trajectory of future research. In sum, the analysis provides crucial insights for institutions seeking to develop the top-notch caliber of leadership necessary to steer modern learning organizations.

### **Significance of this systematic literature reviews**

The systematic review is generally conduct to organize and interpret the existing research studies on the topic in order to comprehend and advanced the knowledge. Accordingly, this systematic review has multifaceted benefits such as the **summarized the existing literature on the topic, answered the formulated question based on existence literature and help the readers to grasp the prevailing state of understanding. Further, synthesizing the information** multiple research findings further explore different theoretical perspectives/approaches and offer insights into prevailing trends, inconsistency in results, research gaps and recommendation for further research(s).

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the prevailing state of leaders in learning organizations?
2. What is the prevailing design of managerial curriculum?
3. What are the challenges and opportunities in a swiftly changing global business environment?

### **Research Methodology**

In conducting this literature review, the researchers adopted a systematic review approach, distinguished by its selection of research topic, formulated research question and defining search criteria. Compared to narrative method that relies on less structured means to collate and interpret the literature (Rother, 2007) and a meta-analysis is incorporated to enable the statistical aggregation of data (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009) the systematic literature reviews are better suited for investigating a singular aspect or providing answers to more precise and targeted inquiries. In addition to above, this systematic literature reviews offers readers more expansive insight into the current understanding of a particular research topic and complex characteristics of leadership, learning organizations and managerial curricula the review also generate new research questions, identifying future research directions.

With this prospective the researcher established to include the published research work from online databases of Web of Science, Scopus, Science Direct, Ebsco, and Google Scholar. Further, we also include the leading journals related to the topic such as Learning Organization, Human Resource Development Review, Management Learning, Academy of Management Learning & Education, and Journal of Management Education. The including/excluding criteria also comprised to include only English version published work on keywords “learning organizational,” “managerial curriculum,” “leadership,” “key components,” “organizational development,” and “leadership development”.

### **Historical Perspective**



## ***Evolution of Learning Organizations***

The concept of a learning organization gained prominence in the 1990s, with foundational definitions provided by influential writers, such as Pedler et al. (1991) and Senge (1990). Pedler et al. (1991) defined a learning organization as one that facilitates the learning of all its members and continuously transforms itself. On the other hand, Senge (1990) emphasized the importance of systems thinking and posited that a learning organization is one in which people continually expand their capacity to create results that they truly desire. Building on these foundational insights, Sun (2003) emphasized the role of learning organizations in enhancing adaptability and competitiveness in dynamic environments. Gorelick (2005) further expanded the concept, underscoring the pivotal role of knowledge management in nurturing these organizations and defining it as the deliberate and systematic coordination of an organization's people, technology, processes, and organizational structure to add business value through reuse and innovation. King (2001) introduced a nuanced perspective as the discourse evolved, emphasizing "learning partnerships" as collaborative efforts where organizations work together to share and create knowledge. Sicilia and Lytras (2005) ventured into the technological realm, introducing "knowledge assets" as structured data representing valuable information. However, Grieves (2008) approached the concept skeptically, suggesting that learning organization had become a buzzword without a clear, universally accepted definition. Collectively, these scholarly engagements trace the intricate evolution of the learning organization concept, underscoring its enduring relevance and imperative for continuous academic scrutiny.

Building on this historical context, the intellectual landscape of learning organizations, informed by a succession of seminal works, began with Karl Weick's (1969) foundational exposition on human-centered sensemaking in organizational complexities. This foundation is intertwined with the insights of Argyris and Schon (1978), who unveiled the mechanisms of single-loop and double-loop learning yet faced critiques for occasionally overlooking broader system intricacies. Paralleling their focus, Schein (1985) underscored the centrality of organizational culture in learning, suggesting paradigm shifts as a requisite. Five years later, Senge (1990) elucidated and introduced a holistic perspective encapsulating five critical disciplines that characterize a learning organization: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) delineated tacit and explicit knowledge to refine our understanding of knowledge flows as the field matures.

While the academic development of this concept offers profound insights, it represents only one facet of a broader narrative. The confluence of external factors profoundly influences the evolution of learning organizations, each playing a pivotal role in shaping their trajectory. As Suravi (2023) highlighted, socioeconomic shifts have underscored the need for agility in the face of intensified global competition, pushing organizations towards continuous learning. Concurrently, technological advancements, emphasized by Mishra and Bharti (2023), have democratized knowledge access through digital tools, fostering collaborative learning and amplifying the competitive landscape. This technological surge, intertwined with socioeconomic dynamics, has been bolstered by political and regulatory frameworks. As Hoe (2021) points out,



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

governmental initiatives promoting workforce development indirectly reinforce the growth of learning organizations, emphasizing the importance of upskilling amid rapid technological changes. The confluence of these factors has intensified global competition and underscored the importance of continuous learning, as proposed by Tryding (2022). Thus, the intricate interplay of socioeconomic, technological, and political factors creates a unique landscape, making the adoption of a learning-centric approach not only beneficial but also essential for organizations navigating this multifaceted global environment.

With the evolution of the concept and its established external influences, understanding the impacts and outcomes of learning organizations is paramount in today's rapidly changing business environment. As organizations strive to remain competitive, adopting an organizational learning approach has become a focal point for many researchers and practitioners. Ju et al. (2021) emphasized the role of learning organizations in fostering a culture of continuous improvement, which directly influences performance outcomes. Furthermore, regarding adaptability, Sheng et al. (2021) posited that learning organizations, through their emphasis on shared vision and team learning, are better equipped to adapt to external changes, a sentiment further exemplified by Gouédard et al. (2023). On the innovation front, Chughtai et al. (2023) provided empirical evidence suggesting that learning organizations are more innovative, particularly in knowledge management. Beyond these core benefits, Ostrovska et al. (2021) highlighted improved employee satisfaction and enhanced leadership capabilities as notable outcomes of learning organizations. The overwhelming consensus in the literature suggests that, when implemented effectively, learning organizations can drive significant positive outcomes for both individuals and broader organizations.

### ***Early Managerial Curriculum***

Understanding the foundational elements of early managerial curricula is crucial for tracing the evolution of management education and its relevance to today's dynamic business environment. Historically, business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and sustainability have been central to early managerial education, equipping managers with the moral compass required in the complex business world (Fornes et al., 2019). Alongside these subjects, there was a pronounced emphasis on soft skills, particularly communication, negotiation, and critical thinking, which were deemed indispensable for effective leadership and decision-making (Perry & Euler, 1985; Werner et al., 2022). Regarding pedagogical methods, a blend of lectures, case studies, and experiential learning dominates the scene. For instance, the case study method provides students with tangible business scenarios for analysis, fostering a practical approach to theoretical concepts (Ritchie & Yen, 2013) that emphasizes experiential learning, which also encompasses project-based learning, and is driven by the need for hands-on experience in the business realm (Chinowsky et al., 2006). The inclination towards certain subjects and methodologies was not arbitrary but was influenced by the corporate world's demands and pedagogical advancements. For instance, the focus on ethics will likely respond to increasing corporate scrutiny and the call for responsible business operations (Fornes et al., 2019). With its blend of core subjects and diverse methodologies, the early managerial



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

curriculum laid a robust foundation that continued to evolve, reflecting the ever-changing business world landscape.

The evolution of managerial education has been marked by various pedagogical shifts, each with unique strengths and challenges. Central to this evolution is the traditional managerial curriculum, which, as highlighted by Jung et al. (2023), has been lauded for its emphasis on foundational knowledge, equipping students with core management principles essential for navigating complex business environments. Lincoln (2006) posited that this structured approach ensures the impartation of essential managerial concepts. Furthermore, Hay et al. (2004) accentuated the curriculum's focus on analytical subjects such as accounting and logistics, underscoring the acquisition of complex skills indispensable in the business landscape. The emphasis on technical proficiency is based only on empirical backing. For instance, Rueda et al. (2017) found that traditional educational technologies significantly enhance student engagement and improve learning outcomes. Delving deeper into the reasons behind the effectiveness of traditional curricula, it becomes evident that historical economic climates require managers with robust analytical and technical skills. Traditional approaches aptly meet this need. However, Kuechler and Stedham (2018) noted that modern managerial education has evolved by integrating holistic practices such as mindfulness to foster transformational learning. However, despite these modern integrations, the foundational strengths of traditional curricula and challenging skill acquisition remain relevant in today's dynamic business world.

The evolution of management education has been punctuated by significant shifts, with traditional managerial curricula often criticized for their rigidity and overemphasis on theory, leading to a disconnect between academic teaching and real-world business challenges (Teece & Winter, 1984). This theoretical bias, coupled with a failure to instill ethical values, has resulted in managers needing more moral responsibility, further exacerbating their adaptability issues in contemporary business environments (Ghoshal, 2005; Learmonth, 2007). Such challenges underscore the feedback of industry leaders, emphasizing the need for graduates capable of pragmatic application in diverse settings (Elmuti, 2004). Furthermore, the rapid pace of technological advancements and the globalization of business has paced the adaptability of traditional curricula, a limitation that becomes even more pronounced with the rise of learning organizations prioritizing continuous learning and adaptability (Jamali, 2005; Taylor, 2013). Consequently, as the business landscape evolves, the pressing need for a more adaptive and holistic approach to management education becomes increasingly evident.

The dynamic nature of the business environment, underscored by various shortcomings in traditional pedagogies, has necessitated continuous reforms in the managerial curriculum (Hasse 2022). As globalization, technological advancements, and changing organizational needs began to reshape the business landscape, the curriculum responded by integrating international perspectives and emphasizing the importance of preparing students for a globalized business environment (van der Colff, 2004). Simultaneously, a push towards a more holistic approach emerged, emphasizing the integration of both hard and soft skills and recognizing the imperative need for ethical considerations in the wake of corporate scandals (Clinebell & Clinebell, 2008). As the digital age progressed,



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

the curriculum evolved to emphasize e-learning and technology-driven pedagogies, although not without challenges related to the rapid pace of technological advancements (Nonet et al., 2016). A significant shift towards competencies over mere knowledge acquisition emerged, emphasizing skills and attitudes to navigate the complexities of the modern business world (Bratianu et al., 2020). However, the most profound catalyst for transformation in recent times has been the COVID-19 pandemic, which has accelerated online learning, emphasized resilience and adaptability, and fostered an entrepreneurial mindset (Mahajan et al., 2023). While these reforms have largely been positively received, they have also faced criticism, particularly concerning the potential dilution of academic rigor and the challenges of effectively integrating technology (Krishnamurthy, 2020). In essence, the evolution of managerial curricula reflects a continuous quest for relevance, adapting to the changing needs of the business world and incorporating feedback from various stakeholders to produce graduates equipped for modern organizational challenges.

### **Critical Components of Current Managerial Curriculum**

#### ***Modern Curriculum Emphases***

Understanding managerial curricula in learning organizations is crucial for success in today's complex business environment. The shift from traditional paradigms, which mainly focus on hard skills, to a broader approach emphasizing soft skills and personal competencies is evident in modern managerial curricula.

As the educational landscape shifts, there is a marked shift from a purely technical focus to a broader emphasis on soft skills and personal competencies. Varela (2020) contends that these skills bridge the interpersonal and intrapersonal realms, enriching technical task execution. However, Magano et al. (2021) highlight a growing gap between graduate proficiencies and organizational needs, underscoring the increasing demand for experiential and versatile skills. Therefore, soft personal skills are essential. As underscored by Cyphert (2021), effective communication transmits strategy and vision, fosters understanding, and strengthens organizational relationships.

Similarly, as depicted by Gutu et al. (2023), leadership transcends mere authority, emphasizing the importance of inspiring teams and steering organizational success. Moreover, the significance of collaboration is evident in today's interconnected business environment with the rise of cross-functional teams, as highlighted by Witherspoon (2022). Critical thinking has become paramount for managers who must discern facts amid overwhelming information, a perspective shared by (Calma & Davies, 2021). Furthermore, according to Karanja and Malone (2022), cultural awareness plays a pivotal role in international operations, inclusivity, and diverse decision-making. As Malarski and Berte (2023) noted, emotional intelligence encompasses recognizing and interpreting emotions, impacting team dynamics and overall organizational health.

Contemporary curricula underscore technological adaptability and reflect both external events and generational tendencies. The rapid integration of technology into education accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, as detailed by Imran et al. (2023) and Ratten (2023), necessitated transitions from traditional pedagogies



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

to blended and online modalities. This adaptability aligns with the inherent traits of newer generations, notably Generation Z, distinguished by their technological proficiency and ability to efficiently innovate and multitask (Magano et al., 2021). Beyond foundational digital literacy, the evolving digital age mandates proficiency in advanced digital paradigms. Key concepts include the Metaverse and Industry of the Future (IoF) emphasized by Akella (2021) and Love et al. (2022). Gitelman et al. (2019) illuminate how advanced technological integration, epitomized by IoF, reshapes sectors such as manufacturing. Concurrently, Metaverse, introduced by AbuKhoussa et al. (2023), embodies the fusion of virtual and tangible realms, suggesting pivotal shifts in managerial roles and business methodologies. For contemporary managers, adept navigation of emergent digital terrains such as Metaverse is indispensable.

Management education is deeply rooted in ethics, integrity, and corporate responsibility (CSR). Jaganjac et al. (2023) delineated thematic evolution in business ethics education, highlighting the progression from a narrow focus on ethics to a broader lens on sustainability concerns. This shift, in fact, aptly captures the nuanced challenges faced by today's global businesses, including but not limited to climate change and social inequities. Building on this, Greenland et al. (2022) contributed to their empirically derived five-pillar sustainability model, further solidifying the importance of corporate sustainability. Given the heightened globalization and public scrutiny, there has been an intensified call for corporate responsibility. Sison and Redín (2023) argue that the onus of ethics, integrity, and corporate responsibility is not merely about adhering to legalities. Instead, it encourages enterprises to instigate positive societal transformations through sustainable actions. On a parallel note, AbuKhoussa et al. (2023) assert that integrity, beyond its conventional understanding, forms the cornerstone of organizational trust, necessitating an unwavering commitment to ethical behavior. Managers play a crucial role in nurturing a culture anchored by honesty. Sison and Redín (2023) highlighted the significance of a business's moral compass, particularly when navigating the intricate maze of ethical dilemmas.

The intersection of innovative learning and knowledge management has become prominent in dissecting modern managerial education. Bratianu et al. (2021) underscore the essence of knowledge management: strategic capture and utilization of organizational wisdom, ensuring institutional continuity and fostering a culture of continual learning. Instead of rote memorization, the pedagogical shift towards competency foregrounds acquiring tangible managerial skills. Gitelman et al. (2019) introduced proactive management tenets and advocated foresight-driven strategies to improve resilience and nimbleness. Zabiegalski and Marquardt (2022) brought to the fore the paradigm of ambidextrous organizations, an optimal blend of leveraging extant capabilities while remaining open to innovative ventures.

### ***Modern Teaching Methodologies and Pedagogies***

The evolving landscape of management education highlights the critical role of innovative teaching methodologies and pedagogies in shaping tomorrow's business leadership. As global business dynamics shift, a curriculum that effectively imparts essential skills and knowledge becomes paramount (Larsson





## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

et al., 2022). The success of a managerial curriculum is deeply connected to the teaching methodologies and pedagogies employed, with a growing body of literature emphasizing their significance (Ng et al., 2023).

Blended learning is a pedagogical approach that combines traditional face-to-face and online learning methods. This method offers flexibility, catering to various learning needs and fostering student autonomy (Soncin et al., 2022). It harmoniously integrates synchronous and asynchronous learning and balances instructor-led sessions with self-paced learning (Ngoasong, 2022). However, blended learning presents advantages such as cost efficiency and increased student satisfaction (Truss & Anderson, 2023), it also faces challenges such as limited access to technology in specific contexts and significant curriculum adaptation (Ngoasong, 2022).

While blended learning combines traditional and online methods, other pedagogical approaches, such as experiential learning, focus on immersive real-world experiences. Experiential Learning, as advocated by Kumar and Bhandarker (2020) and further emphasized by Maheshkar and Sonwalkar (2023), underscores the principle of "Learning by Doing'." This pedagogy offers a simulated environment that enhances critical thinking and decision-making skills. Initiatives such as the Wharton Leadership Trek and live projects in marketing education exemplify this approach, immersing students in real-world scenarios (Kumar & Bhandarker, 2020).

Beyond the immersive nature of experiential learning, there is a broader mix of teaching methods, particularly in marketing. Maheshkar and Sonwalkar's (2023) concept of "Pedagogy Mix" introduces a comprehensive blend of teaching methods tailored for business education. This mix incorporates a case study method that uses real-world scenarios to elucidate marketing concepts, fostering analytical and problem-solving, and simulations provide controlled environments for analytical exercises, enabling students to experiment with and make collective decisions. Projects allow students to apply theoretical constructs practically. Furthermore, the learning experience is enriched through role-play, group projects, videos, and movies, which collectively deepen the understanding and practical application of management concepts.

While online and blended learning methodologies offer flexibility, it is essential to consider their efficacy and challenges compared to traditional face-to-face courses. Online learning in management education, especially during unprecedented times such as the COVID-19 pandemic, has showcased the resilience and adaptability of educational institutions (Ng et al., 2023). This approach offers flexibility and accessibility and especially benefits professionals with dynamic work schedules. However, the debate comparing the effectiveness of online and face-to-face learning continues, with some critics pointing to potential gaps in student engagement and practical skill development (Soncin et al., 2022).

When comparing these methodologies, traditional face-to-face courses, while foundational, may not always cater to modern students' evolving needs. Blended with nature, embedded learning is often preferred in postgraduate management education, bridging the gap between traditional and online methods (Truss & Anderson, 2023). However, the choice of methodology often depends on the specific objectives of the course, the target audience, and available resources



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

(Iglesias et al., 2020). Looking ahead, the trajectory of management education suggests a continued emphasis on blended and experiential learning. Augmented and virtual reality tools can enhance learning experiences (Bhattacharya et al., 2021). As institutions grapple with the challenges of the digital age, the transformative role of technology in shaping pedagogical approaches has become evident (Farooq et al., 2022).

### **Challenges and Criticisms**

#### ***Balancing Foundational and Emerging Trends***

Management education is at a crossroads, grappling with the challenges of melding time-tested foundational elements and rapidly evolving trends. Historically, the foundational elements of management, as outlined by Mousa et al. (2020), have been the bedrock, offering students a deep understanding of core principles, theories, and practices (Allen et al., 2022). These elements anchor the curriculum and equip students to contextualize contemporary practices within a rich historical framework (L. Anderson et al., 2018). However, the winds of change driven by industrial demands and societal shifts are ushering in a wave of novel trends. The integration of sustainability in curricula (Jun & Moon, 2021), the pivot towards experiential learning (Ziegler et al., 2022), and the break from traditional disciplinary confines (Nisula & Pekkola, 2018) exemplify the transformative shifts in management education.

However, this transformation did not involve any tribulation. As Colicchia et al. (2018) highlight, the rapid pace of global change often risks overshadowing foundational tenets, leading to curricula that might be temporarily relevant but lack historical depth. Gerlach (2016) further underscores this, pointing to the potential dilution of foundational teaching in the face of a sectoral evolution. Innovative solutions are emerging to navigate this intricate balance. Nisula and Pekkola's (2018) proposition of using dynamic capabilities as a curriculum framework stands out as it offers a structured yet flexible approach. Carriger (2016) advocates a hybrid model, melding problem-based learning with traditional lectures and further exemplifying innovative strategies. While the dance between the foundational and novel in management education is intricate, institutions must craft curricula that resonate with both historical depth and contemporary relevance.

#### ***Relevance in Rapidly Changing Environments***

In today's volatile business landscape, swift technological advancements, global events, and shifting market dynamics have converged, underscoring the pressing need for academic curricula to mirror real-world demands. The transformative impact of the unforeseen global events accentuated this urgency. For instance, the COVID-19 pandemic, as elucidated by Adedoyin and Soykan (2023), catalyzed a paradigm shift towards e-learning, compressing years of potential evolution into mere days. Further, dynamism extends beyond education. Different management sectors are in flux, driven by competitive pressure, technological disruptions, and evolving consumer expectations (Alexakis & Jiang, 2019; Drake et al., 2023).

This rapid transformation underscores the need for academic institutions to remain agile. However, achieving this agility is not a challenge. As highlighted by



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

Alexakis and Jiang (2019) and Drake et al. (2023), a salient issue is the discernible lag between academic offerings and industry requirements. This misalignment, often exacerbated by rapid technological shifts and the complexities of globalization, necessitates a more integrative and forward-looking approach to curriculum design, a sentiment echoed by Mielikäinen (2022).

Therefore, innovative methodologies have been developed to address these challenges. Zighan and El-Qasem (2021) champion the application of lean thinking to higher education, a strategy rooted in manufacturing, to enhance the curricular focus on employability. This approach underscores the importance of value addition and advocates for eliminating redundant academic components. Complementing this perspective, the Affordance Theory, posited by Omidire and Aluko (2022), offers insights into the educator-technology nexus, emphasizing the need for a holistic and inclusive e-learning approach.

### ***Catering to a Global Cohort***

A rich tapestry of diversity characterizes modern managerial classes. Students hail from varied cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, bringing unique perspectives, experiences, and expectations (Doucette et al., 2021; Lebrón et al., 2020). This diversity is not limited to ethnicity or nationality but extends to diverse learning styles, preferences, and prior experiences (Lamb et al., 2020; McDowell et al., 2022). For instance, the emphasis on integrating indigenous ways of thinking into business studies (Doucette et al., 2021) and the increasing requirement for arts and cultural sector leaders to operate internationally and across cultures (Mandel & Lambert, 2020) underscore the multifaceted nature of this diversity.

Catering to this diverse set of needs and expectations is crucial. As Lebrón et al. (2020) and Fakhreldin et al. (2021) both emphasize, integrating real-world experiences and fostering cultural intelligence is crucial for preparing students for a global workplace. The significance of experiential learning, whether through real-world case studies or cross-cultural virtual team projects, is evident in its ability to enhance students' creativity, communication, and analytical and critical thinking skills (Vidovic et al., 2021). Moreover, diverse perspectives, such as indigenous paradigms, can offer valuable insights and foster innovation in business education (Doucette et al., 2021).

However, creating a universally relevant and inclusive curriculum has several challenges. For instance, the global relevance of Western management education has been a long-standing concern, with students often questioning its applicability in non-Western contexts (Lamb et al., 2020). Additionally, while the importance of diversity and inclusion is recognized, efforts have been made to limit or eliminate classroom discussions on these topics, potentially hindering the development of a genuinely inclusive curriculum (McDowell et al., 2022).

Despite these challenges, several potential strategies and solutions have been suggested. One prominent approach is the concept of "contextualization," introduced by Lamb et al. (2020), which serves as a tool to make Western management education more relevant in diverse cultural contexts. Similarly, Mandel and Lambert (2020) emphasized the need for a global perspective on arts and cultural management, providing a typology of existing training



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

programs and emphasizing the roles of arts and cultural managers in diverse contexts. Furthermore, integrating culturally responsive teaching practices, continuous professional development for educators, and promoting inclusive practices can ensure that institutions effectively cater to a global cohort (Lamb et al., 2020; McDowell et al., 2022).

### **Gaps in the Literature and Future Research Directions**

In the rapidly evolving landscape of management education and digital leadership, the extant literature provides valuable insights yet reveals pronounced lacunae that warrant scholarly attention. These gaps underscore the nascent nature of specific research areas and delineate avenues for future exploration, ensuring the field's continued relevance and vibrancy.

### ***Digital Leadership: Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Validations***

At the heart of the discourse on digital leadership lies a notable gap: the absence of robust and comprehensive frameworks that encapsulate its multifaceted nature (AlDhaen, 2023). While theoretical postulations abound, there is a discernible dearth of empirical studies that rigorously assess the tangible impact of digital leadership on organizational outcomes. Future research endeavors could benefit from a dual-pronged approach: first, the development and iterative refinement of a digital leadership framework, potentially harnessing the expertise of interdisciplinary panels; and second, the deployment of longitudinal studies that juxtapose organizational metrics before and after the integration of digital leadership initiatives.

### ***Innovation and Organizational Culture: The Digital Leadership Nexus***

The symbiotic relationship between digital leadership and innovation remains an important research area. Preliminary studies hint at the potential of digital leadership to catalyze innovation, yet the mechanisms underlying this relationship remain nebulous (Alsharah & Ghura, 2023). Qualitative inquiries, particularly case studies of organizations at the forefront of innovation, could elucidate the strategies and practices engender a culture of innovation. Concurrently, the ramifications of digital leadership on organizational culture, a dimension highlighted yet underexplored in the works of Sørensen (2023), could be unraveled through ethnographic studies, offering a granular view of cultural dynamics in the digital age.

### ***Digital Transformation: Sectoral Challenges and Pedagogical Implications***

While heralding unprecedented opportunities, the pervasive wave of digital transformation has also surfaced with intricate challenges across sectors. In the educational domain, the implications of this transformation remain an enigma, with Müller and Wulf (2020) emphasizing the imperative for research that delves into the pedagogical shifts engendered by digitalization. Simultaneously, the exigencies faced by emergency services in assimilating digital tools, as underscored by Rayner and Webb (2021), present a compelling case for action-



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

oriented research that gauges the efficacy and efficiency of digital interventions.

### ***Sector-Specific Nuances and Geographical Considerations***

A deeper foray into the literature reveals the sector-specific challenges that merit attention. For instance, as Kanashiro et al. (2020) highlighted, the nonprofit sector's tryst towards digital transformation remains uncharted territory. Empirical studies, especially those employing a case study methodology, could illuminate nonprofits' unique challenges and triumphs in the digital era. Furthermore, McDowell et al. (2022) emphasize the pivotal role of SMEs in the Gulf region's economic tapestry, underscoring the need for geographically contextualized research that captures the nuances of regional ecosystems.

### ***Curriculum Development and the Employability Conundrum***

The literature also unveils a pressing debate centered on curriculum development and the nebulous construct of employability. Sandoval and Ormazábal (2021) highlighted the challenges inherent in defining and operationalizing graduate employability, a conundrum that has profound ramifications for curriculum architects. Delphi studies, harnessing the collective wisdom of educators, industry stalwarts, and policymakers, could pave the way for a more coherent and universally accepted definition of employability. Additionally, the quest to identify and integrate generic skills into curricula, especially in distinct sociocultural contexts, necessitates collaborative research endeavors that bridge academia and industry.

In summary, the literature, in its current avatar, offers a mosaic of insights yet is punctuated with gaps that, when addressed, can significantly elevate the field's academic and practical contributions. Addressing these gaps transcends academic rigor. It is a call to sculpt a future in which managers and leaders are adeptly equipped to navigate the complexities of a digitized world. The literature's collective narrative underscores the imperative for research: integrative, empirically robust, and attuned to micro nuances and macro trends.

### **Conclusion**

In the face of rapid technological innovation and global interconnectedness, the evolution of management education and learning organizations underscores the importance of organizational agility, adaptability, and continuous learning. Historical trajectories reveal a shift from foundational knowledge in traditional curricula to modern approaches that emphasize sustainability, digital literacy, and experiential learning. However, challenges persist, such as more alignment between academic offerings and industry needs, rapid technological advancements, and catering to diverse global cohorts. As the landscape of learning organizations and management education continues to evolve, synthesizing historical insights with contemporary trends will be vital for nurturing talent and leadership in modern learning organizations in a dynamic business environment.

### **References**

AbuKhoua, E., El-Tahawy, M. S., & Atif, Y. (2023). Envisioning Architecture of Metaverse Intensive Learning Experience (MiLEx): Career Readiness in the



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- 21st Century and Collective Intelligence Development Scenario. In *Future Internet* (Vol. 15, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15020053>
- Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2023). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(2), 863–875. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>
- Ahmad, S., Suhag, A. K., Lashari, A. A., & Jamali, S. (2023). Women's leadership in school education: Barriers and opportunities in Karachi, Sindh. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(3), 222-234.
- Akella, D. (2021). A learner-centric model of learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 28(1), 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-06-2020-0117>
- Al Aina, R., & Atan, T. (2020). The Impact of Implementing Talent Management Practices on Sustainable Organizational Performance. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 12, Issue 20). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208372>
- Al-Jamali, S. A. (2021). Qatar Learning Management Project: Exploration of factors influencing secondary school teachers' practices. University of Northumbria at Newcastle (United Kingdom).
- AlDhaen, E. (2023). Education skills for digital age toward sustainable development – analysis and future directions. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 37(3), 11–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-06-2022-0108>
- Alexakis, G., & Jiang, L. (2019). Industry Competencies and the Optimal Hospitality Management Curriculum: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 31(4), 210–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2019.1575748>
- Alexander, A., Martin, D. P., Manolchev, C., & Miller, K. (2020). University–industry collaboration: using meta-rules to overcome barriers to knowledge transfer. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 45(2), 371–392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-018-9685-1>
- Allen, S. J., Rosch, D. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2022). Advancing Leadership Education and Development: Integrating Adult Learning Theory. *Journal of Management Education*, 46(2), 252–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629211008645>
- Alsharah, H., & Ghura, H. (2023). Online learning in business education: key lessons from COVID-19 pandemic. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 37(3), 4–6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-08-2022-0171>
- Anderson, L., Hibbert, P., Mason, K., & Rivers, C. (2018). Management Education in Turbulent Times. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(4), 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562918779421>
- Anderson, S., Rayburn, S. W., Sierra, J. J., Murdock, K., & McGeorge, A. (2022). Consumer buying behavior and retailer strategy through a crisis: A futures studies perspective. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 457–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2021.1982648>
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- Asfahani, A. (2024). Curating future leaders: a literature review on managerial curriculum in learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*.



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- Bhattacharya, S., Kumar, R. V., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2021). Revisiting Marketing Management Teaching Pedagogy: A Study Based on the Voice of Indian Marketing Professionals. *FIIB Business Review*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23197145211006961>
- Bratianu, C., Hadad, S., & Bejinaru, R. (2020). Paradigm Shift in Business Education: A Competence-Based Approach. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 12, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041348>
- Bratianu, C., Stanescu, D. F., & Mocanu, R. (2021). Exploring the Knowledge Management Impact on Business Education. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 13, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042313>
- Calma, A., & Davies, M. (2021). Critical thinking in business education: current outlook and future prospects. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), 2279–2295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1716324>
- Candelon, B., Ferrara, L., & Joëts, M. (2021). Global financial interconnectedness: a non-linear assessment of the uncertainty channel. *Applied Economics*, 53(25), 2865–2887. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2020.1870651>
- Carriger, M. S. (2016). What is the best way to develop new managers? Problem-based learning vs. lecture-based instruction. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 14(2), 92–101. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2016.02.003>
- Cheng, M., Adekola, O., Albia, J., & Cai, S. (2022). Employability in higher education: a review of key stakeholders' perspectives. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 16(1), 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HEED-03-2021-0025>
- Chinowsky, P. S., Brown, H., Szajnman, A., & Realph, A. (2006). Developing knowledge landscapes through project-based learning. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 132(2), 118–124. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1052-3928\(2006\)132:2\(118\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1052-3928(2006)132:2(118))
- Chughtai, M. S., Syed, F., Naseer, S., & Chinchilla, N. (2023). Role of adaptive leadership in learning organizations to boost organizational innovations with change self-efficacy. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04669-z>
- Clinebell, S. K., & Clinebell, J. M. (2008). The Tension in Business Education Between Academic Rigor and Real-World Relevance: The Role of Executive Professors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(1), 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.31413867>
- Colicchia, C., Creazza, A., & Strozzi, F. (2018). Citation network analysis for supporting continuous improvement in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(9), 1637–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1276550>
- Cyphert, D. (2021). From Product to Process: The Rhetoric of Sustainability and Evolving Management Practice. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 84(3), 242–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329490620987835>
- Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a Systematic Review. In D. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Research Methods* (pp. 671–689). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Jones, D., Young, B., & Sutton, A. (2005).



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- Synthesising qualitative and quantitative evidence: A review of possible methods. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 10(1), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.1258/1355819052801804>
- Doucette, M. B., Gladstone, J. S., & Carter, T. (2021). Indigenous Conversational Approach to History and Business Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20(3), 473–484. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2020.0530>
- Drake, M. J., Pittman, P. H., & Talbert, M. (2023). Analysis of the incorporation of current trends in supply chain management within curricula. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2023.2235295>
- Dsouza, D., & Sharma, D. (2021). Online food delivery portals during COVID-19 times: an analysis of changing consumer behavior and expectations. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 13(2), 218–232. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-10-2020-0184>
- Elmuti, D. (2004). Can management be taught? If so, what should management education curricula include and how should the process be approached? *Management Decision*, 42(3/4), 439–453. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740410523240>
- ElSayary, A. (2021). Transdisciplinary STEAM Curriculum Design and Authentic Assessment in Online Learning: A Model of Cognitive, Psychomotor, and Affective Domains. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 18(3), 493–511.
- Fakhreldin, H., Youssef, N., & Anis, M. (2021). Cross-Cultural Management Education: Core for Business Students in the 21st Century. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 32(2), 109–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2021.1960242>
- Farooq, M. S., Hamid, A., Alvi, A., & Omer, U. (2022). Blended Learning Models, Curricula, and Gamification in Project Management Education. *IEEE Access*, 10, 60341–60361. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3180355>
- Ferrari, R. (2015). Writing narrative style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230–235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>
- Fornes, G., Monfort, A., Ilie, C., Koo, C. K., & Cardoza, G. (2019). Ethics, Responsibility, and Sustainability in MBAs. Understanding the Motivations for the Incorporation of ERS in Less Traditional Markets. *Sustainability*, 11(24). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11247060>
- Gerlach, J. D. (2016). Nonprofit Management Education in MPA Programs: Lessons for Successful Track Building. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 12(4), 471–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2016.1165105>
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(1), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2005.16132558>
- Gitelman, L., Kozhevnikov, M., & Ryzhuk, O. (2019). Advance Management Education for Power-Engineering and Industry of the Future. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 11, Issue 21). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11215930>
- Gorelick, C. (2005). Organizational learning vs the learning organization: A conversation with a practitioner. *Learning Organization*, 12(4), 383–388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470510599154>
- Gouédard, P., Kools, M., & George, B. (2023). The impact of schools as learning





## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- organisations on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: a cross-country analysis. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 34(3), 331–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2196081>
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., MacFarlane, F., Bate, P., Kyriakidou, O., & Peacock, R. (2005). Storylines of research in diffusion of innovation: A meta-narrative approach to systematic review. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61(2), 417–430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.12.001>
- Greenland, S., Saleem, M., Misra, R., & Mason, J. (2022). Sustainable management education and an empirical five-pillar model of sustainability. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 20(3), 100658. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100658>
- Grieves, J. (2008). Why we should abandon the idea of the learning organization. *Learning Organization*, 15(6), 463–473. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470810907374>
- Gutu, I., Agheorghiesei, D. T., & Tugui, A. (2023). Assessment of a Workforce Sustainability Tool through Leadership and Digitalization. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 20, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20021360>
- Harsch, K., & Festing, M. (2020). Dynamic talent management capabilities and organizational agility—A qualitative exploration. *Human Resource Management*, 59(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21972>
- Hasse, V. C. (2022). In pursuit of a global mindset: Toward a theory-driven pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 33(4), 224–246.
- Hay, A., Peltier, J. W., & Drago, W. A. (2004). Reflective learning and online management education: A comparison of traditional and online MBA students. *Strategic Change*, 13(4), 169.
- Henry, B. M., Skinningsrud, B., Vikse, J., Pękala, P. A., Walocha, J. A., Loukas, M., Tubbs, R. S., & Tomaszewski, K. A. (2018). Systematic reviews versus narrative reviews in clinical anatomy: Methodological approaches in the era of evidence-based anatomy. *Clinical Anatomy*, 31(3), 364–367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.23042>
- Hodgkinson, G. P., & Ford, J. K. (2014). Narrative, meta-analytic, and systematic reviews: What are the differences and why do they matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S1–S5. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1918>
- Hoe, S. L. (2021). “Information Technology and Organizational Learning – Managing Behavioral Change in the Digital Age.” *The Learning Organization*, 28(6), 569–571. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2021-275>
- Iglesias, V., Entrialgo, M., & Müller, F. (2020). Supply-side Antecedents of dropout rates in MBA programs. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(9), 1848–1863. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1723521>
- Imran, R., Fatima, A., Elbayoumi Salem, I., & Allil, K. (2023). Teaching and learning delivery modes in higher education: Looking back to move forward post-COVID-19 era. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100805>
- Ingstrup, M. B., Aarikka-Stenroos, L., & Adlin, N. (2021). When institutional logics meet: Alignment and misalignment in collaboration between



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- academia and practitioners. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 92, 267–276. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.01.004>
- Jaganjac, B., Abrahamsen, L. M., Olsen, T. S., & Hunnes, J. A. (2023). Is It Time to Reclaim the ‘Ethics’ in Business Ethics Education? *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05400-5>
- Jamali, D. (2005). Changing management paradigms: implications for educational institutions. *Journal of Management Development*, 24(2), 104–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710510579473>
- Ju, B., Lee, Y., Park, S., & Yoon, S. W. (2021). A Meta-Analytic Review of the Relationship Between Learning Organization and Organizational Performance and Employee Attitudes: Using the Dimensions of Learning Organization Questionnaire. *Human Resource Development Review*, 20(2), 207–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320987363>
- Jun, H., & Moon, S. (2021). An analysis of sustainability integration in business school curricula: Evidence from Korea. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052779>
- Jung, S., Shin, H. W., Gohary, A., & Chan, E. Y. (2023). Benefits and challenges of online collaborative learning from the perspectives of non-traditional event management students: a comparison between asynchronous and synchronous learning. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 23(2), 109–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2022.2109553>
- Kanashiro, P., Iizuka, E. S., Sousa, C., & Dias, S. E. F. (2020). Sustainability in management education: a Biggs’ 3P model application. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 21(4), 671–684. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-05-2019-0176>
- Karanja, E., & Malone, L. C. (2022). The role of industry and academia partnership in improving project management curriculum and competencies. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 38(4), 667–691. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-12-2020-0200>
- King, W. R. (2001). Strategies for creating a learning organization. *Information Systems Management*, 18(1), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.1201/1078/43194.18.1.20010101/31261.3>
- Kayyali, M. (Ed.). (2024). *Building Resiliency in Higher Education: Globalization, Digital Skills, and Student Wellness: Globalization, Digital Skills, and Student Wellness*. IGI Global.
- Krishnamurthy, S. (2020). The future of business education: A commentary in the shadow of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 1–5. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.034>
- Kuechler, W., & Stedham, Y. (2018). Management Education and Transformational Learning: The Integration of Mindfulness in an MBA Course. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(1), 8–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562917727797>
- Kumar, S., & Bhandarker, A. (2020). Experiential learning and its efficacy in management education. *Purushartha*, 13(1), 35–55. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85097553560&partnerID=40&md5=79b6902321040b4ccbaea5f76a809517>
- Lamb, P., Hsu, S.-W., & Lemanski, M. (2020). A Threshold Concept and Capability Approach to the Cross-Cultural Contextualization of Western



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- Management Education. *Journal of Management Education*, 44(1), 101–120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562919851826>
- Larsson, C. F., Marshall, B., & Ritchie, B. (2022). The alumni project: Fostering student-alumni engagement in the curriculum. *Journal of Education for Business*, 97(4), 253–260.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2021.1932704>
- Learmonth, M. (2007). Critical Management Education in Action: Personal Tales of Management Unlearning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(1), 109–113. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2007.24401708>
- Lebrón, M. J., Brannon, D., Sanford, D., & Ellison, L. (2020). Applying Theory to Practice: Implementing a Live Case Competition in a Capstone Strategic Management Course. *Journal of Management Education*, 44(1), 66–100.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562919876006>
- Li, L. (2022). Reskilling and Upskilling the Future-ready Workforce for Industry 4.0 and Beyond. *Information Systems Frontiers*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10308-y>
- Lincoln, D. J. (2006). Student Authored Cases: Combining Benefits of Traditional and Live Case Methods of Instruction. *Marketing Education Review*, 16(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2006.11488930>
- Love, H. B., Cross, J. E., Fosdick, B. K., Tofany, E., & Dickmann, E. M. (2022). Teaching Team Science: The Key to Addressing 21st Century Global Challenges. *Small Group Research*, 54(3), 396–427.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964221121349>
- Magano, J., Silva, C. S., Figueiredo, C., Vitoria, A., & Nogueira, T. (2021). Project Management in Engineering Education: Providing Generation Z with Transferable Skills. *Revista Iberoamericana de Tecnologías Del Aprendizaje*, 16(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RITA.2021.3052496>
- Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Kumar, S., & Sareen, M. (2023). COVID-19 and management education: From pandemic to endemic. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), 100801.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100801>
- Maheshkar, C., & Sonwalkar, J. (2023). The pedagogy mix: teaching marketing effectively in business/management education. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, ahead-of-p(ahead-of-print).  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2023-0019>
- Malarski, J. S., & Berte, E. (2023). Shaping future business leaders through responsible management education: A model of RME implementation. *Journal of Education for Business*, 1–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2023.2232924>
- Mandel, B. R., & Lambert, P. D. (2020). International Arts/Cultural Management: Global Perspectives on Strategies, Competencies, and Education. *Journal of Arts Management Law and Society*, 50(4–5), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2020.1771495>
- McDowell, J., Pickett, A. C., & Pitts, B. G. (2022). Introduction to the Special Issue on Diversity and Inclusion in Sport Management Education. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 16(1), 1–3.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2022-0006>
- Meglio, O., & Risberg, A. (2011). The (mis)measurement of M&A performance-A



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- systematic narrative literature review. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 27(4), 418–433.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2011.09.002>
- Miceli, A., Hagen, B., Riccardi, M. P., Sotti, F., & Settembre-Blundo, D. (2021). Thriving, Not Just Surviving in Changing Times: How Sustainability, Agility and Digitalization Intertwine with Organizational Resilience. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 13, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042052>
- Mielikäinen, M. (2022). Towards blended learning: Stakeholders' perspectives on a project-based integrated curriculum in ICT engineering education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 36(1), 74–85.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0950422221994471>
- Mishra, N., & Bharti, T. (2023). Exploring the nexus of social support, work–life balance and life satisfaction in hybrid work scenario in learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*, ahead-of-p(ahead-of-print).  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-08-2022-0099>
- Mousa, M., Massoud, H. K., Ayoubi, R. M., & Abdelgaffar, H. A. (2020). Should responsible management education become a priority? A qualitative study of academics in Egyptian public business schools. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(1), 100326.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2019.100326>
- Müller, F. A., & Wulf, T. (2020). Technology-supported management education: a systematic review of antecedents of learning effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), 47.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00226-x>
- Naqshbandi, M. M., Meeran, S., Kim, M., & Mughal, F. (2023). The role of AMO HR practices and knowledge sharing in developing a learning organizational culture: evidence from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print).  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-01-2023-0032>
- Ng, D. T. K., Ching, A. C. H., & Law, S. W. (2023). Online learning in management education amid the pandemic: A bibliometric and content analysis. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100796>
- Ngoasong, M. Z. (2022). Curriculum Adaptation for Blended Learning in Resource-Scarce Contexts. *Journal of Management Education*, 46(4), 622–655. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629211047168>
- Nisula, K., & Pekkola, S. (2018). How to move away from the silos of business management education? *Journal of Education for Business*, 93(3), 97–111.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2018.1425283>
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Nonet, G., Kassel, K., & Meijs, L. (2016). Understanding Responsible Management: Emerging Themes and Variations from European Business School Programs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(4), 717–736.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3149-z>
- Omidire, M. F., & Aluko, F. R. (2022). Academic and institutional readiness towards e-Learning to inform policy and practice in an evolving post-school



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- education sector. *Perspectives in Education*, 40(1), 62–79. <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/PIE.V40.I1.4>
- Ostrowska, H. Y., Sherstiuk, R. P., Tsikh, H. V., Demianyshyn, V. H., & Danyliuk-Chernykh, I. M. (2021). Conceptual principles of learning organization building. *Naukovyi Visnyk Natsionalnoho Hirnychoho Universytetu*, 2021(3), 167–172. <https://doi.org/10.33271/nvngu/2021-3/167>
- Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J., & Boydell, T. (1991). *The learning company*. Springer.
- Perry, C., & Euler, T. (1985). Experiential Learning and Management Education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 4(2), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436850040206>
- Ratten, V. (2023). The post COVID-19 pandemic era: Changes in teaching and learning methods for management educators. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100777>
- Rayner, M., & Webb, T. (2021). Implications and opportunities for sport management education in the COVID-19 era. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 15(1), 49–53. <https://doi.org/10.1123/SMEJ.2020-0013>
- Ritchie, D. J., & Yen, M. L. (2013). Health services management development: What formal knowledge should support the skills and experience required? *Australian Health Review*, 37(2), 189–193. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AH11116>
- Robinson, G. (2020). Organizations are people: reflections, obstacles and learning opportunities. *The Learning Organization*, 27(6), 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-07-2020-0122>
- Rother, E. T. (2007). Systematic literature review X narrative review. *ACTA Paulista de Enfermagem*, 20(2), v–x. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0103-21002007000200001>
- Rueda, L., Benitez, J., & Braojos, J. (2017). From traditional education technologies to student satisfaction in Management education: A theory of the role of social media applications. *Information & Management*, 54(8), 1059–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2017.06.002>
- Safari, M., Shahidi, S., & Avizhgan, M. (2024). Challenges in applying theoretical knowledge from the general medicine course in clinical practice: A qualitative study. *Journal of Medical Education Development*, 17(54).1-10.
- Sandoval, L., & Ormazábal, M. (2021). The Generic skills challenge for higher education institutions: Experience of public universities in Chile. *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, 8(2), 55–83. [https://doi.org/10.18543/TJHE-8\(2\)-2021PP55-83](https://doi.org/10.18543/TJHE-8(2)-2021PP55-83)
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Century Business.
- Sheng, Z., Watkins, S., Yoon, S. W., & Kim, J. (2021). Examining schools as learning organizations: an integrative approach. *Learning Organization*, 28(4), 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-03-2020-0050>
- Shill, P. C., Wu, R., Jamali, H., Hutchins, B., Dascalu, S., Harris, F. C., & Feil-Seifer, D. (2023, October). Wip: Development of a student-centered personalized learning framework to advance undergraduate robotics education. In 2023 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE) (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
- Sicilia, M. A., & Lytras, M. D. (2005). The semantic learning organization. *The*



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- Learning Organization, 12(5), 402–410.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470510611375>
- Sison, A. J. G., & Redín, D. M. (2023). If MacIntyre ran a business school... how practical wisdom can be developed in management education. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 32(1), 274–291.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12471>
- Soncin, M., Agasisti, T., Frattini, F., Patrucco, A., & Pero, M. (2022). The Costs, Quality, and Scalability of Blended Learning in Postgraduate Management Education. *Journal of Management Education*, 46(6), 1052–1085.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629221103826>
- Sørensen, P. (2023). The effects of continuing public sector management education: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-01-2022-0001>
- Sun, H.-C. (2003). Conceptual clarifications for ‘organizational learning’, ‘learning organization’ and ‘a learning organization.’ *Human Resource Development International*, 6(2), 153–166.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860110086465>
- Suravi, S. (2023). Training and development in the hybrid workplace. *The Learning Organization*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-10-2022-0119>
- Taylor, S. N. (2013). Student Self-Assessment and Multisource Feedback Assessment: Exploring Benefits, Limitations, and Remedies. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(3), 359–383.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562913488111>
- Teece, D. J., & Winter, S. G. (1984). The limits of neoclassical theory in management education. *The American Economic Review*, 74(2), 116–121.
- Thind, R., & Yakavenka, H. (2023). Creating culturally relevant curricula and pedagogy: Rethinking fashion business and management education in UK business schools. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), 100870. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100870>
- Troise, C., Corvello, V., Ghobadian, A., & O’Regan, N. (2022). How can SMEs successfully navigate VUCA environment: The role of agility in the digital transformation era. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121227>
- Truss, A., & Anderson, V. (2023). The navigational challenges of a blended learning approach to teaching in business and management. *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100733>
- Tryding, P. (2022). Nordic no more? How recent trends may prevent the Nordic organization model to adapt and develop. *The Learning Organization*, 29(3), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-05-2021-0070>
- van der Colff, L. (2004). A new paradigm for business education. *Management Decision*, 42(3/4), 499–507. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740410521468>
- Varela, O. E. (2020). Teaching core soft skills into business curriculum: Can we teach longitudinally? *Journal of Education for Business*, 95(3), 180–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2019.1627992>
- Varmus, M., Kubina, M., Boško, P., & Mičiak, M. (2022). Application of the perceived popularity of sports to support the sustainable management of sports organizations. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1927.



## Vol. 2 No. 3 (October) (2024)

- Vidovic, M., Hammond, M., Lenhardt, J., Palanski, M., & Olabisi, J. (2021). Teaching Virtual and Cross-Cultural Collaborations: Exploring Experiences of Croatia- and U.S.-Based Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Management Education*, 45(6), 953–986. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562920972170>
- Weick, K. E. (1969). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Random House.
- Werner, K., Junek, O., & Wang, C. (2022). EVENT MANAGEMENT SKILLS IN THE POST-COVID-19 WORLD: INSIGHTS FROM CHINA, GERMANY, AND AUSTRALIA. *Event Management*, 26(4), 867–882. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599521X16288665119558>
- Wichmann, J. R. K., Uppal, A., Sharma, A., & Dekimpe, M. G. (2022). A global perspective on the marketing mix across time and space. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 39(2), 502–521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2021.09.001>
- Witherspoon, A. (2022). The role of team processes in innovation development to sustain learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 29(1), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-09-2020-0164>
- Zabiegalski, E., & Marquardt, M. J. (2022). Action learning and the ambidextrous organization. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, 14(2), 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-11-2021-0062>
- Ziegler, E., Charnish, E., & DeCiantis, N. (2022). Out of the Closet: Nurse Practitioner Faculty Knowledge, Comfort and Willingness to Incorporate LGBTQ2SA Content into the Curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 54(3), 313–319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08445621211073289>
- Zighan, S., & EL-Qasem, A. (2021). Lean thinking and higher education management: revaluing the business school programme management. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 70(3), 675–703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2019-0215>