Saxion University of Applied Sciences

Research Centre Business Development
Research Group Hospitality Business

Beyond teaching and learning

Working Paper 2009 № 1

Thomas J.P. Thijssen

22nd of July 2009

Saxion University of Applied Sciences

Research Centre Business Development

Handelskade 75

7417 DH Deventer

E: hbskenniscentrum@saxion.nl

W: www.saxion.nl/hospitalitybusiness

Kom verder. Saxion.

saxion.nl

SAXION

ABSTRACT

Teaching and learning are seen as prerequisites for acquiring qualifications to enter employment. This paper raises the question: what is there beyond teaching and learning? Current debates in management journals as the American Management Review include the notion of knowledge production as a new paradigm (Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006) as compared to the paradigm of knowledge transfer. The proposition posed in this paper is that teaching, learning and even knowledge production are means to an end. To what end is the basic question to be asked? We propose that the answer to that question is constructing quality of life. The paper provides an overview of the paradigm debate on teaching, learning and knowledge production, identifies contemporary issues in corporate business, and connects these issues to emerging quality of life studies. This knowledge is applied in the spring of 2007 at the University of Amsterdam in a course of Information Management in Practice. The course has no fixed curriculum and no recommended literature. In stead each of the 53 students was asked what they valued most and how they themselves would envision making a contribution to the quality of life for themselves and for others. 11 learning projects evolved and within 4 months value was shared and created within the classroom but more importantly with relevant stakeholders outside class. The implications for higher education are that less 'teaching' could very well be more 'learning' and that 'knowledge transfer" as a means can possibly effectively be replaced by the paradigm of 'building quality of life' as an end.

Key words: knowledge construction, teaching, learning, business, management, corporate issues, quality of life

Biography

Thomas Thijssen is director of the Graduate School Hospitality Business, Reader Experience in Hospitality & Leisure at Saxion University of Applied Sciences, ambassador for EDiNEB and chair of the ERA Committee at SPACE.

Introduction

This paper addresses a new paradigm beyond the paradigm of teaching and learning. Teaching and learning are generally seen as prerequisites for acquiring qualifications to enter employment. This paper raises the question: what is there beyond teaching and learning? Current debates in management journals as the American Management Review include the notion of knowledge production as a new paradigm (Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006) as compared to the paradigm of knowledge transfer. The proposition posed in this paper is that teaching, learning and even knowledge production are means to an end. To what end is the basic question to be asked? We propose that the answer to that question is *constructing quality of life.*

In section 2 we present current debates on paradigms in respect of knowledge transfer, knowledge production and knowledge use. In section 3 we provide three corporate examples for identifying contemporary business issues and in section 4 we connect these issues to quality of life research. In section 5 we report on the application of the quality of life principles in the Information Management in Practice Course at the Amsterdam Business School/University of Amsterdam. In section 6 we discuss findings from the case study. Finally in section 7 we list implications for higher education and formulate suggestions for further research on teaching, learning and constructing quality of life.

Current Debates on Paradigms

Van de Ven & Johnson (2006) examine three ways in which the gap between theory and practice has been framed and argue for *engaged scholarship.* They define engaged scholarship as a collaboration between researchers and practitioners co-producing knowledge that can advance theory and practice in a given domain. The gap between theory and practice is typically framed as either (1) a knowledge transfer problem, (2) theory and practice as distinct forms of knowledge and (3) as a knowledge production problem.

Viewing it as a Knowledge Transfer Problem

This approach is based on the assumption that practical knowledge (knowledge of how to do things) in a professional domain derives at least in part from research knowledge (knowledge from science in particular and scholarship more broadly). Practitioners fail to adopt the findings of research in various fields because the knowledge that is produced is not in a form that can be readily applied in contexts of practice. Argyris and Schön (1996) argue that scientific knowledge will be implemented only if researchers, consultants, and practitioners jointly engage in interpreting and implementing study findings. Empirically we know very little about what makes research use happen or not happen (Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006).

Viewing Knowledge of Theory and Practice as Distinct Kinds of Knowledge

Users of both scientific and practical knowledge demand that it meet the dual hurdles of being relevant and rigorous in serving their particular domains and interests (Pettigrew, 2001). However different criteria of relevance and rigor apply to scientific knowledge and practical knowledge because their purposes, processes, and contexts are different. The relevance of each form of knowledge should be judged in terms of how well it addresses the problematic situation or issue for which it was intended (Dewey, 1938). Van de Ven & Johnson (2006) state that we may have misunderstood the relationship between practical and scholarly knowledge, and this has contributed to our limited success in bridging these two forms of knowledge in arenas of *human activity*. Exhortations for academics to put their theories into practice and for managers to put their practices into theory may be misdirected because they assume that the relationship between knowledge of theory and knowledge of practice entails a literal transfer or translation of one into the other. Instead Van de Ven & Johnson take a *pluralistic view of science* and practice as representing distinct kinds of knowledge that provide complementary insight for understanding reality. Each kind of knowledge is developed and sustained by its own professional community, which consists of people who share a common body of specialized knowledge or expertise. Each form of knowledge is partial – a way of seeing is a way of not seeing. Strengths of one form of knowledge tend to be the weaknesses of another. Once *different perspectives* and kinds of knowledge are recognized as partial, incomplete, and involving inherent bias with respect to any complex problem, then it is easy to see *the need for a pluralistic approach to knowledge co-production among scholars and practitioners.*

Viewing it as a Knowledge Production Problem

Van de Ven & Johnson (2006) propose that there is a growing recognition that the gap between theory and practice may be a knowledge production problem. Common to the assessments of the status and relevance of practice-oriented social science is the view that a key defining characteristic of *management research* is its applied nature. A variety of suggestions have been made for producing practice-based knowledge. Many have been institutional in nature. Structural reforms are important, but analysis of structural reforms, tend to overlook the activities of individual researchers. Pettigrew (2001) states that a deeper form of research that *engages both academics and practitioners is needed to produce knowledge that meets the dual hurdle of relevance and rigor for theory as well as practice in a given domain*.

Van de Ven & Johnson (2006) propose engaged scholarship to be extended with the strategy of intellectual arbitrage– to exploit the differing perspectives that scholars from different disciplines and practitioners with different functional experiences bring forth to address complex problems or questions. Arbitrage represents a dialectical method of inquiry where understanding and synthesis of a common problem evolve from the confrontation of divergent thesis and antitheses. It is a strategy for triangulating on problems by involving individuals whose perspectives are different.

Means and Ends Debate

To a high degree we can support the paradigm of knowledge production as argued by Van de Ven & Johnson (2006). In particular the proposition for engaged scholarship between students, scholars and practitioners to address complex problems through arbitrage aligns with our longitudinal research on Learning-by-Sharing (Thijssen, Maes, Vernooy, 2002; Thijssen, 2007) and can be supported based on our empirical findings. The main question we raise in this article is: what is there beyond teaching and learning? Aren't we missing out on something very crucial to human existence and human practice? To what *end* are we teaching and learning? Is it just to become a *qualified professional* in making a good product or providing a good service, or is there more to it? Our perspective is that even knowledge production can be seen as means to an end. Is the *end* of teaching and learning to produce new knowledge or is the end still something else? As presented in the introduction in section 1: we proposed that the answer to the question is the *end* of teaching and learning is *constructing quality of life*.

To explore these questions we will first look at 3 global companies to identify new challenges for business and management. If we wish to provide excellent education in business and management we must be informed about emerging challenges businesses face, to be able to innovate our educational programmes.

New Challenges for Business and Management

If we look at the corporate information of 3 renowned global companies we can identify a number of relevant corporate issues that go beyond knowledge production and address issues that point at taking responsibility for the quality of life. We list these issues by company, compare them and then reflect on findings.

Johnson & Johnson (Pharmaceutical Company)

From the corporate website of Johnson & Johnson we can list the following issues:

- "Social responsibility and community improvement"

- "Environmental commitments"

- "Health and safety efforts"

- "Policies on equal opportunity, child labour, business conduct"

- "Financial performance"

- "Corporate governance and ethical business conduct"

- "We believe our *first* responsibility is to the doctors, nurses and patients, to mothers and fathers and all others who use our products and services."

- "We are responsible to our employees, the men and women who work with us throughout the world. Everyone must be considered as an individual. We must respect their dignity and

recognize their merit."

- "We are responsible to the communities in which we live and work and to the world community as well. We must be good citizens – support good works and charities and bear our fair share of taxes. We must encourage civic improvements and better health and education. We must maintain in good order the property we are privileged to use, protecting the environment and natural resources."

- "Our *final* responsibility is to our stockholders. Business must make a sound profit. We must experiment with new ideas. Research must be carried on, innovative programs developed and mistakes paid for. Knew equipment must be purchased, new facilities provided and new products launched. Reserves must be created to provide for adverse times. When we operate according to these principles, the stockholders should realize a fair return."

The key of Johnson & Johnson is that the company presents itself as a 'responsible' company, to a variety of stakeholders as clients (first responsibility), employees, communities, the environment and to stockholders (final responsibility). In essence the company is contributing to human capital, social capital, economic capital and environmental capital to create value.

Pfizer (Pharmaceutical Company)

From the corporate website of Pfizer we can list similar issues:
"At Pfizer, we're inspired by a single goal: your health. That's why we're dedicated to developing new, safe medicines to prevent and treat the world's most serious diseases. And why we are making them available to the people who need them most. We believe that from progress comes hope and the promise of a healthier world".

"Here, you will find timely, relevant information about our company, products, policies and performance. At Pfizer, we are committed to sharing openly with our diverse stakeholders—those who affect and are affected by our business. Whatever your position—patient, health care provider, investor or other—we work to bring you the information you need to make decisions about Pfizer, our products, and their role in your health".

"Part of being a responsible company is operating with transparency. That's why Pfizer has created a Corporate Responsibility Report to help our diverse stakeholders learn more about our work as a partner in building sustainable health care solutions. This report details our corporate responsibility priorities: discovering and developing new medicines, improving access to medicines and partnering to find health system solutions".

The key of Pfizer is improving client's health through safe medicines in an open and transparent fashion. In essence the company is providing health solutions to patients (human capital), make them accessible to people who need them most and contribute to a healthier world (social, economic and ecological capital).

Microsoft (Software Company)

From the corporate website we can list the following issues:

"In fiscal year 2004, Microsoft asked SustainAbility, a leading business consultancy on corporate responsibility and sustainable development, to help us review and develop our approach to nongovernmental organization (NGO) strategy and engagement in a number of EMEA markets, namely the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany, Poland, and South Africa. Within the United Kingdom market, the research was widened to include all stakeholders to serve as the pilot for a broader approach to stakeholder engagement throughout EMEA".

"At Microsoft, we believe that constructive stakeholder engagement improves our business decision-making processes and helps us anticipate and address the changing expectations of society. We understand that our reputation outside the company is a direct reflection of how we demonstrate our corporate values. Engagement with customers, partners, shareholders, NGOs, governments, and other stakeholders will be essential in helping us identify and manage key issues that will test how successfully we live our values".

"At Microsoft, we know that how we conduct ourselves and our business is as important as delivering outstanding products and services. How we work with customers, partners, governments, vendors, and communities worldwide is fundamental to our success as a company".

"Our commitment to responsible business practices is absolute—in our core values and in our daily work. That means being open about our business operations, transparent in all of our dealings with stakeholders, and compliant with all laws and regulations that apply to our business. It also means having the honesty to acknowledge when we fall short of those goals, and having the integrity to set things right. As Microsoft continues to grow, we will continually strive to exceed expectations regarding the responsible manner in which we conduct our business".

"Microsoft's mission is to enable people and businesses throughout the world to realize their full potential. One way we fulfil our mission is by developing innovative software that transforms the way people work, learn, and communicate. Another way is by using our resources and expertise to help expand social and economic opportunities in communities around the world".

"Our company's greatest strengths are our employees' passion, creativity, and dedication, and our strong partnerships with thousands of private, public, and community organizations. Our people and partnerships propel innovation at Microsoft, and they also guide our worldwide citizenship efforts".

"At Microsoft, environmental stewardship is important and integral to our business. Over the past 30 years, we have translated our personal beliefs and corporate philosophy into meaningful environmental action. Today more than ever we are focusing our efforts on sustainability and continuing innovation.

In February 2006, we adopted the Microsoft Environmental Principles. These principles formalize our ongoing commitment to protecting the environment and natural resources, and the health and safety of our employees, our customers, and the local communities where we operate and do business. Every Microsoft employee shares the responsibility of helping the company fulfil these principles, which guide our long-term goals and objectives". View the [Microsoft

.

The key of Microsoft is 'your potential, our passion' that captures the aim to enable people and businesses to reach their full potential through innovative software that transforms the way people work, learn and communicate in a sustainable way. In addition to that constructive stakeholder engagement is used to anticipate changing expectations.

Reflection on these Corporate Examples

In Table 1 we compare corporate issues from Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer and Microsoft by stakeholder group:

Stakeholder	Johnson & Johnson	Pfizer	Microsoft	Comment
Client	Doctors, nurses, mothers and fathers	Goal is to improve your health	Your potential, our passion	The focus is on clients as the primary target group
Employee	Considered as an individual. Respect their dignity and recognize their merit. Corporate governance and ethical business conduct	Organisation is open and transparent aimed at partnerships	Passion, creativity, dedication is greatest strength Values in daily work open, honest, integrity	Employees are seen as an asset to the company Employee's conduct is governed by values. Passion, creativity and dedication are seen as strength
Community	Good citizenship and encourage civic improvement	Open information to allow decision making	Expand social and economic opportunities Exceed expectations	Social responsibility and good citizenship become the norm
Stockholder	Business must make a profit. Invest in research and innovation		Stakeholder engagement improves business processes	Making profit is seen as the basis and as means to serve stakeholders
Government			Stakeholder engagement and respecting all laws	The role of government to collect taxes, provide infrastructure, education and

				health services is less mentioned
Environment	Environmental commitment	Treat the world's most serious diseases	Environmental stewardship	Making the world a better place to live in.

When reflecting on the corporate stakeholder issues it can be stated that both social responsibility and environmental stewardship are relatively new and added to stockholder responsibility in recent years. Social and environmental responsibility, transparency and openness are requirements in the global business world where Internet access to information and communication enable stakeholders to exchange positive but certainly also negative information about a company and the products and services. One can see a 'power shift' from the company to the client and to the community. This shift of power can be read from the issues listed above where (1) the client and the employee are at the centre of attention in building human capital. Broader corporate responsibility is reflected in (2) social responsibility (community), (3) economic responsibility (stockholder and vendors) and (4) environmental responsibility (natural resources and energy). The issues listed above align well with the main topics of recent quality of life research, as we will demonstrate in the following section 5.

Quality of Life Research

The International Society of Quality of Life Studies (ISQOLS), through conferences and publications (Glatzer, Von Below & Stoffregen, 2004), is contributing to establishing a scientific discipline in the field of Quality of life. Quality of life in social sciences is a concept related to different dimensions of society. The new trend in quality of life research is often a strong emphasis on the subjective perception of life by the people. Quality of life implies a positive view of the world, but it does not neglect the negative features of society, like alienation and exclusion, anxieties and fears, as well as worries and loneliness. Besides the positive and negative dimensions of quality of life the future dimension is taken into account considering hopes and fears for the future.

Quality of life is a multi-level term and this is essential for the questions connected with the concept. Quality of life can be defined for the individual on the one hand and for the global world on the other hand. It is conceived and measured differently in the individual case, in local areas, in communities, in regions, nations, continents or in global terms. Consistency in theoretical and practical respect is a serious problem. Quality of life is interdisciplinary as different approaches use it in different ways. The quantitative methods were clearly preferred in the beginning of quality of life research (Veenhoven, 2004). But the qualitative methods have also detected the field through by example (Kontos, 2004) biographical analysis and life processes built on the concept of capabilities introduced in the writings of Amartya Sen (1995).

Quantitative methods measure the *state of quality of life* in a representative sample at a certain moment in time: 1) material sphere: material wealth, health and well-being, 2) social sphere: care, family life, friendship, love and affection 3) personal development and self-

realisation sphere: esteem, reputations, joy of life, capabilities and 4) societal sphere: freedom, justice, security and participation.

Qualitative methods take into account the *processuality of social life* and the agency of social actors. Erik Allardt (1973, 1993) defined the quality of life concept on three basic needs:

Having: material dimensions as economic resources, living conditions, work conditions, health, education and the environment.

Loving: needs for belonging and social relationships, in the neighbourhood, family, friends, participation.

Being: options for participation and self-realisation such as political participation, possibilities of influence, the possibility of exercising a meaningful professional occupation and free time activities.

Kontos (2004) developed a 'capabilities' approach inspired by Amartya Sen (1995). Capability of a person represents the various alternative combinations of beings and doings of which a person can choose. Capability refers thus to a *space* of alternative combinations of functionings (doing and being) from which the actual set of functionings have been chosen. The quality of life is related to the ability to choose relevant functionings. In this approach freedom, as thought of the range of choices a person has, becomes central in the quality of life concept.

Max-Neef (1991) described a matrix model for human scale development including aspects of being, doing, having and interacting addressing issues of human needs as: subsistence, protection, affection, understanding, participation, idleness, creation, identity and freedom. When we compare suggestions from Max-Neef (1991) on human scale development with Allardt (1973,1993) on the dimensions of quality of life, we propose that the quality of life concept can expanded and defined on four basic needs of being, doing, loving (interacting) and having.

Beyond Teaching and Learning

When we consider contemporary Quality of life research and new qualitative trends in the field we can see that *shaping* quality of life is a *capability and freedom* of choosing relevant functionings of *being, doing, loving and having*. The focus of business and management education is often limited to attaining professional qualifications to be productive in work. We propose that current education is one-dimensional directed at *having.* To answer the main question addressed in this paper what is there beyond teaching and learning (directed at *having*) can possibility be answered by taking a broader view of the role of education in increasing the capability and freedom of choosing relevant functionings including *being, doing, loving and having.* As we presented three corporate examples we can see that the needs of business also become more inclusive. Apart from the stockholder (economic focus) we can see corporate responsibility to include building human capital, social capital and environmental capital. It can be stated that these corporate issues address various topics concerning the shaping of quality of life. This presents a strong argument for business schools to innovate and prepare future students for a wider *space of alternative combinations of functionings (being, doing, loving and having)* and thereby aligns better with economic, social and environmental responsibilities business face.

These notions on shaping quality of life inspired an experiment at the Amsterdam Business School of the University of Amsterdam in a course for final year master students in Information Management. The aim is to allow for freedom to choose and to allow for being yourself, do what inspires you most to enhance quality of life, find and manage real world connections and shape social arrangements to construct (lasting) value beyond the four months course.

Case Study Information Management in Practice

The case study is conducted following basic case study research design (Yin, 2003) and data collection methods. The authors are teachers in the Information Management in Practice course and have full access to documents and (student) presentations, reports and assessments. To share information and findings before, during and after the course a password protected wiki was available to 53 students, 4 teachers and 8 practitioner/coaches. The proposition P1 to be tested is: Constructing quality of life is the *end* where teaching and learning are the *means*. We first place the case study in context and motivate the new design of the course. We provide more detail on student projects, information on the roles of teachers and practitioner/coaches as well as the method of assessment. Finally we gather lessons learned.

The Context and the Problem Addressed

The Information Management in Practice Course at the University of Amsterdam previously was a course addressing real world issues of the City of Amsterdam allowing students to engage into real life challenges and working in teams for real clients. For a number of years this approach worked well but contrasted to our notion of student driven learning as we as the teachers together with city officials provided the challenges for learning. We also became increasingly aware of the fact that students from a single discipline generally define real world problems in terms of the discipline they have been taught (For a hammer every problem looks like a nail). This appears to be the case for students in Information Management as well, who generally define a problem as an information systems problem. In real life this may not be the case at all.

New Course Design

So we concluded that the 2007 course design should allow for the following quality of life issues of being, doing, loving and having:
- Being: freedom to define personal passion and choose a real world social issue
- Doing: work on the issue in a team of approximately 4 students with a similar passion for four months constructing (lasting) value
- Loving: reach out to people in the real world
- Having: to generate (lasting) value for clients/networks served

Additional design criteria for the course included:
- Open space for learning with weekly 3 hours class room contact: no fixed curriculum or list of recommended literature
- Guest lecturers for inspiration and creative thinking purposes only
- Intensive coaching by a team of four teaching staff and 8 inspiring practitioners

Structure of the Course

- A limited number of criteria for constructing and evaluating the value creating team activities were formulated by the teachers such as:
    i. First month: formulate personal passion for a real life social issue, form a team of four and focus on *capability of* **feeling** by '*living' with the client in the client situation.*
    ii. Second month: focus on *capability of* **thinking** *out off the box and generating a wider range of possible solutions*
    iii. Third month: focus on *capability of selecting promising solutions and* **designing** *one or more solutions in practice*
    iv. Fourth month: focus on *capability of* **assessing feasibility** *through actual implementation with the client.*

The order of the process in time of feeling, thinking, designing and feasibility we chose to allow students to *unlearn* set habits of seeing every problem as an *information system* problem. Particularly the first month is experienced as unsettling by the students as in the case of 1) freedom to choose: nobody ever asked for their personal passion and how they would prefer to spend the next four months. This question presented a novelty to the students who are used to fixed curricula and a given set of issues from literature. And 2) to immerse in the client environment by feeling and dialogue without thinking of information systems as a solution is not the way students were educated: it opened up the readiness to consider and accept a wider space of *capabilities and functionings (being, doing, loving and having).*

Students, Teachers, Practitioner/Coaches and Student Generated Projects

Following the design of this learning expedition between, 53 students, 8 practitioners (coaches) and 4 teachers, 11 projects emerged:
- Combating Poverty: Food Bank and Educating the Poor to become 'Rich'
- Digital Entrepreneurship: Experimenting in Second Life
- Digital Government: Offering distributed government services
- Sustainability: Energy efficient solutions
- Fighting Cancer: Transparent information for patients and parents
- Honest reporting on Iraq: Separating facts from opinion
- Party Crashers: Safety and security for all party goers
- Perspectives on reality: Exploring open innovation practices
- Privacy on the Internet: Awareness and privacy protection measures
- Struggling with reality: Changing the rules of education and innovation in a complex world
- Changes in organisations: The influence of power in organisational change processes.

It is interesting to see that if 53 young students are offered the *freedom* to select their own issue, immediately serious quality of life issues emerge such as poverty, disease, privacy, power, safety and security etc.

Unlearning Calls for Additional Structure

In the first month the 'feeling' process went every which way. So as teachers we where forced to provide for some additional guidance. Based on the general notions of quality of life we identified a number of additional criteria to self-evaluate and judge the value creating projects:

- Personal interest: can you learn something for later when you have to execute a project posed on you by others within time and budget?
- Real world: in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) we generally work with databases and systems. The environment we choose ex ante is not an automation environment but the real world. Automation may however be one of the range of possible solutions.
- Information component: this criterion seems to contradict the suggestion of 'feeling' as a first step. As you will address a real world issue through immersion you will eventually address the information related question in reality. Not by starting to sketch new information architecture and other simplifications of reality.
- Relevance: Can we really mean something to the client organisation where we will operate for 4 months? In general this is easier when a question is relevant to society and within smaller organisations.
- Daring: Why not pick a project where we have to apply 'out-of-the-box' thinking? Something totally different that generates surprise.
- Visibility: This will be an added advantage. It is no hard criterion. We may try and get some publicity for our project. That may be an extra incentive.
- Realisable: Relevance leads the question of can it be realised? Can we within four months generate something (at least an attractive general design) with reality value that can be presented to stakeholders in the feasibility phase?

Presentations and Assessment

On June 5th, 2007 students presented their projects to the coaches, the teachers and in some cases some client guests attended the session. The presentation style was free and ranged from PowerPoint, to film, to story telling. A full report of the project including the individual contribution of each student allowed us to rate the work of individual students. The personal freedom to chose quality of life real world issues and subsequently addressed by the students in teams of four, generated so much interaction, intensive learning and value creation. The time and intensity of learning and constructing quality of life in a specific area appears to exceed the level of learning of more traditional lecture based courses, detached from student and client reality.

Discussion

The proposition P1 to be tested in the case study is: Constructing quality of life is the *end* where teaching and learning are the *means.* In the case study Information Management in Practice students were challenged to express their personal interest in a social relevant issue. In teams of four students sharing the same passion for the topic, real life client organisations where contacted to engage in a process of constructing quality of life for stakeholders. Following the cycle of feeling, thinking, designing and feasibility in four months allowed for 1) unlearning habits of

seeing every problem as an information systems problem and for 2) generating (lasting) value for self and client organisation served in 10 out of 11 student projects. The project that failed, failed to select and engage a real life client organisation.

The case study indicates that if we change the paradigm from knowledge transfer through teaching and learning (as means), to a new paradigm of constructing quality of life (as the end of teaching and learning) we can broaden the scope of education to include quality of life issues as being, doing, loving and having. The proposition P1 can be confirmed for this course and these 53 students. Students experience this type of education and the freedom to choose based on personal interest, challenging, inspiring and rewarding. Both for themselves and the client organisations served. If we reflect on the issues that Microsoft, Pfizer and Johnson & Johnson face concerning stockholder responsibility, social responsibility and environmental responsibility it can be stated that students where challenged to experience and learn from real world complex issues in the projects they generated. It is a form of engaged scholarship as proposed by Van der Ven & Johnson (2006). This engagement can be seen as a positive step toward understanding and dealing with complex quality of life issues and finding solutions to real problems. It is anticipated that future employers will value these capabilities.

Implications for Higher Education

The advantages of traditional paradigms of knowledge transfer and knowledge production in business education are that these processes can be organised in an efficient way, on a large scale, can be controlled easily and evaluated with set rules for assessing knowledge gained. It allows for accreditation of course and universities and ranking.

Emerging corporate issues of social and environmental responsibility, in addition to stockholder responsibility increase the dynamics and the complexity for businesses. Constructive stakeholder engagement is a new requirement to constantly uncover and monitor new stakeholder expectations. Quality of life issues (being, doing, loving, having) become more inclusive in bringing corporate values to practice for creating sustainable stakeholder value as human capital, social capital, economic and ecological capital.

Innovating business education to meet the future needs of corporations and society is inevitable for universities and schools of Higher Education. The implications for Higher Education are:
1) Open a debate on the paradigms of knowledge transfer, knowledge production as means and compared to construction of quality of life as the end of teaching and learning. Compare fresh notions with current business education practices.
2) Experiment on constructing quality of life learning expeditions for students in real world settings allowing for freedom and exploring capabilities and to select a specific set of functionings (being, doing, loving, having) to create (lasting) value for themselves and stakeholders served.
3) Share and publish results of these experiments to allow for establishing a body of knowledge on constructing quality of life that can be available to all innovative schools of

HE and to the business community showing social responsibility, environmental responsibility and stockholder responsibility in a dynamic and global world.

In 2008 we will repeat the experiment with more likely more students than last year, as word of mouth by students about how much 'fun' this course is, stimulates enrolment. As teachers we have fun as well and accept the 'disadvantage' of very intensive student coaching, not knowing the quality of life issues and outcomes in advance and having limited tools for controlling team efforts during the journey. The quality, value and passion in the final student presentations and written reports allow for individual assessment after four months. So instead of controlling ex-ante we can control ex-post. To summarise the implications for higher education, this study indicates that less 'teaching' could very well be more 'learning' and that 'knowledge transfer" as a means can possibly effectively be replaced by the paradigm of 'building quality of life' as an end.

Questions can be raised if this type of *free form* quality of life education is suitable for all students at all levels? The answer is we don't know. So let us start a debate. Our next proposition P2 is that students should be exposed to real world quality of life issues as early as possible in their formal and informal learning career and discover what their passion is in real life and what contributions they are exited about to make to a better world. In short: construct quality of life.

We recommend further research into the effects on student's performance in various stages of their formal and informal learning career based on the proposed paradigm of constructing quality of life as described in this article.

References

http://im.fee.uva.nl/wiki/Informatiemanagement_toepassingen_in_de_praktijk
Retrieved from the Internet on: February 20th, 2008.

http://www.jnj.com/community/index.htm
Retrieved from the Internet on: February 20th, 2008.

http://www.microsoft.com
Retrieved from the Internet on: February 20th, 2008.

http://www.pfizer.com/home/
Retrieved from the Internet on: February 20th, 2008.

Allardt, E. (1973). *About Dimensions of Welfare*. Research Group for Comparative Sociology. Research Report No. 1. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Allardt, E. (1993). Having, Loving, Being: An Alternative to the Swedish Model of Welfare Research. M.C. Nussbaum & A.K. Sen (eds.): *The Quality of Life*, New York: Oxford University Press, 88-94.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D.A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience & Education*. New York: Touchstone.

Glatzer, W., Van Below, S., & Stoffregen, M. (2004). *Challenges for Quality of Life in the Contemporary World: Advances in quality of life studies, theory and research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kontos, M. (2004). Biographical Analysis of Quality of Life Processes in Migration. In Glatzer, W.

Van Below, S., & Stoffregen, M. (Eds.). *Challenges for Quality of Life in the Contemporary World: Advances in quality of life studies, theory and research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Max-Neef, M.A. (1991). *Human Scale Development: conception, application and further reflections.* New York: The Apex Press.

Pettigrew, A.M. (2001). Management Research after Modernism. *British Journal of Management*. Special Issue: S 61– S70.

Sen, A. K. (1995). Capability & Well-Being. In: M.C. Nussbaum & A.K. Sen (eds.): *The Quality of Life*, New York: Oxford University Press, 30–53.

Thijssen, J.P.T., Maes, R. & Vernooy, A.T.J. (2002). Learning by Sharing: a Model for Life-long Learning. In T.A. Johannesssen, Pedersen, A., & Petersen, K. (Eds.), *Educational Innovation in Economics and Business VI.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Thijssen, J.P.T. (2007). *Developing A Learning-by-Sharing Approach for Managers: Testing Transferable Design Principles*. s.l.: Via Nova Foundation: Dissertation forthcoming at the University of Amsterdam.

Van de Ven, A. H. & Johnson, P.E. (2006). Knowledge for Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*. 31. No. 4, pp. 802–821.

Veenhoven, R. (2004). World Database of Happiness. In M.C. Nussbaum & A.K. Sen (eds.): *The Quality of Life*, New York: Oxford University Press,75– 88.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.