

## LEARNING OF UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

*Tunc Medeni, JAIST, Japanese Advanced Institution of Science and Technology,  
8-1 Asahidai, Tatsunokuchi, Nomigun, Ishikawaken, 923-1211  
medeni@jaist.ac.jp*

### EXTENDED ABSTRACT

As an interdisciplinary field, Management Learning (ML) is both the Management of Learning and the Learning of Management for the individual, the organization, and the society. Fox suggests (1997) that management education (ME) and management development (MD) are two distinct but also increasingly overlapping worlds. In their content, the teaching methods they use, and by the organisations through which they are delivered it is possible to identify their unique qualities. ML mainly emerges from combining the practices of these two worlds, ME and MD, with those of the world of management practice (MP). Burgoyne & Jackson (1997) developed MmLl categorization, (m)anagement and (M)anagement and (L)earning and (l)earning, which distinguishes not only the informal and formal practices of management, but also those of learning, in support of these suggestions:

**MM:** Formal attempts to manage management – formally define a management philosophy

**Mm:** Formal management attempts to control informal management processes – e.g. attempts to manage culture

**mm:** The interplay of informal management processes on each other

**mM:** The informal, personal, private strategies that individuals and groups employ to deal with formal management systems

**LL:** Formal research on and the study of deliberate and explicit learning processes, as in courses, etc.

**Ll:** Formal research on and the study of informal learning: psychology of learning, sociology of knowledge

**lL:** Learning to cope with formal learning experiences and situations: for instance, learning to be a good student

**ll:** Informal understandings of informal learning processes : for instance, of how to be a good learner

As result of research conducted in a United Kingdom university, we have also contributed to these academic works by developing an  $M^m L^l$  Framework. Applying the concepts of ML to the higher education institution we identified various

management and learning types from a series of interviews done by 10 academic and non-academic managers at different levels and in different parts of the university.

### **Mm Ll Framework**

In this modeling, first we distinguished the formal and informal qualities of the title held by a manager, and then the nature of the tasks that the manager deals with, comparing and contrasting the relatively high-level tasks of leadership, decision-making, and long-term planning with lower level everyday operational routines. In the model we connected the formal titles and high-level tasks to the capital letter 'M', and the informal titles and low-level tasks to the lower-case letter 'm', as follows:

**M<sup>m</sup>** : formal management (administration) title, day-to-day routine operational tasks

**M<sup>M</sup>** : formal management title, big scale long term issues like strategic planning, leadership.

**m<sup>M</sup>** : no formal management title, but active responsibility in critical process of decision-making, leadership

**m<sup>m</sup>** : no formal management title, everyday processes of getting things done

In our case, these four different management types are seen as follows:

**TABLE 1:**

Type	Example in the University
M <sup>m</sup>	Secretarial, Support, Administrative staff
M <sup>M</sup>	Pro-Vice Chancellor (PVC), Faculty Deans (FD), Heads of Department (HD)
m <sup>M</sup>	Project Managers, Research Leaders
m <sup>m</sup>	People like Program Coordinators who have no formal description of their managerial role in their title or job description

Then, a similar logic was followed for identifying different types of learning; this time distinguishing not only the informal and formal learning practices (processes) but also the formal and informal learning outcomes (products):

**L<sup>l</sup>** : formal activities which can encourage informal learning

**L<sup>L</sup>** : formal learning activities for formal learning

**I<sup>L</sup>** : informal activities that encourages formal learning

**I<sup>l</sup>** : relatively Informal activities that stimulates informal learning

Our organizational study also incorporated the distinctions of academic education (AE), management training (MT), and competency framework models (CFM); some examples of these distinctions are shown in the table below:

**TABLE 2:**

Learning Type	Management Learning (Fox, 1997)
L <sup>l</sup>	MD, ME (their overlapping)
L <sup>L</sup>	Academic Education (AE)
I <sup>L</sup>	Competency Framework Models (CFM), Management Training (MT)
I <sup>l</sup>	MP

Our analysis of the interviews guided us to identify these unique types of ML in the university. The interviewees openly commented on the nature of their job, the training provided by the related university administrative department, on other useful knowledge for them, and how this knowledge could be gained. In accordance with suggestions from the interviewees, the management types were matched with the suitable learning types for individual and organizational development, as in this final table:

**TABLE 3:**

Type of Manager / Management	Example in the University	Matching Learning Type	Example in the Discourse of ML
M <sup>M</sup>	PVC, FD, HD	I <sup>l</sup>	MP
m <sup>M</sup>	Project Managers	L <sup>l</sup>	MD, ME
M <sup>m</sup>	Secretarial, Support, Administrative Staff	I <sup>L</sup>	CFM, MT
m <sup>m</sup>	Program Coordinators	L <sup>L</sup>	AE in management

This model can be interpreted as a kind of “training needs by subtraction” learning model (Burgoyne, 1975). In addition, results of the research stressed the need for the University to have a better system of knowledge management, with specific suggestions to develop management teams, a help-line, and diversified Meetings”. We also believe that the developed framework for the learning needs analysis of the managers can be applied to other higher education institutions.

## REFERENCES

- Burgoyne, J. 1975. *Learning theories and design assumptions in management development programmes*. CSML Publications, University of Lancaster.
- Burgoyne, J. & Reynolds, M. (Eds.). 1997. *Management learning: Integrating perspectives in theory and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fox, S. 1997. From management education and development to the study of management learning. In J. Burgoyne & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Management learning: Integrating perspectives in theory and practice*, 21-37. London: Sage Publications.