© Academy of Management Learning & Education, 2015, Vol. 14, No. 1, 133–149. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0396

Book & Resource Reviews

Disrupt or Be Disrupted*: *A Blueprint for Change in Management Education, edited by Brooks Holtom and Erich Dierdorff. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 413 pages, hard cover.

Reviewed by **Gianpiero Petriglieri**, INSEAD.

There are two bold pronouncements at each end of *Disrupt or Be Disrupted*, a landmark book edited by Brooks Holtom and Erich Dierdorff whose subtitle promises "a blueprint for change in management education." The volume greets the reader with the boast that "The MBA program, the flagship of business schools, was the greatest educational innovation of the twentieth century" (p. vii) and bids farewell with the warning that "we must choose to disrupt, renovate, and renew our current approaches to graduate management education, least we allow ourselves to drift into continued complacency and, ultimately, irrelevance" (p. 371).

Anyone even vaguely familiar with the rhetoric of contemporary business schools, the controversies surrounding and uncertainties within them, will recognize this "rise and fall" storyline. It is the kind of threatening, downward narrative arc that charismatic leaders trace to build urgency and support for their own visions. What happens between those sentences, fortunately, could not be farther from advocacy for a singular and universal path to salvation, enlightenment, or growth.

Holtom and Dierdorff bring together contributions from an all-star lineup of management education scholars, many with recent experiences as deans. The message they deliver is both multifaceted and complex, as well as informative and empowering. The volume provides a detailed map of the challenges facing management education worldwide and illustrates multiple possible ways of addressing them, accounting for the resources needed and trade-offs necessary to make different choices.

Disrupt or Be Disrupted is sponsored by the Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC), which owns and administers the most widely adopted admission test for aspiring management students, and its ambition is clearly spelled out. It aims to mark "another quarter century step in the development of the field" (p. 15) of management education, an inflection similar in magnitude but different in direction to those provoked by reports commissioned over 50 and 25 years ago, respectively, by the Ford Foundation (Gordon & Howell, 1959) and the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB; Porter & McKibbin, 1988).

These landmark reports feature prominently in seminal work on the trajectory of management education over the past century. Scholars have argued that their recommendations, the 1959 ones in particular, set business schools on a quest for academic legitimacy that eroded their social standing in the long run (Augier & March, 2011; Khurana, 2007). The rise of disciplinary research, of a rational approach to management, and of a utilitarian view of its function, critics contend, has proven damaging to students, society, and management academia itself (Ghoshal, 2005; Mintzberg, 2004; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002).

That work has helped us understand how business schools arrived at a place of such controversial popularity. These days, degrees in business are the most popular in the United States, representing 20 and 25% respectively of all bachelor's and master's degrees granted (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Competition for MBA slots at elite institutions is fierce. And yet, scholars and practitioners alike voice serious concern that management education is inadequate, irrelevant, or harmful (it is indeed one of few concerns they appear to share). In *Disrupt or Be Disrupted*, the authors acknowledge how we got here, but their overarching focus is on how to move forward.

If there is one universal message delivered throughout the book, it is about the importance of differentiation for individual schools if the field of management education is to survive and thrive. The collection is written with business school deans and decision makers in mind, and offers them evidence-based instruments to chart their schools' unique courses amid an ever-more crowded and competitive domain. It is a powerful testimony of the richness, value, and usefulness of scholarship on management learning and education, as well as of its current limitations.

Nevertheless, this is far more than a strategic manual for the scholarly minded. You do not need to be a dean or administrator of any stripe to learn a lot from it. Anyone working or studying in a business school, or aspiring to do so, should read it. Readers will gain a sharper picture of the forces that shape these institutions' practices and norms and of the insecurities and ambitions of those who work and study there. Unlike many edited volumes, *Disrupt or Be Disrupted* reads like an integrated whole. The chapters build upon each other to cover every aspect of conceptualizing, positioning, designing, delivering, and evaluating management education.

A succinct and striking introduction by Brooks Holtom and Lyman Porter lays out the circumstances that make change imperative: staggering and unsustainable tuition increases; declining government funding; global competition; ever more diverse, yet unclearly differentiated, course portfolios; little consensus about standards and curricula; public doubts about business schools' value and relevance; and all in the midst of an ongoing technological revolution. Each challenge is illustrated with compelling data, and together they leave no other option than revisiting—and reinventing—the ways in which management educators, and therefore, management education delivers value.

In chapter 1, Erich Dierdorff, Denis Nayden, Dipak Jain, and Subhash Jain tackle the apparent contradiction I touched upon above. When one reviews the evidence on the skills it equips students with and opportunities it affords them, management education seems to be worth the investment. Aspiring managers flock to business school classrooms and employers continue to hire them upon graduation despite widespread doubts regarding the value of an MBA degree. So why is there such discontent with it? Economic worth in the employment marketplace, clearly, is too narrow a definition of value—especially when viewed from the perspective of those whose lives are affected by the deeds of managers who are business school graduates. Dierdorff and colleagues suggest that we expand that definition to encompass the enhancement of managerial competence and the transmission of a prosocial set of values, urging business schools to abandon their overt reluctance to be normative. This is, after all, only a thin cover for the continued promotion of values that are "quintessentially economic and financial in nature" (p. 41). Alongside increasing the effectiveness of our teaching practices, they conclude, we must revisit and broaden the values we promulgate and be more explicit about the value of different educational offerings. This would enable us to honor the forgotten promise of professionalism.

Chapter 2 is a compendium of competitive strategy for business school managers. Michael Hay presents a central theme of the book at the outset: "There is no single way to be a successful business school" (p. 57), and attempting to replicate the model of established North American business schools with large endowments (yes, Harvard, he is talking about you) is a recipe for failure. Hay lays out a framework to help decision makers determine the positioning best suited to creating value given the constraints and opportunities in their environment. The framework encompasses broad questions: who the school serves; its main activities; how, where, and by whom programs are delivered; how big the school is; and how it is structured and financed. Each is usefully broken down into major elements, and then farther into the parameters for which different choices are possible. Needless to say, the questions he raises are related to each other. Serving the needs of an industry within one's region, for example, calls for developing content and pedagogical expertise on that industry and region, and perhaps bundling them in a specialized degree that attracts talent to the region, rather than, say, offering a more general executive MBA. Given that Hay's focus is on strategy, alignments between environment, resources, and activities as well as disciplined implementation are portrayed as essential. Achieving them, however, is far from straightforward.

The trade-offs and difficulties one may encounter in the pursuit of purposeful alignment are the remit of chapter 3, where Jikyeong Kang and Andrew Stark give voice to 19 business school deans, distilling their insights into the challenges of funding an ambitious organizational agenda. That the chapter examines business schools using different models and from different regions (North America, Europe, and Asia) is refreshing and reflects a virtue of the whole book. Kang and Stark focus in particular on the relation between a school's revenue sources and its faculty's research orientation. With MBA tuition having risen to levels where it may hardly do so farther, they note, administrators at institutions with limited donation streams need to develop different sources of funding. The most common, such as specialized master's and executive education courses, require substantial practice and client focus that are seldom congruent with the interests, abilities, and commitments of research-oriented faculty. This is one of the most striking sections of the books. A commitment to research, seen through these deans' eyes, is necessary to hire and retain the best faculty and accrue a coveted spot near the top of popular rankings. At least a portion of the deans interviewed, however, go on record with the claim that research has little, if not a negative, impact on pedagogical practice in their respective institutions. The troubling image of research that transpires from these interviews is not as the pursuit of truth or solutions for managerial and social problems of the day. It is neither elegant nor practical, let alone, as Augier and March (2011) hoped, both. It is rather like the expensive vanity exercise of an institution, and perhaps Academy, more preoccupied about its own legitimacy than about how meaningful and useful it is.

Kang and Stark predict further polarization between well-funded schools that can afford to remain research-oriented, and those where reliance on teaching revenues will drive superior customer focus. Put another way, only the most privileged among students will be able to be treated as such. If that comes to pass, it will institutionalize an image of research as inward looking and peer-oriented, and teaching as outward looking and manager-oriented. An image, that is, that segregates academics from practitioners and casts them as living at different paces, speaking different languages, and pursuing different interests. This is a schism that many take for granted and it imperils the relevance of management academia. How it came about, and how it is perpetuated through the doctoral programs that train and socialize business school faculty, is the subject of chapter 4 by J.C. Spender and Rakesh Khurana, a chapter that I believe should be required reading in every PhD program.

Spender and Khurana revisit the legacy of the 1959 Ford Foundation report and the resulting rise to prominence in business schools of the most scientific-looking among disciplinary scholarship—that which employs mathematical models and quantitative methods. Already in 1988, the AACSB noted that those changes could drive a wedge between academic and practitioner communities. Those concerns were well placed, argue Spender and Khurana. To address this split, however, reforming curricula to make them more "relevant" is not enough. We need "a critical examination of the school's doctoral programs and how they shape faculty and business schools and, by extension, the discipline" (p. 135). This is, they suggest, an institutional field rather close to home where organizational scholars would do well (in more than one sense) to focus their attention.

Spender and Khurana proceed to "walk the talk" here by utilizing the Weberian concept of "ideal type" to examine the history of four paradigmatic and influential doctoral programs—Harvard (HBS), Chicago (Booth), Carnegie Mellon (Tepper), and Yale (School of Management). Each program put forward a distinct "intellectual signature" with differentiated takes on why and what scholarship matters, how it ought to be done, and whom it serves. Whereas the Harvard and Yale signatures privileged multidisciplinary, often inductive, approaches to generating insights that may serve the interests of practicing managers and society at large, Chicago and Carnegie Mellon's signatures privileged modeling and quantitative methods to generate insights on disciplinary questions mostly in economics and systems theory. Eventually, dissemination of the latter two signatures shaped an institutional field where "our present, almost dogmatic emphasis on positivist methods means that instead of pursuing critically bold intellectual ends, our PhD students are being taught to be risk-avoiding journeymen and contributes to the relevance-and-rigor divide" (p. 155). Spender and Khurana don't mince their words. This is consistent with their view that a rebalancing if not integration between quantitative and qualitative methods as well as disciplinary and managerial concerns can and must begin with the rise and cultivation of dissident by unconventional scholarly voices.

The message of innovation as rebalancing and integration echoes through the following chapter, where Sara Rynes and Jean Bartunek tackle another component of many management academics' agendas: the curriculum. Rynes and Bartunek begin by addressing the common complaint that business schools do not prepare students enough for their future work as managers. Building on a substantial body of research, they offer advice to remedy another imbalance closely related to that described by Spender and Khurana—that between functional or analytic courses that dominate MBA core curricula and courses aimed at equipping students with leadership ability, interpersonal finesse, decision-making and problem-solving skills, an ethical stance, and an international outlook. The imbalance between these two broad categories of courses, the authors suggest, is at the core of most critiques of management education. As a counterpoint to the previous chapter, Rynes and Bartunek note that curricular imbalance is not just driven by management professors' cast of mind. The finance and consulting jobs many MBA students gravitate toward upon graduation, for reasons that include salaries large enough to pay back hefty student loans, require technical prowess as a necessary if not sufficient condition for success. That is what a heavily functional or technical curriculum delivers. This may explain why alumni consistently report greater satisfaction with the knowledge and skills MBA programs equip them with than their recruiters do.

The chapter includes many examples of schools that are revamping curricula to take into account the whole person and their context. It is hard to disagree with Rynes and Bartunek's conclusion that moving farther in this direction is a defining challenge for business schools—if we aspire to develop competent, considerate, and ethical managers. It is also hard to be overly optimistic. As they note, their recommendations call for addition, not substitution, and for finding space for more courses in already cramped curricula where coursework competes for students' attention with job search and extracurricular activities. Furthermore, offering such courses, which are often experiential and delve into students' values and sensitivities, requires specific skills on the part of instructors, an issue to which we now turn.

Although most critiques of business schools tend to focus on the material we teach, how we teach it and what students expect and desire to learn are equally important. These are the topics of two fascinating chapters that build on research on teaching and learning (chap. 6) and student engagement (chap. 7). The title of the first, "Overlooked and Unappreciated," says all there is to say about the place of research on learning and pedagogy in contemporary business schools, as well as its impact on both what is taught and how it is taught to future managers and professors. Research has shown, for example, that professors' content expertise has no correlation with the extent of their general and specific pedagogical expertise, that is, to their knowledge of and competence in how to transmit their expertise to others. That is true of instructors whose expertise is gained through study, research, or practice. Knowing how to know, or how to do, is different from knowing how to teach.

Unfortunately, "compared to other professional schools," Kenneth Brown, Ben Arbaugh, George Hrivnak and Amy Kenworthy observe, "and especially medicine and engineering—business schools pay meager attention, resources and respect to educational research" (p. 230). This neglect is ironic given the focus business schools put on research, and it is not limited to faculty and administrators. The *Financial Times*, which publishes one of the most influential rankings of business schools, does not include even the most prestigious and selective journals on management education among the 45 it counts to assess research productivity.

Brown and colleagues depart from a broad definition of learning that encompasses changes in knowledge, skills, perspectives, and identities—what students know and can do, how they approach the world, and who they are. Through this lens, they shift the focus from knowledge to learning and expand it to include what students learn within and outside the classroom, in the formal and informal activities that faculty encourage or ignore. If we are serious about effecting deep change in our students, they contend, we cannot ignore the social learning that takes place throughout students' time at business schools—whether it is during a case discussion, a company visit, or a party. This focus on what business schools' "hidden curriculum" conveys, on both cognitive and social learning, is particularly important in light of the growth of on-line, blended, and experiential learning—emergent domains where research, the chapter shows, has much to offer.

Brown and colleagues return to a refrain in the book—change must start within. "Despite the increasing prevalence of . . . experiential methods," they write, "the unfortunate truth is that too often most faculty members teach the way that they were taught: through lectures or other similar approaches. Although the results have not always been ideal, this reality is evidence of two things: the power of observational learning highlighted by social learning theory, and the lack of formal training that doctoral students receive in general pedagogical and content pedagogical knowledge" (p. 244). In short, the variety of learning experiences business schools can offer reflects the variety of skills faculty members are exposed to, trained in, and rewarded for. Put another way, our depth and breadth as leaders of learning mirror those we can develop in leaders of organizations. Research and practice point in the same direction here, and both make a strong case for change—one that ties our ability to change to the change we want to see in our students.

The focus on what is learned within and outside the classroom continues through chapter 7, which brings systematic clarity to a term used as often as it is misunderstood—students' "engagement." Daniel Feldman challenges the assumption that the more engaged students are, the better. He acknowledges instead the tension between the time and energy students are willing and able to invest into coursework, extracurricular activities, and job search activities—all pulling them in interesting and useful directions, but competing for their attention. Feldman puts the learner at the center of the learning process and shows him or her as fully human—active, conflicted, neither a passive recipient of knowledge and socialization nor a single-minded pursuer of one and one goal only, whether that be enduring wisdom or a job at Goldman Sachs.

This view of learners as having desires and proclivities of their own that affect the learning process, points to the issue of selection. Research is unequivocal here. The students who are most engaged in their coursework leave business schools most satisfied. However, it is the students most engaged in their career development who engage most in the coursework. This leads Feldman to highlight the importance of admitting students who have a clear motivation to pursue management education—whether that is attaining a certain job or finding out what job they may like to have. Interestingly, this is the only chapter that questions the value of immersion and acknowledges that students have lives outside that affect their experience at business school, not only the other way around. It is a reminder, perhaps, that lurking in the ambition to transform students' hearts and minds so they can change society for good is a rather expansive view of our own influence. The question, Feldman concludes, is not how can we maximize student engagement, but rather, are students engaged "as they want and need to be" (p. 289)?

In the last chapter, a capstone for the book, Robert Rubin and Frederick Morgeson present an ambitious framework to "reclaim quality in graduate management education." Quality—and information about quality—is extremely important for all parties in management education. It influences both an institution's ability to attract faculty and students as well as employers' willingness to hire graduates. Nevertheless, or perhaps because of it, consensus on what quality looks like remains elusive. To this end, both accreditation agencies and popular media have been more concerned with measuring quality than defining it. Rubin and Morgeson offer a functional definition as "the extent to which a product or service manages to fulfill the purposes it was designed for (Certo & Certo, 2009)" (p. 301). At first read, this definition may appear to turn quality into a synonym of effectiveness and transfer all the controversy and ambiguity into the definition of purpose. The authors, however, are not playing to the sensitivity of most business school faculty and to the functional culture that prevails in our institutions. They are offering a definition that leaves room for different schools to pursue different aims, as the book suggests they should. The framework they propose is powerful precisely because it is broad and multidimensional.

Rubin and Morgeson report the rigorous and inclusive process that led to their program quality model (PQM), a rating system that takes into account the input, throughput, and output elements of an educational system. The dimensions include strategic focus; program student composition; institutional resources (input); curriculum; faculty; program and institution climate; student learning outcomes; placement (throughput); reputation; economic outcomes; and alumni network (output). The PQM is meant to reflect different quality profiles or "signatures," in order to enable prospective faculty, students, and employers to gravitate toward schools that best fit their needs and aspirations. It is a system better suited to the kind of differentiation the book advocates, rather than one with rankings that drive conformity.

In the epilogue, Dierdorff and Holtom use the PQM dimensions to summarize lessons from each chapter and end with seven "half-truths." Their reflections on these deceptively simple statements, so easy to rally around or dismiss, are one last gem in this treasure of a collection. It is worth listing them here: (1) management is not a profession; (2) reputation equates to educational quality; (3) learning technology is innovation; (4) new markets will sustain growth; (5) more programs equal more value; (6) graduate management education is value free; and (7) missions make us unique. I found the third and sixth particularly important. The current excitement about on-line delivery has reduced a needed conversation about what and how managers need to learn to a heated debate about massive open on-line courses (MOOCs). It is easy to forget that we create—or destroy—value in more ways than through our courses, as we sustain or challenge the ways management is understood, practiced, and learned.

Disrupt or Be Disrupted left me with a better grasp of management learning and education research and a clearer understanding of the challenges and trade-offs our institutions face. I witnessed its practical value recently, when the dean of my school assigned two chapters as readings before a faculty retreat. They informed and enriched our debates. The authors fulfill their promise to offer evidence-based suggestions to steer future institutional change. The messages here are both optimistic and pragmatic. Readers consistently see one or more solutions for each issue examined. Given how comprehensive the volume is, by the end, the reader is left with a portrait of our field and our institutions that is notable not only for what we have, but also for what we are missing.

The picture that emerges is one of an institution in transition, whose members recognize that its past strengths will not guarantee future success, but are not yet sure about what they may need to learn and how to learn it. There is no doubt that management education has grown exponentially since the reports that set it on its current course. Business schools have become gateways to a broad range of careers that reach beyond business, and also serve as retreats where students go to clarify their career trajectories. They contribute to the production of business culture through case studies, books, and a plethora of scholarly and popular publications. They partner with corporations to train and socialize employees and are seen as places where leaders' values are forged. They are, in short, far from trade schools where managers stop to pick up a specific knowledge set and a few skills. Much more than that, students often entrust our programs, and the faculty and administrators that shape them, to help them become who they aspire to be (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010).

No business school can do it all, and differentiation is the only way for our field to continue developing rather than just grow. The risk, however, is that differentiation turns the field into (even more of) an industry. Although differentiation may be key, it is critical that professionals in different segments of this burgeoning industry find ways to productively relate to each other, and continue to recognize themselves as involved in the same field; that is, as collectively engaged in the broad enterprise of making a positive difference in the lives of students, organizations, and society. In some cases, the most productive form of engagement may be collaboration. In others, it may be conflict.

Take, for example, the relationship between MBA programs and other course offerings. The book portrays the former as the outpost of business schools' conscience—not only the most popular but also the most controversial of their offerings. Most chapters in *Disrupt or Be Disrupted* focus exclusively on the MBA program, as does the majority of extant research. It is the place where business schools are most clearly attempting to find a balance between necessity and calling, functional and humanistic aims, transferring knowledge and shaping identities, raising revenues and making a difference in the world. Specialized master's and executive education courses have a less distinct identity to date, are far less researched, and risk being driven primarily by commercial concerns unless we give them the same scholarly and public attention than we currently give our MBAs. Here is a clear example of a space where more collaboration may well be needed.

The opposite may be true, on occasion, vis-à-vis recruiters. Chapter authors here never question the rhetoric of alignment. It would appear that alignment is the ultimate good. The idea that business schools do not fully equip students for corporate jobs is taken for granted. In that respect, our sense making and that of recruiters is perfectly aligned. In a differentiated field, however, some misalignment and even tension may also be fruitful. It may allow us, for example, to wonder whether part of the problem is that curricula privilege what recruiters hire for, rather than what they ask for. Or whether, no matter what business schools teach and stand for, the only skills and identities that "stick" after graduation are those reinforced by the organizations our alumni go on to work for.

I was also struck by the fact that the authors rarely questioned the rhetoric of "complacency." This may reflect the same model of rational problem solving that they found limiting. The familiar sequence from-diagnosis-to-solution leaves the question open. Why is so much good research routinely ignored and common sense often cast aside? Is our slow embrace of change really a result of complacency? There may be more active avoidance behind it. Many of us, after all, have shaped and benefit and are proud of at least parts of the institutions we are in, and calls for disruption make little distinction between what may be worth preserving and what needs to be let go of.

This type of self-examination and sorting out would require a conversation about the motives that more or less consciously drive our own resistance, and what forms of resistance may bring more progress than a blind embrace of change. All the evidence about human beings, especially those in positions that they have worked hard to obtain, is that we disregard evidence to protect our interests. *Disrupt or Be Disrupted* points to the need for more conversations about what keeps us stuck, and about the interesting and valuable places we might go to if we were able to move.

REFERENCES

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

Certo, S. C., & Certo, S. T. 2009. ***Modern management: Concepts and skills*** (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practice. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 4: 75–91.

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

Khurana, R. 2007. ***From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession.*** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mintzberg, H. 2004. ***Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development.*** San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. 2010. Identity workspaces: The case of business schools. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 9: 44–60.

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. 2002. The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 1: 78–95.

Porter, L. W., & McKibbin, L. E. 1988. ***Management education and development: Drift or thrust into the 21st century.*** New York: McGraw-Hill.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. 2013. ***Digest of Education Statistics, 2012*** (NCES 2014–015). Retreived from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=37.

Entrepreneurship Programs and the Modern University, by M. H. Morris, D. F. Kuratko, and J. R. Cornwall. 2013. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., 312 pages, hard cover.

Reviewed by **Per Davidsson**, Queensland University of Technology.

Entrepreneurship Programs and the Modern University is an excellent resource for those who intend to set up an entrepreneurship program or center, and arguably even more so for those who wish to coordinate or expand such activities into an effective "entrepreneurship ecosystem" across the university and its external stakeholders. Morris, Kuratko, and Cornwall's intention in writing this book is to "advocate a more strategic and integrative framework for building the curricular, cocurricular, research, community engagement, and infrastructure components of a program" (p. xii). There can be no doubt that the authors are pioneers and leaders in this area, and the value of the wealth of experience they generously share in this volume is quite considerable for the right user. The treatment of the topic is comprehensive—albeit not always deep—yet very accessible throughout. The book is organized into five main parts consisting of 2–5 concise chapters each, for a total of 16 chapters plus a preface and an epilogue. The writing style is succinct and effective with extensive use of tables, figures, and "best practice" exhibits. The tone is generally optimistic and inspirational. As a cover-to-cover reading, the volume is likely to work well both for the experienced insider looking for some new, useful ideas and the newcomer seeking a thorough introduction. In addition, it would function as a guide to repeatedly consult and seek inspiration during the planning and decision-making stages of university-based entrepreneurship program development.

Part I consists of three chapters. In the first, the authors describe the history and phenomenal growth of entrepreneurship as a university subject. This is followed by a chapter in which the pros and cons of five alternative, organizational structures for entrepreneurship programs are discussed. The third chapter in this section is focused on addressing the important issue of how to effectively assess program outcomes. The authors argue for assessment of the development of defined entrepreneur-