Nurturing Integrity in Management Education with the Development of an Alternative Web of Metaphors

Patrick Onsando and Thomas Cheruiyot, Moi University

Abstract

Management education has set the goal to improve the content of undergraduate and graduate courses so that they broadly integrate concerns for ethics and integrity. In order to reach that goal, management educators must consider how an overreliance on mainstream metaphors (e.g., business-as-war) perpetuates uneasy incorporation of ethics and integrity. They need to be mindful of how metaphors are used and the images that they evoke. Part of the challenge in fostering ethics and integrity is to deal with student preconceptions about the nature of business activities, which is generally in line with these mainstream metaphors. With this paper, our goal is not to find the best metaphor to incorporatepraxis of integrity within management education, but to suggest the need for a web of metaphors to grow and develop into an appealing alternative. Exposure to different metaphors can lead to different lines of reasoning and decision-making. By using different metaphors to understand the complex and paradoxical character of management, students could see things in ways that they may not have thought possible before. In short, management education needs some sort of metaphorical pluralism in order to embrace concerns for ethics and integrity.

Introduction

Since the Enron, WorldCom and other scandals of the first few years of this century it has become axiomatic to say that ethics needs to be part of the business school pogramme (AACSB, 2004).The financial collapse of 2007-2008 was in large part attributable to a failure of morality on the part of countless graduates of business schools who provided mortgage loans to unqualified applicants and sold those loans in bundles without disclosing the level of risk involved (Holland, 2009,Lewis,2010,Trevino& Nelson,2011).The use of mathematical models to the exclusion of other ways of framing their behaviour allowed countless participants in the financial markets to completely ignore the ethical implications of their activities. Given the concern with a lack of ethics, it is puzzling to read comments in the business press such as this "How did integrity become the key characteristic of leaders?" and particular business leaders (Weinberger, 2010).The author quotes Jack Welch, the legendary former CEO of General Electric, as saying he never held a management meeting where integrity was not mentioned. Great leaders of the past Weinberger (2010) notes would more likely be cited for courage, wisdom and steadfast resolve-think of Churchill, Roosevelt and Gandhi-but leaders today, at least in business do not claim those values, they claim integrity.

Our puzzlement arises because integrity, which is cited so often as a quality of a leader, is a term that speaks of moral rectitude. The Oxford English Dictionary defines integrity as; "Unimpaired moral state; freedom from moral corruption; innocence, sinlessness" and further as "soundness of moral principle; the character of uncorrupted virtue, esp.in relation to truth and fair dealing; uprightness, honesty, sincerity" (OED, 2011). If integrity is the commonest trait in leaders, and integrity means that those leaders are morally sound, how is that unethical behaviour occurs with such frequency in business organizations. While not all the blame for the ethical failings of business practitioners can be attributed to business schools they certainly must accept some of it (Podolny, 2009).Business schools have done very well in teaching the techniques, skills and tools of the substantive disciplines-marketing,finance,operations and so forth. But the high proportion of MBAs among the felons behind the scandals suggests that there has been a failure to instill a sense of integrity or moral responsibility into students. This criticism is given peculiar immediacy by the recent collapse, but it is hardly new.Khurana (2009) provides peculiar

a history of the long standing tension within management education between educating students in the technical aspects of management and engaging in the formation of the personal and professional characteristics that are required if business is to fulfill its social responsibility and graduates are to leaders of integrity. Even if the social responsibility of business is solely to increase its profits as Friedman (1970) claimed, it must, as he noted, do so within the laws and the 'rules of the game 'Too many graduates of business schools have not adhered to this limitation.

If the current concern for ethical education is not to suffer the fate of previous efforts and quietly fade away then a change of approach, it seems reasonable to claim, is required. Some years ago Piper et al. (1993), in the aftermath of the insider trading scandals of the 1980s, developed an approach to ethics education that was introduced with some success into the program at Harvard Business School. The success was in implementing a mandatory course in ethics into the programme.The more challenging part of their recommendation was the integration of ethics education into the business school experience as a whole. While some progress has been made recent events indicate that an effective approach to nurturing ethical business practitioners is a challenge which is yet to be met. In this this paper we suggest a way in which management education can be reoriented to accomplish that integration and technique. We will present a model for developing in student's praxis of integrity, which is an approach to business practice that incorporates reflection on ethical and social implications as a standard component.

This study demonstrates the strongly negative impact of the war metaphor, commonly used in teaching business strategy, particularly for ethics and sustainability. The results, we suggest, provide strong support for the importance we place on developing in business student's awareness of metaphors as well as a capacity to use a variety of metaphorical frames in developing their mental models of the world. Scholars from the cognitive science (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Johnson 1993; 1987; Lakoff, 1987) have demonstrated that humans structure reality by developing a cognitive framework which links ideas and images from one realm, usually a more concrete or experiential one, to ideas that are more abstract. This imaginative activity is an unavoidable feature of the mental modeling by which we make sense of the world we encounter. Metaphor is the term that cognitive scientists have given to this process.

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows. After a brief definition of integrity, we discuss the way in which the metaphors that we use to structure reality have very significant impacts on our understanding of events and ethical analysis thereof. We then briefly describe one experiment on metaphors that give most interesting results. We then suggest a model of "integrity as praxis" that we believe will greatly enhance the process of forming students as business practitioners of integrity. We offer some practical suggestions for how management educators might approach developing in their students a *praxis* of integrity that will form them into management professionals who robustly confront moral and ethical dilemmas will requisite knowledge, sensitivity, and conviction.

Integrity in the business world and in management education

While the term 'integrity" is much used, we argue that it is seldom defined with sufficient clarity to provide much guidance for behaviour.Indeed, for a quality that is so important to business leadership and so ubiquitous, integrity is poorly understood. The origins of the word in the Latin root *integer,* which refers to a whole number, suggest the idea of wholeness. The broadest meaning given to the term integrity in the Oxford English Dictionary is "The condition of having no part or element taken away or wanting; undivided or unbroken state; material wholeness, completeness, entirety" (OED, 2011).When used to describe a person's integrity implies wholeness or the integration of the whole person-physical,intellectual,spiritual,and emotional. In the moral sense in which the word used when speaking of leadership, a person of integrity knows who they are and what their values are. A person of integrity acts in a way that keeps their values and their actions aligned.Killinger (2007, p.12) defines integrity as "a personal choice, an uncompromising and predictably consistent commitment to honour moral, ethical, spiritual, and artistic values and principles" Killinger (2007), in discussing the development of integrity, links it to the gradual process by which humans acquire a sense of values. Thus integrity seems to involve knowing our values in a way that creates wholeness of the person.

We believe that it may be helpful not to think of integrity as a value in the same sense as most human characteristics that are so labeled. We agree with Carter (1996,p.7),who suggests that integrity requires three steps:(1) discerning what is right and what is wrong; (2) acting on what you have

discerned, even at personal cost; and (3) saying openly that you are acting on your understanding of right and wrong". What is interesting in Carter's (1996) definition is that he understands integrity as a process that involves three actions or activities that can be separated in time and space: *discerning* right from wrong, *acting* in accord with the action that has been discerned, and *saying* that your action is based on that discernment.

The first step of integrity involves knowing both our values. Values, as attributes of human beings can be thought of broadly as those concepts or characteristics that we think are important for ourselves and for the broader community. Values motivate us. We move in the direction of that which we value(Grim,2005).Gentile (2010) suggests that there is abroad consensus that there is broad consensus that such things as widom,cou rage,humanity,justice,temperance,and transcendence constitute values. Kidder's (2009) list consists of honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness, compassion. By virtues we refer to those moral qualities that Aristotle and subsequent philosophers have catalogued. Virtues are those characteristics to which we as individuals aspire. They define the moral center of our character and guide us in leading a life that we think worthy; a life of value. We do not suggest that integrity requires that we embody list of virtues. Rather integrity requires that we know ourselves well enough to know which virtues are most salient in our own lives.

Knowing our values and knowing ourselves is not the whole of integrity, however. When we say that a person has a conscience we are referring to this type of awareness. But integrity is not just hearing one's conscience or being aware of one's values, it is also about making the "right" decision by which we mean at least a decision that is not solely focused on our selfish interests. We needto consider not only ourselves but others as well. As Cicero wrote long ago "We are not born, we do not live for ourselves alone; our country, our friends, have a share in us"

We the second step, *acting,* the individual integrates her or his actions with his or her values-thereby avoiding contradiction, discontinuity and misalignment. In this sense integrity is not a value as such but a catalyst for implementing values in one's life. Integrity links one's own values with broader values and both of those with one's actions. The person of integrity is acting not out of self-knowledge or personal conscience alone, nor on moral principle (e.g., right and wrong) alone. A person of integrity

is rather, constantly seeking to integrate their own values with broader understandings of value and to then act in a way that is aligned with both. A person of integrity does not need to ponder whether to act fairly or compassionately or to exercise wisdom; a person of integrity knows that if they are to live a good life they must seek to embody those values in concrete actions

With the third step, *saying,* one explains why he or she has acted that way. This serves an educative function for the person, the organization and society by exposing to public review the discernment and the action of the individual. This is less an exercise of accountability than it is an acknowledgement that "no man is an island" and that to be a person of integrity requires that our discernment not to be entirely solitary. We can only be persons of integrity if we are willing to test our discernment in society and in so doing to be humble enough to revisit our values and our understanding of the values of others.

We content that business schools have a role to play in helping students to develop and enhance their innate capacity to act with integrity in the challenging and novel situations they will be confronted to upon graduation. In the context of management education, teaching integrity implies to help students be clear on their values. Students do not choose their values through a rational process; rather they discover them as they learn to them holistically. The role of metaphorical thinking and moral imagination are elements of reflection that must be included in that process.

Impacts of Metaphors and Cognitive Frames on Integrity

At least since Morgan's (1986) *Images of Organization,* management scholars have been active participants in the discussion about metaphors and its treatment in management education.Tsoukas (1993) has identified three perspectives on metaphors in the management literature. Metaphors are depicted as rhetorical device, ideological distortion, or a way thinking. The first perspective views metaphors as merely ornamental and expendable linguist, literary, and (Pinder & Bourgeois, 1982). The criticism is that metaphors used in this way distort facts-facts that should be presented in clear and precise language. Metaphor is familiar to most of us as a figurative device by which a writer invites a reader

to comprehend a given phenomenon in a richer fashion. Metaphor draws our attention to the way in which one thing shares at least some characteristics of a second. Adam Smith's 'invisible hand' is an instance of such a literary or rhetorical metaphor. The second perspective views metaphors as potential ideological distortions (Tinker,1986).Metaphors viewed from this perspective manipulate social conflict and inequality, at the expense of underprivileged stakeholders (Audebrand,2010).This usage can undermine the root source of social conflict and manipulate the conflict in order to make it fit in with pre-existing social structures. The third perspective on metaphors views metaphor as a "way of thinking" (Audebrand, 2010).Metaphor constitutes "a basic structural form of experience through which human beings engage, organize, and understand their world" (Morgan, 1983, p.601).To eliminate metaphor would be to eliminate thought and language. Metaphors can go unnoticed by people even though "there is at least one root metaphor lying at the heart of every complex system of thought" (Pepper, 1972, p.96). This is because when we are exposed to a new situation, we try to categorize it as something similar to a concept we are familiar with. Metaphorical thought, or analogical reasoning, is the first level of theorization a available to human beings (Llewellyn, 2003).Root metaphors certainly have an impact on the way in which we understand the world, but they are very seldom used with intentionality, because they are so deeply embedded in the structure of cognition that to say we choose them would imply a level of awareness that is not in fact present.

Metaphors can be identified and with considerable effort changed, although to do so would make communication with others who share and retain the original cognitive framework difficult (Johnson, 1987). Rather than change our metaphors, however, we are more likely to add on a new one and move back and forth between the two ways of framing reality in a fashion similar to that in which a native speaker of one language moves back and forth between it and a newly learned language. By and large we are not even aware that we are using such metaphors. In most cases we treat them as objective datum. Metaphors can be identified and the meaning they convey challenged. While it is a chimera of objectivist linguistics to think that language can be free of metaphor and thus describe the world "as it really is", it is certainly important and worthwhile to identify metaphors and the communicative impact they have. We need not accept the metaphors that are imposed on us (Lakoff, 2002).

Business schools, with their emphasis on quantitative calculations develop in students a number of cognitive frameworks using a variety of metaphors that will be helpful in sorting data, making sense of it and making decisions. Metaphors influence the weight that we attach to some features of the world that we encounter and they affect the way in which we think about the alignment of our values and our actions. The metaphor framing a business situation is particularly important in the way that it impacts the values that are highlighted for the person dealing with that situation. Different values, for example, will predominate when the underlying metaphor is business-as-war than when the metaphor is business-as-health or business-as-cooking. If management education is to nurture integrity more effectively in students then it must develop in them an awareness of the process of cognitive framing and of the way in which metaphors impacts on how participants see a situation. Most importantly students must develop a capacity to employ a variety of metaphors in framing the situations they encounter. Only by doing so will they be able to interpret data with the wealth of perspectives that is required to sufficiently enrich their understanding to identify the full range of values that are in play; personal, organizational and social.

Of war, health and food

A study conducted in America shows that metaphors have a significant influence on our understanding of values and ethics; (Audebrand & Burton, 2011).From this study we see that, bringing metaphors to our awareness and developing praxis of integrity that includes discernment and reflection about them is required for ethical competence.

The study was conducted with a group of some 200 undergraduates in the management programme at a major university who were asked to answer a series of questions using a Likert-like scale. The students had first read a scenario describing a business situation facing Kitchen Equipment Company (KEC).The students were divided into three groups, however, and each group was given a slightly different version of the scenario. In the first case a war metaphor was used, in the second health was the metaphor and in the third, food. The scenarios all used the same words as much as possible, except that in key spots language was changed to convey the different metaphor. For example "you are confronted with a new Taiwanese opponent that has started to set up its camp in North and

South America" was changed to "you are facing a new Taiwanese player that has started to train lean and dynamic affiliates in North and South America" or "a Saucy new Taiwanese contender has come to the table, and has started to soup up its affiliates in North and South America"

The students were asked how serious the situation was and how competitive they felt the industry was. Those who read the war metaphor version of the scenario were significantly more likely to view the situation as serious and the level of competition as high. Another question asked students to speculate on what had caused the problem for KEC.Students with the war scenario were significantly more likely to blame regulation, an external cause, rather than inefficiency in the way the operation was run, in other words an internal cause. This result can be attributed to the tendency aroused by militaristic thinking to cast blame on others when facing defeat (Audebrand & Burton, 2011).When students were asked to rate the prospects for a reversal of fortune, those reading the war scenario were the most pessimistic. When they were asked how likely KEC was to engage in ethical misconduct or act in a way that was negative for the environment, it was the war group who thought it most likely. Again the results in all cases were statistically significant leThis data confirms that on a number of different levels respondents who read the war scenario constructed a different view of reality and were more likely to make ethical decisions that display a lack of integrity. It is clear to see that the participants who read the war scenario were much more likely to interpret the situation as extremely dire and to assume that KEC's existence is being threatened. The life or death frame which the war metaphor provides as students construct the reality of this frictional situation conferred a level of desperation that made it more probable for them to assume that unethical actions will take place in order to save the company.

While the study cannot be said to establish that the war metaphor was only factor behind the belief that anything goes in business when your back is against the wall, this study provides a strong caution to business educators who use the war metaphor, consciously and unconsciously, with great frequency to evaluate and explain business situations. The war metaphor brings to mind thoughts of our own safety and survival. When things turn for the worse in a war, asopposed to in a gym or a kitchen, there is a tendency to adopt a "by whatever means necessary" policy to make sure that we will survive. The war metaphor reinforces and legitimates this

willingness to do whatever is necessary to survive. The survival instinct is thereby distorted and life itself is inappropriately equated with financial success.

The war metaphor map onto the realm of business the belief that there are only the most rudimentary rules of engagement.This fosters the belief that there are no rules in business; at least not when survival is at stake. This misconception provides an unhelpful and inaccurate caricature of the nature of the nature of both war and business behaviours (Audebrand, 2010).This overly simplistic application of the war metaphor can have damaging consequences on the integrity of individuals and lead to a greater chance of students making unethical choices in their careers.

The KEC experiment looked at how metaphor impacts the way in which different persons frame the same "reality". Telling the same story three times, changing the metaphor from war to health to cooking, resulted in three different interpretations of the strategic threats and opportunities as well as the likelihood of the organization to engage in behaviour that compromised sustainability or ethics. This study indicates that many business students accept the premise that breaches of ethics or damage to the environment are necessary when profitability is at risk.

Implications of this experiment for praxis of integrity

It is important to develop a practice of critical metaphorical analysis, which includes a conscious construction of a web of metaphors. If students are to be formed into management professionals who robustly confront moral and ethical dilemmas with requisite knowledge, sensitivity, and conviction they need the moral imagination to engage in an active and reflective praxis of integrity. To see the world framed through a single metaphor is like wearing glasses that filter out all colours but one. It may be that there is no pair of glasses-that is to say there is no single metaphor-that will enable us to see the full colour spectrum. To see the full range of colour, albeit one hue at a time, is the best we can accomplish, and that requires a number of different pairs of glasses.

A dictum attributed to the ancient Greek states that "all metaphors limp". The implication is that all metaphors have their vulnerabilities and that none completely capture the reality they attempt to frame. Identifying the weaknesses, and the strengths of prevailing metaphors of management

education such as "business is war; "will lead to a more balanced perspective on the nature of business. As that web of metaphors is spun and re-spun in every business classroom the ensuing discussion will inevitably be informed by the values that students and academics bring with them. This awareness of the link between our framing metaphors and our values is required if we are to find the best alignment of the two. Awareness of the link is also an important means by which values and actions we take can be made congruent. In other words, aligning metaphors and values contributes significantly to the ability of individuals to act with integrity.

Our suggestion is that management education should focus on the formation of students in a way that develops integrity as *praxis.* Most texts and teachers emphasize to their students that the analytic approach to ethics will not yield clear-cut solutions. Analysis will help to bring clarity, but judgment is required and decisions must be made in situations where there is unresolved ambiguity. Notwithstanding these admonitions the

conventional analytic approach is derived from $a\ source \rightarrow path$ cognitive structure. When data is framed linearly the brain focuses narrowly and moves more quickly to identify a solution, perhaps finding clarity prematurely. The metaphoric structure of the process of ethical dilemma resolution is itself a component of our teaching approach and though we are nearly unconscious of that structure its impact on how students frame and think about ethical issues is profound. The impact is all the more powerful because the linear, analytic problem solving approach plays such a large part in management education

Groome (1992) has suggested that the word *praxis* be employed to identify the reciprocal of theory and practice. The latter is not simply action informed by the former; rather praxis connotes a melding of the two. The relationship of theory and practice is infused with reflection such that each is always informed by and informing the other. Theory, practice and reflection together constitute praxis as a hermeneutic circle for the interpretation of experience. Our suggestion is that it is helpful to conceive of integrity in a similar cyclical manner such that values inform and are informed by action through the process of reflection. We have adapted Groome's (1992) praxis model and represented it in Figure 1 as praxis of integrity. In our model *values* replace *theory* as the repository of

ideas that inform action. We have also shown observation and reflection as two steps for greater clarity, although observation is clearly a necessary step in Groome's (1992) model it is implied not explicit. Finally we make identification of metaphors a distinct step in recognition of the key role that cognitive framing plays in our processing our perceptions and the making of value judgments about the reality we construct.

Johnson (1993) and Lakoff (2002) have both written about how the use of metaphors and cognitive frames are foundational to the way in which we do ethics. Nurturing integrity in management education requires that we develop in students a capacity to identify the metaphors that are in use in structuring situations they encounter and capacity to work with a web of metaphors to explore different ways of structuring those realities. In doing so the ethical dilemmas and the outright temptations that they encounter can be readily identified and more importantly different ways of looking at the situation can be articulated. No one claims that students can be inoculated against unethical behaviour, but they can learn practices that will increase their capacity to identify ethical dilemmas and choose action that is aligned with their values. In doingso they may, by offering articulate analysis of the thinking that has led them to their decision, influence others to rethink their own actions in the light of a different metaphor that reframes the situation.

Identifying metaphors and reflecting on the manner in which they impact our framing of the issues we face and how they relate to our values is a key component of integrity as *praxis*. Educators can use examples such as the scenario that was presented in three metaphoric voices in the KEC study (Audebrand & Burton, 2011) as approach to nurturing integrity. Integrity as praxis involves reflection in the study begins with the recognition that the war metaphor frames reality leads to a certain understanding of the seriousness of the situation, the possibilities for response and the likelihood of success for the chosen response. When this analysis is framed by the war metaphor it leads to a stronger temptation to act unethically or in a way that is insensitive to environmental concerns. A student or business practitioner who has developed the capacity to name the framing metaphor and suggest a different way of framing the situation, for instance by using the health or cooking or some other metaphor has the capacity to present their analysis clearly and persuasively and offer their colleagues a compelling way of (re)conceiving of the reality with which they are confronted.

If students are to become business practioners of integrity they need to be nurtured in praxis that empowers them to challenge inappropriate exercises of authority as well as the norms and beliefs that guide our actions in our organizational life. Students presented with a war metaphor were more likely to condone unethical behaviour or environmentally unsustainable behaviour than those presented with the metaphors of health or cooking. A necessary component of responsible decision-making therefore is an awareness of the metaphors that are employed in structuring the shared reality within the organization. The identification of metaphors and the search for new ones are important components of praxis of integrity.

Discussion: Praxis of Integrity in Management Education

It may be objected that having been critical of the overemphasis on analysis that is a feature of the business school approach to ethics teaching we are now exacerbating the problem by suggesting that a further analytic tool be introduced to thinking about ethical dilemmas. It is important, however, to distinguish between the rational approaches of traditional philosophy and the imaginative approach which thinking about metaphor involves. There has been a considerable amount written urging an imaginative approach which thinking about metaphor involves. There has been a considerable amount written urging an imaginative approach to ethics (Werhane, 1999, Johnson, 1993, Somerville, 2006).Imagination in this context is not the fantasizing or unrealistic mental activity that the word sometimes connotes. Imagination as Johnson (1993; 1987) and Lakoff (1987), have demonstrated is a central feature of human cognition because we cannot understand reality, the data received by our senses, without some type ordering mechanism. And so we use metaphors to frame reality by mapping what we know from one domain (e.g. War, health, cooking) onto another domain (business).This process of metaphorical cognition is often invisible to us. If we are to be ethically responsible, however, we must alert ourselves both to its existence and to the ways in which our framing of reality is influenced by the metaphors we employ. Praxis approach to integrity will bring metaphors to our awareness and promote thoughtful reflection on the implications they have for the alignment of our values actions.

Identifying root metaphors helps us to understand how we have constructed our version of reality. Recognizing that we could not understand reality

at all without them relieves us of the impossible task of seeking out objective knowledge if reality from a 'god's eye 'view (Johnson, 1987, Lakoff, 1987).More importantly rather than deconstruct and criticize the metaphoric use of language we might understand and reconstruct a richer view of reason and by that means learn to intentionally employ new metaphors (Winter, 1989).If those root metaphors lead inexorably in dangerous directions, we can begin the long process of changing to a more adequate metaphor. Winter (1989) argue we should help students developing their capacity for identifying the metaphors that underlie the ethical dilemmas and ethical temptations as well as the many strategic challenges with significant ethical import that they will face. Moral imagination is integral to the praxis of integrity. The reflection required to assess how actions and values align must include identification of the metaphors that are framing the situation and thus shaping the way in which we understand its ethical import. What is helpful to our understanding of communication and language generally and to the praxis of integrity as we are presenting it is to identify all of the metaphors that we employ and ask whether they further our understanding or obscure it.Then we need to follow that with a consideration of the ethical implications of the understanding so derived.

If business educators accept the responsibility for the formation of students who can robustly confront moral and ethical dilemmas with requisite knowledge, sensitivity, and conviction then management education needs to be significantly enhanced. The first thing that is to give students an opportunity in each of the business school disciplines to practice identifying values and reflecting on how to integrate them into actions that are relevant to that field. When we use the term 'practice' here we are using a sporting analogy (Gentile, 2010). Business practitioners need to develop the strength, the skills and the instincts to swim against the tide when their colleagues or their organization are drifting into morally turbulent waters. A well-developed praxis of integrity as we have outlined it in the preceding section is required if one is to maintain the alignment of one's values and one's actions. Business educators can provide students with the opportunity to develop such praxis by engaging in ethical reflection, learning analytic tools, and practicing engagement in dialogue, discussion and debate about ethical dilemmas. Just as practice in executing plays on the football field provides a powerful assistance to

performance in the big game, so development of praxis of integrity in business school will provide students with the capacity to "make the big catch"and also to engage in business with integrity in all of the routine plays that make up the "game"

The orientation of management education that we are suggesting, and we are not the first to do so, would see a shift from an emphasis on analysis of complex ethical dilemmas as stand-alone course to an emphasis on nurturing praxis of integrity in all disciplines so that it becomes second nature for students, when they become business practitioners; to resist temptation, choose to act on their values and be able to articulate in a forceful and clear fashion why they are doing so.*In the voicing our Values* approach, Gentile (2010) begun an important conversation about the need for such a reorientation.

One way to develop praxis of integrity such as we would suggest to engage exercises such as the KEC study (Audebrand & Burton,2011) that bring to the level of awareness the impact that metaphors have on the mental models of reality that we construct. Simply bringing to awareness the way in which we are influenced by the unconsciously accepted metaphors in our approach to management education will inevitably lead, we believe, to discussion about the efficacy of various metaphors and the relationship between our language, our mental models and the values that we seek to advance through business and economic activity. If as business educators we develop a web of metaphors and encourage students to make that part of their analytic process they will be more conscious of those they choose and those that are used by others. This process in turn provides a helpful tool for action that aligns with one's values. Our experiment provides an excellent illustration of one approach that business educators might take to introduce both the metaphorical nature of cognition and its impact on how we frame reality. This can be done by employing in the classroom an exercise that would mirror what was done in that study. A discussion of the results that explored the way in which the different metaphors influenced student responses and account for the variations offers rich potential for developing students 'appreciation for the role of metaphor.

Building on such an experience educators might present students with cases, both new and familiar, and invite a discussion of the framing metaphors that underlie the way in which the actors in the case understand

their situation. The moral imagination of students could be exercised by having them examine the impact of framing the situation through a different metaphor. A similar exercise could be undertaken using news stories of current interest from the business presss.Students might be asked to reframe the stories using different metaphors. Novels are also a rich source of material for developing the imaginative capacity of students necessary to ethical reasoning. They too provide the opportunity for identifying root metaphors and reflecting on how the situation faced by a protagonist would be viewed differently were the metaphor changed.

The most effective way to develop an understanding of the role of metaphor for students may be to have them reflect on the incident in their own lives where they faced an ethically problematic situation. Having them identify the metaphor that framed the situation and its impact on their ethical thinking will require a fairly developed capacity for self-reflection, but can yield rich results that have more impact because they are personal. Students can go on to reflect on how they might have dealt with the situation differently had they framed it with a different metaphor.

If educators are to teach their students to recognize metaphors and appreciate their impact on thinking and behaviour we need to first develop that capacity ourselves as teachers and as management scholars. The metaphors that we use, often unconsciously, to frame the lessons we impart to our students about the nature of business and the economy, need to be uncovered and their implications considered. In particular we need to consider the limits of those metaphors, and the way in which they distort or colour our understanding of reality (Audebrand,2010).This approach will require that educators abandon the illusion that they can present to students an objective or literal picture of reality. We must adopt a little humility and recognize that reality is actually always under negotiation. Just as a diamond held up to the light reveals different colours as it is viewed from different perspectives, so it is with the 'hard facts' that we think speak to us with unequivocal clarity. A little shift of direction and we see things in a whole new way. We are not capable as individuals of viewing any datum from all perspectives and thus it is through the web of metaphors developed by all participants that we come to a more complete, though still incomplete, understanding of reality.

Conclusion

In this paper, we presented integrity as an activity rather than a quality of the person. Integrity is a process whereby the individual seeks to integrate their self-understanding, their understanding of what is socially fitting and their actions so that there is no contradiction between those three. Integrity in this understanding is an iterative process requiring constant vigilance in attending to both self-awareness and social awareness. It also requires that individual acknowledge their social embeddedness. A necessary part of the discernment cycle is open reflection with others about one's actions as well as theirs and reasons that underlie them. Engaging in that cycle requires that we be aware of the cognitive process and the impact of the framing metaphors we employ on the way in which we understand the world around us. Those metaphors have a significant impact on the values to which we give most weight and thus on our praxis of integrity.

Management education provides students with metaphors and cognitive frameworks that become tools, often used without awareness, for sorting the data that must be dealt with in the conduct of business and especially in decision-making. Tools such as SWOT analysis and cost/benefit analysis are such devices that are overtly directed at analyzing the data by sorting and weighting it. Students cannot engage in the praxis of integrity-reflection on how their and values align-if they have no awareness that there is even a question of misalignment. Management educators have a responsibility to help students in this praxis of integrity. If management education is to nurture the praxis of integrity in its students so that ethical failures are avoided, one key to doing so is to develop in them the capacity to frame data using a variety of metaphors, some of which will refract financial issues with more clarity, others of which will refract ethical concerns with higher visibility.

Reference

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB): Ethics Education Task

Force (2004), Ethics education in business schools: Report to the Board of Directors. Retrieved from http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/ researcherreports/archives/ethics-education.pdf

Audebrand, L.K (2010).Sustainability in strategic management education: The quest for new root metaphors. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9,413-428.

Audebrand, L.K. & Burton, J.W.2011.Teaching Sustainability in Strategic Management: The Case for Metaphorical Pluralism. University of British Columbia Working Paper.

Badaracco, J.L. (1997).Defining moments: When managers must choose between right and right.Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Friedman, M. (1970, September 13).The sole responsibility of business is to increase its profits.New York Times Magazine

Gentile, M.C. (2010).Giving Voice to Values: How to speak your mind when you know what's

right. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Grim, P (2005).Questions of Value (audio recording), Chantilly, VA: The Great Courses.

Holland. K. (2009 March 15).Is it time to retrain B schools? New York Times.

Johnson, M. (1993). Moral imagination: implications of cognitive science for ethics.

Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson. M. (1987).The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason.Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Khurana, R. (2009).From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American

Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession. Princeton, NJ: University Press.

Killinger, B. (2007).Integrity: Doing the right thing for the right reason. Montréal, QC: McGill- Queen's University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987) Women, fire and dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (2003). Metaphors we live by. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (2002).Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think. Chicago, IL:University of Chicago Press, 2002

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western Thought. New York, NY: Basic Books

Lewis, M. (2010).The big short: Inside the Doomsday Machine, New York, NY: W.W.Norton

LIewelyn, S. (2003). What counts as "theory" in qualitative management and accounting

research? Introducing five levels of theorizing. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 16,662-708

Morgan, G. (1983). More on metaphors: Why we cannot control tropes in administrative science. Administrative Science Quarterly,28,601-607.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organization, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pepper, S.C. (1972). World hypotheses. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pinder, C.C., & Bourgeois, W.V. (1982). Controlling tropes in administrative science. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, 641-652

Piper, T.R., Gentile, M.C., & Parks, S.D. (1993).Can ethics be taught? Perspectives, Challenges, and Approaches at Harvard Business School. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Podolny, J.M. (2009, June).The Buck stops (and starts) at
    Business School,

Harvard   Business   Review.   Retrieved   from
    http://hbr.org/2009/06/the-buck-stops-and-starts-

at-business-school/ar/1

Somerville, M, (2009), The Ethical Imagination, Montreal, QC:
    McGill-Queen's University Press.

Tinker. T (1986).Metaphor or reification: Are radical humanists
    really libertarian anarchists? Journal of Management Studies,
    23,363-384.

Trevino, L., & Nelson, J. Managing business ethics: Straight talk
    about how to do it right 5thedition. (2011) Hoboken, NJ: John
    Wiley &Sons

Tsoukas, H. (1993) .Analogical reasoning and knowledge generation
    in organization theory. Organization Studies, 14,323-346

Weinberger (2010, October 29).The American leader's love affair
    with integrity (Conversations Blog).Retrieved from Harvard
    Business Review

http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/10/the American leaders love affa.html

Werhane, P. (1999).Moral imagination and management decision-
    making. New York N.Y./Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wicks, A.C., Freeman, R.E., Werhane, P.H., & Martin, K.E. (2010).
    Business ethics: A managerial approach, Upper Saddle River,
    NJ: Prentice Hall.

Winter, S.L. (1989).Transcendental nonsense, metaphoric reasoning,
    and the cognitive stakes for law. University of Pennsylvania
    Law Review, 137(4): 1105-1237