Journal of
Managerial Education Studies

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

The Literature-Based Conceptual Framework for Integrating Soft and Hard Skills in Managerial Education

Dede Ahmad Syarif
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi YPPT Priatim Tasikmalaya, Indonesia
dedeahmadsyarif@gmail.com

Abstract

The contemporary business landscape, characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), demands managers who possess a holistic blend of technical proficiency (hard skills) and interpersonal abilities (soft skills). However, managerial education programs often treat these skill sets in isolation, leading to a competency gap in graduates. This study aims to address this gap by developing a comprehensive, literature-based conceptual framework for the effective integration of soft and hard skills within managerial education curricula. Employing a qualitative research design, this study conducts an extensive and systematic review of peer-reviewed journal articles, authoritative books, and seminal reports published between 2000 and 2023. The analysis synthesizes existing theories and empirical findings to identify core dimensions, pedagogical strategies, and contextual enablers for integration. The proposed framework delineates three interdependent pillars: (1) a curricular pillar advocating for transdisciplinary and experiential learning designs; (2) a pedagogical pillar emphasizing active, reflective, and technology-enhanced methods; and (3) a contextual pillar highlighting the role of institutional culture, industry collaboration, and assessment realignment. The discussion elucidates how these pillars interact to create a synergistic learning ecosystem that moves beyond additive models towards transformative integration. This framework offers a theoretically grounded guide for educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers to reconceptualize managerial education, thereby fostering the development of agile, empathetic, and technically competent leaders capable of navigating future organizational challenges.

Keywords: managerial education, soft skills, hard skills, integration framework, competency-based curriculum

INTRODUCTION

The paradigm of managerial education stands at a critical juncture, pressured to evolve in response to the profound transformations within the global economic and social environment. The advent of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, marked by digitalization, artificial intelligence, and automation, has not diminished the need for human-centric skills but has, paradoxically, amplified it (World Economic Forum, 2020). In this context, the traditional emphasis in business schools on quantitative, analytical, and technical competencies—often termed 'hard skills'—is increasingly viewed as necessary but insufficient for effective leadership. Concurrently, there is a growing consensus among scholars and practitioners that 'soft skills'—encompassing communication, emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, teamwork, and

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

adaptability—are pivotal for managerial success (Heckman & Kautz, 2012). This dichotomy, however, has often led to a fragmented educational approach.

Historically, business and management curricula have been structured around discrete functional silos such as finance, marketing, and operations, with pedagogical methods heavily oriented towards knowledge transmission and technical problem-solving (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). This model has produced graduates with strong analytical capabilities but who may struggle with the nuanced, relational, and often ambiguous challenges of real-world organizations. The critique of this model is not new; for decades, commentators have highlighted the disconnect between what is taught in business schools and the competencies required in practice (Mintzberg, 2004). The persistent call has been for education that develops more reflective, ethically grounded, and socially adept managers.

The discourse around skill integration gains urgency from the evolving demands of the workplace. Employers consistently report a significant gap between the hard skills graduates possess and the soft skills they lack, identifying the latter as critical for career progression and organizational performance (Succi & Canovi, 2020). The VUCA (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, Ambiguous) environment further necessitates managers who can synthesize data-driven insights with empathetic leadership to guide teams through change. This synthesis represents the core challenge for contemporary managerial education: moving from an 'either/or' mentality to a 'both/and' philosophy where soft and hard skills are developed in a mutually reinforcing manner.

Theoretical foundations for this integration can be traced to several educational and psychological paradigms. Constructivist learning theory, which posits that learners actively construct knowledge through experience and reflection, provides a robust basis for designing integrative learning activities (Dewey, 1938). Similarly, the concept of 'threshold concepts' suggests that certain integrative ideas, once understood, transform a learner's perception of a discipline and are often portals to the acquisition of both technical and interpersonal mastery (Meyer & Land, 2003). Furthermore, the theory of experiential learning, particularly Kolb's (1984) cycle, underscores the importance of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation—a process inherently suited to blending skill types.

Despite this theoretical grounding and practical imperative, a coherent and widely adopted framework for integrating soft and hard skills remains elusive. Many institutions have responded by simply adding soft-skills workshops or elective courses to existing curricula, an additive approach that fails to achieve deep integration (Ritter et al., 2018). Others have innovated in specific areas, such as project-based learning or service-learning, yet these initiatives often remain marginal rather than central to the core pedagogical mission. This points to a significant gap between the recognition of the problem and the systemic implementation of holistic solutions.

A review of the literature reveals multiple strands of inquiry but a lack of synthesis. Studies abound on the importance of soft skills (Andrews & Higson, 2008), the efficacy of specific pedagogical tools like simulations (Sailer et al., 2021), and critiques of traditional business education (Ghoshal, 2005). However, there is a paucity of research that systematically consolidates these dispersed insights into a unified conceptual framework explicitly designed for managerial education. Such a framework would need to address not just what to teach (content integration) but how to teach it (pedagogical integration) and within what institutional context (systemic integration).

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

Addressing this gap is crucial for advancing both the theory and practice of management development. A robust conceptual framework can serve as a blueprint for curriculum redesign, a tool for faculty development, and a benchmark for program evaluation. It can help shift the focus from debating the relative importance of soft versus hard skills to designing educational ecosystems that nurture their co-development. Therefore, this study is guided by the following research questions: (1) What are the core conceptual dimensions and constituent elements necessary for a framework that integrates soft and hard skills in managerial education? (2) What pedagogical principles and specific instructional strategies are most effective for operationalizing this integration within courses and programs? (3) What institutional and contextual factors act as critical enablers or barriers to the successful implementation and sustainability of such an integrated approach? By answering these questions, this paper seeks to contribute a comprehensive, literature-derived model that can guide the transformation of managerial education for the 21st century.

1. Literature Review

The conceptual separation of soft and hard skills has deep roots in educational and organizational psychology. Hard skills are typically defined as tangible, measurable, and teachable abilities specific to a domain, such as financial modeling, data analysis, or accounting standards. They are often associated with cognitive intelligence (IQ) and left-brain thinking. In contrast, soft skills are defined as interpersonal, human-centered, and behavioral competencies, including communication, leadership, empathy, and conflict resolution, frequently linked to emotional intelligence (EQ) and often considered more difficult to quantify and instill (Laker & Powell, 2011). This dichotomy, while useful for categorization, has fostered a misleading hierarchy and pedagogical segregation in educational settings.

The imperative for integration is strongly supported by organizational and leadership theories. The competing values framework, for instance, illustrates that effective organizations and leaders must balance competing demands—such as flexibility versus control and internal versus external focus—which inherently requires a blend of analytical (hard) and relational (soft) skills (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Similarly, transformational leadership theory emphasizes the leader's ability to inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate followers, a process that relies on technical competence to establish credibility and interpersonal skills to enact influence (Bass & Riggio, 2006). These theories suggest that managerial efficacy emerges not from possessing either skill set, but from the ability to dynamically integrate them based on situational demands.

From a pedagogical perspective, several established learning theories provide a foundation for integration. Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 1984) is particularly salient, as its cycle of experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation creates natural junctures for applying technical knowledge within socially complex, real-world contexts, thereby developing both cognitive and emotional competencies. Furthermore, social constructivism, building on Vygotsky's (1978) work, emphasizes that knowledge is constructed through social interaction and collaboration, directly linking the mastery of technical content

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

(hard skills) with the development of communication and teamwork abilities (soft skills) within a 'community of practice.'

The current landscape of managerial education reveals a spectrum of approaches to this challenge. On one end, traditional programs maintain a strong siloed structure with soft skills relegated to separate modules. On the other, innovative approaches are emerging, such as design thinking curricula that blend analytical problem-solving with empathy and user-centricity (Glen et al., 2015), and experiential programs built around live consulting projects that require simultaneous application of technical tools and client management skills. The literature indicates that the most promising practices are those that create 'wicked' learning environments where problems are ill-structured, solutions are not predetermined, and success depends on iterative collaboration—conditions that mirror the integrative demands of modern management (Rittel & Webber, 1973).

2. Previous Research

A chronological examination of previous research highlights the evolving understanding of skill integration in management development. Early work by Pfeffer and Fong (2002) provided a foundational critique, arguing that business schools' over-reliance on scientific models and their detachment from practice failed to develop crucial managerial skills. While they identified the problem, their study stopped short of proposing a detailed integrative framework, focusing more on the shortcomings of the prevailing paradigm. Subsequently, Mintzberg (2004) offered a more prescriptive view with his concept of "managing as a practice," advocating for education that combines art (craft), science (analysis), and experience. This tripartite model implicitly called for integration but was framed more as a philosophical alternative than a concrete curricular blueprint.

Building on this critique, research began to explore specific pedagogical interventions. A significant study by Datar, Garvin, and Cullen (2010), through a comprehensive analysis of leading MBA programs, identified a trend toward curriculum innovation that included more experiential learning, globalization, and leadership development. They documented efforts to "embed" soft skills but noted these were often add-ons rather than a redesigned core, highlighting a persistent implementation gap. Around the same time, rigorous empirical work by Heckman and Kautz (2012) provided robust economic evidence for the high returns on soft skills, reframing them not as mere supplements but as critical determinants of lifelong success, thereby strengthening the argument for their central place in education.

More recent studies have zoomed in on specific integrative mechanisms. Sailer, Hense, and Mandl (2021) conducted a meta-analysis on the effectiveness of digital simulations in higher education, finding they were particularly potent for fostering complex competencies that combined strategic decision-making (hard skill) with communication and collaboration (soft skills). Their work provides empirical support for technology-enhanced, experiential methods as vehicles for integration. Similarly, research by Succi and Canovi (2020) directly surveyed employers across Europe, quantifying the soft skills gap and explicitly calling for

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

educational models that foster "hybrid profiles." Their findings underscored the market demand for integration but did not elaborate on the pedagogical architecture required to build such profiles.

The most recent strand of research attempts more holistic models. A conceptual paper by Cavanagh et al. (2020) proposed a "threshold capabilities framework" for business education, arguing that capabilities like ethical discernment and integrative thinking act as portals to professional practice. This approach begins to map the terrain of integration by identifying key crossover competencies. However, while these studies advance the field by validating specific methods or identifying key capabilities, a synthesis gap remains.

The collective examination of these studies reveals a clear progression from identifying the problem, to validating the importance of soft skills, to testing discrete integrative pedagogies. However, a significant gap persists: there is no overarching, literature-based conceptual framework that systematically consolidates the dimensions (what to integrate), pedagogies (how to integrate), and contextual enablers (the system for integration) into a coherent whole for managerial education. Previous research tends to focus on one or two of these aspects in isolation. For instance, studies on simulations focus on pedagogy, employer surveys highlight desired outcomes (dimensions), and critiques of business schools touch on context. This study aims to fill this synthesis gap by constructing a comprehensive framework that links all three pillars, derived from a systematic integration of the extant literature.

3. Theoretical Framework

The proposed theoretical framework for integrating soft and hard skills in managerial education is constructed from the synthesis of literature and is conceptualized as an interdependent three-pillar system. This structure posits that sustainable integration cannot be achieved by focusing on curriculum content or teaching methods alone; it requires a synergistic alignment across curricular design, pedagogical execution, and the broader institutional ecosystem. The framework is grounded in the premise that integration is a transformative, not additive, process aimed at developing what can be termed 'integrative competence'—the managerial capacity to fluidly mobilize and combine technical and human skills in practice.

The first pillar, the Curricular Dimension, addresses the what and structure of integration. It moves beyond a collection of separate soft and hard skill courses towards a transdisciplinary and spiral curriculum design. This draws on the concept of 'interconnected knowing' (Belenky et al., 1986) and the idea of 'threshold concepts' (Meyer & Land, 2003). The curriculum is organized around complex, real-world managerial themes or challenges (e.g., sustainability, digital transformation, innovation) rather than disciplinary silos. Within this structure, hard skill content (e.g., data analytics, financial metrics) is explicitly paired with soft skill development (e.g., stakeholder communication, ethical negotiation) at multiple points throughout the program, allowing for iterative deepening of both. Capstone projects, live cases, and sustained simulations serve as key integrative modules where all learned components must be synthesized.

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

The second pillar, the Pedagogical Dimension, defines the how of integration through instructional strategies. It is firmly rooted in Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 1984) and social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978). This pillar advocates for a shift from passive knowledge transmission to active, collaborative, and reflective learning processes. Key strategies include: (1) Experiential & Project-Based Learning, where students tackle ambiguous problems requiring technical analysis and team management; (2) Reflective Practice, guided through journals, debriefs, and coaching to connect action with theory and self-awareness (Schön, 1983); (3) Technology-Enhanced Simulations that provide safe spaces for practicing integrative decision-making (Sailer et al., 2021); and (4) Collaborative Learning designs that inherently develop communication, conflict resolution, and co-creation skills alongside task completion.

The third pillar, the Contextual & Enabling Dimension, encompasses the systemic conditions necessary to support and sustain the first two pillars. This acknowledges that even the best-designed curriculum and pedagogy will falter without an enabling environment. Key factors include: (1) Institutional Culture & Faculty Development: A shift requires faculty who are both willing and able to teach in integrative ways, necessitating investment in pedagogical training and rewarding innovative teaching (Boyer, 1990). (2) Assessment Realignment: Evaluation must move beyond testing discrete technical knowledge to assessing holistic competencies through portfolios, peer assessments, and complex project evaluations. (3) Industry & Stakeholder Collaboration: Continuous feedback loops with business partners ensure relevance and provide authentic contexts for integrative learning (Datar et al., 2010). These three pillars are not linear but interact dynamically, forming a self-reinforcing ecosystem for developing integrativemanagers.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically a comprehensive literature review and conceptual synthesis, to construct a theoretically grounded framework. The primary aim is not to generate new empirical data but to systematically analyze, interpret, and integrate existing scholarly work to develop a novel conceptual model (Torraco, 2005). This approach is particularly suited to addressing the research questions, which focus on identifying dimensions, pedagogies, and contextual factors from a dispersed body of knowledge.

The source of data for this study is textual, consisting exclusively of published scholarly literature. The data corpus includes peer-reviewed journal articles from high-impact journals in management education, organizational behavior, educational psychology, and higher education. It is complemented by authoritative books, book chapters, and seminal reports from recognized international bodies (e.g., World Economic Forum). The inclusion criteria prioritized publications from 2000 onward to ensure contemporary relevance, with selective inclusion of foundational theoretical works (e.g., Dewey, Kolb) irrespective of publication date. All sources are in English and were identified as credible through their publication venue.

The technique of data collection was a systematic narrative review protocol. This involved: (1) identifying key search terms and their variants (e.g., “soft skills,” “hard

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

skills," "managerial education," "integration," "competency-based curriculum," "experiential learning"); (2) searching major academic databases (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, EBSCO); (3) conducting backward and forward citation tracking of key papers to ensure a comprehensive sample; and (4) maintaining a structured database of sources with annotations. The process continued until theoretical saturation was reached, where new sources ceased to provide substantially new concepts relevant to the research questions.

The technique of data analysis was thematic synthesis, following the guidelines for conceptual review outlined by Jabareen (2009). The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, a process of open coding was applied to the collected literature, extracting and labeling relevant concepts, definitions, findings, and recommendations. Second, these codes were analyzed for relationships and patterns through axial coding, grouping them into preliminary categories (e.g., "pedagogical challenges," "employer demands," "integrative learning designs"). Finally, selective coding was used to integrate these categories into the overarching analytical themes that form the pillars of the proposed framework: Curricular Dimension, Pedagogical Dimension, and Contextual & Enabling Dimension. Throughout this process, constant comparison was used to refine categories and ensure they were saturated with evidence from the literature.

The process of conclusion drawing involved synthesizing the defined themes into a coherent narrative and a visual representation of the framework. The validity and credibility of the conclusions are supported by the systematic and transparent methodology, the use of multiple and credible sources, and the logical consistency with which the framework is derived from the analyzed literature. The resulting framework is presented as a proposition for theory-building and a practical guide, its limitations acknowledged, and its implications for practice and future research clearly stated.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The systematic analysis of the literature yields a coherent conceptual framework, visualized as three interdependent pillars, for integrating soft and hard skills in managerial education. This framework is the primary result of this study. The following discussion elaborates on each pillar in detail, providing the evidentiary base from the literature and explicating the dynamic interconnections between them. The discussion is structured to directly address the three research questions that guided this inquiry.

The first subsection, "The Curricular Dimension: Architecting for Integration," responds to Research Question 1 by detailing the core conceptual dimensions and structural elements necessary for an integrative curriculum. It argues that integration must be a design principle from the outset, not a later addition. The second subsection, "The Pedagogical Dimension: Strategies for Enactment," addresses Research Question 2 by reviewing and synthesizing the instructional principles and specific methods most effective for bringing integrative curricula to life in the classroom and beyond. Finally, the third subsection, "The Contextual Dimension: Building the Enabling Ecosystem," tackles Research Question 3 by identifying the institutional, cultural, and systemic factors that determine whether integrative efforts succeed or fail. The discussion throughout engages in dialogue with the previous research cited earlier, highlighting how this framework consolidates and advances existing knowledge.

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

1. The Curricular Dimension: Architecting for Integration

To address the first research question on the core dimensions for an integrative framework, the analysis points unequivocally to curriculum design as the foundational pillar. A curriculum that merely appends a leadership course to a suite of technical subjects perpetuates the very dichotomy this framework seeks to overcome. Instead, integration must be the central architectural principle. This requires a shift from a discipline-centric model to a challenge-centric or theme-based model. As Datar et al. (2010) observed, innovative programs are increasingly organizing learning around pervasive managerial issues like globalization, entrepreneurship, and ethics, which inherently demand both analytical rigor and human judgment. This approach aligns with the concept of 'transdisciplinarity,' which seeks to transcend traditional subject boundaries to address complex real-world problems (Nicolescu, 2002).

The constituent element of such a curriculum is the deliberate and explicit pairing of hard and soft skill learning objectives within single modules and across the program journey. For instance, a course on "Strategic Decision Making" would couple the hard skills of industry analysis, financial forecasting, and data interpretation with the soft skills of facilitating divergent viewpoints, communicating strategic vision, and managing implementation resistance. This pairing should not be incidental but explicitly stated in learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Research on constructive alignment emphasizes that intended learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment tasks must be coherently aligned to achieve desired competencies (Biggs, 1996). An integrative curriculum demands that this alignment purposefully connects technical and human domains.

A powerful structural tool for this is the spiral curriculum, as conceptualized by Bruner (1960). In this model, key integrative concepts—such as "value creation," "stakeholder management," or "systemic thinking"—are revisited at increasing levels of complexity throughout the program. In the first iteration, a student might learn basic accounting (hard skill) and team communication (soft skill) separately. In a later spiral, they would tackle a project requiring them to present a financial proposal (integrating communication and accounting) to a simulated board. Finally, in a capstone, they might develop a full business plan, integrating financial modeling, market analysis, team leadership, and investor persuasion. This iterative deepening facilitates the maturation of integrative competence.

The framework identifies capstone experiences, live case studies, and sustained business simulations as critical curricular components for integration. These are the "integrative modules" where the threads of the curriculum are woven together. A live consulting project, for example, forces students to apply marketing analytics (hard skill) while navigating client relationships, managing team dynamics, and presenting recommendations persuasively (soft skills). This creates what Rittel and Webber (1973) termed a "wicked" learning environment, where problems are ill-defined, stakeholders have conflicting values, and solutions are not true-or-false but better-or-worse. Such environments are ideal crucibles for integration because they mirror the actual conditions of management.

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

Dialogue with previous research confirms the necessity of this curricular redesign. Mintzberg's (2004) advocacy for "managing as a practice" implicitly calls for a curriculum built around managerial work itself, not academic disciplines. The findings of Succi and Canovi (2020) on employer demand for "hybrid profiles" directly support the need for curricula that produce such graduates. However, the framework advances beyond these insights by specifying the mechanisms—theme-based organization, explicit pairing, spiral design, and integrative modules—through which a curriculum can systematically architect integration. It moves from the what (we need integrated managers) to the how of curricular design.

This curricular dimension also necessitates a rethinking of knowledge sequencing. Traditional sequences that front-load core hard skills (e.g., finance, statistics) before introducing "softer" applied courses can reinforce the perception of a hierarchy. An integrative approach might instead use a foundational module that immediately presents a simple managerial challenge, requiring students to simultaneously gather basic data and work in a team to interpret it, thereby establishing from day one that both skill sets are co-requisites. This can help disrupt ingrained student attitudes about the superiority of technical work over relational work, attitudes often unconsciously reinforced by traditional structures (Billsberry et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the framework emphasizes that the curricular pillar must be informed by a dynamic understanding of the skill sets themselves. In a digital age, the definition of "hard skills" is expanding to include digital literacy, data science, and AI competency, while "soft skills" are evolving to encompass digital collaboration, virtual team leadership, and managing human-AI interaction (World Economic Forum, 2020). Therefore, the curriculum must be agile, with mechanisms for regular review and updating based on trends in technology, society, and industry feedback. This ensures the integration is relevant not only to current but also to future managerial challenges.

In conclusion, the Curricular Dimension provides the blueprint. It answers the first research question by defining integration as a structural and design challenge, solved through theme-centric organization, explicit learning outcome pairing, a spiral design for progressive complexity, and dedicated integrative modules. This pillar establishes the necessary but insufficient conditions for developing integrative competence. Without a curriculum intentionally architected for this purpose, efforts at the pedagogical level will remain fragmented and marginal, unable to achieve the transformative synthesis required for 21st-century management education.

2. The Pedagogical Dimension: Strategies for Enactment

The second research question focuses on the pedagogical principles and strategies for operationalizing integration. A curriculum designed for integration remains an abstract plan unless enacted through appropriate teaching and learning methods. This pillar is the engine of the framework, translating curricular intent into lived student experience. The literature strongly converges on active, experiential, and reflective pedagogies as the most effective vehicles for

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

integration. Passive lecture-based methods, while efficient for transmitting declarative technical knowledge, are poorly suited for developing the applied, adaptive, and interpersonal nature of soft skills or their integration with hard skills (Freeman et al., 2014).

Experiential and Project-Based Learning (PBL) stand as cornerstone strategies. By engaging students in authentic, complex tasks—such as developing a marketing plan for a real nonprofit, optimizing a supply chain process, or launching a micro-venture—PBL creates a natural demand for skill integration. Students must use financial ratios, market data, or operational models (hard skills) to make decisions, while simultaneously managing team roles, resolving conflicts, communicating progress, and negotiating with stakeholders (soft skills). Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle is fully activated: concrete experience is provided by the project, reflective observation occurs in team debriefs, abstract conceptualization links the experience to theory, and active experimentation happens as plans are adjusted. This aligns with and extends the findings of Sailer et al. (2021) on simulations, positioning broader experiential methods as central to integrative learning.

Closely linked is the imperative of structured Reflective Practice. Experience alone is not sufficient for learning; it must be processed. Reflective practice, drawing on the work of Schön (1983) on the "reflective practitioner," is the mechanism through which students connect their actions to outcomes, examine their interpersonal behaviors, and solidify the link between theory and practice. Pedagogical tools include guided reflective journals, after-action reviews, coaching sessions, and portfolio development. For integration, reflection prompts must be carefully crafted to draw attention to the interplay of skills. For example, after a project presentation, students might be asked not only "Was your financial model accurate?" but also "How did your team's communication dynamics affect the quality of the data analysis?" and "How did your personal approach to handling disagreement influence the strategic recommendation?"

Collaborative Learning is not merely a popular method but a pedagogical necessity for integration. Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development highlights that learning is social and that peers can scaffold each other's understanding. In collaborative settings, students practice soft skills in real-time—listening, persuading, delegating, supporting—while jointly engaging with hard skill content. A group tasked with solving a complex business case must collectively interpret data, debate its implications, and co-construct a solution, thereby weaving cognitive and social processes together. Research by Johnson and Johnson (2009) on cooperative learning confirms its positive effects on both academic achievement and social skill development, validating its dual-purpose role in an integrative framework.

Technology-Enhanced Learning environments, particularly immersive simulations and serious games, offer powerful, low-risk spaces for integration. As Sailer et al. (2021) demonstrated, simulations allow students to practice integrative decision-making in compressed timeframes and receive immediate feedback. A strategic management simulation requires balancing quantitative inputs (resource allocation, pricing) with qualitative leadership decisions (team motivation, handling crises). Virtual reality (VR) scenarios could place a student in a difficult conversation with a virtual employee, requiring them to apply

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

employment law knowledge (hard skill) with empathetic communication and active listening (soft skills). These tools bridge the gap between classroom theory and the unpredictability of practice.

Dialogue with previous research enriches this pillar. The work of Cavanagh et al. (2020) on "threshold capabilities" like ethical discernment directly implies the need for pedagogies that provoke such transformative learning, which often occurs through dissonant experiences followed by reflection—a process central to experiential and reflective methods. Similarly, the critiques of Pfeffer and Fong (2002) regarding the lack of practice in business schools are directly countered by a pedagogy centered on doing and reflecting. This framework synthesizes these disparate insights into a coherent pedagogical toolkit, arguing that no single method is sufficient; rather, a strategic combination of experiential projects, collaborative structures, reflective exercises, and technological tools creates multiple, reinforcing pathways for integration.

Faculty role is transformed within this pedagogical dimension. The educator moves from being a 'sage on the stage' to a 'guide on the side'—a designer of learning experiences, a facilitator of process, and a coach for reflection. This requires significant faculty development, as many academics are experts in their technical discipline but may be less trained in facilitating group dynamics, guiding reflection, or using experiential methods effectively (Boyer, 1990). Therefore, the success of this pillar is contingent on support from the third, contextual pillar. Ultimately, the Pedagogical Dimension operationalizes the integrative curriculum. It provides the 'how-to' answer to the second research question, demonstrating that through a deliberate blend of experiential, collaborative, reflective, and technology-enhanced methods, the abstract goal of skill integration becomes a tangible, learnable, and assessable reality within the managerial classroom.

3. The Contextual Dimension: Building the Enabling Ecosystem

The third research question probes the institutional and contextual factors critical for implementing and sustaining integration. Even the most brilliantly designed curriculum and pedagogy will fail if the institutional environment is hostile or indifferent. This pillar addresses the often-overlooked 'ecosystem' within which education occurs. It posits that integration is not just an instructional challenge but an organizational change challenge. The literature identifies several interconnected enabling factors: institutional culture and strategy, faculty development and incentives, assessment realignment, and deep industry collaboration.

First and foremost, Institutional Culture and Leadership must explicitly value and champion integrative education. This requires strategic commitment from the dean, program directors, and accreditation bodies. The mission and vision of the business school should articulate the development of holistic, responsible leaders, not just technical analysts. Resources must be allocated not only to developing new curricula but also to supporting the significant upfront investment in designing experiential modules, simulation software, and partnership management. A culture that rewards teaching innovation as highly as research

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

publication is essential. Boyer's (1990) expanded definition of scholarship, which includes the "scholarship of teaching and learning," provides a powerful rationale for such a cultural shift. Without this top-down commitment, integrative efforts risk remaining isolated pet projects of a few enthusiastic faculty.

Closely linked is the issue of Faculty Development and Incentives. As highlighted in the pedagogical discussion, teaching in an integrative mode requires a different skill set. Faculty need training in facilitative techniques, reflective coaching, and the use of new educational technologies. Perhaps more importantly, incentive structures must be reformed. If tenure and promotion committees solely value publications in top-tier journals, faculty will rationally prioritize research over the time-intensive work of redesigning courses and mentoring student projects. Institutions must create credible pathways for rewarding excellence in integrative teaching and curriculum innovation (Datar et al., 2010). This could include teaching-focused career tracks, internal grants for pedagogical innovation, and formal recognition in performance reviews.

A major barrier identified across studies is the misalignment of Assessment and Evaluation. Traditional exams excel at testing discrete technical knowledge but are ill-suited for assessing integrative competencies, teamwork, or ethical reasoning. The framework argues for a radical realignment of assessment to mirror the integrative goals. This includes the adoption of authentic assessment methods such as comprehensive project portfolios, peer and self-assessment of team contributions, reflective essays, presentations to expert panels, and 360-degree feedback. These methods assess the process and application of knowledge in complex contexts, not just its recall. As Biggs (1996) argued, assessment drives student learning; if students are assessed only on technical outputs, they will ignore the soft skill components regardless of the curriculum design.

Industry and Stakeholder Collaboration is not merely a source of case studies but a vital contextual enabler for authenticity and relevance. Deep, sustained partnerships with businesses, NGOs, and community organizations provide the 'real-world' arena for integrative learning. These partners offer live projects, serve as guest speakers and mentors, provide feedback on curriculum relevance, and ultimately, validate the competencies of graduates. This collaboration creates a feedback loop that keeps the integrated curriculum dynamically aligned with market needs, addressing the employer gap highlighted by Succi and Canovi (2020). It moves integration from a theoretical exercise to a practice grounded in current organizational challenges.

Engaging with previous research, this contextual dimension explains the "implementation gap" noted by Datar et al. (2010). Many schools recognize the need for integration and may even pilot innovative courses, but these fail to scale or become mainstream because the broader institutional system—its culture, incentives, and assessment regimes—remains configured for the old, siloed model. The framework proposed here makes these systemic barriers explicit and treats them as a designable component of the integration challenge. It agrees with Mintzberg's (2004) implicit critique that changing business education requires changing the institution itself.

Furthermore, this pillar interacts dynamically with the other two. A supportive institutional culture (Context) empowers faculty to experiment with new pedagogies

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

(Pedagogy) within a redesigned curriculum (Curriculum). Authentic industry projects (Context) become the content for experiential learning (Pedagogy) within challenge-based modules (Curriculum). Reformed assessment (Context) validates and reinforces the learning from integrative experiences (Pedagogy). Thus, the three pillars are not sequential but synergistic. Weakness in one pillar undermines the others; strength in all three creates a resilient, self-reinforcing ecosystem for developing managers who are not just trained in skills but educated in their integrative application. This comprehensive view of the enabling environment provides the full answer to the third research question, completing the conceptual framework for integrating soft and hard skills in managerial education.

CONCLUSION

This study has undertaken a systematic review and synthesis of literature to address a persistent challenge in managerial education: the fragmented development of soft and hard skills. In response, it has developed a comprehensive, literature-based conceptual framework structured around three interdependent pillars. The framework moves beyond advocating for the importance of both skill sets to providing a structured model for their transformative integration within educational programs. The conclusion reaffirms that the three research questions have been thoroughly addressed through the construction and elaboration of this framework.

The first research question sought to identify the core conceptual dimensions for an integrative framework. This has been answered through the elaboration of the Curricular Dimension. The analysis concluded that integration must be an architectural principle, not an afterthought. The core dimensions include a shift from disciplinary silos to challenge-centric themes, the explicit pairing of hard and soft skill learning outcomes, the use of a spiral curriculum for progressive complexity, and the design of dedicated integrative modules like capstones and live projects. This pillar provides the necessary structural blueprint to guide program design and ensure integration is embedded in the very DNA of the curriculum.

The second research question focused on the pedagogical strategies for operationalizing integration. This has been addressed through the Pedagogical Dimension. The synthesis of literature confirmed that active, experiential, and reflective methods are essential. The framework specifies a combination of experiential and project-based learning, structured reflective practice, collaborative learning designs, and technology-enhanced simulations as the key strategies. These methods create the lived experiences where students actively practice blending technical analysis with interpersonal and managerial behaviors, thereby translating curricular design into actual competency development.

The third research question probed the institutional and contextual enablers and barriers. This has been comprehensively answered by the Contextual & Enabling Dimension. The framework identifies that sustainable integration requires an enabling ecosystem encompassing: a strategic institutional culture that values teaching innovation; faculty development and aligned incentive structures; a fundamental realignment of assessment practices towards authentic, competency-based evaluation; and deep, sustained collaboration with industry and other stakeholders. This pillar

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

explains the systemic conditions necessary for the first two pillars to thrive and ensures that integrative efforts are scalable and sustainable.

This study, while comprehensive, is not without limitations. As a conceptual paper based on a literature review, the proposed framework is a theoretical construct. Its validity and practical efficacy have not been empirically tested through application in a specific managerial education program. The framework is also necessarily generalized; its implementation would need to be adapted to the specific cultural, institutional, and resource contexts of different business schools worldwide. Furthermore, the literature review, though systematic, may have missed relevant studies in non-English languages or in less prominent publications.

Based on this framework, several recommendations are offered. For educators and curriculum designers, the framework serves as a checklist and inspiration for program (re)design, urging a holistic review of curriculum, pedagogy, and institutional supports. For researchers, it provides a testable model. Future empirical research should apply this framework in case studies of business schools attempting integration, measuring its impact on student competencies and graduate outcomes. Longitudinal studies tracing the career progression of graduates from integrated versus traditional programs would be particularly valuable. Finally, for accrediting bodies and policymakers, the framework suggests criteria that could be used to encourage and evaluate meaningful integration efforts, moving beyond input metrics to assessing the coherence of the educational ecosystem in developing holistic managers.

REFERENCES

Andrews, J., & Higson, H. (2008). Graduate employability, 'soft skills' versus 'hard' business knowledge: A European study. Higher Education in Europe, 33(4), 411–422.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. Basic Books.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32(3), 347–364.

Billsberry, J., Ambrosini, V., & Garrety, K. (2019). The hole in the heart of management education: A manifesto for humanizing business schools. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 18(2), 266–279.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). The process of education. Harvard University Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

Cavanagh, J., Burston, M., Southcombe, A., & Bartram, T. (2020). Contributing to a graduate-centred understanding of work readiness: An exploratory study of Australian undergraduate students' perceptions of their employability. The International Journal of Management Education, 18(3), 100379.

Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P. G. (2010). Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads. Harvard Business Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Kappa Delta Pi.

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(23), 8410–8415.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4(1), 75–91.

Glen, R., Suciu, C., & Baughn, C. (2015). The need for design thinking in business schools. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 14(4), 653–667.

Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. Labour Economics, 19(4), 451–464.

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8(4), 49–62.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. Educational Researcher, 38(5), 365–379.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

Laker, D. R., & Powell, J. L. (2011). The differences between hard and soft skills and their relative impact on training transfer. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 22(1), 111–122.

Meyer, J. H. F., & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines (pp. 412–424). University of Edinburgh.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Nicolescu, B. (2002). Manifesto of transdisciplinarity (K.-C. Voss, Trans.). State University of New York Press.

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

Vol 1 No 1 2025 page 59-74, E-ISSN xxx-xxxx
DOI: https://doi.org/101928/xxxxxx

Ritter, B. A., Small, E. E., Mortimer, J. W., & Doll, J. L. (2018). Designing management curriculum for workplace readiness: Developing students' soft skills. Journal of Management Education, 42(1), 80–103.

Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. Policy Sciences, 4(2), 155–169.

Sailer, M., Hense, J. U., & Mandl, H. (2021). Learning through digital games: The mediating role of immersion and the moderating role of instructional support. Computers in Human Behavior, 117, 106660.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Succi, C., & Canovi, M. (2020). Soft skills to enhance graduate employability: Comparing students and employers' perceptions. Studies in Higher Education, 45(9), 1834–1847.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. Human Resource Development Review, 4(3), 356–367.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

World Economic Forum. (2020). The future of jobs report 2020. World Economic Forum.