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Abstract:
Although issues such as opportunistic behaviour or economic profit maximization have dominated business school curricula, in recent years interest has grown in all matters relating to the corporate social dimension. The training of business students in this area is an important part of their preparation to assume responsible roles in society. This paper analyzes students’ attitudes to the role of social issues in business education and to companies’ responsibilities (about what a well-run company is). Findings show that students define a well-run company from a stakeholder perspective. Furthermore, the students surveyed claimed that social issues are not adequately covered in their current business studies.
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Introduction
The problems associated with social and ethical issues, especially those related to economic matters, have been a central element of debate in most great civilizations (Kulshreshtha, 2005). Although the economic view of the company has dominated theories of management in the last decades, in recent years interest has grown in all matters relating to the corporate social dimension. Issues concerning Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and business ethics are increasingly dealt with in the academic literature as well as in company annual reports. Most of this research concludes that corporations have a responsibility towards various stakeholder groups beyond maximizing stock price and that social responsibility is important in determining corporate effectiveness (Carroll, 1991, 1999; Freeman, 1984; Meehan et al., 2006).

The implementation of CSR approaches allows companies to project a favourable image to all their interest groups, thereby enhancing their reputations. Today the benefits of corporate responsibility for good business are widely acknowledged. This growing perspective should be accompanied by a change in business education. Indeed, business schools play a considerable role in shaping the attitudes of tomorrow’s business women and men towards good business behaviour and good decision making for the success of their business and the wellbeing of their local and global environment (Lämsä et al., 2008). However, some authors (e.g., Ghoshal, 2005; Kashyap et al., 2006) point out that business school education is still inadequate to address changes in ethical behaviour among future business professionals, since business schools primarily focus on the theories and economic models that emphasize shareholder values over the stakeholder model.

Recent business scandals have led business schools around the world to take a serious look at the role of business education in relation to such phenomena (Lämsä et al., 2008). It is therefore important to pay more attention to assessing student attitudes towards CSR, assuming that those students will be the managers of tomorrow. In consequence, the main objective of this paper is to analyze students’ attitudes towards the role of business education in preparing them to make decisions that affect social needs and, in addition, to analyze students’ perceptions of what a well-run company is (in order to know its position with respect to the shareholder vs. stakeholder perspective).

The present paper is organized as follows. Firstly, we present the theoretical background and the research questions. Then we describe the methodological aspects of the research and set out the results. Finally, we discuss our main conclusions and the implications of the study.
**Theoretical background**

Many of the corporate scandals resulting from bad management practices have their origin in a set of ideas that have been emphasized in the academic line followed by business schools over the last decades (Ghoshal, 2005). Traditional theories such as transaction cost economics and agency theory, which take economic and financial variables as their primary—or even exclusive—consideration, and that form the basis of much of business schools’ curricula, have had a harmful impact on students’ values, attitudes and behaviour. In the context of these theories it is assumed that managers behave opportunistically and seek to maximize economic profit. Furthermore, such theories emphasize the supposition that by maximizing their profits companies automatically make the greatest possible contribution to social welfare. This approach usually takes shareholder value maximization as the supreme referent for corporate decision making, in accordance with the ideology described by Milton Friedman (2002) as “liberalism”. In addition to Ghoshal, several other authors have raised similar critical questions about the current state of business education (Mitroff, 2004; Pfeffer, 2005; Kashyap et al., 2006).

The shareholder approach has serious limitations, including an unequal distribution of the value created for shareholders. In contrast to this approach, the current conception of CSR is closely bound to the strategic conception of the company and stakeholder—or interest group—theory (Freeman, 1984; Weiss, 1994; Mahoney, 1990; Carroll, 1999). This theory holds that the company’s survival and growth will be guaranteed when there is a convergence of the interests of all these different groups: employees, shareholders, suppliers, clients, social community, etc. According to Freeman (1984), the main feature running through the CSR literature is its emphasis on satisfying the stakeholders that have traditionally been given less consideration, essentially, the community and employees, as opposed to the owners, whose objectives have historically been the main concern of the shareholder model. Today, it is broadly accepted that maximization of shareholder value is perfectly compatible with the satisfaction of the needs of others who are also affected by corporate policies and practices. In practice, several studies have explored the correlation between CSR and corporate financial performance. An increasing number of these studies show a positive correlation between companies’ social responsibility and their financial performance (Frooman, 1997; Key & Popkin, 1998). The stakeholder view holds that corporate governance is a complex process of negotiation that seeks to balance the interests of all the groups involved. The adoption of CSR approaches allows companies to solve conflicts and to distribute the value created among the different interest groups. Stakeholder theory appears to offer a useful framework for studying the relationship between business and society and, more specifically, the concept of CSR. Analyzing business students’ attitudes about
which of these two approaches –shareholders versus stakeholders– should take priority in driving the orientation of the company is a relevant issue that has received scant attention in the literature. Some exceptions are the studies of the Aspen Institute (2008) and Lämsä et al. (2008). According to Fernández-Gago and Martínez-Campillo (2012), the approach teachers follow in business management studies should be carefully evaluated to verify its suitability. Several studies suggest that the increasing business school emphasis on CSR and social issues can influence students’ attitudes (White & Montgomery, 1980; Boyd, 1981; Stead & Miller, 1988; Angelidis & Ibrahim 2004; Kleinrichert et al., 2013). The literature stresses that education is one of the most influential and important elements in the development of moral judgment (McCabe et al., 1991). Consequently, the training of business students in business ethics and CSR issues is an important part of their preparation for responsible roles in society. Whereas the importance of links between business and society has been explored in the literature, little academic interest has been shown in whether students consider that business schools should include social issues in their formal education. The work of Sleeper et al. (2006) offers an initial approach to this topic. The present research uses Sleeper et al.’s Business Education’s Role in Addressing Social Issues (BERSI) scale to assess student attitudes. These authors noted in their suggestions for future research that “the scale and findings reported here need to be replicated in a variety of other business school settings to provide generalizability to the study’s findings. Suggested pedagogical applications need to be adapted and reported” (p. 390). Moreover, our study aims to go beyond the work of Sleeper et al. (2006) by assessing student attitudes towards business education’s role in addressing social issues based on two separate attitudinal dimensions: (1) students’ attitudes to their ideal educational situation (“what it should be”); and (2) students’ attitudes to their current educational situation (“what it is”).

**Research questions**

In light of the above considerations and the growing interest in the literature to analyze business students’ attitudes, the research questions we address in this paper are as follows:

1. What are business students’ attitudes to the responsibilities of a company (what a well-run company is)? With this question, we aim to verify with which approach –shareholder or stakeholder– business students identify most closely, while comparing our results with those from previous empirical studies.

2. Our study also focuses on two separate attitudinal dimensions regarding business students’ attitudes to their education: (1) What are business students’ attitudes towards the role of education in addressing social issues? and (2) What are students’ perceptions of how social
issues are being addressed on their business studies courses? We therefore aim to verify whether business students consider that social issues are adequately covered in their studies or, on the contrary, whether their studies are deficient in this subject.

Gender is an important aspect to consider in the analysis of students’ attitudes. Possible differences between the ethical orientation of men and women have previously been a subject for discussion. Although the evidence is mixed, most studies show that women have a more pronounced social and ethical orientation (Robin & Babin, 1997; Franke et al., 1997; Luthar et al. 1997; Borkowski & Ugras, 1998; Albaum & Peterson, 2006; Eweje & Brunton, 2010). In this line, we consider gender when analyzing our research questions.

In the next section, we describe the research methodology; the following sections discuss the results of the data analysis and present our conclusions.

**Research method**

Our research sample consisted of 124 final year undergraduate business students at a Spanish public university (Universitat Jaume I). The study was conducted in 2012. The total number of students enrolled in this course was 190, thus giving a response rate of 65%, which is considered acceptable for the purposes of this research. Of the sample, 48 (39%) were male and 75 (61%) female (in 1 case gender was not specified).

Firstly, we applied the questionnaire developed by the Aspen Institute’s Initiative for Social Innovation through Business (Aspen ISIB) to gauge student perception of what makes a well-run company. In 1999, the Aspen ISIB launched a longitudinal survey measuring the effects of an MBA education on students’ attitudes to the roles and responsibilities of business. Specifically, they aimed to find out: (1) How MBA students view the role of the company in society; (2) How students’ attitudes toward the roles and responsibilities of the company in society are shaped by the MBA experience, and (3) What messages MBA students are receiving from business schools about acceptable values and behaviours in business. The questionnaire was first used in 2001 as part of an international survey entitled ‘Where Will They Lead?’ (Aspen Institute, 2001). The study was repeated in the years 2002 and 2007.

Secondly, as noted above, we used the scale developed by Sleeper et al. (2006) to assess the students’ attitudes towards the role of business education in preparing them to make decisions that affect social needs. According to these authors, this scale incorporates questions on “the value of student learning about awareness of and solutions to social problems, civic leadership, discrimination, service, and general CSR issues” (p. 384).
The questionnaire used in the survey was translated from English into Spanish at the beginning of the research process to enable a better understanding by participating students. The respondents filled out the questionnaire in the classroom setting on a voluntary and anonymous basis.

**Results**

Firstly, we analyze the business students’ definition of a well-run company. Respondents evaluate twelve characteristics on a five-point scale (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important). Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics about the students’ view of what a well-run company consists of. According to our respondents, the main characteristics of a well-run company were excellent customer service and retaining the best people. Specifically, the students considered the most important characteristics to be actions that improve the customers’ and employees’ conditions. Financial return to shareholders, however, was regarded as the least important. These results are very similar to those obtained recently in a Finnish study (Lämsä et al., 2008) and in the Aspen ISIB survey (Aspen Institute, 2008). However, our Spanish results are closer to the Finnish results than to the Aspen ISIB survey findings. For instance, Spanish and Finnish students evaluated financial return to shareholders as the least important characteristic, while the Aspen ISIB results placed this characteristic ninth out of the twelve positions. Another difference was in the Spanish students’ perception of a stable employer as one of the main characteristics of a well-run company, a characteristic that the American respondents considered as the least important. In sum, Spanish students define a well-run company from a stakeholder perspective, in which the purpose of the company is to satisfy various interest groups, among which employees and customers are the most important.

______________________________

Insert Table 1

______________________________

Next, we performed an ANOVA to examine the assessment of the twelve characteristics of a well-run company from a gender perspective. We found statistically significant differences in seven characteristics (Table 2). The results show that female students valued the environmental and social dimensions of a well-run company more than their male counterparts, indicating a greater degree of commitment to the stakeholder perspective amongst women. This result is in line with previous studies which suggest that women may be socialized to accept such responsibilities more than men are (Robin & Babin, 1997; Luthar et al., 1997; Franke et al., 1997; Borkowski & Ugras, 1998; Albaum & Peterson, 2006; Eweje & Brunton, 2010). This is
an important element in assessing business students’ attitudes—people who will become managers and entrepreneurs in the future—especially because top leadership positions in most companies are held by men. According to the *International Business Report* of 2012, women in Spain occupy 24% of management positions, 3% more than the global average. However, not all of these positions involve great responsibility. Globally, fewer than one in 10 businesses are led by women, indicating that it is even harder for women to reach the very top of the business world. 9% of businesses have a female CEO, although this ranges from 15% in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) region to just 6% in North America. In the Asia Pacific region (with the exception of Japan) and Europe, 13% of businesses are led by a woman. Australia emerges as the country with the highest proportion of female CEOs: three in 10 businesses are led by women, ahead of Thailand (29%), Italy (24%) and Argentina (23%). Botswana, Brazil and Japan (all 3%) perform worst on this measure, with the United Kingdom and the United States (both 6%) not far ahead of them. Women are best represented in finance and human resources positions. In finance, 13% of businesses have female Chief Financial Officers (CFO), and a further 13% employ women in other senior finance roles such as Corporate Controller. At the country level, businesses in Taiwan (48%), mainland China (39%), Sweden (37%) and Finland (31%) are most likely to have a female CFO.

Secondly, and before assessing the students’ perceptions of the BERSI scale characteristics, they were asked about the contribution that different institutions make in shaping aspects related to ethics. This question was measured using a five-point scale (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important). A summary of the results is presented in Table 3. Their responses showed that the students surveyed attributed a similar importance to family and educational institutions (3.57), a somewhat lower importance to the social context (3.42) and the business context (3.39) and gave a significantly lower assessment to public institutions (2.873). These results allow us to confirm the high consideration of educational institutions in shaping students’ moral and ethical attitudes. Indeed, college education has been shown to be a powerful experience in the moral development for all students (McNeel, 1994). Therefore, the role of education in promoting social factors in business should be taken into account when designing courses related to business ethics and corporate social responsibility.
Table 4 shows the results for the assessment of student perceptions of business education’s role in addressing social issues. Each of the nine items in the BERSI scale was answered on a five-point Likert scale, from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Most of the values of the scale items (seven out of nine) are above the scale midpoint (3). Moreover, the mean value of the scale is 3.46. Similar to Sleeper et al.’s (2006) study, the findings show that students consider that business education should provide a comprehensive coverage of social issues. Especially high values are shown in items such as ‘business studies should prepare students to be civic leaders as well as business leaders’ or ‘business education should require students to study issues concerning corporate social responsibility’.

We also assessed student perceptions, according to their experience, of how issues included in the BERSI scale are being addressed in their current business studies courses (Table 5). In this case, the values of all the scale items are below the scale midpoint (3). The most outstanding conclusion drawn from tables 4 and 5 lies in the important differences among the students’ perceptions of business education’s role in addressing social issues and their perceptions of how these issues are being addressed in their current studies. This gap appears to denote certain dissatisfaction among business students with the current coverage of social issues in their business education.

Lastly, we also performed an ANOVA to uncover the students’ perceptions of the role business education plays in addressing social issues from a gender perspective (Table 6). Although in most cases the assessments were higher for women (in 6 of the 9 items), significant differences were only found in two cases, specifically the items, ‘business studies should prepare students
to be civic leaders as well as business leaders’, and ‘business education should require students to study issues concerning corporate social responsibility’. These were the scale items with higher mean scores, as we noted above. It is precisely these items that contain elements more closely related to the field of management, such as leadership or corporate social responsibility. We also analyzed the possible existence of significant differences between men and women’s perceptions of how the BERSI scale items are being addressed in their current business studies courses (Table 7). The table reveals no significant differences in this respect for any of the scale items.

Conclusions
In the wake of the various business scandals that have emerged over the last two decades, the importance of business studies in creating more socially aware leaders is rising. Higher education institutions influence the perception that students have of companies and their responsibilities to society. Economic thinking grounded in elements such as self-interest, opportunistic behaviour and maximizing profits for shareholders has tended to dominate the curricula and research agendas in all the social and policy sciences. In this context, the treatment of social issues has clearly been undervalued. However, each individual must ponder on the social consequences of his or her actions in an organization. In this regard, students should be trained in the context of an interdisciplinary education that goes beyond management sciences (Kletz, 2009).

In order to answer our research questions, we report the results of a survey into business students’ attitudes regarding: (1) the responsibilities of a company (what a well-run company is) and; (2) the role of business education in social issues. Concerning our first research question, the study findings suggest that Spanish students define a well-run company from a stakeholder perspective, emphasizing the role of employees and customers. Contrary to the assumption by critics of business education (e.g., Ghoshal 2005), our results do not provide evidence that business students’ education generates an attitude upholding a reductionist model of the firm,
where responsibilities towards society are avoided and shareholder value is prioritized. Moreover, when compared with previous empirical studies, we find that the Spanish results are closer to the Finnish results (Lämsä et al., 2008) than to the Aspen ISIB survey findings (Aspen Institute, 2008). For instance, the Aspen ISIB respondents viewed maximizing value for shareholders as a more important company responsibility than did Spanish and Finnish students (who regarded it as the least important responsibility). Another notable difference refers to the importance of work stability for Spanish students; they consider it as one of the main characteristics of a well-run company, whereas the American respondents considered it as the least important. The results also show that female students valued the environmental and social dimensions of a well-run company more than male students did. This finding is in line with previous studies which suggest that women tend to be more aware of social issues and are more likely to act ethically than their male counterparts.

In relation to our second research question on the students’ perceptions of business education’s role in addressing social issues, our findings are consistent with the results of Sleeper et al. (2006), and suggest that students consider relevant the social issues offered as part of their business education. As these authors noted, “this apparent movement in student acceptance of a role for social issues education may indicate that these students have become sensitized to corporate social contexts from increasingly public and socially destructive corporate abuses” (p. 388). Our findings also provide support, although limited, that female students are relatively more concerned than male students with the role of business education in addressing social issues. However, our study goes further than the research of Sleeper et al. (2006) by considering students’ assessments of how the issues included in the BERSI scale are being addressed in their current business studies. The results of these assessments show significantly lower values than the results for their assessments of the role that business education should play. These findings represent a relevant contribution to business education field, showing a significant gap between what is perceived and what is desired in the question of the role of business studies in addressing social issues. This finding might suggest that students’ concerns for social issues are higher than those reflected on their business studies and it also seems to reveal their awareness of this gap between “what is” and “what should be”.

In sum, our study shows that the business students we surveyed hold attitudes that are closer to the stakeholder model than to the shareholder model. Although business education may be influenced by what critics such as Ghoshal (2005) or Mirtroff (2004) term “bad theories”, our findings could be a result of the fact that the values students acquire in other contexts (family, business context, social context, etc.) determine what they consider to be a good company, understood as one that assumes its responsibilities in the social sphere and therefore goes
beyond the specific objective of maximizing value for its shareholders. This interpretation may be supported by the emphasis students give to the importance of social issues on business studies courses and, furthermore, their claim that the education they currently receive in these matters falls below the standards they would like to see. We cannot, therefore, ignore the existence of other institutions or contexts that influence the way their social conscience is shaped, and as educational institutions, we need to introduce initiatives that society, through its students, is demanding to close this gap.

The fact that most students are receptive to the relationship between business and social issues should encourage universities to consider a pedagogical response that results in the design of subjects related to business ethics and corporate social responsibility. This response is particularly relevant since undergraduate business students recognize that, along with the family, educational institutions are the two institutions that most contribute to shaping their ethical values. The implication for educators is that they need to do a better job of raising students’ awareness of the importance of social factors in business decision making.

The demand from students for social issues in business studies highlights the scarcity of such content in Spanish university curricula, as reflected in a recent report about the CSR approach in university education (Club de Excelencia en Sostenibilidad, 2010). This study notes the absence of any specific CSR degree and finds only five universities that have introduced a compulsory subject in their higher education business courses. In other higher education studies, CSR is poorly represented and only appears as an optional subject in degrees such as Environmental Science, English Studies or Nursing. However, as noted in this study, this issue is receiving greater attention through specialized postgraduate studies, reflecting a certain demand from society for these issues to be addressed.
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**TABLE 1**  
Business students’ definition of a well-run company

| A well-run company                                      | Item Mean | Item SD |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Provides excellent customer service                    | 4.66      | 0.60    |
| Attracts and retains exceptional people                 | 4.54      | 0.63    |
| Invests in employee training and development            | 4.32      | 0.76    |
| Produces high-quality products and services             | 4.32      | 0.73    |
| Has efficient and flexible operations                   | 4.24      | 0.69    |
| Is a stable employer                                   | 4.23      | 0.77    |
| Provides competitive compensation                       | 4.01      | 0.76    |
| Operates according to its values and a strong code of ethics | 3.93      | 0.89    |
| Creates products and services that benefit society      | 3.85      | 0.92    |
| Adheres to progressive environmental policies           | 3.81      | 0.88    |
| Adheres to a strong mission                            | 3.67      | 0.89    |
| Offers high financial returns to shareholders           | 3.37      | 0.87    |
### TABLE 2
Characteristics of a well-run company from a gender perspective

| Characteristics of a well-run company | Gender | Mean | F-test |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|--------|
| Provides excellent customer service   | Male   | 4.57 | 1.723  |
|                                      | Female | 4.72 |        |
| Attracts and retains exceptional people | Male  | 4.58 | 0.295  |
|                                      | Female | 4.52 |        |
| Invests in employee training and development | Male  | 4.09 | 7.611*** |
|                                      | Female | 4.47 |        |
| Produces high-quality products and services | Male  | 4.23 | 1.052  |
|                                      | Female | 4.37 |        |
| Has efficient and flexible operations | Male   | 4.08 | 4.335** |
|                                      | Female | 4.35 |        |
| Is a stable employer                 | Male   | 4.02 | 5.662** |
|                                      | Female | 4.36 |        |
| Provides competitive compensation    | Male   | 3.89 | 1.721  |
|                                      | Female | 4.08 |        |
| Operates according to its values and a strong code of ethics | Male  | 3.74 | 4.310** |
|                                      | Female | 4.08 |        |
| Creates products and services that benefit society | Male  | 3.51 | 12.051*** |
|                                      | Female | 4.08 |        |
| Adheres to progressive environmental policies | Male  | 3.45 | 15.293*** |
|                                      | Female | 4.05 |        |
| Adheres to a strong mission          | Male   | 3.45 | 5.417** |
|                                      | Female | 3.83 |        |
| Offers high financial returns to shareholders | Male  | 3.43 | 0.320  |
|                                      | Female | 3.33 |        |

**p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01

### TABLE 3
Contribution of different institutions to education in the area of ethics

| Institutions               | Item mean | Item SD |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Family                    | 3.57      | 1.23    |
| Social context (friends, etc.) | 3.42     | 0.98    |
| Educational institutions  | 3.57      | 0.96    |
| Business context          | 3.39      | 1.11    |
| Public authorities        | 2.83      | 1.01    |
TABLE 4  
**Business education’s role in social issues (BERSI) scale evaluation results**

| Item                                                                 | Item Mean | Item SD |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Learning to help others should be an important part of business education | 3.10      | 1.01    |
| Business education should require students to become involved in service projects | 3.66      | 0.90    |
| Business education should prepare students to be civic leaders as well as business leaders | 4.20      | 0.91    |
| Business education should encourage students to help needy people in their communities | 2.90      | 1.08    |
| Business educations should offer opportunities for students to increase their understanding of community issues | 3.60      | 0.94    |
| A good business education should make students aware of the needs of less fortunate citizens | 3.32      | 1.12    |
| Business school graduates should know how to help solve social problems | 3.48      | 0.98    |
| Business education should require students to study issues concerning corporate social responsibility | 3.97      | 0.85    |
| Business courses should include topics on discrimination                | 2.91      | 1.08    |
| Mean value of the scale                                                | 3.46      | 0.67    |

Coefficient alpha for scale = 0.859
| Item                                                                 | Item mean | Item SD |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Learning to help others is an important part of business education  | 2.31      | 0.97    |
| Business education requires students to become involved in service projects | 2.44      | 0.97    |
| Business education prepares students to be civic leaders as well as business leaders | 2.73      | 0.97    |
| Business education encourages students to help needy people in their communities | 1.83      | 0.84    |
| Business education offers opportunities for students to increase their understanding of community issues | 2.35      | 0.91    |
| Business education makes students aware of the needs of less fortunate citizens | 2.17      | 1.00    |
| Business school graduates know how to help solve social problems    | 2.40      | 0.99    |
| Business education requires students to study issues concerning corporate social responsibility | 2.92      | 1.05    |
| Business courses include topics on discrimination                    | 1.67      | 0.88    |
| Mean value of the scale                                             | 2.31      | 0.67    |

Coefficient alpha for scale = 0.869
### TABLE 6
Business education’s role in social issues (BERSI) scale evaluation results from a gender perspective

| Item                                                                 | Gender | Item mean | F-test   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------|----------|
| Learning to help others should be an important part of business      | Male   | 3.08      | 0.041    |
| education                                                            | Female | 3.12      |          |
| Business education should require students to become involved in     | Male   | 3.56      | 1.251    |
| service projects                                                     | Female | 3.75      |          |
| Business education should prepare students to be civic leaders       | Male   | 3.90      | 9.135*** |
| as well as business leaders                                          | Female | 4.39      |          |
| Business education should encourage students to help needy people in | Male   | 2.88      | 0.050    |
| their communities                                                    | Female | 2.92      |          |
| Business education should offer opportunities for students to        | Male   | 3.65      | 0.173    |
| increase their understanding of community issues                     | Female | 3.57      |          |
| A good business education should make students aware of the needs    | Male   | 3.30      | 0.029    |
| of less fortunate citizens                                            | Female | 3.33      |          |
| Business school graduates should know how to help solve social       | Male   | 3.52      | 0.051    |
| problems                                                             | Female | 3.48      |          |
| Business education should require students to study issues           | Male   | 3.77      | 4.342**  |
| concerning corporate social responsibility                           | Female | 4.09      |          |
| Business courses should include topics on discrimination              | Male   | 2.98      | 0.394    |
|                                                                     | Female | 2.85      |          |

**p< 0.05; ***p < 0.01

### TABLE 7
Student perceptions of how issues included in the BERSI scale are being addressed in their current business studies courses from a gender perspective

| Item                                                                 | Gender | Item mean | F-test   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------|----------|
| Learning to help others is an important part of business education   | Male   | 2.29      | 0.054    |
|                                                                      | Female | 2.33      |          |
| Business education requires students to become involved in service   | Male   | 2.44      | 0.027    |
| projects                                                            | Female | 2.47      |          |
| Business education prepares students to be civic leaders as well     | Male   | 2.69      | 0.308    |
| as business leaders                                                  | Female | 2.79      |          |
| Business education encourages students to help needy people in their | Male   | 1.81      | 0.068    |
| communities                                                          | Female | 1.85      |          |
| Business educations offers opportunities for students to increase     | Male   | 2.48      | 1.347    |
| their understanding of community issues                              | Female | 2.28      |          |
| Business education makes students aware of the needs of less          | Male   | 2.40      | 3.789    |
| fortunate citizens                                                   | Female | 2.04      |          |
| Business school graduates know how to help solve social problems      | Male   | 2.54      | 1.472    |
|                                                                      | Female | 2.32      |          |
| Business education requires students to study issues concerning      | Male   | 2.90      | 0.111    |
| corporate social responsibility                                      | Female | 2.96      |          |
| Business courses include topics on discrimination                     | Male   | 1.73      | 0.297    |
|                                                                      | Female | 1.64      |          |

**p< 0.05; ***p < 0.01