

проф. д-р ПОЛ ЛЕОНАРД ГАЛИНА
БИЗНЕС ФАКУЛТЕТ УЛЯМС
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ БИШЪПС, ШЕРБРУУК, КАНАДА

**НЕОБХОДИМИ УЧЕБНИ ПЛАНОВЕ ЗА БИЗНЕС ФАКУЛТЕТИТЕ ПРЕЗ ТОВА
ХИЛЯДОЛЕТИЕ: НЯКОИ МИСЛИ ОТ КАНАДА**

**NECESSARY BUSINESS SCHOOL CURRICULA FOR THIS MILLENNIUM: SOME
THOUGHTS FROM CANADA***

Prof. Dr. PAUL LEONARD GALLINA
WILLIAMS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
BISHOP'S UNIVERSITY, SHERBROOKE, CANADA

Abstract: Within the context of some current debates on management education in Canada, this paper discusses corporate social responsibility and innovation as follows: why there is a new urgency for these concepts to be taught; how this material is traditionally taught; and, how it might be taught in the future. Finally in each instance reference made to two leading Canadian multinational companies. Data, albeit limited, suggest that some leading Canadian companies readily embrace corporate social responsibility and innovation. Such practice is leading and business schools need to catch up.

Keywords: Business schools; education; management; innovation; corporate social responsibility; Canada; Conference Board of Canada

*The author wishes to acknowledge the support of Research Services and the Williams School of Business at Bishop's University for financial assistance in preparing this paper. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at a Conference held at Neofit Rilski University in Bulgaria, in October 2009.

Thanks, too, are in order to the Centre for Strategic Research (ESAM) Ege University in Izmir, Turkey in whose facilities the final draft of this paper was prepared.

A. Introduction

Few areas of instruction in higher education have been the subject of more intense ongoing commentary and controversy than business school education. Canada has been active in this ongoing debate.

One often cited view from Canada argues that management itself is a practice that cannot be taught—management is an ongoing practice that needs to be informed by critical inquiry.¹ There is nothing entirely new with this model of pedagogy particularly among those familiar with adult education. Nonetheless this academic applauds this adaptation for management education.

However rather than further debate how management should be taught, this paper looks at the content of curricula. It is argued here that two areas of content increasingly inform the overall context of management decision making and education—corporate social responsibility and innovation. It is further argued that although these perspectives are taught as part of traditional management education, they now have a new urgency and should infuse all management curricula. In other words, concepts of innovation and corporate social responsibility should inform all courses, and not be left to a specialized one or two.

In making these arguments, this paper attempts to contribute at least in part to another debate on management education posed by the report by the Conference Board of Canada entitled *Report Card on*

¹ Mintzberg, H. *Managers not MBAs*. London: Pearson 2004.

*Business, Management and Finance Education in Canada: Are Graduates Ready for Business?*¹ -- a rare attempt to solicit from Canadian employers an assessment of the abilities of recent management graduates and making reference to their education. Corporate social responsibility and innovation are among the areas this study suggests as requiring further development for new management graduates.

As a way of contributing to the debate the following are discussed: the problematic case of a new urgency and expanded curriculum; how this material is traditionally taught; and, how it might be taught in the future. Finally in each instance reference is made to two leading Canadian multinational companies to the experience of two leading Canadian multinationals. Data, albeit limited, suggest that these Canadian companies readily embrace innovation and corporate social responsibility. Such practice is leading rather than what is being taught in business schools.

B. Corporate Social Responsibility

The phrase corporate social responsibility (CSR) is being used with increasing frequency not just in Canadian circles, but internationally. Yet despite this common use no common definition exists. In a major move to promote corporate social responsibility, a report from the Canadian federal government suggests that CSR overlaps with notions such as sustainable development, business ethics, and corporate citizenship. CSR might be best defined as the private sector way of integrating economic, social and environment imperatives. It could also entail internal and external collaboration.²

Although it is not possible to completely account for the origins of CSR, one might argue it is an attempt to address some of the more egregious excesses of capitalism and concomitant events. Just a few such well known examples are as follows: occupational deaths in Bhopal; the financial thefts at Enron; and, the environmental crisis in Canada's tar sands. In short in each instance a crass face of business has been exposed-- entirely self-serving, unregulated, and without any sense of moral or social responsibility.

In response to these, and similar crises, public outcry is increasingly demanding ethical and socially responsible behaviour from business, and many business leaders are attempting such a response. At the same time, at least in Canada, there is data to suggest that recent management graduates are seen to be not entirely up to the task.³ And this may not be entirely surprising.

Independent of this study, at least two reasons can be given for this. First business school education in the area of business ethics and CSR for the most part remains very limited, possibly one course, and for many is still considered an oxymoron. Second the argument reiterated here⁴ is that what limited content that is taught often remains at odds with seriously dated 20 year old management theory.

For example a business ethics class might articulate a good argument for ethical behavior, corporate social responsibility, and stakeholder consultation. Yet down the hall in strategic management the student is entertained by a 20 year old Friedmanite mantra of a unitary management style with the only responsibility of management being

¹ Conference Board of Canada. *Report Card on Business, Management and Finance Education in Canada: Are Graduates Ready for Business?* Ottawa:2009

² Government of Canada. Corporate Social Responsibility. Lessons Learned.

<http://www.businessethicscanada.ca/capacity/tools/file_csr.pdf

³ Conference Board of Canada *op cit*.

⁴ Ghoshal, Sumantra. "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, 1, (2005), pp. 75-91

the pursuit of profit. In the process it is perfectly all right to break unions, control employees, and do whatever it takes to eliminate competitors. Further down the hall the ethics of manipulative marketing remain unexamined.

One could go on. The point here is that corporate social responsibility is likely at odds with much of the management theory that is being taught in business schools today. Whereas business schools teach change management, they themselves do not practice what they preach—change is more often than not slow and reluctant. Rather than being a leader in informing the practice of management, business schools are more often than not desperately behind the curve. Let us now look at the websites of two Canadian multi nationals in order to get some idea as to where they stand regarding corporate social responsibilities.

SNC Lavalin is a global leader in engineering and process management. When one looks at their website one sees that vision and values, corporate governance, and a code of ethics are prominent. A representative sample reads:

Our vision is supported by the following values which we are committed to carrying out:

- *Ensure that high standards of health and safety are a primary objective in all our activities worldwide.*
- *Respect for our code of ethics, the environment, quality, and a philosophy of on-going improvement.*

Corporate social responsibility informs all of SNC Lavalin's activities, and it becomes profitable doing so. For example the President of SNC Lavalin recently reported that a very important contributing factor to their success is their commitment to health and safety. Foreign clients are particularly attracted to SNC Lavalin

maintaining Canadian standards of health and safety on all their jobsites.¹

When looks at the website of Research in Motion (RIM) creators of Blackberry for evidence of CSR there are similar findings. For example:

Research In Motion (RIM) believes that it is important to give back to the local, national and global communities in which we operate. The primary focus of RIM's corporate philanthropy program is outreach to students in science, engineering and business programs.

Certainly this RIM sees itself committed to other things than solely the pursuit of profit. Yet this CSR commitment does not appear to negatively impact firm profitability. On August 18, 2009 *Fortune Magazine* named RIM the fastest growing company in the world with a growth rate of 84% in profit over three years despite the recession.

Assuming our argument and that of the business community for better education in corporate social responsibility is correct, let us now compare how CSR is currently taught and how it might infuse new curricula in the future (Figure 1).

¹ Meeting of CRIMT on the success of multinationals. HEC, Montreal, September 2008.

Figure 1

<i>Traditional business school course content and CSR</i>	
Elective course in professional and business ethics, and passing reference in accounting and finance	
<i>Revised CSR Curricula</i>	
Professional and business ethics	mandatory course
Introduction to management	a full module
Accounting	module on ethical considerations of accounting
Finance	separate course on corporate governance and stakeholder consultation
Marketing	critique of consumerism and manipulative advertising.
Strategic management	sustainable development, stakeholder consultation, the benefits of CSR
Human resource management	managing diversity, employee empowerment, models of employee representation

C.

D. Innovation

Whereas innovation remains of key importance for business school education in all economies it also lacks a tight definition. In a most basic sense innovation refers to the need to develop new products, new services, new or improved production processes and new business models. Increasingly so Canada cannot compete globally on the basis of labour costs—knowledge and creativity are the new engines of growth and productivity, and this is what innovation is all about. Furthermore universities can be powerful drivers of this necessary motor of economic change:

They produce people with knowledge and skills; they generate new knowledge and import it from diverse sources; and they apply knowledge in a range of environments. They are also the seedbed for new industries, products and services

and are at the hub of business networks and industrial clusters of the knowledge economy.¹

University graduates are well positioned to be the creators of innovative products and services. Moreover, graduates of business schools are asked to manage such innovation. Current graduates need more skills. It is not that innovation is not taught as part of management education, it is not taught enough.

Before making the claim for expanded curricula for innovation, however, let us look again at the website of SNC Lavalin to see how this corporation reports on innovation. SNC Lavalin markets itself as a cutting edge firm and the corporate website shows

¹ Department of Trade and Industry. *Opportunity for All in a World of Change*. White Paper on Enterprise, Skills and Innovation. London: Queen's Printer, 2001.

a clear understanding of what is at stake with innovation:

SNC-Lavalin achieves this through the know-how of its people by contributing to the success of its clients through value-added services and by continuous investment in the improvement of its technical and managerial competence.

An equally forceful case is made by RIM:

E. Conclusion

This paper is a limited attempt to participate in the Conference Board of Canada's call for debate on management education in Canada. Accepting the claim that there is a need for expanded education in the areas of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and innovation, it highlights the practice of two leading Canadian international firms. It is argued that CSR and innovation are central to the business practice of these firms. The paper

At RIM, innovation and creative thinking are not only welcomed, but also encouraged. We recognize the importance of providing an environment that inspires people to realize their full potential.

Given the importance these two companies place on innovation, let us now see how Canadian business school education stacks up:

then suggests how these concepts are currently taught and need to be taught in an expanded curriculum.

With regard to CSR and innovation business education in Canada is behind the curve and business practice leads. With reference to Hegel's Owl of Minerva, the Dusk has settled long ago. Business schools in Canada must learn from leading business practice and update curricula accordingly.

Figure 2

<i>Traditional business school curricula and innovation</i>	
Entrepreneurship Product development Strategic management (limited)	
<i>Additional business school curricula and innovation</i>	
Introduction to management Human resource management	recruiting for innovation, retaining and managing innovative personnel
Business management skills Strategic management Change management Marketing	For non business management students More than passing reference Becoming an innovative firm Marketing innovative products, marketing and SMEs