



**SWP 52/91 "THE MISMATCH BETWEEN ACADEMIC AND
PRACTITIONER CONSTRUCTS OF ETHICS:
IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS SCHOOLS"**

DR SHAILENDRA VYAKARNAM
Enterprise Group
Cranfield School of Management
Cranfield Institute of Technology
Cranfield
Bedford MK43 0AL
(Tel: 0234 751122)



Dr. Shailendra Vyakarnam.

The author is a lecturer in enterprise development and promotion, both in the UK and developing country context. He has worked in small businesses and the main research areas are in entrepreneurship. In addition he conducted a doctoral study on the social relevance of MBA education in developing countries and elicited a number of definitions from practising managers. Ethics and corporate social responsibility, especially in the developing country context are of particular interest.

THE MISMATCH BETWEEN ACADEMIC
AND PRACTITIONER CONSTRUCTS OF ETHICS.
IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS SCHOOLS.

ABSTRACT

Many business schools attempt to teach ethics, often based on definitions offered by academics or philosophers. These definitions are not always sensitive to the way managers construe definitions of ethics with the result that academics and practising managers remain on different wavelengths. This paper presents definitions of social responsibility elicited from 120 managers in India. The implications of the study are set in the context of a model of learning theory and suggests that unless academics are sensitive to the definitions which are used in practise, it will not be possible to effectively address the issue of ethics in business school curricula.

INTRODUCTION

Management education can be construed either as a vocational form of training which is entirely for the concern and benefit of industry and students or it can be construed as a part of higher education making a valuable contribution to society.

If it is the latter perspective one takes, either directly or implicitly, then it is clear that the main product of management education institutions, the MBA graduates need to be accountable to society in some way.

The evaluation of MBAs is of course a controversial area and a potential graveyard for researchers as the set of assumptions and the conclusions one has to make or arrive at would either reinforce one lobby group or challenge another establishment (Vyakarnam, 1988). Therefore, Business Schools might do better to focus on the

qualitative contributions which their graduates could make, such as through socially responsible or ethical behaviour.

THE CALL FOR ETHICS

Indeed the call for increased teaching in ethics comes from a number of directions. One view (Whitcraft, 1989 and Gilbreath 1990) suggests that society as a whole has become greedy, that it has shed some of the old values of hard work and frugal living in preference to increased materialism. Others (Lee, 1990 and Armstrong et al 1989) are concerned with reviving codes of conduct in the professions, such as public administration and accounting, where integrity and service to society are of prime concern. These concerns have lead to a recent wave of interest in business ethics (Castro, 1989 and Unnia, 1990), especially at Business Schools.

Although Mahoney (1990) suggests that American Business Schools have been more responsive compared to their European counterparts, Woods et al (1989) feel that some portion of the blame for the lack of socially responsible behaviour in business can be placed on Business Schools. Indeed, Bassiry (1990) is critical of American Universities as he believes they spend little time on building the social conscience of the students.

Irrespective of the effectiveness of the Business Schools, then, a common thread among them is their debate about whether or not ethics can and should be taught. (Conry et al, 1989)

CAN OR SHOULD ETHICS BE TAUGHT?

Peter Drucker (Williams, 1982) suggests that the best that Business Schools can manage is a consequentialist model, where a Business behaves ethically because it is

good for business. A slightly different argument is that ethics cannot be taught because there are a variety of blockages to the teaching and learning. One of these is that character and personality are already formed by the age of 20, making subsequent attempts to change a person's ethics useless. (Shenkir, 1990) Further, Pamental (1989) argues that young people do not have any knowledge of functional aspects of business, therefore would not be able to relate to the case studies which are frequently used for the teaching of ethics.

One of the main arguments against the "teaching" of ethics is that it is a form of indoctrination and can therefore be construed as an invasion of privacy (Etzioni, 1989). However, this is a ridiculous argument as Business Schools are in the business of education, which implies changing attitudes and beliefs. Students on a marketing course or an industrial relations course are just as likely to be "indoctrinated" as they might on an ethics course.

ETHICAL PEDAGOGY

Part of the reason for the apparent resistance or nervousness towards ethics may stem from the difficulty of knowing (Derry et al, 1989) what to teach and how to teach the subject. The debate of pedagogy spans six critical areas. The first being moral philosophy (Conry, 1990) where the greater good of society must be met both by the individual manager and the corporation.

The second area is that of awareness raising in ethical issues. Supporters of this "teaching" process feel there are blocks to learning and that it is best to address the issues and allow individuals to make up their own minds about what stand they will take (Smith et al, 1990). In addition to raising awareness, some authors suggest that ethical reasoning is important, because ethical thinking is a process rather than a product (Kremers, 1989 and Snell, 1990).

The fourth area of concern is the reinforcement of existing values, because it is felt that values are set early in a person's life and Business Schools cannot implant missing values (Burns et al, 1990 and Akers, 1989). However, this may be construed as somewhat defeatist as the purpose of Business Schools as education institutions is to help bring about change in society and if educators believe that change cannot be achieved they might as well close shop and go home.

The fifth area is reflected by some of the professional associations, especially accounting, which are concerned with a drop in ethical standards and argue for the introduction of a code of conduct (Kullberg, 1990). Indeed, the issue is felt strongly enough by the National Association of Accountants in the USA (Frank et al, 1990) that they would like to see a liaison person at the Business Schools to link into the Associations efforts. In fact Armstrong et al (1989) suggest that structural changes are needed for the inclusion of ethics in the curricula, including a more thorough coverage of ethical issues in professional examinations.

The sixth area of debate is probably the most difficult as it concerns the resolution of conflict which people face in their personal and business lives. According to Cava (1990) the two main theories of ethics are teleology, which focuses on the consequences of choice and deontology, which is based on moral duty of the individual. She argues that people pass through a number of stages of moral development from; 1. obedience to authority, 2. cooperation to advance common interests, 3. good behaviour to gain approval, 4. conformity, 5. acceptance of a social contract and 6. ideals of justice and equality.

This is a neat theory which might fit the development of the "seven stages of man" and can be helpful in seeking explanations for people's ethical stand. On a practical level Cohen (1989) puts forward the view that people often have to choose between

competing and legitimate alternatives. For example, is it ethical for a firm to close down a plant because it is unprofitable, when its closure will cause personal difficulties for the redundant staff.

Another form of conflict which exists is whether issues are overt and need tacit approval thus judged to be more unethical than are issues which are more covert and easily rationalized (Mason et al, 1990).

The above review of literature on the pedagogy of ethics needs to be put in the context of what is "ethics" or indeed the preferred term here "social responsibility". The reason for this concern with a definition is that it is unclear what can or should be taught unless one can establish a starting point.

COMING TO TERMS WITH ETHICS OR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The term "social responsibility" has a multitude of meanings; covering the idea of legal responsibility or liability; behaviour in an ethical sense; charitable donations; an awareness of the issues; as a synonym for legitimacy in the sense of belonging or being proper or valid (Votaw, 1973). It has also been defined as "the voluntary consideration of public social goals alongside the private economic ones" (Mintzberg, 1985,p47).

The span of definitions begins with one extreme which suggests that the social responsibility of a manager is to make a profit (Friedman, 1975) within the parameters of legal and normal ethical guide-lines. He argues that the shareholders can decide how corporate wealth can be spent rather than the managers. Support for this view is provided by Chamberlain (1973) who suggests that corporations are powerless to effect significant change in society because they are part of a network of relationships which bind society together and such discretion as they have is

constrained by this network. However, Galbraith (1973) argues that the planning system of the USA consists of 2,000 corporations at the most and;

"In their operation they have power that transcends the market...Thus we agree that the modern corporation, either in itself or in conjunction with others, has extensive influence..." (in Elkins and Callaghan, 1975, p4).

On another dimension, Kristol (1970) has argued that while capitalism had provided the promise of the "good life", the dynamics of achieving affluence and liberty has subverted the goal because the process has created a "bourgeois" in which philistinism is inherent; he quotes Frederick von Hayek who distinguishes between a free society and a just society. In the former, reward is handed out by a self-selected elite based on how they perceive the merit of other men, but the concern is that there is not a clear picture on what constitutes a just society.

At the other extreme of the "hands-off" argument is the "hands-on" definition of social responsibility. The line of argument here is that a business cannot survive or even exist unless it accounts for social concerns and that separation from the economic interests of the firm from its social and political interests is impossible as there is no room for separation (Sethi, 1974). Support for this view comes from Powers and Vogel (1980, p9):

"In its more sophisticated forms, corporate responsibility has come to mean that the interests of the several corporate constituencies are no longer seen as constraints on corporate activity which must be managed; instead these constituencies are seen as stakeholders, groups which have legitimate interests, and at least some of whose claims should be met and reconciled in the management process".

In addition to the more proactive definition suggested by the writers above, as a contrast to "hands-off", there are other writers who suggest that corporations tend to respond to market signals or other forms of pressure.

Smith (1990) has catalogued the consumer pressure which was applied to Barclays Bank to withdraw from South Africa and the pressure on Nestle to stop exporting infant formula (milk powders) to developing countries. The effects of infant mortality through the use of milk powders has been discussed in great detail by Chetley (1985) and clearly exemplifies the weakness of the "hands-off" definition of social responsibility.

Mintzberg (1985) has conceptualised both extremes of the definition on a horseshoe in terms of management responses to external social demands. He argues that both extremes; of nationalising an organisation to achieve social objectives on the one hand and restoring ownership to shareholders to pursue economic goals on the other hand actually mean the same thing for the managers as they have to contend with outsiders.

While the extreme positions cover the two ends of control, Mintzberg offers a further six forms of control or autonomy which managers can work with.

1. Democracy, which calls for a sharing of decision making with workers, consumer groups, perhaps environmentalists and so on.
2. Regulation, is implicitly based on the need for corporations to share their responsibilities with government, in the sense that corporations will respond to external regulations which are backed by a legal process. The internal regulatory processes would be left to the managers.

3. Pressure is thought to achieve what regulation cannot, by provoking the corporation into meeting social needs.

4. Trust on the other hand is based on the premise that a corporation has no need to act irresponsibly and there is no need for it to be controlled in any formal way. Managers are thought to be able, rationally, to meet both social and economic goals. However, this position comes under attack from both sides, as managers' right to decide on social goals is questioned by one side as indeed is the belief that they actually know or care to pursue social goals at all by the other side.

5. Ignore the corporation, as a position, assumes that because social goals are met through the pursuit of economic goals, there is no need for a change of behaviour. This statement is the classic position adopted by Adam Smith (Hay, Gray and Gates, 1976) who said:

"Every individual is continually exerting himself to find out the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, indeed, and not that of society, which he has in view. But the study of his own advantage, naturally, or rather necessarily, leads him to prefer that employment which is the most advantageous to the society"

In more contemporary terms it might be described as a "consequentialist" definition as it suggests that ethical behaviour is a commercially sound proposition.

6. The next position on the "horseshoe" is to induce the corporation to be "good". In this view the corporation does not pursue social objectives at all, even when it is a means to economic goals. Corporations wait for incentives, in the form of

government subsidies and then provide a limited response. They anticipate assistance because they fear that any proactive move would cause a cost increase which would make them uncompetitive.

These six positions suggested by Mintzberg apparently allow for greater freedom for managers to select their behaviour without the external pressures of either the shareholders or the government (assuming they are nationalised).

The definitions of social responsibility have also been construed in terms of phases and run parallel to the notion of a hierarchy of needs propounded by Maslow (1970) where he suggests that an individual can move his own expectations from basic needs (such as survival) to higher level (such as self actualisation) depending on how a person's conditions are changing.

In the first phase the definitions would be provided by Adam Smith (as discussed above) and Mintzberg's suggestion that the corporation can be left alone as it "pays to be good".

In the second phase of development, corporations are seen as trustees, not only of the profits for the owners, but also of the interests of various groups in society - the stakeholders (Hay et al, 1976).

The third phase includes the "quality of life" concept as a definition of social responsibility, because society has achieved growth in economic terms and satisfied most of the basic needs. As a result of the relative success in overcoming economic scarcity, there have been direct and indirect social problems which have resulted.

With a new set of priorities, society is demanding more from the corporations, which have technical and managerial skills to help with solving many of the problems

created by industry and expects management to behave in a manner which goes beyond phase 1 and phase 2 styles of management.

Achieving phase three management styles requires corporations to face up to their current constructs of social responsibility. Indeed Clutterbuck (1981,p8) said:

"The Chief executive who assumes that his company is a good corporate citizen because it has well-meant policies towards some social issues is making the mistake of assuming social responsibility is something to add on to a company's activities - an external veneer aimed at keeping the outside world happy. The moment social responsibility becomes part of the company's public relations activities, it is a dead duck. Not only will outsiders frequently see through the sham, but people inside the company will soon get the idea that social responsibility does not really matter, that it is only for show, and that they are at liberty to slide around social responsibility issues if it becomes convenient"

The definitions offered so far by the various academics and researchers do not take account of how managers define social responsibility. Indeed they may be criticised for being prescriptive and thus creating problems for teaching of ethics at Business Schools.

THE CURRENT WEAKNESSES IN TEACHING ETHICS

Ethics, as a subject and a philosophy seems to sit uncomfortably at Business Schools. It is not a functional subject like marketing or finance; it has so many definitions; and, it seems, no clear pedagogic approach exists to satisfy the users.

It seems that the case for ethics at Business-Schools has been largely based on the great and the good prescribing definitions and trying to "teach it", "infuse it" "raise self awareness of it" or "help examine ones value systems through it".

The weakness in the arguments might be the result of the lack of empirical data to help identify how the MBAs define social responsibility (in their own words) in order to distinguish the distance which might have to be travelled to help them re-define the concept in line with those espoused by academics.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The rest of this paper attempts to close the gap in literature by presenting the findings of a study which elicited definitions of social responsibility from a group of MBAs and their peer group non-MBAs. These findings are followed by a discussion of the implications for the teaching of ethics at Business Schools.

RESEARCH METHOD

The data collection for the study was carried out in India, with 53 managers who had MBAs and with another 53 managers at an equivalent occupational level who did not have an MBA qualification. The main instrument used for interviews was based on the "Repertory Grid Technique", which is a tool from clinical psychology and relies on eliciting the respondents' own perceptions (Fransella and Bannister 1977, Stewart, Stewart and Fonda 1981 and Smith 1980). The technique is based on George Kelly's Theory of Personal Constructs (Holland, 1977).

The instrument's major advantage is that it gets at the respondents' perceptions and eliminates any researcher bias from data collection. According to the theory, these perceptions, or constructs, which the individual holds, help that person to make

choices which face him or her. Therefore in the context of this study, if we can understand how managers construe social responsibility then we can "anticipate" their future actions, which in turn provides us with an understanding on how to treat the subject of social responsibility in management education.

The elicited constructs of social responsibility were then analysed according to qualitative research methods (Miles and Huberman 1984 and Siegel 1956) in a search for patterns among the respondents.

The main findings from the research are the constructs of social responsibility. (A full appendix of 9 tables is enclosed).

FINDINGS

Most commonly used constructs of social responsibility

Multiple responses - n = 53

Constructs		MBAs		non-MBAs	
		n	r	n	r
1.	Interpersonal skills at work, with family and friends	35	1	36	2
2.	Integrity and honesty	32	2	38	1
3.	Care for people	23	3.5	30	3
4.	Work ethic, reliability	23	3.5	22	4
5.	Self-actualisation	20	5	18	5
6.	Egocentric concerns	19	6	11	6
7.	Social responsibilities in a general sense (low meaning)	14	7	11	6
8.	Helpfulness and consideration	13	8	10	8
9.	Social responsibility and social concerns	9	9	8	9
RHO = 0.975					

The high correlation value of 0.975 indicates that there is no difference between MBAs and non-MBAs. The implications drawn from this finding is that although the Business Schools aimed to raise the level of awareness and debate on social responsibility, there were no apparent differences in the way the graduates of the Business schools construed social responsibility from the way that other graduates defined the concept.

The most frequently used constructs of social responsibility involved **interpersonal skills, integrity and honesty and caring for people.**

Interpersonal skills is about how well one can get on with others, especially at work, with family and friends. In terms of the teaching of ethics at Business Schools, clearly this is an important area as it helps to address the issue of how one deals with others at work. The definition does not address the behaviour towards society as a whole.

Integrity and honesty were construed as desirable characteristics and probably reflect the most popular definitions of ethical behaviour. There appeared to be some 35 different ways of construing honesty. However, it was also clear that many of the respondents felt there was a conflict between their personal and professional ethical standards, where the latter tended to be consequentialist

The notion of **caring for people** was a deeper construct than the interpersonal skills, as it suggests that the individual has a concern and feeling for the people which leads to certain forms of interaction. On the other hand, interpersonal skills only suggests that someone is good at communicating without necessarily caring for the other person.

Work ethic and reliability as constructs are strong ideas about professional behaviour. It implies that people are getting on with their job, have a commitment to the organisation, clients, employees and so on. In terms of cognitive distance between ideas, this construct would be close to **honesty and integrity** as a desirable value system for individuals to have.

Self actualisation and egocentric concerns were to do with how other people contributed to a better existence for the respondent and how s/he was able to express their own development beyond day to day tasks. These were exemplified by concepts such as "independence of thought", "intellect, creativity and depth of maturity"

There were a number of constructs which described social responsibility as **social responsibility**! The respondents were very general in their elaboration of the definition and it was clear from other data in the study that they attached low meaning to the term. The statements exemplify the "public relations" side of management.

The next two definitions were getting at deeper value systems. "**Helpfulness and consideration**" encompasses a proactive characteristic where someone is doing something for another person without requiring anything in return. In the context of this study these definitions were related to people within the immediate orbit of the person's life, such as family, colleagues, friends and so on.

The least frequently used constructs of social responsibility were an extension of helpfulness and consideration, but for society as a whole, not just for the people in the immediate orbit of contact. These constructs were elicited from people who worked in rural development, government departments involved with public policy and managers of charitable organisations. These people, both, defined social responsibility in the form of **concern for society** and acted out the definition through their jobs.

CONCLUSIONS

The above findings reflect the various definitions which a large number of Indian managers offered for social responsibility. Interestingly, they contrast with the more philosophical approach taken by academics, reflecting the micro-level concerns around behaviour of managers. There is some support for this view from Woods and Berger (1989) who found that students on social projects learned about the importance of support systems, friendships, good humour and the acceptance of people as they are. They also learned about the value of patience, empathy and caring.

The contrast between the definitions offered by academics and by managers is indeed a sharp one. It is really a debate based on two completely different wavelengths. On the one hand the empirical definitions include people's interpersonal skills, straightforward ethical behaviour whether it is towards work or other people. There are notions of caring and helpfulness. On the other hand the definitions by the academics do not include any of these constructs at all.

The implications for Business Schools may be interpreted around personal construct theory of George Kelly (cited above, Holland 1977). One of the central points made in this theory is that a person needs to either cope with new learning ("define it") or take on-board completely new learning ("elaborate it") in order to make choices in the way he behaves.

In addition a person is thought to feel anxiety or fear when faced with or threatened by new situations and a clarification of the form of learning the person has to cope with may provide an indication of how to progress.

By ignoring the empirical definitions, Business Schools clearly "threaten" their students when they offer constructs which are not even on the mental maps of the individuals. For the students who have not thought about social responsibility in the terms used by the academics, the gulf is so wide that raising the debate in lecture rooms would seem threatening to the individuals, as they would not have the "constructs" to cope with the learning. Therefore, according to construct theory, the individual would be "defining" his construct system, to cope with new learning.

Students who come to Business Schools aspire to increasing their career prospects and thus anticipate functional subjects to be taught. Therefore, although they may find certain topics difficult to comprehend or absorb, they do expect these topics in Business Schools and are thus open to learning. However, if they are confronted by topics which are not anticipated, in the sense that they are not directly related to career moves, then the inclusion of such topics would be outside the range of expectation and thus create problems. In this situation, construct theory suggests that a person has to "elaborate" his construct system; in other words give up beliefs which are held in order to adopt some new ones.

Hence the feeling of threat and the concomitant rejection of the topic.

Perhaps, Business schools need to consider how to introduce the subject in a way which extends the definitions held by the students, so that the new and more complete definitions can be absorbed. At present the curricula do not account for the empirical definitions which are evident in the Indian managers, so efforts by Business Schools have been rejected by the students and in many cases by many of the staff.

The empirical evidence does provide examples of definitions which subsume those offered by the academics in the literature review. However, there is no evidence that

Business Schools acknowledge the starting point from which these definitions can be built. If there is a recommendation to make, then it is that Business Schools should begin their courses with a discussion of how, at a micro-level, the definitions held by managers can be gradually extended to include those offered above in the literature. Indeed, such an approach would minimise the "threat" to the construct systems of the students in order that there is time to make a transition in adopting the new constructs into their psychological processes.

This study has attempted to provide an empirical basis for defining social responsibility and thus fill one of the gaps in literature. It has also attempted to show the void between academics and practitioners and will, hopefully, help towards a more applicable definition of ethics and social responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Akers, John F.: Ethics and Competitiveness, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol 30 Iss 2, Winter 1989, p69-71.
- Armstrong, Mary Beth; Mintz Steven M.: Ethics Education in Accounting: Present Status and Policy Implications. *Government Accountants Journal*, Vol 38 Iss 2, Summer 1989, p70-76.
- Bassiry G.R.: Ethics, Education and Corporate Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics (Netherlands)*, Vol 9 Iss 10, Oct 1990, p799-806
- Burns, David J; Lanasa John M.: Sharing the Burden of Ethical Conduct: The Educational System and the Corporation. *Review of Business*, Vol 12 Iss 1, Summer 1990, p33-38.
- Castro, Barry.: Business Ethics and Business Education: A report from a Regional State University. *Journal of Business Ethics (Netherlands)* Vol 8 Iss 6, June 1990.
- Cava, Anita.: Teaching Ethics: A Moral Model. *Business and Economic Review*, Vol 36 Iss 3, Apr-Jun 1990, p10-13.
- Chamberlain Neil W.: *The Limits of Corporate Responsibility*. Basic Books, New York, 1973
- Clutterbuck D.: *How to be a Good Corporate Citizen*. McGraw Hill, London, 1986.
- Cohen, Jeffrey R; Pant, Laurie W.: Standard of Ethical Conduct for Management Accountants: Ethics in the Classroom. *Management Accounting*, Vol 71 Iss 2, August 1990, p19 - 21.
- Conry, Edward J; Nelson, Donald R.: Business Law and Moral Growth. *American Business Law Journal*, Vol 27 Iss 1, Spring 1989, p1-39
- Conry, Edward J.: Philosophical Dialogue. *American Business Law Journal*, Vol 28 Iss 2, Summer 1990, p201-244
- Derry, Robbin; Green, Ronald M.: Ethical Theory in Business Ethics: A critical Assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics (Netherlands)*, Vol 8 Iss 7, July 1989, p521-533.
- Etzioni, Amitai.: Are Business Schools Brain-Washing their MBAs? *Business and Society Review*, Iss 70, Summer 1989, p18-19.
- Frank, Gary B; Sarhan, M.H.; Fisher, Steven A.: Business and Academe: Forging and Ethics Partnership. *Management Accounting*, Vol 71 Iss 12, June 1990, p47-49
- Fransella Fay; Bannister Don.: *A Manual for Repertory Grid Technique*. Academic Press, 1977
- Friedman M.: The Social Responsibility of Business is to increase its Profits. In *A Managerial Odyssey. Problems in Business and its Environment*. (Eds.) Elkins A and Callaghan D.W., Addison Wesley, 1975, p41-46
- Galbraith J.K.: Power and the Useful Economist. *The American Economic Review*, Vol 63 Iss 1, March 1973.

Gilbreath, Kent.: The Quest for Professional Balance Begins with a Broad Education. *Baylor Business Review*, Vol 8 Iss 2, Summer 1990, p24-28.

Hay R.D.; Gray Edmund R.; Gates James E.: *Business and Society*. Southwestern Publishing, USA, 1976

Holland R.: George Kelly: Constructive Innocent and Reluctant Existentialist in *Perspectives In Personal Construct Theory*. (Ed) Bannister D, Academic Press, London, 1977.

Kremers, Marshall.: Teaching Ethical Thinking in a Technical Writing Course. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, Vol 32, Iss 2, June 1989, p58-61.

Kristol I.: When Virtue loses all her Loveliness - Some Reflections on Capitalism and the "Free Society". *The Public Interest*, Fall 1970, p3-15

Kullberg, Duane R.: Standards of Ethical Conduct for Management Accountants. *Management Accounting*, Vol 71 Iss 8, February 1990, p20-21.

Lee, Dalton S.: Moral Education and the Teaching of Public Administration Ethics. *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol 13 Iss 1,2, 1990, p359-389.

Mahoney Jack.: *Teaching Business Ethics in the United Kingdom, Europe and the United States of America: A Comparative Study*. Athlone Press, July 1990

Maslow Abraham H.: *Motivation and Personality*. Harper and Row, New York, 1970.

Mason, J Barry; Bearden, William O; Richardson, Lynne Davis.: Perceived Conduct and Professional Ethics Among Marketing Faculty. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol 18, Iss 3, Summer 1990, p185-197.

Miles B Matthew; Huberman Michael A.: *Qualitative Data Analysis. A sourcebook of New Methods*. Sage Publications, 1984.

Mintzberg H.: Who Should Control the Corporation. The McKinsey Quarterly, Autumn 1985. Condensed from *California Management Review*, Vol XXVII Iss 1, Fall 1984.

Pamental, George L.: The Course in Business Ethics: Can it Work? *Journal of Business Ethics (Netherlands)* Vol 8 Iss 7, July 1989, p547-551.

Powers C.W.; Vogel David.: Ethics in *The Education of Business Managers*. The Hastings on Hudson Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, The Hastings Centre, 1980.

Sethi S. Prakash.(Ed): *The Unstable Ground. Corporate Social Policy in a Dynamic Society*. J. Wiley and Sons, USA, 1974

Shenkir, William G.: A Perspective from Education: Business Ethics. *Management Accounting*, Vol 71 Iss 12, June 1990, p30-33.

Siegel S.: *Nonparametric Statistics (for the behavioural Sciences)*. McGraw Hill, New York, 1956.

Smith Craig N.: *Morality and the Market*. Routledge, London, 1990

Smith M.: Applications and Uses of Repertory Grids in Management Education. In *Advances in Management Education*. (Eds) Beck J and Cox C. John Wiley and Sons, 1980

Smith, L; Bain, Craig.: The Challenge of Professional Accounting Ethics: *Internal Auditing*, Vol 5 Iss 4, Spring 1990, p20-31.

Snell, Robin.: Managers' Development of Ethical Awareness and Personal Morality. *Personnel Review* (UK), Vol 19 Iss 1, 1990, p13-20

Stewart V; Stewart A; Fonda N.: *Business Applications of Repertory Grid*. McGraw Hill, UK, 1981.

Unnia, Mario.: Business Ethics in Italy. The State of the Art. *Journal of Business Ethics (Netherlands)*, Vol 9 Iss 7, July 1990, p551-554.

Vyakarnam S.: *The Social Relevance of Management Education - A Case Study of India*. Phd Thesis, Cranfield School of Management, 1988

Whitcraft, Carol J.: Ethical Decisions: Beyond Greed through Education. *Journal of State Government*, Vol 62 Iss 5, Sep/Oct 1989, p189-194.

Williams O.F.: Business Ethics: A Trojan Horse? *California Management Review*, Vol XXIV Iss 4, Summer 1982.

Woods, Robert H.; Berger, Florence.: Teaching Social Responsibility. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol 30 Iss 2, August 1989, p61-63.

APPENDIX

Table I Interpersonal Skills

MBAs

- * Impartial lead by example
- * Will hurt to achieve, abuse influence
- * Unselfish in the sense of interpersonal skills
- * Supports talent, mutual growth, accepts strengths and weaknesses
- * Always finds faults, no interpersonal skills
- * Creative strengthen people around versus exploitative
- * High need for material success; motivator
- * Leadership guidance * Fairness approachability
- * Tolerance, treat people with respect versus aggression * Arrogance
- * Buck passing versus professional integrity.
- * Pushy over-confidence versus humility approachable
- * Manipulative, slimy, management skills
- * Gets on with people, open, listens, managerial skills and competence * Good at corporate politics
- * Creates trouble vs. positive influence
- * Friendly, dominant versus reserved and not dominant
- * Cunning, selfish, opportunist, give and take, charismatic * Business-like, will trample
- * Cool aloof, not people oriented, creates defensive attitudes, exerts authority, sociable, gains co-operation, treats people well
- * Trample, abrasive versus know they need people and use them well *
- * Ruthless, taskmaster * Likeable
- * Demonstrative of kindness versus curt and business like. * Needs pushing, no self motivation
- * Trample to achieve goals versus will not achieve goals due to others

non MBAs

- * Blunt versus tactful * aggressive
- * Harmful to others, mean, creates trouble
- * Argumentative, inward looking versus courteous, hospitable * Brash *
- * Backbiting vs. straight
- * Engenders hostility versus positive influence
- * creates problems versus problem solver will hurt to achieve goals *
- * Poor interpersonal skills, indecisive versus good leadership qualities
- * Tolerance * Professional, task vs people orientation
- * Nasty, will hurt, pushing * "Cut throat", strict disciplinarian, soft laissez faire
- * Sadistic Taking vs. giving, independence encouraged, strictness, dogma, selflessness
- * Trample versus fairness, understanding of people
- * Blunt insensitive, dominating versus sensitive
- * Positive, friendly, concern for fellow workers
- * Bad treatment of people * Get job done without hurting * Gentle / Hard *
- * Encourage / Discourage * Sense of humour * Creates discomfort *
- * Exploitative / Co-operative * Courteous
- * Jealousy, easy going / positive use of power leadership * Comfort to others, considerate / possessive, excitable
- * Team work prevent people getting into trouble / buck passing * Can guide but not lead
- * Antisocial, violent, high need for power / professional excellence

Table II Integrity and honesty

MBAs

- * Academic honesty * Straightforward * Integrity
- * Trustworthy * Hypocrisy * Dishonest / Honest
- * Evokes mistrust * Fairness * Unreliable / reliable
- * Unscrupulous * Unethical / ethical * Principles / morals * Basic decency * Professional integrity
- * manipulative vs. honesty * Sincere * crooked vs. honesty * open, sincere * Honesty, dependable * Slimy calculative vs. open integrity

non-MBAs

- * Untrusting * Deceitful vs. dependable
- * Sycophancy flattery vs. out spoken
- * Sincere will accept responsibility
- * Frank personally, maybe not professionally
- * Devious, corrupt vs. honesty * Genuine
- * Sincerity to task & people * Sincere to employer
- * Straightforward, open mind
- * Adult behaviour, positive upbringing
- * Hypocrisy, questionable integrity, devious versus straightforward, honest and sincere
- * Down to earth, sincere, honest * Respected

Table III Caring and consideration for people

There were 23 MBAs and 30 non-MBAs who construed social responsibility in these terms, implying that non-MBAs are more likely to use this construct to make choices than are MBAs.

MBAs

- * Care for people * Fairness, genuine affection
- * Helpful, concern for people
- * warmth * Loving gentle * Compassion for people
- * Will use people, opportunist * Empathy towards people * Caring in a proactive sense * Totally callous * Inconsiderate / considerate * People oriented * Good "interaction" with people
- * Understand and care for others, service to others
- * Empathise, positive influence on people

non-MBAs

- * Harmful to others * Humane
- * Does not care at all, sadistic
- * Giving, sacrificing * Sensitive
- * Will not hurt * Affection
- * Sincerity to task and people * Gentle vs. Hard

Table IV Work ethic, reliability

There were 23 MBAs and 22 non MBAs who construed social responsibility in over 30 terms of work ethic.

MBAs

- * Lazy / Hard working * Action oriented * Self confident * Line of least resistance / persistent
- * Content, laid back / ambition, hard driving,
- * High need for material success * Commitment to work * Objectivity * Professional, sense of duty * Prove self through merit and content
- * High / Low competence * Indecisive not capable
- * Flashy materialistic / conservative not materialistic
- * Status conscious, professional integrity, high standards
- * Get job done, aggressive career path, mediocrity, plateau, stability * Achieve objectives / mediocrity
- * Create something new, commitment to responsibility
- * Drive to attain something, own / organisation goals
- * Not develop organisational goals / helpfulness

non-MBAs

- * Need for achievement, dynamic * Materialism
 - * Systematic * Pursue objectives * Task oriented
 - * Professional excellence * Meritocracy
 - * Practical, pushing * Commitment to hard work
 - * Result oriented, no nonsense / tolerant
 - * Seek success * Career centred / people oriented
 - * Total dedication to job and organisation
 - * Positive hard working / self centred arrogant
 - * High / Low quality of work, honour commitment
 - * Mediocrity non achievers / achievers organised disciplined
-

Table V
Self-actualisation, Concern with intellectual development

This construct is confusing, because it seems to be, at the same time, a catch all and something of depth and value. An example of an intellectual application of social development would be Mahatma Gandhi. On the other hand there is much intellectual debate in most of the middle-class dining rooms around the world, contributing vastly to intellectual debate and little to social development. The difficulty with this construct therefore is to decide whether the respondents are part of the former or latter description of intellectual contribution and do they actually work at it as well.

Only four of each of the MBAs and non-MBAs who have construed social responsibility in terms of development have also contributed to this construct. The majority of the 20 MBAs and 18 non-MBAs are not directly involved in development and may be construing social responsibility in an abstract sense.

MBAs

- * Independence of thought vs. follow the leader
- * Seek breadth and depth of thought
- * Thinker vs. practical * Open vs. close minded
- * Search for excellence vs. short-sighted
- * High intellect, understanding, broad-minded
- * Secretive, not open, not intelligent vs. open minded, positive, intelligent and logical
- * Integrity of personality, intellect, problem solver
- * Clarity of thought, open to new ideas vs traditional
- * Unorthodox, liberal socialist approach vs. shallow self centred * "value systems"
- * Philosophically highly developed, High intellectual commitment to work * Deeper understanding
- * High / Low achievement, larger than life goals
- * Lateral thinker, open, intellect, democratic
- * Uses intelligence vs. "slogging" * Rational, in "control" * High maturity, long term perspectives, respect for human values and does not expect things from others * Open to new ideas vs. resist change

non-MBAs

- * Intellect, creativity, depth maturity vs. low conceptual skills * Clear objectives & understanding
 - * Firm will / wishy washy * Close / open minded
 - * Impulsive short sighted vs. rational balanced
 - * Understanding, maturity, depth, intellect, rational, vs. lack understanding, shallow mentality, emotional decisions * Dedication to a cause * open minded
 - * Shallow vs. achievement oriented * Listener, approachable, (thought processes)
 - * Ideals and will stand up for them, Intellectual compassion and action, idealism * Depth of knowledge, philosophic, scholarly, well informed, simplicity as a way of life
 - * Close minded, no sense of humour, no desire to learn or go on improving at work * Clear (broad) objectives * High maturity * Broad minded, open to new ideas * Positive use of power leadership, dynamic clear thinkers
-

Table VI Egocentric Concerns

Most of the constructs in this section are the polar opposites to "concern for people" and "considerate". The most frequently used description is at the top. This section has been separated from "concern" because there are a few "egocentric" terms which are not polar opposites to any of the preceding categories.

MBAs

- * Selfish / Unselfish / Selfless
- * Self centred / greedy / Ego / Business-like
- * Self interest
- * "False" will do anything / Double standards of integrity one which is personal the other professional
- * High / Low ego
- * Extroversion / Introversion
- * Own goals important
- * Selfishness / will hurt to achieve ends / or fair
- * Selfishness / manipulative / or open stand

non-MBAs

- * Mostly as above; selfish, self centred, High and Low ego.
 - * Uncaring
 - * Dedication / No dedication to organisation
 - * High ego, not receptive to new ideas
-

Table VII Social responsibilities as generalisations.

This category of construct can create even greater confusion than intellectual development, because respondents are actually alluding to social development. However, they are general descriptions and may again be constructs which can lead to specific terms about social development or may remain at a generalised level.

MBAs

- * Materialistic, greedy, and idealistic. Idealism was construed negatively to high intellect and practical and purposeful.
- * Respondent construed "practical" as negative with the opposite being "thinker and idealism"
- * Respondent said he would "like" to imbibe "socially responsible" constructs such as social awareness, honesty, care for people and value systems.
- * Opportunism versus straightforward, selfishness and unhelpful. *
- * Opportunism, flashy materialism.
- * Dedication to a cause, not materialistic.
- * Benevolent despots, larger than life goals, fight for belief or cause. *
- * Religious values.
- * Holding (or not) ideals. Strength of character.
- * Highly conscious of duty to family and close associates. Will perform and give help. * Idealism versus materialism. * Wider social objectives, dependable,

Table VIII Helpfulness and Consideration

The term helpful appears in every respondent's repertoire, the variations being with the leading or following statement in support of the term. Constructs are not repeated, but all those with different leading and following statements are reported below.

MBAs

- * Will not help unless some return
- * Help in the community * Very helpful
- * Socially aware, helpful to everyone vs. selectively
- * Trustworthy, will actually help
- * Self help vs. will guide
- * Charismatic, helpful
- * Openly helpful
- * Helpful, helping, help appeared several times.

non-MBAs

- * Help, develop, listen * Helpful, able to guide
 - * Open, helpful, impart knowledge, giving
 - * Giving to others * Listen, guide, help
-

Table IX Social responsibility and concerns

MBAs

- * Apply knowledge for the benefit of others.
- * Professionalism with social responsibility.
Sets an example for others.
- * Socially aware and helpful in practical terms.
- * Wider social concerns, with issues and gets on with it.
- * Gandhian needs, simple, social awareness.
- * Liberal socialist approach, search for a cause and meaning beyond immediate self.
- * High social awareness, care for people.
- * Open to society, involved in social action.
- * Feeling of debt to society, will help if needed.

non-MBAs

- * Identify and pursue social problems, dedication to work and cause.
- * Loyalty / sincerity to organisation, sense of duty and concern for people.
- * Social awareness, willing to teach and help.
- * Sets an example, duty, obligation and people oriented.
- * Social concern on a wider basis.
- * Intellectual compassion and action. Ideals, will stand up for them.
- * Socially "aware". emphasis added by respondent.
- * Social concerns, agnostic, democracy, civil rights and peace.

non MBAs

- * Theorists versus doers, realists. Help materially, positive help to build character.
 - * Opportunism versus high moral standard.
 - * Content, idealistic, honest will accept responsibility.
 - * Social concerns, but with low score on component analysis.
 - * Opportunism versus integrity
 - * Dedication to a cause or organisation, versus self centred.
 - * High materialism
 - * Social involvement or commitment (through support for charities). No desire to learn, close minded versus open, humility willing to learn and improve self.
 - * Caring for people, social concerns. * Materialism, hypocrisy, can guide people but are not leaders versus straightforward, less materialistic, guidance through quality of leadership.
-