



Fighting Poverty through Management Education: Challenges, Opportunities, Solutions

**Report to the 3rd PRME Global Forum
Rio de Janeiro, 2012**

Prepared by

PRME Working Group on
Poverty as a Challenge to Management Education

With Support from
European QUALity Link (EQUAL)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	2
METHODOLOGY	5
RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS	7
RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT EDUCATION – QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS	10
PERCEIVED BARRIERS – QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS.....	15
QUALITATIVE RESPONSES.....	17
CHALLENGES	18
SOLUTIONS.....	23
OPPORTUNITIES.....	28
PRME-RELATED IMPLICATIONS/ REFLECTIONS	31
APPENDICES	36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Working Group on Poverty as a Challenge to Management Education (Anti-Poverty Working Group) wishes to acknowledge the generous support of EQUAL (European QUALity Link) for the research described in this report.

The Working Group consists of 87 members from 68 institutions from 35 countries. In July 2011, the steering team of the Working Group met at a workshop in Bled, Slovenia, to help design this global research effort. Participants in that workshop were:

Maritana Sedysheva, Estonia
Irina Sennikova, Latvia
Shuan SadreGhazi, the Netherlands
Milenko Gudić, Slovenia/Serbia
Sophia Opatska, Ukraine
Carole Parkes, United Kingdom
Al Rosenbloom, USA

The workshop also received contributions from:

Danica Purg, Slovenia
Nadya Zhexembayeva, Slovenia/Kazakhstan
Olga Veligurska, Slovenia/Latvia

1

The authors wish to acknowledge the special contribution of Alejandra Pollesello and Miguel Angel Gardetti, Center for Study of Corporate Sustainability, Buenos Aires, Argentina, as well as Maria Potapkina, Baikal International Business School, Irkutsk, Russia for survey translation assistance.

Report authors:

Milenko Gudić
Slovenia/Serbia

Carole Parkes
United Kingdom

Al Rosenbloom
USA

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The PRME Anti-Poverty Working Group Report on *Fighting Poverty through Management Education: Challenges, Opportunities, Solutions* is the third in a series of global surveys conducted between 2008-2011, each of whose aim was to better understand the role that management education and management educators can and have played in alleviating global poverty – thereby helping to achieve the first of the eight Millennium Development Goals: To eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.

In 2008 CEEMAN, an international management association of more than 200 members from 51 countries from all over the world, sponsored the first global survey on **poverty and its relationship to management education**: The CEEMAN Survey on *Management Education: Corporate Social Responsibility and Poverty*. A total of 154 respondents from 33 countries, from four continents (Europe, North America, Latin America and Asia), shared their opinions about the importance of CSR and global poverty in management education.

According to the survey results, the three highest mean ratings regarding personal attitudes towards the poor were as follows:

- (a) society has a responsibility to help poor people;
- (b) poor people are discriminated against; and
- (c) the private sector is best able to reduce global poverty.

2

Two thirds of the survey respondents said global poverty was “a very serious problem”, while almost three-quarters (72%) of respondents said global poverty was a **legitimate topic** that should be included in a management education curriculum.

When asked *why* global poverty is a legitimate topic in management education, respondents noted the following:

- *Combating poverty is a part of CSR*
- *Poverty prevents people from developing in every sense of the word. Not only do societies not benefit from this situation but they spend a large part of their resources “patching up” the consequences. I believe to allow the status quo is one more crime against humanity.*
- *The solution of such a complex problem as poverty needs the participation of all actors in society: governments, civil society, and the private sector. Business students need to be aware of the complexity and importance of dealing with this topic.*
- *Business players have the possibility of reducing global poverty - so they need to be sensitized to the topic.*
- *Businesses are among the main change agents and their leaders and managers bring important values and attitudes from the management education inputs they received.*
- *Future managers should not only do well but also do good. A solid understanding of what is needed to make this world a better place should be considered crucial.*
- *For better decision making on company, government and individual level.*
- *It gives an opportunity to educate people to be more responsible.*
- *Understanding of social responsibility is not a fashion but a necessity for business.*

- *Because... it is important for sustainable development ... Management education is an important part of sustainable development.*

Following this and the 1st PRME Global Forum in New York in December 2008, the PRME Secretariat established the **Anti-Poverty PRME Working Group**, which developed its vision statement and a general frame of work, aimed at helping business schools and management educators integrate poverty-related discussion into all levels of management education worldwide. The Working Group now consists of 87 members from 68 institutions in 35 countries from all the continents.

The Working Group designed and administered the 2010 CEEMAN/PRME Survey on *Poverty as a Challenge to Management Education*, whose aim was to **capture innovation and creativity** in terms of teaching about poverty and the responsibilities of leadership in management education. The survey included 377 respondents, from all levels of management education, from 51 countries from all over the world.

The survey results, which were presented in the 2nd PRME Global Forum in New York in June 2010 and at the 19th CEEMAN Annual Conference in Caserta/Naples, Italy in September 2010, reported on numerous innovations taking place across all major segments of management education programs: undergraduate, MBA, EMBA and PhD, as well as across all aspects of management education, including educational content, programs and courses, educational processes, materials and tools, and institutional arrangements and partnerships. The Working Group found that many of the initiatives briefly described in the survey had a potential to be further elaborated and broadly exposed as best practices and inspirational solutions.

Recognizing the role that corporate social responsibility and business ethics courses could have in integrating poverty-related issues into educational content and programs, the survey respondents strongly advocated the need to integrate poverty into the foundation and core courses as well.

This requires an agreement among schools' faculty that poverty *is* an important topic. However, respondents said there was a wide range of opinion about the relevance of poverty in management education within their own faculty. So, where do we stand? Do we teach about poverty? Some said, "Yes we do." Others answered, "We do not." These varied views indicated that there were still challenges, but also opportunities, and in some cases already successfully implemented solutions.

Therefore the Working Group decided that its future work should focus on the challenges, opportunities and solutions for fighting poverty through management education. The decision was supported by the results of a three-round Delphi survey carried out among Working Group members in order to assess the Working Group's priorities regarding future work areas and methods.

In parallel, the PRME Steering Committee invited the Working Group to present the results of its work as deliverables for the 3rd PRME Global Forum, to be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 2012 in conjunction with the Rio50+20 Meeting. Additional support came from EQUAL, the association of European associations involved in the improvement of the quality

of management education, which decided to support the project due to its relevance for the both management education and business communities.

In May 2011, the PRME Secretariat facilitated a Webinar for Working Group members. During that Webinar, Working Group members were introduced to the UNDP initiative Growing Inclusive Markets (GIM). Because the perspective of the GIM approach is “to demonstrate how business can significantly contribute to human development by including the poor in the value chain as consumers, producers, business owners or employees (‘inclusive business models’, GIM website), the GIM “model” was thought to be relevant to the Working Group.

In July 2011, the Steering Committee of the Working Group met at a workshop in Bled, Slovenia, to follow up on ideas presented in the May Webinar. A significant part of the meeting’s agenda was devoted to discussing and evaluating projects relevant to the Working Group’s mission. Using a model similar to GIM, the Steering Committee agreed to develop and launch a third global survey on poverty and management education, this time with an emphasis on identifying specific challenges, opportunities and solutions business schools/management education programs face as they integrate the issue of poverty in their school’s curricula. This survey is the basis for the Working Group’s main deliverable for the 3rd PRME Global Forum: **PRME WG Report** on *Fighting Poverty through Management Education: Challenges, Opportunities, Solutions*.

Closely linked with the survey, the Steering Committee agreed, would be a *Collection of Best Practices and Inspirational Solutions* for integrating poverty issues into management education curricula and practice, which also will be presented at the PRME 3rd Global Forum as another deliverable of the Working Group.

The first step is personal - whether I believe this subject is worth being taught. The second is intellectual - how does it fit to a broader philosophy of business education. The third is properly institutional - what measure should we take on the level of programs, courses' syllabi and cases.

*--- Survey Respondent,
Russia*

METHODOLOGY

As noted in the Introduction and Background Section, a Delphi decision-making process began the survey development. During three rounds of consensus decision making (January – June 2011), Working Group members brainstormed and then ultimately reached consensus on nine topics and projects supportive of the Working Group’s mission. At a July 2011 Steering Committee meeting in Bled, Slovenia, the Steering Committee agreed to launch the challenges, opportunities and solutions global survey. Steering Committee members spent an afternoon suggesting content areas to be included in the survey.

In August 2011, survey questions were drafted. To assure uniformity and completeness of meaning, survey items were reviewed by experts from the United Kingdom, central Europe and the United States. Some items were rewritten to clarify meaning. A draft of the complete survey was then circulated to all members of the Working Group for review. Additional changes were made based on member feedback. At that point, the revised survey was translated into Russian, Spanish and Serbo-Croatian. All four survey versions (English, Russian, Spanish and Serbo-Croatian) were posted on a web-based survey hosting service for ease of access. The survey had five sections:

1. The degree of opportunity undergraduate and graduate students have to study various topics on responsible management in the formal curriculum (quantitative assessment)
2. Obstacles or barriers to the inclusion of poverty in the school’s current curricula, courses or modules (quantitative assessment)
3. Explanation of obstacles, barriers and challenges and whether there was an action plan to overcome the obstacle (open-ended, qualitative)
4. Success stories for integrating poverty topics into courses, modules, curricula (open-ended, qualitative)
5. Demographics (quantitative)

Initial invitations to participate in the survey were sent to all Working Group members, all PRME Steering Committee associations, alumni of the CEEMAN’s International Management Teachers Academy (IMTA), CEEMAN members and contacts, and members of selected special interest groups of the Academy of Management in early September 2011. In conjunction with The International Day for the Eradication of Poverty on 17 October 2011, survey reminders were sent. The survey closed on 9 December 2011. Survey responses written in Russian, Spanish and Serbo-Croatian were translated into English.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 435 individuals from 70 countries responded to the survey. *Table 1* lists the countries represented in the survey.

Albania	Argentina	Australia	Austria
Belarus	Belgium	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Brazil
Bulgaria	Canada	China	Colombia
Croatia	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark
Ecuador	Egypt	Estonia	Finland
France	Georgia	Germany	Greece
Hungary	Iceland	India	Ireland
Italy	Japan	Kazakhstan	Kenya
Korea	Kuwait	Latvia	Lithuania
Macedonia	Mauritius	Mexico	Montenegro
The Netherlands	New Zealand	Nigeria	Norway
Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Peru	Poland
Portugal	Romania	Russia	Saudi Arabia
Serbia	Singapore	Slovenia	South Africa
Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Tanzania
Turkey	UAE	Uganda	UK
Ukraine	Uruguay	USA	Uzbekistan
Venezuela	Vietnam		

Respondents represented all major business disciplines (see *Table 2*). Seventy-five percent of the entire sample was clustered in the following five disciplines: management, marketing, strategy, HR and economics.

Respondents were almost evenly split between private and public institutions, with 51% of those who answered this question identifying themselves as working in a public institution and 49% in a private institution. *Table 3* indicates that the largest group of respondents identified themselves as faculty members who also had some administrative duties (45%). Least represented in the sample were individuals who were fulltime administrators with no faculty duties (9%).

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Management	73	26.1
Marketing	44	15.7
Strategy	36	12.9
Human Resources	28	10.0
Management		
Economics	27	9.6
Finance	18	6.4
Ethics	17	6.1
Administration	11	3.9
Accounting	9	3.2
Statistics/Quantitative	8	2.9
Methods		
Operations	5	1.8
Information systems	4	1.4
Total	280	100.0

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Faculty with some administrative duties	142	44.9
Faculty with no administrative duties	76	24.1
Manager/Administrator with some teaching duties	71	22.5
Manager/Administrator with no teaching duties	27	8.5
Total	316	100.0

Respondents also classified their student body as to its relative mix of international students to national students (see *Table 4*). Over two-thirds of respondent schools identified the mix of students as being predominantly national, with some international students. Only 6% of the respondents said their school had a totally international student body.

Table 4. Relative Mix of International to National Students in the Student Body

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Predominantly national	217	69.1
Completely national	45	14.3
Predominantly international	32	10.2
Completely international	20	6.4
Total	314	100.0

Table 5 identifies the known accreditation of respondent schools. The large number of missing responses to this question might not accurately reflect the true accreditation status of the institutions represented in the survey.

Table 5. School Accreditation

	Frequency	Percent
AMBA	58	13.3
AACSB	44	10.1
EQUIS	31	7.1
CEEMAN IQA	22	5.0
Sub-total	155	35.5
Missing	282	64.5
Total	437	100.0

Additional data tables on accreditation are in the Appendix.

Finally, Table 6 presents the number of respondents who knew whether their school was a PRME signatory. Similar to Table 5, a large number of respondents didn't know the PRME status of their school.

Table 6. Respondent's Knowledge of Whether their School is a PRME signatory

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	33.0
No	64	20.9
Don't know	141	46.1
Total	306	100.0

“Economists often assume that markets are inert, that they do not affect the goods being exchanged. But this is untrue. Markets leave their mark. Sometimes, market values crowd out nonmarket values worth caring about.”

*--- Michael Sandel.
(2012). What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets*

RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT EDUCATION – QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Respondents were asked to evaluate the opportunity students had to study 14 topics/issues that fell under the broad umbrella of “responsible management,” and they were asked to do that separately for undergraduate and graduate programs.

Table 7 presents a rank ordering of the fourteen topics from most extensive opportunity for undergraduate students to study to least extensive opportunity to study. The ranking order in *Table 7* is based on mean scores.

Table 7. Undergraduate Opportunities to Study Topics of Responsible Management (Rank Ordered by Mean Scores)			
	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Ethics (n=380)	3.77	.051	.993
Corporate Social Responsibility (n=380)	3.65	.051	.992
International Development (n=375)	3.64	.057	1.097
Corporate Governance (n=378)	3.62	.056	1.094
Sustainable Development (n=371)	3.32	.060	1.158
Social Entrepreneurship (n=376)	3.07	.059	1.148
Environmental Sustainability (n=371)	3.02	.057	1.095
Public Policy/Governmental Studies (n=363)	3.01	.064	1.227
Political Stability (n=367)	2.74	.061	1.165
Third Sector/Civil Society/NGO Relationships (n=364)	2.71	.060	1.137
Human Rights (n=367)	2.67	.057	1.093
Corruption (n=365)	2.65	.058	1.108
Poverty & Inequality (n=371)	2.51	.057	1.089
Climate Change (n=365)	2.41	.058	1.101
Scale used: 1= no opportunity to study, 2= little opportunity to study, 3=some opportunity to study, 4=significant opportunity to study, 5=extensive opportunity to study.			

As evident in *Table 7*, undergraduates have the greatest opportunity to study issues related to responsible management within ethics and corporate social responsibility (CSR) courses. Given many recent examples of corporate misbehaviour and societal demands for greater accountability for private sector businesses, it is not surprising that ethics and CSR stand in the first and second position for undergraduate study opportunities. Of major interest for this research, though, is the relatively low ranking for undergraduates business to study about poverty and inequality (mean=2.51). The topic of poverty and inequality ranked next

to last. Only climate change ranked lower in terms of undergraduate student opportunities to study.

Table 8 presents a rank ordered of the opportunity graduate students have to study the 14 topics that broadly encompass responsible management. Again, the ranking order is based on mean scores.

Table 8. Graduate Opportunities to Study Topics of Responsible Management, Rank Ordered by Mean Score			
	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Corporate Governance (n=344)	3.80	.056	1.034
Corporate Social Responsibility (n=353)	3.77	.053	.990
International Development (n=345)	3.71	.057	1.061
Ethics (n=351)	3.68	.053	.998
Sustainable Development (n=341)	3.42	.060	1.115
Social Entrepreneurship (n=344)	3.13	.059	1.090
Environmental Sustainability (n=347)	3.07	.060	1.110
Public Policy/Governmental Studies (n=340)	3.05	.064	1.189
Third Sector/Civil Society/NGO Relationships (n=341)	2.80	.064	1.183
Political Stability (n=333)	2.74	.062	1.140
Corruption (n=335)	2.73	.062	1.132
Human Rights (n=334)	2.66	.062	1.128
Poverty & Inequality (n=343)	2.60	.058	1.082
Climate Change (n=334)	2.46	.062	1.140
Scale used: 1= no opportunity to study, 2= little opportunity to study, 3=some opportunity to study, 4=significant opportunity to study, 5=extensive opportunity to study.			

Graduate students have the most opportunity to study issues related to responsible management as part of corporate governance and CSR topics. Given the emphasis on corporate leadership and strategic management at the graduate level, it is not surprising that graduate students have the greatest opportunity to study corporate governance. Similar to the rank order of topics at the undergraduate level (*Table 7*), graduate opportunities to study poverty and inequality ranked very low. Again, it was next to last in the rank ordering.

A comparison of means was conducted to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between schools that were PRME signatories and schools that were not, with regard to the degree of opportunity students had to study the 14 identified responsible management topics. *Table 9* presents the differences in opportunity to study these topics at the undergraduate level. The scales used for this question were: 1= no opportunity to study, 2= little opportunity to study, 3=some opportunity to study, 4=significant opportunity to study, 5=extensive opportunity to study.

Undergraduates had statistically significantly greater opportunities to study the following eight topics: international development, sustainable development, social entrepreneurship, public policy, political stability, third sector/NGO/civil society, human rights and climate change.

Table 9. Opportunities for Undergraduate Students to Study Responsible Management Topics Compared Between PRME and non-PRME Schools		
	Is your business school a PRME Signatory?	
	Yes	No
Opportunity to study topic in undergraduate curriculum	Mean (n=85)	Mean (n=59)
Ethics	3.98	3.73
Corporate Social Responsibility	3.85	3.68
International Development	3.83	3.39 *
Corporate Governance	3.75	3.47
Sustainable Development	3.61	3.10 **
Social Entrepreneurship	3.44	2.76 ***
Environmental Sustainability	3.24	3.02
Public Policy/Governmental Studies	3.22	2.79 *
Political Stability	3.01	2.59 *
Third Sector/Civil Society/NGO Relationships	2.95	2.42 **
Human Rights	2.91	2.55 *
Corruption	2.87	2.79
Climate Change	2.80	2.36 *
Poverty & Inequality	2.69	2.39
* significant at the .05 level; ** significant at the .005 level; *** significant at the .001 level		

Table 10 presents a similar comparison of means between PRME and non-PRME signatory schools and the opportunities graduate students have for studying the 14 identified responsible management topics. Table 10 indicates that except for corporate governance, corporate social responsibility and corruption, graduate students in PRME schools had statistically significant greater opportunities to study the remaining 11 topics.

Table 10. Opportunities for Graduate Students to Study Responsible Management Topics Compared Between PRME and non-PRME Schools		
	Is your business school a PRME Signatory?	
	Yes	No
Opportunity to study topic in graduate curriculum	Mean (n=96)	Mean (n=57)
Ethics	4.01	3.61 **
Corporate Governance	3.98	3.82
Corporate Social Responsibility	3.96	3.79
International Development	3.89	3.44 **
Sustainable Development	3.76	3.32 **
Social Entrepreneurship	3.38	2.77 ***
Environmental Sustainability	3.36	2.98 **
Public Policy/Governmental Studies	3.32	2.88 *
Third Sector/Civil Society/NGO Relationships	3.18	2.58 ***
Political Stability	3.15	2.55 ***
Human Rights	3.00	2.46 **
Corruption	2.97	2.73
Climate Change	2.88	2.38 **
Poverty & Inequality	2.86	2.40 **
* significant at the .05 level; ** significant at the .005 level; *** significant at the .001 level		

PERCEIVED BARRIERS – QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

An important part of this research was to identify the challenges respondents perceived to be either obstacles or barriers to the inclusion of poverty in their school's current curricula, courses or modules. We note that care was taken to explain the survey's use of the word "poverty." Survey sections included this statement: "The survey uses the word 'poverty' broadly and refers to teaching and learning about any of the following: the base/bottom of the pyramid, pro-poor business models, low income, subsistence or inclusive markets, etc."

This survey section listed 23 items for respondent evaluation. The broad domains covered in these items were program leadership, pedagogy, accreditation, employer and student markets, funding, faculty development and curriculum. A five-point scale was used for all items as follows: 1=not an obstacle/barrier, 2=a slight obstacle/barrier, 3=somewhat of an obstacle/barrier, 4=a significant obstacle/barrier and 5=a very significant obstacle/barrier. Respondents were asked to evaluate each item in terms of the degree to which it was perceived as a barrier/obstacle in their school or program. *Table 11* presents a rank ordering by mean score of the 23 items.

Table 11. Perceived Barriers/Obstacles to the Inclusion of Poverty Discussions in Programs, Modules, Curricula (Rank Order by Mean Scores)			
	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
Outside funding support (n=328)	3.25	.068	1.240
Time to develop appropriate teaching materials (n=329)	3.10	.067	1.213
Faculty development funds (n=329)	3.08	.070	1.308
Expectations of content coverage (i.e., no time in current course for topic) (n=331)	3.06	.066	1.207
Knowledge of "best practices" (n=331)	2.91	.068	1.238
Knowledge of appropriate cases with teaching notes (n=325)	2.90	.068	1.221
PhD educated faculty to teach topic (n=352)	2.89	.069	1.296
Publication outlets for research in this area (n=352)	2.86	.067	1.264
Employer market(s) (n=329)	2.84	.068	1.240
Faculty members willing to do research in the area (n=352)	2.83	.067	1.255
Support from managers/administrators outside business programs/business school (n=327)	2.72	.069	1.251
Disciplinary norms as to topic legitimacy (n=326)	2.63	.069	1.240
Faculty members ability to make the	2.63	.064	1.190

business case for the topic (n=351)			
Knowledge of what other schools/programs are doing (n=350)	2.61	.068	1.263
Personal confidence to teach the topic (n=329)	2.56	.069	1.253
Institutional culture (i.e., openness to innovation & change) (n=329)	2.51	.072	1.302
Knowing the right place in the curriculum for the topic (n=333)	2.47	.062	1.134
Access to external speakers/contacts (n=350)	2.44	.068	1.278
Accreditation standards (n=347)	2.39	.071	1.326
Assessment of student learning on the topic (n=330)	2.30	.062	1.126
Student resistance to the topic (n=332)	2.10	.058	1.061
Dean's support for including the topic in the curriculum (n=349)	1.97	.063	1.184
Dean's understanding of the topic (n=351)	1.81	.060	1.128
Scale used: : 1= not an obstacle/barrier, 2=a slight obstacle/barrier, 3=somewhat of an obstacle/barrier, 4=a significant obstacle/barrier and 5=a very significant obstacle/barrier			

The greatest perceived barrier overall to the inclusion of poverty discussions in current business programs was the lack of outside funding support. The lack of time to develop appropriate teaching materials, along with the lack of faculty development funds and lack of room in current courses to cover the topic, were also identified as being barriers somewhat. Overall, respondents did not think designing assessments of student learning, outright or covert student resistance, or lack of support from the Dean were obstacles to including poverty discussions in courses, modules or in the curriculum.

QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

In addition to the quantitative sections mentioned above, the survey two sections that asked respondents to more fully explain both the challenges and the successes they have had relative to the topic of poverty. In addition, they were asked for their perspectives on the possible opportunities in this respect.

The first qualitative section focused on challenges. Respondents were asked to identify their first and second greatest challenge for including the topic of poverty into their curriculum, courses or modules. Respondents were then asked whether there was a plan for dealing with stated challenge(s). The survey skip logic led respondents to separate questions where respondents could either describe (a) how they or their school actually met or addressed the challenge(s) just identified or (b) what resources they would need in the next two years to overcome the challenge(s) identified.

The second qualitative section focused on successes. Respondents were asked to briefly describe two success stories or success examples at either the school or course level that illustrated how poverty issues were incorporated into the curriculum, modules, or courses.

The first qualitative section about challenges and plans resulted in 453 unique responses. The successes section had 210 total entries.

The qualitative responses must be interpreted with care. Links between a respondent's quantitative evaluation of obstacles/barriers and their qualitative response (if any) have not been made.

17

The pages below present some of the key findings related to challenges, solutions, and opportunities for integrating poverty-related issues into management education.

[The greatest obstacle is that] the focus of our teaching disciplines often competes with our ability to focus on what is important... If something doesn't help us teach the disciplines, it faces higher hurdles for getting funding, teaching slots, etc. We're very rigorous, but are we relevant in a world where most economic growth is happening in emerging markets, where many of our existing tools and frameworks seem like corner cases? We teach to and for the developed world and ignore about 4-5 billion of the world's citizens, because their circumstances don't fit the assumptions of our disciplines very well.

*--- Survey Respondent,
United States*

CHALLENGES

This section identifies the main challenges respondents identified in the open-ended sections of the survey.

A Need to Better Understand “Poverty”

At the highest yet most foundational level of understanding, respondents raised issues about the term itself. What does “poverty” actually mean and what should be included in that term? A representative comment is:

- *It would be necessary to have a better understanding about the term ‘poverty’ in a global context and to change the mindset.*

Topic Legitimacy

A strong, recurrent theme from respondents was that of topic legitimacy: Why *should* “poverty” be considered a business topic at all? Representative comments include the following:

- *The topic is not considered as legitimate and it is not on the radars [of stakeholders]... There is no evidence why the subject should become part of mainstream business education, although ‘social responsibility’ and ‘sustainable development’ [are] widely accepted.*
- *...not considered a BUSINESS topic/issue*
- *The sense that poverty is a bit peripheral - not central to what we do as a business school.*
- *Poverty is considered a sociology topic and is taught by the sociology department.*
- *Business oriented topics are seen as inconsistent with a focus on poverty issues.*
- *These are topics that are seen as more natural part of policy studies rather than business.*
- *The nature of management education generally (focused on the bottom line) [so that] challenges like addressing climate change, ethics, and poverty are seen as ‘secondary’ or even ‘soft’ subjects.*
- *Not a ‘hot’ topic at the school... our school is primarily looking at business ‘growth’ models rather than difficult social issues.*
- *How do we justify having this course in a business school? It is the job of business to address poverty? I may think it is, but I need to have a good argument for that and I’m not sure I do at this exact moment.*

Mindsets

Closely related to the above quotations on legitimacy, many respondents noted that prevailing/existing mindsets/attitudes hindered poverty discussions. Some representative comments follow:

- *[Our biggest challenge is] conventional mindsets around what management/business as a discipline does/should consist of.*
- *[We need] a different mindset and leadership.*
- *The managers (including the Dean) and the faculty of our school don’t see a reason why they should include such topics in the curriculum.*
- *I think it would be difficult for our University management to understand and accept that poverty issues should be included in the MBA curriculum.*

Disciplinary Barriers/Boundaries

Respondents noted as well the primacy of the quantitative disciplines (accounting, finance and economics) in their school/program. As such, faculty members in these disciplines were often viewed as gatekeepers of the curriculum, often impeding inclusion of poverty-related topics:

- *The dominance in business schools of very conservative finance, economics, and quantitative disciplines, and the faculty socialized by PhD and disciplinary professional training into those disciplines.*
- *Creating a case for legitimacy among finance and accounting professors.*
- *Prevailing in the teaching of Economics: Simplistic liberal concepts, focused on the pursuit of profit and ignoring the other motives of human activity.*

Closely allied with this perspective were observations that a “silo mentality” existed within business programs/schools, similarly thwarting poverty discussions:

- *Faculty are entrenched in functional silos and believe students need greater depth in functional knowledge such as accounting, finance, marketing, etc.*
- *Dominance of ‘functional’ subjects.*
- *Most faculty members remain focused on their disciplinary speciality and are protective of the amount of their discipline covered in a general business degree; thus finding additional ‘space’ for important topics is challenging.*
- *Silo-thinking within subjects; ‘not-invented here’ resistance to topics.*
- *Poverty issues are very cross-disciplinary and just to add a BOP-course (situated e.g. in marketing) would not really solve the issue... We have very few true incentives for cross-disciplinary courses.*

A Congested Curriculum

A common observation was that even if faculty members were supportive of this topic, there was simply no room within the current curriculum to place it. Respondents frequently viewed the curriculum as a zero-sum game: If something new went in, something else would have to be taken out:

- *Limitations in the number of credits within the program and the need to cover certain basic concepts often leads to heightened competition for ‘extras.’ There is always a reason why there isn’t room for the topic.*
- *I teach in an undergraduate-only business program. The focus of the program is basic business knowledge. There is not much room in the curriculum to address these issues in any kind of depth.*
- *Not enough room in the curriculum once the core knowledge is covered.*
- *Lack of overall agreement that our curriculum should shift to spend more time on poverty - there are so many topics to cover, so courses and topics compete for limited time.*
- *Finding time in the current curriculum to fit it in.*
- *The curriculum is already congested.*
- *Fitting poverty into an already overcrowded curriculum - the reality is to determine what*

would have to be taken out to create this space.

- *I think the biggest challenge is simply a matter of 'space' in the curricula. Many faculty already feel we are trying to do too much (and not as well as we might like to). This is certainly an important topic, but I think it needs to be part of a more broadly based 'design of curricula' discussion - i.e., which topics will be focused upon where.*

Faculty Competence and Confidence

Respondents frequently mentioned the lack of content experts to teach this topic. Often mentioned was the need to hire new faculty members who have done research in this field. Representative comments include the following:

- *[The lack of] qualified (PhD) professionals in the area.*
- *Lack of specialists and teachers with PhDs to teach this topic, lack of interest among teachers to do research on this topic.*
- *The most important challenge is that we don't have enough faculty members who can make some business case for this topic and who are willing to do research in this area.*
- *Above all, additional human resources, since all people are overloaded. I, for instance, lecture 5 undergraduate courses in the winter semester, while in the summer semester I have 1 course in the undergraduate and 4 in the postgraduate programs. With all the projects, one simply cannot find time for drastic changes. Consequently, only incremental changes happen or people try to maintain the status quo.*

Student and Employer Markets

Student and employer markets are both critically important to business schools and business programs. Organizations want individuals who can solve problems and who can help them achieve their organization's mission efficiently, effectively and responsibly. Students, in turn, want the certification that formal business education provides. Management education is the intermediary between the two markets.

Respondents frequently noted the lack of student interest in issues related to poverty. Often the lack of student interest was driven by respondent perceptions of job markets.

Respondents reported that students did not see any relation between poverty topics/issues and possibilities of employment upon graduation. No demand equalled no need.

Respondents noted the following:

- *Neither faculty members nor the students see the need for the topic, which causes reluctance to include the courses in [the] curriculum.*
- *The number of MBA students, really interested in those issues, is rather limited. Most of them look for straight business management ideas and methodologies.*
- *There is no strong drive/demand for such teaching from the established market (students, employers).*
- *The most important barrier perhaps is that students may not immediately find a benefit by way of improved placement opportunities.*
- *Total absence of interest from the clients, i.e. MBA students.*
- *I believe that the most significant obstacle to poverty discussions in our business school are students' expectations. They pay money to study business, so significant attention to the*

issues of poverty in our classes is likely to puzzle them.

- *[The most important barrier] might be student interest: Students might ask themselves: what is the relevance of this issue for my skills / knowledge / professional career?*

Respondents often noted that employers were not asking for graduates with skill sets that included understanding the role of business in alleviating poverty. With businesses/employer markets showing no or limited interest in the topic, the incentives for programs/schools of business to include poverty discussions were viewed as marginal at best:

- *Business schools define their product on the basis of market demands. Market never emphasizes the need for effective teaching in this area.*
- *[First is] the need by local employers to see that it is important.*
- *Being a regional university the employment for graduates is mostly in the region. Demand for this kind of knowledge is very low.*
- *[The most significant challenge] is employment opportunities.*
- *There are not enough students at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels that express sufficient interest to choose the topic as major. Students prefer courses that will enable them [to] find employment easily.*
- *To have enough demand to make it feasible for school to offer it, and enough demand for graduates so they can find jobs in this field.*

Accreditation

Respondents noted the influence of accreditation and accrediting bodies in curriculum, course and module offerings:

- *[T]he payoff that would be most likely to get the Dean's attention would be interest on the part of accrediting bodies.*
- *Should accreditation bodies include poverty as part of their expectations it would make the development of such modules much easier.*
- *We need AACSB to acknowledge in its review processes that relevance to the world's needs is as important as the number of peer reviewed journal articles we publish... Our school has offered courses on business and poverty for seven years, and there has been no recognition of that innovation in two cycles of AACSB review.*
- *Policy coming from EQUIS, AMBA, AACSB.*
- *We need to lead a change in industry and accreditation.*
- *While I know of two or three colleagues who are also interested in these topics as both opportunities for teaching innovations and for research... most are dismissive of these issues and incorporate them only to the extent that AACSB might mandate.*

SOLUTIONS

This section presents solutions that emerged from survey respondent descriptions of their “successes.”

Begin close to home

This is an umbrella term that captures respondent’s perspectives that they began to include poverty-focused items/discussions in domains of interest that were literally close at hand. These domains were typically the course(s) that the respondent already taught, the existing faculty with whom the respondent typically interacted, and local community organizations. The following are a representative sample of comments in each category.

Courses:

- *I have managed to squeeze in a reading on microfinance in the small business finance unit.*
- *I try to spend at least 20 minutes on the topic (which may not seem like much, but it is still much work wedging this into the course).*
- *The plan is personal, but in my pre-grad and postgrad studies I integrate cases of organizations that have overcome poverty and that work with their communities with that goal in mind. I include thoughts and lectures of contemporary sociologists and philosophers (Bauman, Lipovetsky, Sennett, Castells, Beck, among others), also movies like ‘Ressources Humains’ (a film by Laurent Cantet), ‘Inside Job’ and ‘The Margin Call’. They help [students] see organizational reality and to think of administrative decisions made based not only on their financial effects but also the social ones.*
- *Personally, I have included some case studies related to poverty in one of my courses taught at a master program – this course is about development economics.*
- *In my class on management I incorporate the ideals of Catholic social thought into the essence of all business and that includes the preferential option for the poor and the concept of human dignity.*
- *In business ethics courses, I usually integrate a role play ‘Stakeholder Dialogue’ in supply chains.*
- *I teach International Human Resource Management and I educate my students into the effects of globalization through in-sourcing and out-sourcing emphasising how labour ‘flexibility’ often translates to labour insecurity for the workers it affects.*
- *I have a course in Public Finance and one of the topics is distribution of income, poverty and poverty reduction including poverty reduction program in Georgia. Usually I ask students to make their presentations on the topic which we discuss in the class. But business students don’t feel that this is their field issue!*

Faculty:

- *Formed an informal committee to discuss poverty issues.*
- *I would like to introduce the topics to the various faculty of the school through an informal discussion.*
- *I plan on running sensitization and motivation workshop for this purpose.*

Community:

- *[W]e partnered with Assocham, an umbrella organisation of Chambers of Commerce, in a pioneering study on successful initiatives of corporates, cooperatives, gov[ernmen]t agencies and NGOs within a managerial framework, which was formally presented to the Prime Minister and Gov[ernmen]t of India. This study was an eye-opener for us.*
- *Project in which students work and play with migrant children at a child care place in our city and at the same time evaluate their capabilities together with researchers of our university to assess dimensions, extent and potential measures against poverty in the sense of capability deprivation.*
- *[We use] a business incubator that links students with community development projects - [for example,] to aid in the generation of new or different type of income generation for marginalized populations such as women farmers.*
- *Collaboration with NGOs and CSOs, which deal with social entrepreneurship and education of other NGOs and/or advocating social entrepreneurship and its impact on poverty reduction.*
- *Involvement with the neighbouring slum community and developing a closer relationship with its representatives.*

Leverage the co-curriculum

Respondents frequently noted that students were actively engaged with poverty issues through co-curricular activities. Such activities included fundraising for charitable organizations, formation of clubs and service organizations, and volunteer work in community organizations. Leveraging the co-curriculum is a creative response to the “over full” curriculum described in the previous section on Challenges.

- *While the curriculum itself does not offer much in the way of academic study of such matters, the students get [a] semester-long hands-on [service learning] experience. Sometimes the students even continue the relationships they form well after the courses are over.*
- *Student associations organize charitable events for poor children at Christmas time. They also organize humanitarian missions in Burkina Faso and Madagascar.*
- *Students are organizing different funding campaigns to support different organizations locally or abroad. We are, for instance, supporting the development of several villages in Africa. Nevertheless, students had also the chance to see that poverty can also be around the corner... and that people living next to us might be suffering... We raised money [for] a local woman shelter in the area.*
- *We support student-run initiatives (clubs, outreach events) that help create and nurture community around social change and doing good. As students are attracted and validated by their peers, they gain courage in pursuing this path.*

Create service learning opportunities

Respondents also noted the role action/service learning projects played in engaging students with poverty-based issues. Service learning projects ranged from short term projects, e.g., six-weeks, to long term ones, e.g., an entire semester. Selected examples follow:

- *Our students do a fairly extensive servant-leadership project that often provides them with*

exposure to non-profits addressing issues in poverty.

- *The Introduction to Management course uses service learning methods to have student initiate a project where they raise funds. The students learn management and leadership skills, while the money is used to fund a small NGO that sends senior students to supervise micro finance initiatives in Uganda and Peru.*
- *University (UD) is involved in employee volunteering activity through ENGAGE Dubai, an initiative by Dubai Chamber. Faculty members and students actively take part in volunteering opportunities.*
- *Our accounting department operates a VITA program (Volunteer Income Tax Assistance) where students work with locally impoverished individuals to prepare a tax return that will yield them a better outcome.*
- *We have service-learning courses that focus on justice, public-private, and other related issues.*

Develop new courses/certificates

Central to all academic programs is the development/evolution of courses and other types of academic offerings (such as short courses and certificates). Frequently, respondents mentioned the inclusion of poverty discussions in newly created courses on sustainability, sustainable development and social entrepreneurship. However, poverty discussions were not only in those new, emerging domains, as the following examples indicate:

- *I created an undergraduate course on business and poverty... [and] was able to launch an MBA course that has since become part of our MBA emphasis in sustainable business.*
- *Inclusion of specific sessions [on poverty] as part of MSc in Social Responsibility and Sustainability.*
- *This academic year I have started to teach new course 'Social Corporate Responsibility', which is devoted to issues of CSR history, CSR advantages for companies, CSR models, CSR in Corporate Governance, CSR in market activity, [etc.]. Into this course I have used... eight case studies of companies' best practice in different fields of CSR including practice of fight with poverty in Ukraine.*
- *We just started a Social Entrepreneurship major and MBA concentration.*
- *New course this fall... on social impact. Competitive application for 12 qualified and interdisciplinary students to focus on water quality in developmental contexts and the consumer viability and micro-venture potential for a water low-cost/low-tech purifier.*
- *We have added concentrations in social entrepreneurship in both our undergraduate and graduate programs. These concentrations have allowed our students to consider deeply the intersection of business with issues of poverty often with students from other disciplines.*
- *We are introducing interdisciplinary UG minors that draw heavily from existing humanities courses exploring many of the BoP root issues. UG students gain greater exposure to the subject through this minor.*
- *We have created a Sustainability Certificate, introduce[d] new curricula, and host high-profile speakers to energize students in this direction.*

Mandate involvement

Respondents from some schools noted a very direct way in which they engaged students with the issue of poverty: They made either a course or a service/action learning project a requirement for graduation. Respondents said:

- *My university has a compulsory course on doing a civil service independent of what the department student is attending.*
- *The school requires that all undergraduate students gain a first-hand experience on community-based projects for the needy (whom you would say are poor, etc.).*
- *Every student has to carry a project addressing corporate social responsibility (like raising funds for the fight against AIDS, for the fight against poverty or hunger, etc.).*
- *All students have to complete a 6-week stay at their own expense, with a rural NGO and prepare a study report on live managerial problems affecting the NGO for 3 course credits. All students also must mentor a 7th Standard slum child to enable goal-setting for the child and compassion/understanding among our students. We believe that our students become better managers with sound social values.*
- *Students are encouraged to improve the lives of the needy in community-based projects both locally and abroad. This is part of their graduation requirement.*
- *Introduction of compulsory courses in graduate programs: The first compulsory course all of our students [is a course that] emphasizes Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility. By these means, the school starts to encourage students to act with a constructive attitude towards poverty, not just studying it but also taking a step forward to provide solutions. The course, "Enterprise, Society and the State," is compulsory for our MBA students and elective for the other graduate programs. This course is intended to give students the whole perspective to deal with poverty and other common issues of our reality, [including] the joint efforts of the enterprise, the society and the State.*

Leverage PRME

Some respondents noted that participation in PRME, itself, created opportunities to discuss poverty-related issues. For example:

- *We use the PRME-initiative to comprehensively integrate Sustainability and BoP issues in our curricula and research.*
- *We use the PRME-initiatives to convince our colleagues.*
- *2-3 professors incorporating some aspects of PRME into their courses.*
- *A faculty member is playing a significant role in the UN Working Group in this area. It is beginning to permeate our discussions - especially with respect to the PRME.*

Legitimize the topic

As noted in the previous section on Challenges, obstacles to the inclusion of poverty in the curriculum, courses and modules were varied. These barriers involved resistance from key stakeholders (students, employers, faculty both within and outside of business). Also, there were complex issues related to disciplinary and cross-disciplinary boundaries and curricular/course/module design. Respondents reflected the complex reality of management education by citing a number of different strategies used to legitimize the topic of poverty in their schools and programs. Selected examples include the following:

- *Students are encouraged to think about Bottom of the Pyramid (or relevant concepts) when they search for a master thesis.*
- *Increasing integration of social innovation themes within core curriculum. Establishment of a funded centre for social innovation. (Note: social innovation to broadly include creative organizational responses to social and environmental problems and possibilities.)*
- *A dedicated center of expertise in Social & Solidarity-based Economics percolates the way [poverty] topics are dealt with, producing a strong basis in terms of knowledge.*
- *We started an annual speaker series in spring 2009, called Global Problems & Solutions Colloquium... The colloquium brings thought leaders and leading practitioners to share their struggles with our students and faculty in figuring out solutions to some of the world's most pressing problems... The cross-disciplinary and cross-sector interactions were wonderful unintended consequences of this innovation.*
- *[T]he invitation to write a Master thesis on related topics.*
- *We host a bi-annual "Business and Global Poverty" conference that focuses on the role of business in alleviating poverty.*
- *Every year, our MBA students organize a Social Responsibility Forum that lasts 2 full days, attracts international participation, and promotes these issues widely within the school.*

OPPORTUNITIES

This section of the report summarizes respondent perspectives on “what needs doing next” to move the discussion about management education’s role in - and relationship to - poverty alleviation forward.

Build a strong business case

One respondent, as noted in the Challenges section of this report, got to the essence of things. This respondent summarized both the challenge and the implied opportunity thusly:

- *How do we justify having this course in a business school? It is the job of business to address poverty? I may think it is, but I need to have a good argument for that and I’m not sure I do at this exact moment.*

Many respondents echoed that sentiment. Selected variations on this theme follow:

- *Without a compelling case, it is unlikely that my faculty would be engaged with a change.*
- *I [need] to hear from an international perspective why it is important to address this issue.*
- *There is a lack of recognition of its value and the topic is generally reduced to an issue of public service or civil society.*
- *A need is not created.*
- *Lack of understanding [of] the need for poverty topics in management education.*
- *We don’t have enough faculty members who can make some business case for this topic.*
- *All attempts to do so in executive education programs have failed so far due to the academic, not practical business case, being presented.*
- *Create a case for legitimacy.*

Collectively, these statements suggest there is a need for a strong, compelling *business* rationale for thinking about poverty as a *business* topic. In short, what’s needed is a business case.

Find champions

Champions are individuals who advocate for ideas/ approaches that are innovative, disruptive, overlooked and/or disparaged. Champions are change agents. Respondents identified the need for champions as follows:

- *I guess lack of a champion (at any level) is probably the key missing ingredient.*
- *[We need] faculty champions.*
- *The issue of poverty would have to be top of mind... a faculty member or student grassroots group would have to ‘champion’ the idea and its importance.*

Change attitudes of stakeholders

Closely linked with above need for champions is the need to change stakeholder attitudes. As noted in the Challenges section of this report, topic legitimacy is a critical barrier. Respondents noted that without changes in stakeholder attitudes, forward motion on this issue will be limited:

- *Change [the] mindset of everyone from faculty to the President.*

- *Overarching global campaign aimed at changing attitudes of the executives of the boards & senior management of privately owned institutions.*
- *[What's needed is] attitudinal change of students and more participation for the prime stakeholders who are the recruiters.*
- *We have to do two things for our Dean and teachers: 1. Convince them that a certain part of their courses can and should be given to poverty discussion. 2. Educate them on how to do it.*
- *[We need] commitment from the administration and the need by local employers to see that it is important.*
- *Should accreditation bodies include poverty as part of their expectations it would make the development of such modules much easier.*
- *All resources needed to raise awareness of the importance of the topic first to policy makers, then to the leadership of the education institutions.*

Share best practices

Knowledge of best practices helps organizations learn. By making explicit “what works,” organizations are able to learn from each other, thereby shortening their own organizational learning cycles. Selected respondent comments on the need for knowing best practices are these:

- *We have to study best practices: how do other business schools persuade their students to accept poverty discussions in business education?*
- *Information exchange on teaching - materials, best practices and so on - will be of great help.*
- *Time and expert advice from schools that have successfully incorporated poverty into their curriculum.*
- *Easier access to best practices from other schools.*
- *Knowledge of best practices for teaching the topic.*

29

Find the right terms and language

Respondents also affirmed the importance of not only finding the right vocabulary so that shared and common meaning can develop but also of using that common vocabulary effectively within and outside the academy:

- *It is a challenge to find the right vocabulary/language to talk about poverty in the business schools and discuss the ‘value’ and ‘opportunities’ associated with considering it in the curriculum.*
- *‘Poverty’ is not a very attractive subject – ‘sustainability’ may be more engaging.*
- *Companies might be interested in the topic but they might not call it with the same vocabulary that we have (a common vocabulary is yet to develop to clarify what is BoP, what is pro-poor, what is CSR etc., how they are related and how they are different)... When I asked a MNC if they have a project for the poor, they referred me to CSR department; but later when I asked them what project they have for rural markets, then I found [out] about their business projects.*

Develop corporate partnerships

Respondents noted the *prima facie* need to have closer working relationship with corporations:

- *We also need help gaining access to organizations working on issues at the interface between poverty and business.*
- *We need more projects with companies.*
- *[L]ook for champion companies that wish to share their experiences and spread their cases.*
- *Some kind of industry partnership.*

Conduct relevant research

Respondents noted the need for more research related to poverty issues/topics.

- *[Number 1 barrier is] proper research of the topic.*
- *[We need to] develop and encourage active research funding applications.*
- *The most important obstacle is lack of funds for research in poverty-related topics.*
- *Adequate funding should be provided in the form of postdoctoral training, grants or research projects.*
- *A lack of funding in order to research and develop this aspect within the institution.*
- *We need resources for research.*

Create new teaching materials

Similarly, new topics and what is perceived to be a new content area requires new teaching materials:

- *[We need] the books and the study material to back the issues.*
- *Try to find cases and curriculum models that could be incorporated into current class offerings.*
- *Knowledge of appropriate case studies.*
- *Instructional materials and good case studies.*
- *A good "thought piece" published in a top managerial journal would be helpful to kick-off the class.*
- *An outside contribution in this area would be most welcome. The course would start with foreign materials and, in a few years, they would be gradually replaced by domestic materials.*
- *I think that the most important aspect is to give more adequate material to faculty materials to which they can refer to. At the moment, case studies, textbooks are not picking [up] on the subject.*
- *More electronic cases and forum access for staff and students to share ideas and views.*

[T]he main problem at my university is that there is no interest, because there's the belief that successful models are the ones worth studying. When a very poor person has some success with a microenterprise and makes a living for, say, ten years, nobody notices. When somebody starts a business and ten years later they have a company with US\$1 million in sales and two dozen employees, everybody wants to know why it was so "successful". Of course, the first case is successful because a whole family could subsist and probably will subsist for many more years close to a poverty level, even if the owner isn't considered successful. In the second case, the company may go broke at any moment, lay off the employees and in turn they'll go back to poverty. Still, it's the second case that university students are interested in.

*--- Survey Respondent,
Puerto Rico*

PRME-RELATED IMPLICATIONS/ REFLECTIONS

This section uses the six Principles of Responsible Management Education (PRME) to present survey implications and reflections.

Principle 1 – Purpose: We will develop the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy.

This survey, as well as previous surveys carried out by CEEMAN and the PRME Anti-Poverty Working Group in 2008 and 2010, reflects a growing awareness among management educators and business school administrators around the globe that the need for sustainable development and responsible leadership has never been greater – and that the expectations from business education and leadership development institutions are also higher than ever.

Business schools, as the main providers of educational services, as well as their associations and other stakeholders, not only need to act on their own but also need to exchange views and ideas as well as collaborate and develop new ways and means to achieve sustainable development and develop responsible leadership for a better world. In this context, fighting poverty is not only one of the major Millennium Development Goals, but also a big challenge for all of management education’s stakeholders.

The results are a reminder that businesses and business schools do share a common purpose, since markets are at the center of all economic activity, yet that the need to develop inclusive markets is sometimes hindered by language and perspective.

Principle 2 – Values: We will incorporate into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact.

The study shows that both undergraduate and graduate students have more opportunities to study other topics in the area of responsible management than they have to study poverty-related topics.

The main challenges in this context include: still insufficient legitimacy of the topic, prevailing mindsets and attitudes, disciplinary barriers/boundaries and the related “silo” mentality, a congested curriculum, student and employer markets, the lack of faculty competence and confidence, in addition to the lack of external incentives from international accreditation and ranking schemes.

There are also numerous **solutions** in this area. These include integration of poverty-related issues into already existing courses, both those related to a broader area of responsible management as well as those that are considered as core management courses. These solutions also include the development of new courses, either under the umbrella of CSR and responsible management, or as various interdisciplinary courses on Base of the Pyramid issues, or as topics such as business and poverty, social entrepreneurship, social impact, etc. In addition, leveraging the co-curriculum takes place in a number of different and innovative

ways and serves as another response to the “over full” curriculum. Encouraging students to integrate Base of the Pyramid issues into their master theses is an additional solution.

It is encouraging that some of the above-mentioned solutions were facilitated by faculty and institutional involvement in PRME.

Among the **opportunities** in these areas particularly important are those related to building a stronger business case and increasing the legitimacy for including poverty into educational programs and curricula. Finding the right terms and language to be used within and outside the academia is another opportunity with a strong potential.

Another important opportunity relates to faculty champions. This is consistent with the findings of the first WG survey which indicated that the strongest facilitating factors for including discussions of global poverty in a school were (a) having one or two faculty champions; (b) strong leadership from the dean; (c) congruence with the business school’s mission; and (d) support from the entire faculty.

Principle 3 – Method: We will create educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership.

Among the main **challenges** related to the learning frameworks, materials, processes and environments related to the integration of poverty-related issues into management education, were the following: dominance of “functional” subjects, the lack of faculty competence and confidence, the inter-disciplinary character of the topic, the lack of appropriate cases, text-books and other learning materials, and insufficient knowledge of best practices for teaching the topic.

Solutions in these areas are also encouraging and confirm a major finding of the WG’s second global survey: That innovation in teaching methods is occurring globally around the issue of poverty. Poverty-related cases are increasingly included in various courses, and students are more and more being asked to make presentations or take part in debates, role plays and other interactive learning methods. Invited speakers, along with the organization of thematic conferences and events, are also good examples for this. Particularly important are service learning opportunities, project works, student-led campaigns, events and other initiatives and volunteering activities, including those co-organized with the local communities and bodies. Some of these activities are mandatory, so they directly request students to engage with the issue of poverty.

The study identified numerous **opportunities** in this area. Among them are those related to creating new teaching materials, sharing best practices, creating electronic platforms and forums for sharing ideas among faculty and students, faculty development, as well as developing corporate and community partnerships.

Collectively, survey responses under Principle 3 support the need for the *Collection of Best Practices and Inspirational Solutions*, a document that has been developed as a complement to this report.

Principle 4 – Research: We will engage in conceptual and empirical research that advances our understanding about the role, dynamics, and impact of corporations in the creation of sustainable social, environmental and economic value.

The field of research has come out as one of the main **challenges** and at the same time also main **opportunities** related to integrating poverty-related issues into management education.

Previously mentioned issues of the legitimacy of the topic, and the related lack of understanding and even appropriate vocabulary, have to do with the lack of respective research. On the other hand this is closely related to the lack of funding, the lack of time, the interdisciplinary nature of the topic, the lack of faculty competence and confidence, as well as other self-imposed internal and external limitations, including international accreditation.

Principle 5 - Partnership: We will interact with managers of business corporations to extend our knowledge of their challenges in meeting social and environmental responsibilities and to explore jointly effective approaches to meeting these challenges.

One of the main **challenges** identified in the survey was the questionable legitimacy of the topic of poverty for management education, and the lack of interest in student and employer markets.

Solutions that include various forms of partnerships with business partners, social entrepreneurs, business incubators, cooperatives, local and international NGOs, governmental agencies and local community seem to provide answers for many of the above mentioned challenges. Partnership benefits also include opportunities for bringing real-life experience and business practice into the classroom, for inviting speakers from the corporate world to serve on panels and participate in conferences on the role of business in alleviating poverty, as well as for sponsoring centres for social innovation at business schools.

Partnerships are also seen as a great **opportunity** for changing the mindsets and attitudes of all stakeholders – equally those from the corporate world and the management education community. Quite often business schools have a wrong perception of what the educational market needs and wants are. Bringing faculty champions together with corporate champions could have a high synergy-making potential.

Principle 6 – Dialogue: We will facilitate and support dialog and debate among educators, students, business, government, consumers, media, civil society organizations and other interested groups and stakeholders on critical issues related to global social responsibility and sustainability.

Challenges, solutions and opportunities in the area of partnerships indicate the need for a wider and more intensive dialogue among all stakeholders, interest groups and social partners on the role that businesses as well as management education could and should play in both fighting poverty *and* achieving the first Millennium Development Goal.

Particularly important in this respect is the fact that some respondents in the survey noted that participation in PRME itself created opportunities to discuss poverty-related issues. This is an important **opportunity** with a huge potential to help:

- a. Individual schools to start and/or lead poverty-related initiatives for their own organizations
- b. Groups of schools and their stakeholders to collaborate together on projects related to integrating poverty-related issues into management education; and
- c. PRME as an initiative to further enhance its value as a learning and action network for the purpose of fighting poverty through management education.

In this context, the Working Group on Poverty as a Challenge to Management Education will continue to facilitate dialog and implementation of the report's main findings and recommendations.

APPENDICES

Table A. Cross Tabulation of Private/Public Status by Accreditation					
	Accreditation				Total
	AACSB	EQUIS	CEEMAN IQA	AMBA	
Public School	20	19	4	26	69
Private School	24	12	18	32	86
Total	44	31	22	58	155

Table B. Cross Tabulation of the Mix of International to National Students by Accreditation					
	Accreditation				Total
	AACSB	EQUIS	CEEMAN IQA	AMBA	
Completely international student body	1	3	4	8	16
Predominantly international student body	3	5	2	10	20
Predominantly national student body	39	22	12	34	107
Completely national student body	1	1	4	6	12
Total	44	31	22	58	155

Table C presents the five items that respondents affiliated with public programs perceived to be a greater barrier/obstacle to the inclusion of poverty discussion in their school/program than respondents affiliated with private schools/programs.

Table C. Analysis of Variance between Public and Private Programs and Perceived Obstacles/Barriers to Inclusion of Poverty in Programs							
			Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig.
Faculty members willing to do research in the area	Between Groups	(Combined)	6.209	1	6.209	3.98	.047
	Within Groups		475.576	305	1.559		
	Total		481.785	306			
Accreditation standards	Between Groups	(Combined)	9.117	1	9.117	5.28	.022
	Within Groups		518.092	300	1.727		
	Total		527.209	301			

Knowing the right place in the curriculum for the topic	Between Groups	(Combined)	7.469	1	7.469	5.95	.015
	Within Groups		380.682	303	1.256		
	Total		388.151	304			
Institutional culture (i.e., openness to innovation & change)	Between Groups	(Combined)	8.544	1	8.544	5.16	.024
	Within Groups		496.794	300	1.656		
	Total		505.338	301			
Do you or your school have a plan for addressing/overcoming this challenge, obstacle or barrier?	Between Groups	(Combined)	2.265	1	2.265	3.89 2	.049
	Within Groups		177.520	305	.582		
	Total		179.785	306			

