

TEACHING BUSINESS ETHICS: COMPARING COURSE STRUCTURE AND FACULTY GOALS

by

David D. Schein, MBA, JD, Ph.D.

July 2005

© Copyright 2005, David D. Schein,
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A \$1,000 grant for presentation of these research results at the 2005 AACSB Teaching Business Ethics Conference through the generosity of the Writer Family and the Center for Business and Society at the Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado.

Building a Discipline



THE DEBATE

**TEACHING BUSINESS
ETHICS IN AN
INTEGRATED VS.
SEPARATE COURSE
STRUCTURE**

NO DEFINITIVE STANDARDS

- Business School Administrators
- Faculty
- Accreditation Organizations
- Business Community

CONSIDERATIONS

- Faculty Qualifications
- Textbook Selection
- Classroom Approach
- Curriculum Placement

FINDING EVIDENCE

- **Studies of Student Outcomes**
- **Studies of Faculty Behavior**
- **Analysis of Curriculum Materials**
- **Studies of Faculty Goals**

POSSIBLE SURVEY SUBJECTS

- Students
- Faculty
- Administrators
- Employers
- Community Leaders

THIS STUDY'S PREMISE

That faculty who have similar teaching goals will teach with similar content and methodology in order to achieve those goals.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

- Survey of Faculty
- ALSB and SBE Members
- List-Serve and Snail Mail
- Survey Document Available

SIX GOALS

Data Recognition is the identification of ethical dilemmas.

Form is the solution of ethical dilemmas using logical approaches.

Product is the analysis of ethical dilemmas using standardized approaches .

GOALS CONTINUED

Process refers to the approach students use to analyze ethical dilemmas, but does not require the use of a standardized analysis or ethical theory.

Content refers to teaching students specific “right” and “wrong” answers to business ethics issues.

Theory speaks for itself as this relates to the teaching of ethical theories.

BACKGROUND SURVEY

Professor Donald Morris surveyed business and philosophy departments to determine the difference in teaching goals between members of business and philosophy departments who teach business ethics. Used the six goals described above in his survey.

Results published in 2001.

THIS SURVEY

- Various Demographic Questions
- 6 Teaching Goals
- 2 Assessment Questions
- 174 useable survey responses

THE PARTICIPANTS

51.7% ALSB

41.4% SBE

6.9% Both

CONTINUED

91% Full-time Faculty

90.2% Business Department

5.7% Philosophy Department

CONTINUED

30.5% Teach Undergrad

9.2% Teach Grad

60.3% Teach Both

Levels of Teaching Experience

- 5 brackets
- 58.6% with 16 or more years

Size of School

A Range From
9.8% < 2,000 Students
to
24.1% > 20,000 Students

SCHOOL AFFILIATION

59.2% Public

14.9% Private

25.3% Religious

DEGREE LEVEL

9.2% BA/BS

36.2% MS/MBA

54.6% Doctorate

AACSB Membership

70.3% of Participants

Non-AACSB more likely
to have separate courses.

STANDARDIZED TESTING

Only 5.2% of participants reported using the D.I.T. or other standardized assessment method.

COMPARISON OF GOALS

Morris Results

Form

Process

Data Recognition

Theory

Product

Content

New Survey

Data Recognition

Form

Product

Process

Content

Theory

COMPARISON OF COURSE MODES

	<u>SEP</u>	<u>INT</u>	<u>SIG</u>
Data Rec.	6.67	6.45	.142
Form	6.54	6.10	.012
Product	5.92	5.56	.142
Process	5.69	5.10	.028
Content	4.37	3.93	.149
Theory	4.25	3.71	.078

COMPARISON OF COURSE MODES

	<u>SEP</u>	<u>INT</u>	<u>SIG</u>
Awareness	6.67	6.45	.142
Mastery	6.54	6.10	.012

COMPARISON OF SCHOOL AFFILIATION and GOALS

Public and Private Close.

Religious higher than Public
on Process, Awareness and
Mastery.

NOTE

Religious College participants
more likely to teach separate
business ethics courses.

Not Significant:

Size of School

Teaching Experience

CONCLUSIONS?

Emphasis on objective goals
for teaching business ethics.

CONCLUSIONS?

Not a major difference between teaching goals for separate and integrated course structures, but the average scores of teachers of separate courses were higher on all 8 surveyed variables.



Questions



Selected References

- Iyer, G. R. (1998). Integrating business ethics in classroom teaching: Some preliminary considerations. *Teaching Business Ethics, 1*, 315-331.
- Morris, D. (2001). Business ethics assessment criteria: Business v. philosophy-survey results. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 11*(4), 623-650.
- Piper, T. R., Gentile, M. S., & Parks, S. D. (1993). *Can ethics be taught?* Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schoenfeldt, L. F., McDonald, D. M., & Youngblood, S. A. (1991). The teaching of business ethics: A survey of AACSB member schools. *Journal of Business Ethics, 10*, 237-2441.
- Sims, R. R. (2002). *Teaching business ethics for effective learning.* Westport, CT: Quorum Books.