

Toward Sustainable Sustainability Learning: Lessons from a U.S. MBA Study Abroad Program in Scandinavia

Robert Strand
Copenhagen Business School

The debate about how to “fix” business schools is intensifying which has coincided with a call for a greater attention to sustainability in business and business education. Teaching sustainability in MBA programs, however, raises a number of questions and challenges. This article presents a few straightforward ideas to address these challenges and offers findings from MBA level sustainability courses I have taught at a major U.S. business school- including a study abroad course to Scandinavia- in which these ideas have demonstrated their effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

The debate about how to “fix” business schools is intensifying (HBR, 2009; The Economist, 2009a; The Economist, 2009b). While this debate is not new (e.g. Bennis & O’Toole, 2005), the economic crisis has given the debate an increased air of urgency (e.g. Datar et al., 2010). According to the *Harvard Business Review*, “many critics have charged that the values imparted in MBA programs contributed significantly to the ethical and strategic lapses that led to the economic crisis” (HBR, 2009). Much of the associated discussion has focused on the need to educate MBA students in a cross-disciplinary fashion through which students develop a more holistic worldview and actively explore the role of business in society (HBR, 2009; Navarro, 2008). Sustainability, and the need for greater focus on sustainability in business, is at the center of many of these discussions that has amounted to a call for increased and improved teaching in the area of sustainability in our MBA programs.

Teaching sustainability, however, raises a number of questions and challenges. How can we ensure **relevancy**- where sustainability teaching is relevant to practitioners (Bennis & O’Toole, 2005; Rubin & Dierdorf, 2009)? How can we support **reflexivity**- getting students to appreciate that exploring sustainability can raise questions for which there may not be clear “right” answers (Samuelson, 2006)? How can we encourage the students to explore how to make decisions in these complex and uncertain environments (Bennis & O’Toole, 2005) where competing tensions may exist between and within the environmental, societal, and economic dimensions of sustainability (Margolis & Walsh, 2003)? How do we inspire students to develop a holistic worldview extending beyond a myopic, short-term, business-centered perspective (Ghoshal, 2005; Atwater et al., 2008; Giacalone & Thompson, 2006: 270)? And how can we encourage **continuity** where we help to build a foundation for a continued exploration that extends beyond the classroom (Samuelson, 2006; Giacalone & Thompson, 2006: 262)? Thus in an effort to better ensure “**sustainable sustainability learning**”, we should look to address the challenges of relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity.

Drawing on a case study of MBA-level sustainability focused courses I taught at a major U.S. business school during 2008-09, including a study abroad course that takes U.S. MBA students to Scandinavia, this article presents a few straightforward ideas to address these challenges. It offers findings regarding the effectiveness of ideas such as embedding interactions with sustainability practitioners from industry to address the challenge of relevancy; exposing students to multiple perspectives from sustainability practitioners from across sectors (industry, government, NGO's, academia) and subsequently identifying and reflecting upon "common threads" that run across these perspectives to address the challenge of reflexivity (and moreover, to frame these reflexive exercises in a vision of inspiration and hope rather than admonishment); and stimulating the interest of students in sustainability and fostering a community of co-learners to address the challenge of continuity so students are more likely to continue their sustainability explorations beyond the classroom.

CHALLENGES IN TEACHING SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability encompasses all sectors of society with interrelated economic, environmental, and societal dimensions (Marcus & Fremath, 2009: 18) where the collection of these three dimensions has been commonly referred to as the "triple bottom line" (Elkington, 1994; Elkington, 1997). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) also entails these three dimensions and is concerned with the role of business in society (Carroll, 1999; Commission of the European Communities, 2001; Dahlsrud, 2008). Therefore sustainability, the "triple bottom line", and CSR are often discussed in an interrelated fashion. Sustainability is the term that will primarily be used throughout this article where the following section explores the interrelated challenges in teaching sustainability: relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity.

Ensuring relevancy is a challenge to teaching sustainability, as it is a challenge to teaching any MBA course. Bennis & O'Toole (2005) levied serious charges that business schools had "lost their way" where MBA programs demonstrated little connection to the "real world" and the problems faced by practitioners. Rubin & Dierdorff (2009) found a disconnect exists between what is taught in required MBA curricula and the competencies deemed most critical by managers in industry. Chia & Holt (2008) argued that business school's attachment to teaching through such means as formal lectures, conceptual models, and dispassionate analysis runs the "risks of ignorance and detachment" by students.

Reflexivity suggests a number of issues. De Déa Roglio & Light (2009) describe reflective practice as "the ability to make sense of uncertain, unique, or conflicted situations of professional practice" which is composed of three distinctive, but closely interrelated, ways of thinking: 1) connective thinking, 2) critical thinking, and 3) personal thinking. 1) The idea of connective thinking is based in systems thinking as a way of "understanding the connections among the different elements that compose a specific situation or problem, the interrelationships among these elements and their influences on the social context" and "identifying links between ideas and facts for generating creative solutions" (2009: 158). A "systemic perspective of the world," De Déa Roglio & Light suggest, "requires the capacity to identify the sets of interrelationships and process of change, with a focus on and a concern for sustainable development" (2009: 158). 2) Critical thinking involves the ability to become aware of and question the tacit mental models that guide the decision making process for oneself and others, and to critique the dominant mental models in groups, organizations, and society. 3) Personal thinking focuses on self-awareness (2009: 159).

Connective thinking's foundation in systemic thinking relates to the call by Atwater et al. (2008) for a greater cultivation of systemic and holistic thinking in the next generation of business leaders where business students "develop a richer understanding of the complexity they will face on a daily basis" (2008: 10). On a related note, Giacalone & Thompson (2006) argued for the development of holistic thinking business students where "business' raison d'être is conceptualized more holistically as a means of serving humanity rather than being served by it" (2006: 271). Giacalone & Thompson call for a shift in worldviews from the current practice of teaching students that business is at the center, which they call as "peculiar to business education alone" in that "[o]ther professional schools do not share this collective egocentricity" (2006: 267).

Samuelson (2006) called for MBA programs to equip managers with the reflexive capacities “to see new connections between social and environmental challenges on the one hand and firm-level growth and innovations on the other, and to plan far beyond the quarter into the future.” Samuelson continued “business school students will need to understand business and society as a complex, dynamic, and interdependent systems...” Samuelson argued that this requires rigorous exploration into the questions that don’t always have “right answers”. Bennis & O’Toole (2005) also encouraged a deepening exploration into the arenas where the questions may outweigh the answers, having charged that business schools are “graduating students who are ill equipped to wrangle with complex, unquantifiable issues- in other words, the stuff of management.” Margolis & Walsh (2003) demonstrated that the body of scholarship composed over 30 years has attempted largely to dispel the potential tensions between economic, environmental, and societal objectives. They stated that while “a simple compilation of the findings suggests there is a positive association” between companies’ environmental and societal performance and economic performances (2003: 277), this association may be “more illusory than the body of results suggests” (2003: 278). They suggested that research efforts would be better spent exploring the tensions that exist when managers must make decisions with interrelated economic, environmental, and societal ramifications. And as Bennis & O’Toole (2005: 101) pointed out, what professors research directly affects the education of MBA students.

While reflexivity can lead to the exploration of doom and gloom, scholars have pointed to the need for a focus on hope and inspiration. Ghoshal (2005) charged that business schools’ propagation of the myopic, amoral business centered view has “actively freed their students from any sense of moral responsibility” (2005: 76) where “many of the worst excesses of recent management practices have their roots in a set of ideas that have emerged from business school academics over the last 30 years” (2005: 75). Yet Ghoshal (2005: 87) is not calling to shame business students to behave morally, but rather he invokes that business schools must contribute to help these future business leaders to build “delightful organizations” as described by Warren Bennis (2000). Correspondingly, Giacalone & Thompson (2006: 270) call that in helping students to develop a broader, more holistic worldview where “neither profitability nor business are at the center of the universe” these explorations must be framed in a vision of inspiration and hope rather than admonishing the students to “do better”.

Continuity is the final challenge offered here in the teaching of sustainability. This entails the relatively straightforward, but challenging, problem of ensuring that the students’ sustainability explorations continue beyond the classroom. Giacalone & Thompson (2006: 262) cautioned that we should not expect too much from one course, implying that a more sustained attention is needed. Samuelson (2006: 362) called upon business schools to encourage “a lifelong commitment to inquiry” where the foundation for the continued inquiry is laid during the student’s MBA program but extends beyond the classroom and after the MBA program concludes.

CASE STUDY IN SUSTAINABILITY TEACHING

The following section presents a case study based on courses that I taught at a major U.S. business school in which I attempted to address the challenges of relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity. The courses presented in this case study are: 1) an intensive study abroad sustainability course that traveled across Scandinavia in summer 2008 with 25 MBA students and 2) again across Scandinavia in summer 2009 with 25 MBA students, and 3) a comparable on-campus course with 63 MBA students in summer 2008. More detail about the study abroad course is provided because it is the less traditional of the teaching formats in comparison to the on-campus course.

Data Methodology

Data about these courses were gathered from multiple sources. One data source is the standard anonymous university student surveys conducted for all courses across the university at the conclusion of the final class session (prior to the students receiving their final grades). 24 of 25 students in both the 2008 and 2009 Scandinavian programs submitted these surveys and 58 of 63 students in the on-campus

course submitted. The results of the surveys by class are provided to the instructor and department but are not made publicly available. A large sample of university-wide aggregated survey responses are available and are useful for comparisons, however a severe limitation of this is that MBA specific responses cannot be isolated as the information is totaled at the university level. The most recent total university aggregation is available at this time is from spring semester 2008.

**TABLE 1
SAMPLE SIZES FOR UNIVERSITY SURVEYS**

Class	Semester	Final month of instruction	Reported Enrolled	Response Sheets Submitted
Scandinavia Course '08	Summer 2008	July 2008	25	24
Scandinavia Course '09	Summer 2009	July 2009	25	24
On Campus Course '08	Summer 2008	August 2008	63	58
Total University	Spring 2008	May 2008	152908	119510

Additionally, the international programs at the business school conducts an anonymous online survey with open-ended questions after the final class session but prior to the students receiving their final grades. 21 of 25 students in the 2008 Scandinavia program and 22 of 25 students in 2009 responded to this survey. A limitation of this survey is that comparison to the on-campus course is not possible as this is an international programs only survey.

I also draw data from my field notes taken during the courses and, moreover, draw from field notes taken since the courses have concluded. I have the opportunity to observe many of my former students through their continued invitations and correspondence, my encountering former students at events due to my involvement in sustainability minded associations including the local Net Impact Professionals chapter and the Net Impact student chapter at the business school, and my connection to the sustainability focused practitioners at many of the local companies. A limitation of this method is that despite my desire, I have not had continued contact with my former on-campus students. This is a limitation (however, this is also a finding) and thus my continued observations will be solely from the students in the Scandinavia program.

Finally, I draw from an article for a magazine produced by this business school about the 2008 Scandinavia program in which a former student was interviewed. This has limited use as only one student was interviewed.

General Background on the Business School

All courses were offered at a major U.S. business school with approximately 2000 MBA students. This breaks down to about 200 to 250 full-time MBA students and 1700 to 1800 part-time MBA students. Therefore full-time MBA students constitute just over 10% of the student body, however they are enrolled in closer to 20% of credits administered given that part-time MBA students generally take fewer credits per semester (see Endnote 1).

8 intensive short-term study abroad programs are offered at this business school, each 4 credit courses with 2 weeks spent abroad. 3 of the 8 programs have a sustainability or CSR focus (see Endnote 2), 2 of which fulfill the 2 credit “business ethics requirement” at this business school- the Scandinavian program and its “sister program” which travels to Continental Europe and the United Kingdom. Roughly 10% of MBA students at this business school satisfy their business ethics requirement through one of these 2 study abroad courses, the remainder fulfilling this requirement through a 2 credit on-campus course.

Participation in study abroad programs has steadily increased at this business school. In 2003 less than 10% of all MBA students participated in study abroad programs where this figure has grown to above 30% in 2008. This reflects both the increase in students applying for study abroad programs and the

increased capacity of new study abroad offerings. Overall student applications for study abroad programs decreased from 2008 to 2009. However this was seen as an anomaly due to uncertainties stemming from the economic crisis. Students must apply for the intensive study abroad programs through a standard application process that is assessed by an administrative team from the international programs office of the business school (see Endnote 3). The cost to students for the 4 credit study abroad programs is moderately more than the cost for an on-campus 4 credit course. In 2009, the student cost was just over \$5000 where student tuition for a 4 credit on-campus course was about \$4200.

The Scandinavia Study Abroad Program

Why Study Sustainability in Scandinavia?

Scandinavia lays claim to the strongest macro triple bottom line performance in the world. Said another way, the cluster of countries known as Scandinavia have demonstrated the strongest and most balanced economic, environmental, and societal performances in the world when compared to all other country clusters like the Anglo Saxon (which includes the U.S. and U.K.) and Continental European (which includes France and Germany) clusters (see Appendix A). This makes Scandinavia an excellent candidate region in which to explore sustainability through a study abroad program.

When Scandinavia (which includes Norway, Sweden, and Denmark but often assumed to also include the Nordic countries Finland and Iceland (Bondeson, 2003: 3)) is compared to the U.S. alone, the dimensions of this “macro triple bottom line” break down as follows: the U.S. and Scandinavia tend to perform comparably well in economic performances (e.g. World Bank 2009; World Economic Forum 2009), Scandinavia tends to better than the U.S. in societal performances (e.g. UN Human Development Indicator 2008), and Scandinavia tends to perform significantly better than the U.S. in environmental performances (e.g. Environmental Performance Index 2008). While there are many factors that influence the macro triple bottom line performance at the country level (e.g. Campbell 2007), industry is certainly a prominent factor and Scandinavian companies perform disproportionately well in the major sustainability indices in comparison to other regions, including the U.S. (Gjølberg, 2009) (see Endnote 4). This makes Scandinavia an excellent region to draw from a wide suite of leading sustainability companies for site visits, and where Scandinavia can be utilized as an inspirational example offering U.S. MBA students a view of hope, rather than admonishment.

Studying abroad in Scandinavia also presents the opportunity for U.S. MBA students to explore culture. Egan & Bendick (2008: 387-390) cited that the predominant means for teaching culture at business schools is exposing students to cultural studies such as Hofstede’s (2001) work to classify nations along cultural dimensions. But Egan & Bendick charged that these often amount to stereotyping and warned that “graduate business students, however intelligent, are rarely ‘serious students’ in the sense of reading underlying research studies and understanding the fine points of research methodology. Instead, these students more typically retain and apply ‘take-away-lessons’ summarized in lectures and textbooks” (2008: 388). Blasco (2009) also cautioned that these take-away lessons are frequently employed by students as “cultural short-cuts” (2009: 186) used selectively as an “add-on variable” when other explanations cannot readily be made. Blasco called for greater integration of culture within business courses “so that students learn to see business as a cultured and culturing activity rather than as an awkward add-on to business” (2009: 189).

The study of leadership is a relevant subject of study for MBA students considering Raelin’s (2006: 164) call that “we seem to be on the verge of a change in the paradigm of leadership from the individual hero without whom the group would founder to the partner who nurtures everyone’s contribution. We’re not there yet because in our North American culture in particular, we seem to value, even revere, individualism, although we may preach teamwork.” House et al. (2004: 689-90) point that Scandinavia offers a different perspective on leadership, where Scandinavia is noted for particularly high levels of participative leadership and a low tolerance for self-protective attributes of leadership (i.e. low tolerance for face-saving) in comparison to the U.S. and Anglo Saxon cluster. Morsing et al. (2007: 89) state that Scandinavian management encourages a high degree of employee involvement and dialogue, and takes into consideration the implications of their companies’ actions on their local communities and other

stakeholders. Keeping in mind the cautions cited by Egan & Bendick (2008) and Blasco (2009), students can explore these generalizations of Scandinavian leadership approaches firsthand.

Logistically speaking, the relative smallness of Scandinavia and well-developed public transportation systems presents the opportunity to travel across Norway, Sweden, and Denmark easily and within a short period of time. This affords the opportunity for many perspectives from which the students can draw, effectively addressing the challenge of reflexivity. For example, differences and similarities between how government and industry interact in terms of sustainability from country to country can become apparent. This addresses the challenge of reflexivity given the underlying call for connective thinking, as the multiple perspectives that can be demonstrated through numerous visits with multiple sectors across different countries facilitates greater understanding of the connections of interrelationships within and between these sectors.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the commonly used definition of sustainability “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” has Scandinavian roots. Gro Harlem Brundlant is a former Prime Minister of Norway, and this definition of sustainable development was put forward within the Brundlant Commission (1987) Report “Our Common Future”.

The Scandinavia Sustainability Course

The Scandinavia course was first launched in 2008. In 2008, approximately 70 students applied for the 25 available positions. In 2009, approximately 50 students applied. This decline, however, was less than the overall decline in for the business school for this period. During both years, about 5 of the admitted students were full-time MBA students and 20 were from the part-time program.

The challenges of relevancy and reflexivity are both addressed through the mobility of a study abroad course where numerous site visits with a wide suite of organizations can take place in a short period of time. I strive to achieve a mix of organizations that is roughly 50% industry, 20% government, 20% NGO's, and 10% academic institutions to offer cross sectoral perspectives and multiple viewpoints. Meeting with sustainability practitioners and researchers, particularly those from industry facing challenges to which the MBA students are likely to be able to relate, better ensures relevancy to the MBA students whereas the mixture of sectors addresses reflexivity in that interrelationships can be explored between and within sectors. A majority of the organizations visited in 2008 and 2009 were the same including Ericsson, IKEA, Novo Nordisk, Statoil, Storebrand, Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), Amnesty International, WWF, Danish government CSR group, Norwegian government CSR group, the Norwegian Government Pension Fund (aka the “oil fund” or “Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund”), the Nobel Peace Institute, the U.S. Ambassador to Norway, the Stockholm School of Economics, and the Copenhagen Business School Center for CSR. Carlsberg, Scandinavian Airlines, Vestas, the Swedish National Debt Office (Riksgälden) and a session with Mads Øvisen (former CEO and Chair of Novo Nordisk, former Chair of LEGO, and current member of the United Nations Global Compact Board) were among those sessions added in 2009. H&M, V&S (Absolut Vodka), Greenpeace, UNICEF, and the Norwegian School of Management (BI) were among those visited in 2008 but not in 2009 due primarily to scheduling constraints. During the 2 weeks abroad, 8 weekdays are utilized for visits with 2 to 3 organizations scheduled per day resulting in roughly 20 organizations visited in total. Typically 1 to 3 representatives from each organization participate, which leads to the students formally meeting in the neighborhood of 40 people during the site visits.

During the spring semester, 4 pre-departure classes are held on the campus to provide a general foundation about Scandinavia, the organizations we will visit, and provide an opportunity for the students to begin to get to know one another. Classes are 4 hours each scheduled on Friday evenings to avoid all spring semester classes (given this is categorized as a summer course). I have designed these classes to focus on business ethics in the earlier sessions moving into the topics related to sustainability and CSR in the sessions closer to departure. I assign the 25 students into 12 groups where each group is assigned 2 focus organizations. All groups are assigned to have at least 1 company within their 2 organizations. During the final pre-departure session, each group gives a 10 minute “rapid fire” presentation to the class about 1 of the organizations (specified by me). The stated intent for these presentations is twofold- the

first is to get the class up to speed on the organizations we will visit and the second is for the students get familiarized with the particular issues related to sustainability and CSR for specific organizations. I require the presentations to include 3 sustainability related questions they would like to ask the organization. Students are informed that I will share their presentations and questions with the organizations.

I approach the challenge of continuity through two ideas. The first idea is to stoke the interest of the students to a heightened level that would, presumably, lead to greater likelihood for continued exploration by the individual student. This was addressed in large part by attending to the challenges of relevancy and reflexivity, and by my own engagement and demonstration of my authentic interest in sustainability. The second idea is to help foster a social environment through which the students are more likely to become a community of co-learners who will continue their sustainability explorations together long after the course concludes. As part of this, I embedded information about the Net Impact organization throughout the course. Moreover, the social aspect of the course was encouraged from the beginning. During the 2009 class, I invited a panel of students from the 2008 class to join the end of the first preparation class and discuss, primarily, the social aspects of the course. I then invited all students from both the 2008 and 2009 classes to get together after class at a nearby pub. The event was well attended (over half of the students from 2008 attended and almost all of the students from 2009 attended). Members of the local Net Impact professionals chapter also attended upon my invitation.

Moreover, fostering a community of co-learners is simply embedded into the program given the time abroad and traveling together across Scandinavia, which makes for shared experience that is the foundation for long lasting bonds. Site visits are scheduled for 8 to 9 of the weekdays typically from 10am-12pm and again from 2pm-4pm. I considered the students pre-condition for learning, so later morning starts were scheduled in an effort for students to be well rested and engaged during the visits and to not prevent students from socializing in the evenings.

The challenge of continuity in the form of fostering a community of co-learners is also considered in the grading, which is structured to encourage participation and group work. Throughout the pre-departure courses I repeatedly stress that I expect a great deal from each student as everyone's learning depends on one another. 40% of the course grade is weighted on participation and contribution, 30% on final group papers of the 2 organizations assigned to each group (which are provided to the organizations at the conclusion of the course). The final 30% is based on a final individual paper where students are asked to explore relationship between business ethics and sustainability practices and to reflect on differences and similarities between the U.S. and Scandinavian approaches to sustainability.

In an effort to further develop reflexivity, I hold reflection sessions throughout the 2 weeks abroad. After each site visit, often just outside the doors of the site we have just visited, I hold an informal 10 minute discussion to reflect on that visit and compare with previous visits. I ask students to consider what "common threads" they can draw throughout our visits to link complex topics together. I also schedule 2 to 3 formal classroom sessions for 60 to 90 minutes at the Scandinavian partner universities where we can more deeply explore the common threads than run throughout the course. I act as both a guide and fellow learner during these sessions. But perhaps the most fruitful reflection periods occur during the evenings over dinner and at the pubs, which I have the pleasure to often take part. Thus reflexivity is encouraged both within and outside of the formal classroom setting.

The Comparable On-Campus Course

Immediately after I returned from teaching the first run of the Scandinavian program in June 2008, I taught the lone summer semester session of the on-campus 2 credit "business ethics requirement" course. 63 students were enrolled, which is a typical size for this on-campus class, in this 2 credit course that ran over 8 weeks consisting of 4 hour class sessions on Thursday evenings. I utilized most of the same course material that I had developed for the Scandinavia program and, similarly, focused the earlier class sessions on business ethics and moved into the topics related to sustainability and CSR in the later class sessions. I employed a similar grading structure and assignments, however, given the on-campus course was 2 fewer credits I made group sizes 3 students (rather than 2) and reduced the final group assignment

to just 1 paper (rather than 2). Given that just 1 organization was assigned, I assigned only companies from a suite that I felt would be of interest to many of the students that also had relevance to the topic of sustainability. This included a mix of companies from the Scandinavia program (IKEA and Novo Nordisk, for example) and companies with a considerable local presence that had an expressed sustainability agenda. As with the Scandinavia program, in the fourth class session each student group gave a 10 minute “rapid fire” presentation to the class about their assigned company, which included 3 questions they would like to ask the company related to sustainability. To further address the challenge of relevancy, I invited 5 of these companies to the class to present for 75 to 90 minutes each, where these sessions were held over the last half of the course (July through early August). Sustainability practitioners from Best Buy, Cargill, Caribou Coffee, General Mills, and United Health Group took part. During all of the class sessions, I addressed the challenge of reflexivity by attempting to foster a reflective environment where discussion was encouraged, alternating between smaller group discussions with 5 to 8 people to full class discussions to reflect upon what was said in the smaller groups. During the full class discussions, I walked throughout the classroom in an effort to encourage a more informal conversation rather than a lecture. In an effort to address the challenge of continuity, I attempted to increase the interest level of the students by inviting speakers I knew to be engaging and interesting in the hope these talks may spark the curiosity of the students that would lead to continued explorations. I also embedded information about the Net Impact organization throughout the course and encouraged participation.

Thus the on-campus course was modeled after the Scandinavia program, however where the major differences were 1) no travel, 2) the class size was significantly larger, 3) contact with just 5 organizations (versus 20 organizations), 4) 100% of the organizations were industry (versus 50% industry, 20% NGO, 20% government, 10% academia), and 5) all visits were conducted in the classroom (i.e. not site visits). Adjustments were also made given for 2 fewer credits (assignments reduced, for example). Fewer organization visits was primarily due to time constraints associated with conducting a 2 credit course versus a 4 credit course. Given the desire for relevancy to students coupled with limited major NGO activity in the local area (in comparison to the cities visited in Scandinavia), 100% of these organizations selected were from local industry.

Results

The results in addressing the challenges of relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity are now discussed. Some interpretation is required given that the surveys utilized were not developed to explicitly assess these three particular challenges. Also, interrelations exist between the three challenges which calls for additional clarification. Given the international programs conducts an additional survey with the students who took part in the Scandinavia program as well as my ongoing engagement with students from the Scandinavia program, there is a much greater body of data to draw from the Scandinavia program. Therefore, the results section is heavily weighted with data from the Scandinavia program.

Relevancy

The data suggests that students in the Scandinavia program found the course to be highly relevant. The limited available data available for the on-campus course suggests that the course was found to be relevant.

The international programs survey responses offer a strong suggestion that the students found the visits with practitioners to be relevant and applicable. Student feedback included:

“LOVED all the site visits. I really enjoyed how [the course was adaptive] to change the companies we visited based on the industries where people worked, and to get a well-rounded group of companies. It was clear to me that [a lot of effort was put] into making sure we go the most out of the experience, even if it meant long days, but they were well worth it.” -- 2009 Scandinavia student

“The best part of the program was that it allowed students to directly pose questions to these companies and see and feel the different types/interpretations of CSR instead of learning it out of a book or from slides.” -- 2008 Scandinavia student

“Of all the courses I’ve taken in [my MBA] program, I have gotten the most out of this one. The real life experience with the companies was very beneficial to see what we learned in the classroom really come to life.” -- 2008 student

My field notes taken from both the Scandinavia program and the on-campus program also indicate that students perceived the discussions with practitioners to be very relevant. I recorded numerous notes from students during both the 2008 and 2009 Scandinavia classes saying that they felt the discussions with practitioners were relevant, and I received verbal feedback from a significant number of on-campus students that they found the industry speaker visitors to be “the most valuable” or “the most useful” aspect of the class given the practitioners represented “real world” perspectives.

The standard university survey did not include questions that explicitly targeted relevancy. Students’ recommendation rate for the course and perception of amount learned may be a loose proxy for relevance, however this admittedly blends a large amount of factors and one could argue that it this may be a loose proxy for reflexivity also. Nevertheless, recommendation rates were high for both courses but Scandinavian program students responded that they felt they had learned strikingly more in comparison to the on-campus course. 81% and 88% of Scandinavian students responded they felt they had learned more in their course whereas just 20% of the on-campus students responded similarly, thus indicating the impact of the Scandinavia program was much higher.

TABLE 2
“I would recommend this course to other students.”

Class	n	No	Yes
Scandinavia Course '08	21	0%	100%
Scandinavia Course '09	24	0%	100%
On Campus Course '08	49	14%	86%
Total University	not available		

TABLE 3
“Compared to other courses at this level, the amount I have learned in this course is:”

Class	n	Less	About the same	More
Scandinavia Course '08	21	0%	19%	81%
Scandinavia Course '09	24	4%	8%	88%
On Campus Course '08	50	16%	64%	20%
Total University	not available			

Reflexivity

The data suggests that students in the Scandinavia program found the course to strongly encourage reflexivity. The limited data available for the on-campus course, however, suggests the on-campus course did not achieve similarly high results.

The international programs survey responses offer a strong suggestion that the students found the program format to encourage a reflexive environment. Scandinavia students discussed being exposed to new perspectives, seeing new connections, and the impact of learning outside of the classroom:

“[The best part of the program was] getting exposed to alternative perspectives, the dialogue generated in many of the visits could not have been captured from a book.”
 -- 2008 Scandinavia student

“[The best part of the program was] meeting with a diverse set of companies, bonding with other students, [and] seeing concepts come together.” -- 2008 Scandinavia student

"I learned more in this class than in all my other classes combined. Not just on ethics and CSR, but on foreign culture, international business, and new ways of life." -- 2009 Scandinavia student

"An excellent class. I would rate this as one where it has had the most impact to my daily life and has changed my perspective on business. I think the concepts learned in this class can be directly applied to any business." -- 2008 Scandinavia student

Scandinavia students also remarked on the opportunity to have the dedicated time and place to deeply explore the topic and reflect:

“International programs are a great way for part-time students to commit a couple of weeks to only studies- it allows for time to reflect on the topic and apply it. This program in particular seems to be on the forefront of business. I believe it will be a great asset to have this level of knowledge.” -- 2008 Scandinavia student

“...I especially enjoyed the opportunity to be outside of a classroom and to have time to explore the cities we traveled in. A lot of learning was done outside of the classroom.”
 -- 2008 Scandinavia student

My field notes taken from both the Scandinavia program and the on-campus course indicated that while reflective discussions were cultivated in all courses, students in the Scandinavian program demonstrated connective thinking to a greater degree by connecting common threads within industry and across sectors including government and NGOs. Student conversations in the on-campus course largely stayed within industry, linking common threads between companies facing common challenges but rarely exploring the interplay of issues between sectors.

The standard university surveys did not include questions that explicitly targeted reflexivity, however the following may be considered as a loose proxy. The Scandinavia program students strongly agreed with the statement “I have a deeper understanding of this subject matter as a result of this course” at 83% and 96%, which is significantly higher than the response for on-campus (58%) and total university (48%).

TABLE 4
“I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.”

Class	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Scandinavia Course '08	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%
Scandinavia Course '09	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	96%
On Campus Course '08	57	3%	2%	2%	14%	21%	58%
Total University	119144	1%	2%	3%	14%	32%	48%

Continuity

The data strongly suggests that students in the Scandinavia program have increased interest in the subject matter and are continuing their sustainability explorations having formed a community of co-learners. Students in the on-campus course did not express significantly high levels of increased interest and the indications are that the development of a community of co-learners was not achieved in the on-campus course.

Scandinavian program students responded that they “strongly agree” that their interest in the subject matter was stimulated by the course, 79% and 92%, which is significantly greater than students in the on-campus course students who responded at 46% and the total university level of 42%.

TABLE 5
“My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.”

Class	n	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Scandinavia Course '08	24	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%	79%
Scandinavia Course '09	24	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	92%
On Campus Course '08	57	3%	3%	3%	23%	21%	46%
Total University	119089	3%	4%	6%	18%	28%	42%

Scandinavia students also remarked how their general interest level in the topic has increased:

"It was a great experience and I got much more out of the program than I was expecting. I didn't have any interest in the topic when I applied, but now I'm very aware of these practices within my organization." -- 2008 Scandinavia student

“I was extremely pleased with the program. Hands down the best and most engaging class that I have taken at [this business school]...CSR is a topic I never thought I would be interested in and now I am.” -- 2009 Scandinavia student

Students from the Scandinavian program indicated that the lessons will stay with them after the course concludes:

"I have been a student at [this university] through 1 undergraduate degree and 2 graduate degrees, this course is by far the best one that I have ever taken. The amount of learning that takes place during this seminar is priceless. Something that I will always remember!" -- 2008 Scandinavia student

"By far this was the best class in my MBA program. The CSR messaging should be incorporated into every class if possible. This was definitely a life-changing class." -- 2009 Scandinavia student

Regarding the fostering of a community of co-learners, students in 2008 and 2009 Scandinavian programs have each coordinated a number of reunions utilizing Evite (a free online invitation service). I have been included on the invitation lists. The 2008 program concluded in July 2008 and through October 2009, 8 evite coordinated events were held by the students. I attended 4 of the events, where student attendance ranged from about 10 (of the 25) students to over 20 students. These events were primarily social in nature held at a pub or a student’s residence where discussions ranged from sustainability related items to personal. The 2009 program concluded in July 2009 and through October 2009, 2 evite coordinated events were held by the students. I was unable to attend either however one student informed

me that 24 of the 25 students attended the first event. The international programs ran an article about the inaugural Scandinavia program in which a full-time MBA students referenced these reunions:

“One of the best things I got out of the trip was getting to know more students in the part-time program.” “We were together for two straight weeks, taking overnight trains together and having a great time. It was a great group of people—I think a lot of those relationships that we made will continue. We’ve already had a few reunions.”

Additionally, a “Scandinavia alumni group” of 8 former Scandinavia program students has formed within a local Fortune 50 corporation, which is a major employer at this business school. They have a standing quarterly lunch meeting scheduled and members of the group inform one another of sustainability related events and activities occurring in the company. I was included as an invitee to these quarterly meetings and related events, and I have taken part on 2 occasions between July 2008 and October 2009.

Students have engaged in multiple other ways and have shared numerous sustainability related efforts with me. For example, many former part-time MBA students have shared sustainability-focused Powerpoint presentations they have delivered to their companies, which has spurred on discussions with many of these former students about potential sustainability-related opportunities. Other students have asked questions focused on specific issues at their companies and are seeking guidance regarding how to employ lessons from the Scandinavia program. For example, I have been engaged in a discussion with a former student from the 2008 course who is employed with a major pharmaceutical company and sees opportunity for the company to form a partnership with an NGO but is unsure of how to begin this process and would like to draw from the Novo Nordisk – WWF partnership that we explored during the course. Other students have shared sustainability focused projects and presentations that they have made for other courses within their MBA curriculum where they have drawn from lessons learned in the Scandinavia program. For example, 5 former students from the 2009 course had a Project Management course together in which they formed a group and made their final group project on “Sustainability in Project Management”. Other former students are leading initiatives for the business school to offer additional sustainability related courses and integrating sustainability throughout the curriculum. For example, former students conducted a survey of all business school students to solicit student support for increased sustainability related offerings at the business school which they then presented to the leaders of the business school. The students are also actively sharing sustainability related information with one another. For example, students from the 2009 course have established a Google group which they have utilized to exchange sustainability related information. Students are also engaged in sustainability related events in the local area. For example, I have run into many former students from the Scandinavia program at local Net Impact events where the vast majority of these students were not attending Net Impact events prior to the Scandinavia program (unfortunately, I have not run into any of my former on-campus students at these events). A 2008 Scandinavia program student is now a member of the local Net Impact professionals chapter leadership team (who was previously not involved with Net Impact).

DISCUSSION

The Scandinavia program addresses the challenges of relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity in teaching sustainability. The on-campus course addressed the challenge of relevancy, but reflexivity and continuity were not significantly demonstrated. I now want to explore these differing results in an effort to draw general lessons that can be tested in future sustainability courses of both study abroad and on-campus formats.

When considering why differing results were realized, some immediate questions arise regarding potential differences in the students and the instructor that I will first address. The first question is whether the applicant selection significantly biased the student populations where only students with very high GPA’s took part in the program. Students from the 2008 Scandinavia program did self report a

significantly higher GPA than students in the on-campus course. However, the 2009 Scandinavia program students reported a slightly lower GPA than students in the on-campus course. The second question is whether students who made the effort to apply for a study abroad program of this nature were more inclined to continue their explorations after the course concluded. In response to this, there is a strong likelihood that a significant number of students in my on-campus course applied for the study abroad programs but were not accepted (see Endnote 5). A third question is whether I, as the instructor, put in more effort to the Scandinavia courses than the on-campus course. Certainly a great deal of effort was required to initially launch the Scandinavia program primarily regarding further developing a network of contacts across Scandinavia, developing a core body of materials, and general logistical items. However, I taught the on-campus course immediately after the first running of the Scandinavia course and derived a great deal of benefit from these previous efforts.

Regarding the challenges, the primary means of addressing the challenge of relevancy was by embedding visits with sustainability practitioners. Both the Scandinavia program and the on-campus course followed this method with a strong indication of success as a result. Given the dedicated time and mobile nature of the abroad course, students in the Scandinavian program had the opportunity to meet with a greater number of organizations and a greater number of practitioners. When approaching the challenge of relevancy, embedding engagement with sustainability practitioners seems to be a very effective idea.

The challenge of reflexivity was addressed by holding reflection periods and encouraging discussions that explored “common threads” across perspectives. This was conducted in both the Scandinavia program and on-campus course, however the results indicated that a greater degree of connective thinking (a key component of reflexivity) was performed in the Scandinavia program. This may have likely been due to the cross-sector structure of the Scandinavian program where the 20 visits were conducted with 50% industry, 20% government, 20% NGO, and 10% academia whereas the on-campus course entailed 5 visits with 100% industry. The cross-sector visits of the Scandinavia program appears to be a real strength of the program where limited local activity of major NGOs (like WWF, for example) prevented my arranging for cross-sector visits in the on-campus course. However in retrospect this could have been overcome to some degree if I had invited, for example, a panel of active smaller NGOs to come class. Also, I could have hosted local government representatives in my class to offer government perspectives. Moreover, I could have considered drawing from the university’s resources to bring in speakers (and students) from other schools in the university like the school of government. These approaches would have likely helped the on-campus course, however given the vibrant interconnectivity between Scandinavian industry, government, and NGOs it should probably not be assumed that the level to which connective thinking was encouraged in the Scandinavian program would have been entirely achieved through these means.

An area of significant difference between programs was the class size, which impacted the approach to addressing reflexivity. I found that fostering a discussion based, reflexive learning environment was much more challenging in a class of 63 students than in a class of 25 students. When I conduct the thought experience of what the on-campus course dynamics would have been with only 25 students rather than 63, I envision a class where the discussions would have likely been more intimate and engaging with the ability to reflect on topics to a greater degree. Thus, I believe that meeting the challenge of reflexivity would be aided when class sizes are smaller where discussions can be encouraged. However, even if the on-campus course had been 25 students I do not believe that such a strong community of co-learners in line with what was realized in the Scandinavia program would have continued as this community seemed to have developed in large part due to the dedicated time and the shared experiences together as discussed next.

The challenges of reflexivity and continuity were both addressed in the Scandinavia program primarily by the dedicated time and shared experience facilitated by traveling abroad together. This is arguably the most special component of the Scandinavia program when compared to the on-campus course. As with the on-campus course, reflexivity is embedded in the classroom through dedicated reflection discussions. However, unlike in the on-campus course, these reflective discussions continued

outside of the classroom in the informal sessions during the time abroad. Continuity is addressed given that through these shared experiences, a community of co-learners has been fostered in both the 2008 Scandinavia program and 2009 Scandinavia program that have continued to draw from one another. Something like a weekend retreat may be considered as a compliment to an on-campus course in an effort to cultivate students having a shared experience; however the kind of shared experience that two weeks traveling abroad together leads to would be difficult to replicate.

Finally, with its strong and balanced “macro triple bottom line” performance, Scandinavia was held as an inspirational example for U.S. MBA students to visit which, it was argued, could be utilized to offer a view of hope. More U.S. MBA students may have the opportunity to participate in study abroad experiences to this region as Scandinavian educational institutions, like the Copenhagen Business School, further develop their sustainability related offerings open to enrollment by business students and executives from abroad.

CONCLUSION

The debate about how to “fix” business schools is intensifying, which has coincided with a call for a greater attention to sustainability in business and business education. However, teaching sustainability in our MBA programs presents a series of challenges, where the meeting the challenges of relevancy, reflexivity, and continuity was the focus of this article.

I have attempted to demonstrate that these three challenges can be addressed by employing a few straightforward ideas and I offered findings from a case study in which I applied these ideas in MBA level sustainability courses I taught at a major U.S.-business school during 2008-09, including a study abroad course to Scandinavia. The findings of this case study strongly suggest that embedding interactions with sustainability practitioners from industry addresses the challenge of relevancy; exposing students to multiple perspectives from sustainability practitioners from across sectors (industry, government, NGOs, academia) and subsequently identifying and discussing “common threads” across these perspectives addresses the challenge of reflexivity; moreover, framing these reflexive exercises in a vision of inspiration and hope for the students rather than admonishment also better addresses the challenge of reflexivity; and finally, stimulating the interest of students in sustainability as a continued topic of study and fostering a community of co-learners addresses the challenge of continuity where students are more likely to continue their sustainability explorations beyond the classroom.

The case study demonstrates that a study abroad course to a region of the world with strong sustainability performances, such as Scandinavia, can effectively address the challenges of teaching sustainability. While many of the ideas can also be applied to on-campus sustainability courses to address the challenges of relevancy and reflexivity, the challenge of continuity is uniquely addressed by a study abroad course like the Scandinavia program. Through the shared experiences of traveling abroad together exploring sustainability from many perspectives and where the formal and informal lines of the classroom are blurred, the students’ (and my) interest is stoked to heightened level and the shared experience of traveling abroad together fosters the formation of a community of co-learners that will continue their sustainability explorations that extends beyond the course. This alone will not “fix” business schools, but it represents a step in the right direction toward sustainable sustainability learning.

ENDNOTES

1. This business school also has an Executive MBA program with approximately 100 students. The Executive MBA program is run largely independently and is not considered further within this article.
2. Upon a cursory comparison to the study abroad offerings at comparable business schools, 3 out of 8 programs represents a comparably high portion of study abroad offerings with a sustainability or CSR focus. The Scandinavia program is a descendent of the other 2 sustainability and CSR focused study abroad courses, both of which were launched in the earlier part of the decade and

have been successfully sustained. As Thompson & Purdy (2009) point out, innovative curriculum does not always sustain itself on technical merit alone. The success of these other courses can be largely attributed to the two well tenured and highly respected faculty members at this business school who built these two programs that laid the groundwork for the Scandinavia program.

3. The following information about the selection criteria is offered within an FAQ for applicants: “The essay is given the most weight and we look for essays that clearly answer the questions using specific examples and providing clarifying details. Evidence of research into the program, and a clear understanding of the program’s goals and structure are important. The resume needs to be up-to-date, easy to read, and be free from errors. It should clearly outline your professional background and skills. We want to admit a diverse and interesting group of students who will contribute to and benefit from an education abroad experience. We are interested in the experiences and qualifications that distinguish you from other applicants. We will review an online version of your transcript. This confirms that participants meet the minimum 3.0 minimum GPA. Students with high GPA’s are noted for extra consideration. All parts of the application are important. The essay is the largest piece, and each of the other materials are reviewed and add to the overall rating of the application.”
4. As Campbell (2007) discussed, companies are influenced to behave in “socially responsible ways” not due solely to internal forces residing within the companies, but also due to institutional forces such as public and private regulation or the presence of NGOs. Therefore the triple bottom line performance of the Scandinavian companies should not be considered as an industry achievement alone, but rather is the product of the interactions within and between Scandinavian companies and other forces. This presents an argument for taking a cross-sector approach to exploring sustainability and is a reason for visits to be made with industry, governments, NGOs, and academic institutions.
5. In 2008 approximately 140 students applied for the 50 positions available in both the Scandinavia program and its “sister program” which are the 2 international programs that satisfy the 2 credit business ethics requirement. The business ethics requirement typically taken near or the very end of the student’s program, and therefore approximately 90 students likely satisfied this requirement through the on-campus course rather than waiting another year to reapply. 4 business ethics courses were offered during the spring semester 2008 and 1 business ethics course was offered during the summer semester 2008 (which is the session that I taught). Each of these 5 courses had roughly the same amount of enrolled students and thus, on average, approximately 18 students who were not accepted for a study abroad program were enrolled in each of the 5 courses conducted on-campus.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- Support was provided in part by the University of Minnesota Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER), the Archibald Bush Leadership Fellowship, and PwC Denmark. Thank you.
- I would like to thank Maribel Blasco for her constructive input, the participants in the 2010 Academy of Management “*Sustainability and the Consequences of Actions*” session where an earlier version of this article was presented, Norman Bowie for his guidance in the development of this study abroad course, and everyone with International Programs at the University of Minnesota Carlson School of Management. Most of all, I would like to offer my most sincere thank you to my former MBA students at the University of Minnesota Carlson School of Management.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. (2006, March 27). The UK Slips Down the Global Business Environment Rankings. Press Release. *The Economist Intelligence Unit*. Retrieved from http://store.eiu.com/index.asp?layout=pr_story&press_id=1010001901&ref=pr_list (accessed June 1, 2006). Note: Special request for complete list was accommodated by The Economist.
- Atwater, J., Kannan, V., & Stephens, A. (2008). Cultivating systemic thinking in the next generation of business leaders. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7, (1), 9-25.
- Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream: Reflections on leadership and change*. New York: Perseus.
- Bennis, W., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, (5), 96-104.
- Blasco, M. (2009). Cultural pragmatists? Student perspectives on learning culture at a business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. 8, (2), 174-187.
- Bondeson, U. (2003). *Nordic moral climates: Value continuities and discontinuities in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Brundlant Commission (1987). *Our common future: Report by the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, J. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? *Academy of Management Review*. 32, (3), 946-967.
- Conference Board of Canada (2006, June 1). *The World and Canada, Trends Reshaping Our Future: Performance and Potential 2005–06*. Retrieved from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/pandp>. Note-Special request for complete list was accommodated by The Conference Board of Canada.
- Carroll, A. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct. *Business & Society*, 38, (3), 268-295.
- Castles, F. G. (1993). *Families of Nations: Patterns of Public Policy in Western Democracies*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Chia, R. & Holt, R. (2008). The nature of knowledge in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. 7, (4), 471-486.
- Commission of the European Communities (2001). *Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibilities*. Retrieved from www.eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0366en01.pdf on September 26, 2009.
- Conference Board of Canada (2006, June 1). *The World and Canada, Trends Reshaping Our Future: Performance and Potential 2005–06*. Retrieved from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/pandp>. Note-Special request for complete list was accommodated by The Conference Board of Canada.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How Corporate Social Responsibility is Defined: an Analysis of 37 Definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 15, (1), 1-13.

- Datar, Sk., Garvin, D., Cullen, P. (2010). *Rethinking the MBA- Business Education at a Crossroads*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- De Déa Roglio, K. & Light, G. (2009). Executive MBA programs: The development of the reflective executive. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. 8, (2), 156-173.
- The Economist (2009a, September 11). The MBA curriculum: Steering a new course (online article). Retrieved from www.economist.com/business-education/displayStory.cfm?story_id=14437515 on September 29, 2009.
- The Economist (2009b, September 24). The pedagogy of the privileged. 392, (8650), 72.
- Egan, M. L. & Bendick, M. (2008). Combining multicultural management and diversity into one course on cultural competence. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7, (3), 387–393.
- Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporations. *The California Management Review*. 36, (2), 90-100.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st Century business*. Oxford, UK: Capstone Publishing Limited.
- Environmental Performance Index (EPI) (2008). *Environmental Performance Index – Rankings & Scores*. Retrieved from www.sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/es/epi/papers/2008EPI_rankingsandscores_23Jan08.pdf on September 21, 2009.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esty, D. C., Levy, M., Srebotnjak, T., & de Sherbinin, A. (2005). 2005 Environmental Sustainability Index: Benchmarking National Environmental Stewardship. Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. Retrieved from <http://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/es/esi> on June 1, 2006.
- Giacalone, R. & Thompson, K. (2006). Business ethics and social responsibility education: Shifting the worldview. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, (3), 266-277.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, (1), 75-91.
- Gjølberg, M. (2009). Measuring the immeasurable?: Constructing an index of CSR practices and CSR performance in 20 countries. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. 25, 10-22.
- Gupta, V. & Hanges, P. (2004). Regional and Climate Clustering of Societal Cultures. In R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations. The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 178-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harvard Business Review (HBR) (2009, September 14). *How to fix business schools*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.harvardbusiness.org/how-to-fix-business-schools>.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival. 2nd Edition*. London: McGraw-Hill.

- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. Second edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., Gupta, V. (Eds.) (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. Inglehart-Welzel (2006, October 1). *Cultural Map of the World*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.com>.
- Konrad, A., Steurer, R., Langer, M. E. & Matinuzzi, A. (2006). Empirical Findings on Business-Society Relations in Europe. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 89-105.
- Marcus, A. & Fremeth, A. (2009). Green management matters regardless. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23, (3), 17-26.
- Margolis, J. & Walsh, J. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268-305.
- Morsing, M., Midttun, A. & Palmås, K. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in Scandinavia: A turn toward the business case? In S. May, G. Cheney & J. Roper (Eds.), *The debate over corporate social responsibility* (pp.87-104). Oxford University Press, UK: Oxford.
- Navarro, P. (2008). The MBA core curricula of top-ranked U.S. business schools: A study in failure? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7, (1), 108-123.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2006, May 15). "Ratification of the Convention on the OECD: OECD Member Countries". Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/document/58/0,2340,en_2649_201185_1889402_1_1_1_1,00.html.
- Porritt, J. (2004). Locating the Government's Bottom Line. In A. Henriques & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The Triple Bottom Line does it all add up?* (pp. 26-33). London, Sterling: Earthscan.
- Raelin, J. (2006). Does action learning promote collaborative leadership. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, (2), 152-168.
- Rubin, R. & Dierdorff, E. (2009). How relevant is the MBA? Assessing the alignment of required curricula and required managerial competencies. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8, (2), 208-224.
- Samuelson, J. (2006). The new rigor: Beyond the right answer. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, (3), 356-365.
- Sapir, A. (2005). "Globalization and the Reform of European Social Models". *Bruegel Policy Brief*. Issue 1, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.bruegel.org/Public> on April 21, 2006.
- Strand, R. (2007). Nordic Values and Sustainability. Conference paper presented at *The Society for Business Ethics Annual Conference*, August 2-5, 2007 in Philadelphia, USA.
- Thompson, T. & Purdy, J. (2009). When a good idea isn't enough: curricular innovation as a political process. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8, (2), 188-207.

United Nations Human Development Program (UNDP) (2005). *Human Development Report 2005*. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005> on April 1, 2006.

United Nations (UN) Human Development Index (2008). *Human Development Indices: A statistical update 2008*. Retrieved from www.hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDI_2008_EN_Complete.pdf on September 21, 2009.

White, A. (2006). "A Global Projection of Subjective Well-being: A Challenge to Positive Psychology?" Retrieved from <http://www.le.ac.uk/pc/aw57/world/sample.html> on October 15, 2006. Note: University of Leicester Press Release retrieved from <http://www2.le.ac.uk/ebulletin/news/press-releases/2000-2009/2006/07/nparticle.2006-07-28.2448323827> on October 15, 2006. *Pending publication in Psych-Talk (published by The British Psychological Society)*.

World Bank (WB) (2006, October 1). *World Bank Gross National Income per Capita 2005*. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GNIPC.pdf>.

World Bank (2009, September 21). *Gross national income per capita 2008*. Retrieved from www.siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GNIPC.pdf.

World Economic Forum (WEF) (2006, October 15). *World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Index 2006*. <http://www.weforum.org/en/initiatives/gcp/Global%20Competitiveness%20Report/index.htm>.

World Economic Forum (2009, September 21). *Global competitiveness report 2009-10*. Retrieved from www.weforum.org/en/initiatives/gcp/Global%20Competitiveness%20Report/index.htm.

Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy (YCELP) and Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), Columbia University, with the World Economic Forum, and Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission (2006, June 1). *Pilot 2006 Environmental Performance Index*. Retrieved from <http://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/es/epi>.

APPENDIX A

SCANDINAVIAN MACRO TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE

The following section represents the basis from which the claim that "Scandinavia has demonstrated the strongest and most balanced economic, environmental, and societal performances in the world" was made. This data was originally offered in a conference paper presented at the 2007 Society for Business Ethics annual conference (Strand, 2007). Some updated references were provided in the body of this article, where the findings in this appendix remain consistent.

The economic, environmental, and societal dimensions represent "the widely agreed-upon three dimensions of sustainable development" (Konrad et al., 2006: 90) and within this section the relative triple bottom line performances of six OECD country clusters are compared to identify a subset of countries that can serve as a good focus region for researching sustainable development. Consistent with the original presentation of this data in Strand (2007), the expression "Nordic" is used as throughout the tables in this appendix. "Nordic" and "Scandinavia" are often used synonymously (Bondeson, 2003: 3) where the expressions could be exchanged if one desired. (Note: No difference in findings would have resulted if only the traditional Scandinavian countries of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark had been used).

Before presenting the methodology, it is worth acknowledging that the notion of the "triple bottom line" has traditionally been applied at the company level. In keeping with the standard business terminology of the economic "bottom line" (i.e. profit), environmental and a societal conceptual "bottom

lines” for the company are pursued where the collection of the three make up the “triple bottom line” (Elkington, 1999). Within this appendix, the triple bottom line concept is applied at a much more macro level: country clusters. While this is not the norm, a more macro application of the triple bottom line like this is not unprecedented. Beginning in 1999, the government of the United Kingdom began bringing together performance indicators from the three dimensions of the triple bottom line within its “A Better Quality of Life” reports, and it has continued doing so since as part of its strategy for sustainable development (Porritt, 2004).

Section Methodology

All thirty OECD countries were clustered utilizing the foundational works of Esping-Andersen (1990), Castles (1993), Hofstede (1997; 2001), the GLOBE Study (Gupta & Hanges, 2004), Sapir (2005), and Inglehart & Welzel (2006). These works utilized a collection of geographical, historical, linguistic, religious, and cultural considerations to group countries into clusters. Appendix Table 1 represents the general consensus of these works which resulted in the country clusters of Nordic, Anglo-Saxon, Continental European, Mediterranean, and Confucian, and Not Classified.

**APPENDIX TABLE 1
COUNTRY CLUSTERS**

Nordic	Anglo Saxon	Continental	Mediterranean	Confucian	Not Classified
Denmark	Australia	Austria	Greece	Japan	Czech Republic
Finland	Canada	Belgium	Italy	South Korea	Hungary
Iceland	Ireland	France	Portugal		Mexico
Norway	New Zealand	Germany	Spain		Poland
Sweden	United Kingdom	Luxembourg			Slovakia
	United States	Netherlands			Turkey
		Switzerland			

Representatives from organizations including the OECD, the European Union and the United Nations were asked to identify what they considered the most well-respected macro performance measurements for the economy, environment, and society. The identified performance measurements are displayed in Appendix Table 2 followed by their descriptions and references.

**APPENDIX TABLE 2
MACRO PERFORMANCE INDICATORS BY COUNTRY**

Country	Cluster	Population (M)	Economic				Environment			Society		
			The Economist	Conf Board of Canada Economy	GNI/capita (PPP)	Global Competitiveness	Environmental Sustainability	Conf Board of Canada Environment	Environmental Performance	UN Human Development	Conf Board of Canada Society	Happiness
Denmark	Nordic	5.4	1	10	11	4	26	6	7	14	1	1
Finland	Nordic	5.2	2	10	20	2	1	3	3	13	6	6
Iceland	Nordic	0.3	7	8	14	5	11	13	2	6	4	4
Norway	Nordic	4.6	16	1	4	12	2	3	18	1	4	19
Sweden	Nordic	9.0	11	3	18	3	4	1	2	6	3	7
Australia	Anglo Saxon	20.1	12	15	22	19	13	17	20	3	16	26
Canada	Anglo Saxon	31.9	3	12	16	16	6	8	8	5	11	10
Ireland	Anglo Saxon	4.1	5	2	9	21	21	15	9	8	19	11
New Zealand	Anglo Saxon	4.1	3	42	23	13	7	1	19	12	18	18
United Kingdom	Anglo Saxon	59.7	7	14	13	10	66	16	5	15	17	41
United States	Anglo Saxon	293.6	8	3	3	6	45	20	28	10	21	23
Austria	Continental	8.1	17	13	12	17	9	2	6	17	10	3
Belgium	Continental	10.4	15	17	14	20	112	24	39	9	7	28
France	Continental	60.0	17	19	23	18	35	10	12	16	7	62
Germany	Continental	82.6	14	20	27	8	31	14	22	20	5	35
Luxembourg	Continental	0.5			1	22				4		12
Netherlands	Continental	16.3	5	8	15	9	40	8	27	12	2	15
Switzerland	Continental	7.4	9	3	6	1	7	3	16	7	7	2
Greece	Mediterranean	11.0	44	22	41	47	68	18	18	24	18	84
Italy	Mediterranean	57.8	38	24	29	42	69	23	21	18	15	50
Portugal	Mediterranean	10.5	29	21	50	34	37	13	11	27	20	92
Spain	Mediterranean	42.5	21	18	33	28	76	21	23	21	14	46
Japan	Confucian	127.6	28	16	19	7	30	12	14	11		90
South Korea	Confucian	48.2	25		46		122		42	28		102
Czech Republic	Not Classified	10.2	27		49	29				31		77
Hungary	Not Classified	10.1	33		56	41	54		33	35		107
Mexico	Not Classified	106.2	42	23	81	58	93	19	66	53	22	51
Poland	Not Classified	38.2	37		66	48	104		38	36		99
Slovakia	Not Classified	5.4	24		58		49		24	42		129
Turkey	Not Classified	71.3	51		88	59	92		49	94		133

General

- Country (OECD, 2006)
- Cluster (see previous discussion)
- Population (Esty et al., 2005)

Economic Indexes

- The Economist: The Economist Global Business Environment Rankings (Allen, 2006)
- Conference Board of Canada (2006)- *Economy*
- GNI/capita: World Bank Gross National Income per Capita (WB, 2006)
- Global Competitiveness: World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness (WEF, 2006)

Environment Indexes

- Environmental Sustainability Index (Esty et al., 2005)
- Conference Board of Canada (2006)- *Environment*
- Environmental Performance (YCELP & CIESIN & JRC, 2006)

Society Indexes

- The United Nations Human Development Index (UNDP, 2005)
- Conference Board of Canada (2006)- *Society*
- Happiness (White, 2006)

The OECD does not generate holistic “rolled up” macro performance measurements; however it does collect large amounts of data for a wide array of economic, environmental, and societal items. A representative of the OECD recommended using the holistic macro performance measurements generated by the Conference Board of Canada, which were generated from the OECD data. The Conference Board of Canada accommodated the author’s special request for a complete rankings list for the OECD countries as the Conference Board of Canada had publicly only published its rankings for only the top 12 countries.

These rankings were subsequently weighted by population and rolled up by country cluster, which resulted in Appendix Table 3. Countries not ranked for a particular indicator (represented with blanks in

Appendix Table 2) were not included within the cluster rollup for that particular indicator (and thus had no bearing on the calculation).

**APPENDIX TABLE 3
INDICATORS BY CLUSTER, POPULATION WEIGHTED AVERAGE**

Cluster	Economic				Environment			Society		
	The Economist	Conf Board of Canada Economy	GNI/capita (PPP)	Global Competitive-ness	Environmental Sustainability	Conf Board of Canada Environment	Environmental Performance	UN Human Development	Conf Board of Canada Society	Happiness
Nordic	7.8	5.7	14.1	4.8	7.8	3.0	6.4	8.3	3.4	7.7
Anglo Saxon	7.6	5.9	6.8	8.3	42.9	18.2	22.3	10.1	19.3	24.6
Continental	14.2	17.5	22.4	12.2	35.7	11.8	19.2	16.7	5.8	38.8
Mediterranean	31.8	21.5	33.3	36.9	68.6	21.0	20.6	20.4	15.4	55.3
Confucian	27.2	16.0	26.4	7.0	55.2	12.0	21.7	15.7		93.3
Not Classified	42.5	23.0	77.8	54.7	91.8	19.0	53.7	60.5	22.0	88.0

These population weighted rankings in Appendix Table 3 were then ranked in 1-6 order by each performance indicator, which resulted in Appendix Table 4.

**APPENDIX TABLE 4
INDICATORS BY CLUSTER, RANKED**

Cluster	Economic				Environment			Society		
	The Economist	Conf Board of Canada Economy	GNI/capita (PPP)	Global Competitive-ness	Environmental Sustainability	Conf Board of Canada Environment	Environmental Performance	UN Human Development	Conf Board of Canada Society	Happiness
Nordic	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Anglo Saxon	1	2	1	3	3	4	5	2	4	2
Continental	3	4	3	4	2	2	2	4	2	3
Mediterranean	5	5	5	5	5	6	3	5	3	4
Confucian	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	3		6
Not Classified	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	5

The indicators for each cluster were then averaged together by dimension, which resulted in Appendix Table 5.

**APPENDIX TABLE 5
DIMENSIONS BY CLUSTER, AVERAGED**

Cluster	Economic	Environment	Society
Nordic	1.5	1.0	1.0
Anglo Saxon	1.8	4.0	2.7
Continental	3.5	2.0	3.0
Mediterranean	5.0	4.7	4.0
Confucian	3.3	3.7	4.5
Not Classified	6.0	5.7	5.3

Section Results

The results from Appendix Table 5 were ranked in 1-6 order by each triple bottom line dimension which generated the final table- Appendix Table 6.

**APPENDIX TABLE 6
DIMENSIONS BY CLUSTER, RANKED**

Cluster	Economic	Environment	Society
Nordic	1	1	1
Anglo Saxon	2	4	2
Continental	4	2	3
Mediterranean	5	5	4
Confucian	3	3	5
Not Classified	6	6	6

Section Conclusion

The Nordic cluster, i.e. Scandinavia, ranked better than all other OECD country cluster in each triple bottom line dimension. This serves as evidence that Scandinavia has demonstrated the strongest and most balanced economic, environmental, and societal performances in the world, and thus making Scandinavia an excellent candidate region in which to explore sustainability through a study abroad program.