The Role of Entrepreneurship and Spirituality in the Provision of Elective Social Enterprise Courses to Business Students

Cherry W.M Cheung

School of Business

London South Bank University

London

United Kingdom

Email: cheungc5@lsbu.ac.uk

+44 20 7814 7815; +44 75 9041 8687

Sujun Fieldhouse

Economic Development Department

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Southend-on-Sea

United Kingdom

Email:

Tel: +44 1702 212 455

Caleb C Y Kwong

Essex Business School

University of Essex

Southend-on-Sea

United Kingdom

Email: ckwong@essex.ac.uk

Tel: +44 1702 328 394

ABSTRACT

Business students are increasingly being scrutinized for their social and moral responsibilities. With the growing emphasis on social entrepreneurship by policy makers, academics and social economy practitioners over the past few decades, an increasing number of universities are now delivering social enterprise courses and programs intended to develop students' social awareness and aspirations, as well as preparing them to work in or start their own social ventures. This study investigates the extent to which the spirituality of a university may impact on its decision to offer social enterprise as part of their business curriculum. Using data from 494 business schools in the US that are accredited by AACSB, we found that, alongside structural differences, universities with higher entrepreneurship orientation, as well as the presences of spirituality markers, such as sustainability, diversity and religious orientations, are more likely to be offering social enterprise courses for business students, after controlling for other factors. Our findings suggest that spirituality has a role to play in supporting social education which has the potential in developing socially responsible citizens who can create social changes.

INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the increasingly widely held view that both altruistic community and self-directed personal interests are learned behaviors, universities are increasingly being seen as morally obliged to produce civically aware and socially responsible citizens who intend to 'make a difference' (Miller, Wesley & Williams, 2012; Ferraro, Pfeffer & Sutton, 2005). Universities are now using different approaches to tackle this, including the use of social entrepreneurship education in their undergraduate and graduate programs. (Paton, 2008; Mirabella et al., 2007). These social entrepreneurship courses tend to emphasize both social and commercial viabilities (Tracey & Philip, 2007). This suggests that, whilst social enterprise remain rooted in the creation of social change and societal transformation, they also emphasize heavily the use of an entrepreneurial approach towards idea formulation and opportunity recognition, as well as the use of commercial mechanisms in handling marketing, products and services development, to ensure cost containment and surplus generation. This in turn increases their financial sustainability and their ability to upscale, and thereby increases their long term impact (Lawrence, Phillips & Tracy, 2012). The concept has attracted keen interest from policy makers, practitioners and academics, who see this as a cost-effective solution to social exclusion and a means to develop sustainable community (Howorth, Smith & Parkinson, 2012). The "social good" that is advocated by social enterprise and the perceived benefits that can be resulted from the activities, coupled with the neutral stance or the perceived neutral stance undertaken by this concept, make social entrepreneurship and social enterprise much more palatable in a pluralistic society nowadays than, for instance, the religious concept of "common good" in Christianity and its spiritual enterprises.

Business schools and colleges are facing additional pressures stemming from the wave of corporate scandals that have emerged in recent years, with fingers being pointed

squarely at them for being morally responsible for their production of self-serving executives and managers whose unethical and fraudulent behaviors contributed to the downfall of many once great organizations (Ghoshal, 2005; Rasche et al., 2013). Finding an effective way to bridge the gap between the free market orientation of their curriculum and the negativities of the resulting individualistic, profit prioritizing mentality associated with the operation of free markets, it has become crucial for them not only in maintaining their own creditability, but also in halting the erosion of public trust in their graduates. To professors and their students, the concept of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise is particularly appealing, in comparison with the more traditional management courses regarding charities, voluntary and non-profit organizations in the social economy, whilst social enterprise course maintains its root in "social good" and "social interest", the entrepreneurship emphasis of such courses aligns better with the commercial orientation of these colleges and schools as well as the learning expectations from their students (Kwong, Thompson & Cheung, 2012) whom are likely to opt for entering into the profit-making sectors after their graduation. Therefore, it is unsurprising that such courses are increasingly being offered to business students by business schools, especially those religiously affiliated and/or have strong spirituality focus. With their specialisations in management as well as entrepreneurship, business schools and colleges often take a lead in the designing and running of such courses, although it is important to note that the delivery of these courses can be part of a university-wide initiative and henceforth a collaborative effort between the business schools as well as other departments, most notably social work, government and engineering.

While the commercial appeal of social entrepreneurship education to prestigious business schools is clear, for universities with strong emphasis on spirituality, such as universities with religion affiliation, there is a question of whether the commercial and social objectives of social entrepreneurship are compatible or contradictory. As there are many

ways to deliver social education, would a university with strong emphasis on spirituality focus on approaches such as business ethics, corporate social responsibility non-profit and voluntary sector management or social enterprise? Our study makes a step towards improving our understanding of this question, by exploring the ways in which markers of spirituality, including diversity, sustainability and religion orientations, may impact on business schools' decisions to offer such courses, so that future studies may look at how such provision may contribute to spirituality, entrepreneurship and social change.

We structure the remainder of the article as follows. In the first section, we provide an overview of the context faced by universities and business schools and colleges in the development of socially responsible citizens. We then summarize existing literature regarding how the value orientations and structures of a university may affect the offering of social enterprise courses to business students, with particular focus on the value orientations examined in this study. Sample, measures, as well as our approach to data analysis is discussed in the methodology section. Results from the data analysis are presented in the results section, followed by discussion and conclusion.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Spirituality and university education

As a general definition, spirituality can be broadly defined as one's inner, sacred experience that invites increased consciousness and responsibility for oneself and others, in order to attain the fullness of humanity (Hodge, 2005b; Kourie, 2009). It is an umbrella term covering a wide range of activities principles, virtues, ethics, values, emotions, wisdom, and intuitions (McCormick, 1994; Porth, McCall, & Bausch, 1999; Kourie, 2009). The notion of spirituality can exist both within a traditional religious structure, but also, other diverse belief systems ranging from "creative to the distinctive bizarre" (Kourie, 1999, p. 151), that touches

the core of human existence (Waaijman, 2002; Canda & Furman, 1999). Personal change is a key emphasis. Through becoming spiritual, people seek to transcend towards an ultimate value one perceives as desirable (Schneiders, 1986). Such ultimate value can be a divine or supernatural power, nature, community including others in the environment, and, humanity in general (Prior & Quinn, 2012). The focus of spirituality is a personal inner growth, well-captured by Mitroff & Denton (1999, p. 83) as "the basic feeling of being connected with one's complete self, others and the entire universe. If a single word captures the meaning... that word is interconnectedness".

Therefore, a university with high spirituality would aim to disseminate these virtues and values to students (Kuh & Gonyea, 2006). Organizations can disseminate their spirituality emphasis to those within it, expressed through policies and behaviors (Wagner-Marsh & Conley, 1999; Kriger & Hanson 1999; Marcic, 1997; Dehler & Welsh, 1994). Psychologists, sociologists and educationalists have long believed that there is a strong link between university environment and the way their students behave (Pascarella, 1985; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Kuh, 2000). In turn, such spiritual emphasis creates a personal inner experience for those within the organization, and in turn, affect their outer behaviors, principle and practices (McCormick, 1994; Porth, McCall, & Bausch, 1999). Studies have found that university culture can be influenced by faculty members, peers, activities, but also, wider artifacts and beliefs, and these experiences in turn shape students' character development (Kuh, 2000; Kuh & Umbach, 2004). It is also noted that spirituality cannot be captured by one standardized definition (Zsolnai, 2014). Neither can different aspects of spirituality be entirely separated. Pope Benedict XVI, for instance, stated that it is impossible to isolate only one of the many aspects of spirituality, because everything is interconnected. Whilst it is certainly hard to measure the level of spirituality of a university, commitment of a university on spirituality can be seen by its vision, mission, culture, courses offered (O'Neill,

2005; Cheung et al., 2018) as well as activities supported and undertaken. We shall return to the specific markers of spirituality later.

The emphasis of spirituality in university education is certainly not a new topic. John Henry Newman, in his seminal work '*The Idea of a University*' (1852), argues that the soul of a university lies within its ability to offer a holistic education that responds to the deepest human needs of the students, namely spirited curiosity, or the desire to understand the world and to uphold its supposed order (Bollinger, 2003). Such a view perceives universities as places to both stimulate free thinking, or as Newman (1852/2014, p. 130) states, "'to think and to reason and to compare and to discriminate and to analyze", while also developing elevated ideals and conduct. In doing so, it enables students to develop good judgement and play an integral part in upholding social virtues and order. Newman's "idealistic" and "humanist" view has since become what many perceive as the moral code or principles for modern universities (Numetz & Cameron, 2006). Developing socially responsible citizens who 'intend to make a difference' is a key part of the 'civilizing' discourse (Miller, Wesley & Williams, 2012; Ferraro, Pfeffer & Sutton, 2005). Most notably, John Dewey identifies, in *The Public and Its Problems* (1927), the instrumental role of educational establishments in the creation of great communities. In *My Pedagogic Creed* (1897, p. 8), he notes that "education is a regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and that the adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction". Therefore, the emphasis of education should not only be on the development of individual skills and capability for oneself, but also to engage citizens in association with one another to maintain societal cohesion and to promote humane conditions. He argues that in order to do so effectively, it is important that the students are given the opportunity to engage in issues pertinent to the society, which would give them real, guided experiences which foster their capacity to contribute to society. The tragic

weakness of many educational establishments, Dewey (1897, para 28) argued, is the "endeavors to prepare future members of the social order in a medium in which the conditions of the social spirit are eminently wanting". Dewey's thinking has had a profound impact on subsequent writings on the topic. Giroux and Penna (1979), for instance, argue that universities have a clear socio-political function that cannot exist independently of the society within which they operate (Giroux & Penna, 1979). Nemetz and Cameron (2006, p. 40) spoke of the "moulding of good citizens, teaching of proper deportment, development of community cohesion and perpetuation of political culture".

Whilst Newman's principles on what should be considered as the soul of the university as well as Dewey's notion of an effective, socially responsible citizen remain impossible to disagree with, a more socially despondent student community is beginning to emerge (Brint, 2002; Bok, 2003; Harkavy, 2006). Some have noted a reduced emphasis on aspiration, with students being driven by pragmatism and keen to settle into more modest, but nevertheless, demanding roles within societies (Trow, 2007). Astin (1998), for instance, found that the proportion of freshman interested in developing, through higher education, a 'meaningful philosophy of life', dropped by 45% between 1967 and 1987, in sharp contrast with the 40% increase in those motivated to 'become well-off financially'. Kuh (1999) reported that students who went through university at the time of mass education in the 1990s had lost, compared to their counterparts from the 1960s, a sense of awareness and appreciation of different cultural and philosophical standpoints, as well as their own personal development. Kerr (1991) bemoans the loss of community, not only in the sense of a likeminded scholarly community sharing the same passion of pursuing knowledge and wisdom, but also in caring for one another, both within the institution and beyond.

Spirituality and the development of socially responsible citizens within business schools

Such despondence is particularly apparent in the contexts of business schools and colleges, where the commodification process has gone much further than in many other departments. McCabe and Trevino (1995) found that business school students placed least importance on equality and justice, and on developing a philosophy of life. Many have attributed these changes to a business education system that is framed, through philosophical strategies and fundamental standpoints, in a way where virtually everything plays a secondary role to profitability and shareholder value (Wu, Huang, Kuo & Wu, 2010). Within such a system, business students are projecting an organizational- and self-centered worldview whereby the maximization of profit and shareholder interests will result in higher individual rewards through salary, bonus and other extrinsic motivation mechanisms (Giacalone & Thompson, 2006). A study by the Aspen Institute (2001) found that, during the two years of an MBA program, students placed an increasing importance on enhancing shareholders' benefits whilst at the same time become less interested in other people, including employees and even consumers. Meanwhile, the negative social externalities associated with such an approach have been disregarded largely because there is perceptibly neither extrinsic nor intrinsic motivation to do so (Carrithers & Peterson, 2006). Nevertheless, having a socially responsible outlook is important, not least because meta-analytic studies such as Kasser and Ahuvia (2002) demonstrate that lower personal well-being and poorer inter-personal relationships are closely associated with materialistic values.

Many view the problem to be more than mere social despondence, but the resulting damage of a market-driven, dehumanized curriculum on the conduct of business students. With the morally reprehensible actions and even criminal behaviors of business graduates being unendingly unraveled by newspaper articles and TV documentaries, many, such as Ghoshal (2006), are holding business schools and colleges to be at least morally responsible for the significant and negative influences that they exert on the practice of management.

Academic studies further support such a viewpoint. Williams et al. (2000) found that the business school experience of a management team is a mediating factor in occupational safety and health regulations violation. McCabe and Trevino (1995) found that business students are nearly twice as likely as the average student to admit to cheating behavior. Thus whilst change in extrinsic motivation can only come through exogenous changes in corporate governance and payout structure (Mahoney & Thorn, 2006; Perel, 2003), the higher cheating behavior amongst business students points to failure in the process of socialization to create a business student population that is more socially engaged, caring, responsible, motivated by the betterment of society and with a human-centered worldview (Frank et al., 1993). Finding an effective remedy to tackle the despondence and negative intention is no longer an ideological battle between Newman's ideals and economic rationality, but a practical challenge if trust in business graduates as well as the higher educational sector is to be maintained. In order to do so, business graduates will need to demonstrate their humanity, and show that they are making business decisions not based merely on profit and shareholder interests, but also on the betterment of people and their communities.

Theory regarding the stages of social identities points to the important role that university can play in the socialization and reproduction of individuals, potentially turning despondence into active engagement (Hillygus, 2005; Egerton, 2002). The period of higher education, both by educational opportunity and by age, is seen as one of important formative years for individuals to develop values and norms, and thereby presents great opportunities for universities to play a critical role in the "lifelong, all-encompassing development of all the different types of personnel" (Harkavy, 2003, p.16). The mostly adolescent student populations are considered to be relatively unsocialized and thereby, through instruction and different means of dissemination, social values and ideology can then be internalized through both active and passive manifestations, and in doing so the values and norms held by these

individuals can be defined and redefined (Weldman, 1989). The long term intention is to embed and maintain these values and norms, and to enable individuals to be at ease with them (Tierney, 1997). Providing them with a strong foundation in dealing with resistance away from the relatively sterile environment of university, when conflictive viewpoints are often presented, is seen as crucial (Adams et al., 1997). When graduates of these systems failed to reproduce in their future workplaces what they are supposed to have learned in terms of the understanding of social and moral responsibility and act as persons who possess such understanding and regard to it, the organizations and the society may find themselves facing highly undesirable outcomes caused by the unethical or even criminal behaviours such as commercial fraud committed by the graduates (Harkavy, 2006; Ghoshal, 2005; Rasche et al., 2013).

Spirituality and social enterprise courses for business students

Much has been discussed in the existing literature (e.g. Christensen et al., 2007; Setó-Pamies et al., 2011; Wright & Bennett, 2011; Rutherford et al., 2012; Setó-Pamies & Papaoikonomou, 2016;) on the need and benefits for universities to provide business ethics, corporate social responsibilities and/or sustainability studies as options or required core courses within the curriculum of the programmes offered by the business schools, as universities are widely expected to be responsible for the "learned" self-interested behaviours of their unscrupulous graduates who engaged with unethical or criminal behaviours (Ferraro, Pfeffer & Sutton, 2005). However, there are few studies on such contribution from social enterprise courses. This study argues that a social enterprise course within the academic curriculum of the business school offers an edge over conventional business ethics, corporate social responsibilities and sustainability courses in cultivating socially responsible citizens. It enables the cultivation of social values that are embedded in the social enterprise course as

well as the commercial acumen trainings that the course provides. The perceived inclusive nature of "social good" and the commercial appeals of the social enterprise course allows it to potentially encompass all learners from the business school regardless of the sectors that they will involve in (Kwong et al., 2012). Being religion-neutral also enables it to attract a much wider target audience in today's pluralistic society (Kwong et al., 2012; Cheung et al., 2018) than perhaps through offering moral theology or morality studies course that may have a much smaller uptake. Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) found that 70% of business schools consider social enterprise courses as an effective way to enable their students to create a positive social impact while nearly 60% consider it both as an effective way to identify social problems as well as to develop collaborative relationships with others. Kwong et al., (2012) found that social enterprise courses adopting a more community-orientated pedagogy increase the understanding of social needs within the local areas. Howorth, Smith and Parkinson (2012) and Smith and Woodworth (2012) both point to the role of social enterprise education in increasing self-confidence and self-efficacy, encouraging them to 'have a go' and make a difference. To business schools and colleges, social enterprise courses offer an additional advantage with the more market driven concept of social entrepreneurship considered to be more aligned with the business curriculum than traditional courses in the management of non-profit charities and voluntary organizations (Kwong et al., 2012). Business students are likely to be more receptive to the content of these courses as they can resonate with the for-profit principles and managerial practices associated with social entrepreneurship, making it much easier for them to recognize that their business education and the collective purpose of increasing social and community wellbeing are not necessarily contradictory but complementary.

Nevertheless, as empirical studies have repeatedly found, provision of social enterprise courses varies considerably across institutions. In the modern context whereby

specialization of subjects has gone so much further than in Newman's time, with much higher and more varied student demands resulting from the massification of the higher education sector (Zemsky, 1998), universities need to prudently and strategically prioritize resources within their finite budgets. There is also the question of emphasis, with different institutions choosing methods to develop socially responsible citizens that align most with their structural configuration and values and strategic orientations. As universities pursuing different missions and objectives in order to maximize their competitive advantage, it is likely that differentiation at the course level will occur in order for them to capture different catchment groups within the highly diverse market (Leslie & Brinkman, 1987). All of this means that universities may choose to offer a different extent and style of pedagogy - whether these provisions are core, elective or extracurricular, whether to place emphasis on undergraduates or postgraduates, and whether social enterprise courses would be provided alongside, or, instead of, other courses that intend to develop socially responsible citizens, such as business ethics and corporate social responsibility, sustainability and the management of charities, non-profit and the voluntary sector.

In this study, we propose that spirituality plays a crucial role in universities deciding whether or not to provide social enterprise courses to business students. For instance, Catholic universities in the USA are found to be a key provider of such courses (Cheung et al., 2018). This finding is consistent with the findings in the prior studies where researchers found that business schools that are religiously affiliated are more likely to require business ethics course as part of the core curriculum within the MBA programmes (Evans et al. 2006) and undergraduate business studies (Rutherford et al. 2012). As Evans et al. (2006, p. 286) pointed out, these business schools are more likely to "pay attention to matters relevant to their traditions of theological and ethical reflection" and thus are more likely to invest in ethical character-building development of their students by offering courses such as social

entrepreneurship that help cultivating socially responsible persons as well as training their commercial acumens to prepare the students for their future careers.

However, as having a precise measurement of spirituality is not possible, this study will apply three different markers of spirituality, namely, sustainability, diversity and religious orientations. In the follow section, we explain how these markers are connected with the notion of spirituality, and hypothesize whether they are likely to affect the provision of social enterprise courses.

Sustainability Orientation

The notion of sustainability is often embedded in spirituality (Dhiman, 2016; Carroll, 2012; 2016). Many recent Popes, including both Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis, for instance, recognized the inseparability and connectivity of spirituality with the environment, because humanity is part of the nature and the greater whole (Pope Francis, 2015). Spirituality focuses on the ethics of compassion, the development of deep sensitivity to the vulnerability of life (Bouckaert, 2014). Such compassion would ensure the prioritization of the common good of the communities before private interests. Without such compassion, a person may develop blindness about the destructive effects associated with economic and business opportunities and can be oblivious to their social and ecological consequences (Bouckaert & Ghesquiere, 2010). Ever since the industrial revolution, human's approach towards nature had always been about conquest, colonize and control (Zsolnai, 2014). This, according to some scholars, stems from the self-centeredness of human nature (Dhiman, 2016). Caring for the nature and for future generations is a spiritual commitment because it comes from an inner awareness, rather than from recognizing existing rights within the existing framework (Bouckaert, 2014). A spirituality-led transformation, according to some, can be long-lasting, if the sustainability emphasis is profoundly embedded within one's spirituality (Dhiman, 2016). Rather than promoting a quick fix, spirituality-informed sustainability gets to the root of the problem

(Dhiman, 2016). It entails asking difficult life questions, choosing between the economic maximization of individual's utilities, or, to maximize the collective benefits and common good to all those within the community, current generation and beyond. This points to the importance of developing self-contained communities whose ecological footprint does not exceed the carrying capacity of its environment (Wackernagel & Rees, 1998). Alongside the obvious environmental focus, a considerable emphasis has been placed on the economic and social processes in which socially sustainable communities that are equitable, diverse, cohesive and provide a good quality of life can be created and maintained (Anand & Sen, 2000). Social entrepreneurship can be seen as an integral part of that discourse with its strong emphasis on maintaining social justice and cohesion by enabling those involved to make a difference to the social and economic well-being of those within their communities (Nicholls, 2010).

Developing what Dewey considered as the socially responsible citizen whose behaviors are caring and sustainable plays an important part in ensuring that a human-centered worldview, as opposed to a self-centered, profit-maximizing perspective of societal development, can be developed and maintained (Giacalone & Thompson, 2006). Therefore universities with a strong sustainability orientation include having infrastructures to support social and cultural life to social amenities, as well as systems for citizen engagement and opportunities for people and places to evolve, including the offering of courses on sustainability and social entrepreneurship. Therefore,

Hypothesis 1: Universities with a strong social and sustainable orientation are more likely to offer social enterprise courses to their business students than those without

Diversity Orientation

The individual notions of spirituality and diversity are distinctive, and yet "intricately woven together that they cannot be separated" (Paredes-Collins, 2013, p. 125). As mentioned,

spirituality involves the development of compassion and deep sensitivity to the vulnerability of life and to people (Bouckaert, 2014). Although, historically, religious institutions were slow in addressing racial tensions and struggles, such as slavery or the Holocaust (Emerson & Smith, 2000), diversity is increasingly becoming an important emphasis of spirituality (Tisdell, 2007). Diversity is increasingly being promoted at institutions with strong spiritual concerns (Dalton, 2007). As spirituality is often linked to an attitude of being open to the unexpected (Bouckaert, 2014), inclusive institutions would emphasize bringing people, multiple perspectives and identities into the same fold. Rather than seeing spirituality as a sectarian concern, where one branch of spirituality or denomination may dominate, spiritual universities emphasize the spiritual ties that are shared by different forms of spirituality (Dalton, 2007).

Studies have suggested the benefits of inclusivity, as it leads to a much more open way of doing things, and not necessarily confined by previously held viewpoints (Bouckaert, 2014). For instance, white evangelical Christians who were exposed to diversity were more likely to hold a more enlightened view about racial relations, then those who were not (Emerson & Smith, 2000). Thus, for a spiritual university, the interaction of spirituality and diversity may present a greater opportunity to increase students' openness, and become more aligned with their spiritual values (Bouckaert, 2014). This approach to spirituality recognizes the authenticity of different forms of spirituality and religious approaches that are gearing towards the development of a moral orientation that would enable students to engage in spiritual reflection and their inner quest for meaning, identity and purpose (Dalton, 2007). All these led to Paredes-Collins's (2013) assertation that universities must prioritize diversity as a compelling interest, if they are to realise the full scope of their spiritual mission.

Whilst an increasing volume of literature in the wider society points to a corrosive effect that ethnicity diversity can have on social cohesion, trust and civic engagement

(McGhee, 2003; Costa & Kahn, 2003), studies suggest that those who live in integrated and diverse communities (Uslaner, 2010) and regularly interact with their neighbors (Stolle et al., 2008) are less susceptible to the negative effects of community heterogeneity. The university as a bounded socialization environment, where repeated and deep interaction between members of the local student communities occurs, can potentially enable students to develop 'civic' social capital that promotes tolerance of diversity and equality. However, without intervention and support, interaction may only lead to increased tensions (Putman, 2000). Therefore, universities with a more diverse student population will need to be particularly proactive in ensuring that a harmonious environment between different nationality groups can be maintained. As a result, courses that emphasize the importance of social and community cohesion, including those on social entrepreneurship, are crucial in their socialization and in enabling a liberal, community orientated moral viewpoint to be accepted or at least tolerated. This allows us to come up with the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Universities with strong diversity orientation are more likely to offer social enterprise courses to their business students than those without

Religious Orientation

Although the relationships between religion and spirituality are complex and multidimensional (Hill & Pargament, 2003; Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005), they share a complementary relationship (Vogel et al., 2013). It is found that those living in the US tend to be highly committed to their religious convictions, especially those in the Judeo-Christian religions (Gallup Polls, 2009). The Judeo-Christian teaching of "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Leviticus 19:18) is often seen as a passage that summarizes their scriptures' position in relation to the mandates of their followers in welfare and community work. Through sanctification, the need for social action in the wider community is well-embedded among the followers of these religions (Brammer et al., 2006). Instilling a sense of

social responsibility through education is seen as an important mandate of educational establishments with such a religious affiliation (Jackson, 2004). In Newman's (1852) context, his idea of fulfilling the 'life of the mind' is through religious means, by upholding the moral and social values of Christianity and, in doing so, becoming an important pillar of society.

The emphasis is on the systematic and organized way to mobilize Christians to exert their social and community influences by becoming more aware of the issues and challenges faced by humanity, and to come up with appropriate action. In addition, such an education also aims to distil Christian values to those who came through the ranks, whether they are their followers or not, in order to counter the influences of the increasingly individualistic and materialistic ethos in the modern society (Wright, 2003). Empirical studies have found that religious affiliation is positively correlated with the provision of courses on social and ethical issues (Evans et al., 2006; Rutherford et al., 2012). Therefore, it can be expected that the same relation would occur between religious affiliation and social enterprise course provision:

Hypothesis 3: Universities with a strong religious affiliation (Judeo-Christian) are more likely to offer social enterprise courses to their business students than those without

Entrepreneurship and the provision of social enterprise courses

The receptiveness of social enterprise courses as a viable delivery mechanism over other pedagogies is largely dependent on how a university perceives and understands the merit and essence of entrepreneurship. Whilst the dual roles of social entrepreneurship in delivering social and economic goods are increasingly being recognized (Marti & Marti, 2006), sadly, the layman's perspective of entrepreneurship continues to be dominated by the distorted image of an egotistical, opportunistic, 'larger-than-life' personality who builds up a massive, wealth-creating but short-term orientated empire on the very back of limited financial and

technical supports (Chell, 2007; Kirkby, 1971). Such views tend to reinforce the view that entrepreneurship and the delivery of social goals are contradictory, rather than complementary as the literature increasingly demonstrates (Kruger & Brazeal, 1994).

Universities that have developed a vibrant entrepreneurial culture are likely to have a better understanding of what entrepreneurship can offer, and identify synergy between entrepreneurship and their social and moral missions. The core element of an entrepreneurial culture consists of a variety of entrepreneurial activities, including the support offered to potential and budding entrepreneurs in the gestation period, from technical workshops right through to incubation and seed accelerators, as well as other entrepreneurship-related curricular and extracurricular activities intended not only to provide technical support but also to develop aspiration, awareness, and positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship. The presence of these core entrepreneurial elements within a university can help increase the overall understanding of the advantages of the entrepreneurial process of opportunity recognition (Kirzner, 1985; Baron, 2006) as well as the gradual professionalization and competence development (Gibb, 1993; Bird, 1995). This would in turn enable universities to develop a general appreciation of entrepreneurship, as well as utilizing an entrepreneurial approach to problem solving in different aspects of their operation, right from organizational planning to curriculum design, as well as how their infrastructure can best offer support in the development of entrepreneurial individuals. It is also important to note that an entrepreneurial culture is self-reinforcing, as the more entrepreneurial their graduates become in all walks of life, and return to the home university in offering financial, moral and hands-on entrepreneurial support, the more convinced the university will be in continuing the entrepreneurial initiatives.

Hypothesis 4: Universities with strong entrepreneurial orientation are more likely to offer social enterprise courses to their business students than those without.

METHOD

Sample

We began with the 2014-2015 database of AACSB accredited schools and selected only those that were US based due to the relatively larger sample size found in the generally the same economic and political environment. We then visited the online undergraduate and postgraduate catalogues of each university to search for social entrepreneurship courses and went through the course descriptions. We then collated this with information obtained from various sources. 503 were initially identified, but a final sample size of 494 was obtained after excluding some samples with missing variables. When missing values occurred, the researchers visited the website of the university to manually search and input the missing information.

Measures

Dependent Variable

We included courses emphasizing the development and management of entrepreneurial social ventures, but disregarded courses with accounting, finance or marketing focuses. Social orientated courses without an entrepreneurship focus (typically non-profit management) were excluded. We also excluded courses from other departments that were typically not made available to business students, but kept university-wide courses that business students could enrol onto. We denoted 1 to those offering social enterprise courses to business school students, and 0 as otherwise.

Independent and control variables

Entrepreneurial orientation was measured by the number of students, graduates and alumni who identified themselves as entrepreneurs on LinkedIn, adjusted for the number of students.

As a self-reported variable, this measure reflected the prevalence of entrepreneurship by encompassing all kinds of entrepreneurial and intrepreneurial behaviors ranging from founding a business empire to the mere indication of entrepreneurial competence. Thus, whilst the measure may not be the most accurate reflection of the actual number of business start-ups, it indicates the receptivity of entrepreneurship as a concept amongst peers. For spirituality, we adopted three markers, or proxies. Sustainability orientation was derived from the sustainability index of the Princeton Review, which was based on universities' self-reported emphasis on sustainability in terms of governance, curriculum, research, campus engagement and infrastructures (Princeton Review, 2014). Due to the relative unimportance of the actual number but their relative emphasis compared to other institutions, we divided, for both variables, respondents into those listed in the top third (coded as 2), middle third (coded as 1) and the rest (coded as 0). Religious orientation was measured by the university's religious affiliation (coded as 1, otherwise 0). Diversity orientation is measured by the number of countries represented on campus.

Control variables in this study were related to the institutional structure of the organizations. We used log of endowment as a proxy to size and financial wealth. It would be expected that the variable was positively correlated with the decision as to whether a social enterprise course was offered to business students, as it reflected, in an external context where public funding was in continuous decline (Kelderman, 2011); or what Cyert and March (1963) would consider the 'slack' resources that a university could discretionarily place into a course that many would not consider as the core component of their business programs, but which is nevertheless beneficial to their students (Rutherford et al., 2012). We also included two dummy variables. First, we measured university type by dividing the sample into private and public universities (coded 1 as private, otherwise 0). Second, we measured elite affiliation by recording whether a university is affiliated with the Association of American

Universities (**AAU**) (coded as 1, otherwise 0). Both of these measures are measurements of different forms of prestige. In the context of private universities where university fees are high, there is an expectation that a well-rounded educational process, beyond the specialization of subjects, is provided to students in keeping with Newman's ideal (Trow, 2007). Affiliation with the AAU is considered to be an indication of the selectivity of students. As these institutions would be expecting their students to excel in the world of work and, at some point in their life, be propelled into important leadership roles in all segments of society, developing a socially responsible mindset is particularly crucial (Pfeffer, 1977). Therefore we expected both variables to positively correlate with social enterprise course offerings to business students.

Data analysis process

Given that our dependent variable – whether a social enterprise course is being offered to business students as part of the curriculum – is dichotomous, binary logistic regressions were used to test our hypotheses. Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, and correlations of variables used for the analysis are provided in Table 1. An issue was noted between private and religious affiliations, which are highly correlated, and coupled with the fact that all universities with religious affiliations are private, we avoided introducing both variables into the same regression model. In total, seven models were presented in this study. Model 1 introduced all control variables into the regression analysis. Models 2, 3, 4 and 5 introduced each of the independent variables, namely, entrepreneurship, sustainability, diversity and religious orientations. Model 6 introduced the first three independent variables collectively alongside the control variables, whilst Model 7 introduced all four independent variables but minus the variable on university type.

[TABLE 1 – INSERT HERE]

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the regression results. Overall, all of the models appeared to be a good fit for the data. The omnibus tests using chi-squared statistics were significant in all models, suggesting that there was a significant relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable. We also conducted the Hosmer and Lemeshow test which was found to be insignificant in all cases and thereby indicated that the models adequately fit the data (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1989). As interpreting the results of logistic regression is less straightforward than ordinary least-squares regression, we provided here not only the R^2, but also two measures of pseudo R^2. With the introduction of each single independent variable in Models 2, 3 and 4, both pseudo R^2 have, compared with Model 1, increased in each of the cases. Negelkerke R^2 has gone up from 0.267 in Model 1 to between 0.283 and 0.291. Cox and Snell R^2 have gone up from 0.184 in Model 1 to between 0.196 and 0.200. Similarly, when all of the variables were introduced in Models 6 and 7, both pseudo R^2 have once again increased. The Negelkerke R^2 of 0.316 and Cox and Snell R^2 of 0.219 in Model 6 are considerably higher than those found in Models 2, 3, and 4. Equally, the Negelkerke R^2 of 0.332 and Cox and Snell R^2 of 0.223 in Model 7 are also higher than those found in Models 2, 3, 4 and 5. With the introduction of independent variables, the -2 log likelihood functions have significantly improved (p=0.001), down from 484.040 in Model 1, to 459.589 and 456.704 respectively for Models 6 and 7. Overall, the percentage of observations correctly predicted in our models is between 76.7 and 78.5, which is considered to be reasonably good. In Model 1 where our control variables were included, we found that all three are, as expected, significantly and positively correlated with social enterprise course provision. Firstly, log of endowment, as a proxy for size, is found to significantly and positively correlate with the decision as to whether course(s) on social enterprise will be offered to business students. Secondly, private universities are found to be positively related to the

introduction of such courses. Thirdly, a positive correlation is found between AAU affiliation and the offering of such courses.

[TABLE 2 – INSERT HERE]

In Model 2 where entrepreneurship orientation was introduced, we found that, as expected, universities that ranked, within the sample, in the top third in terms of entrepreneurial orientation are found to be significantly more likely, at the 0.1 % level, than those within the lower third to offer social enterprise courses to their business students. The result suggests that H4 is supported. Specifically, the odds ratio of 2.627 suggests that the most entrepreneurial group are more than two and a half times as likely to offer the course than the least entrepreneurial group. The middle group, however, is not significantly different from the bottom group, despite displaying the expected sign. In Model 3 we introduced sustainability orientation. We found that, at a 1% level, universities that are ranked within both the top third and the second third are significantly more likely than the rest to offer social enterprise courses to their business students, thus supporting H1. With the odds ratios of 2.474 and 2.279 respectively, these two groups are between two and two and a half times as likely to offer the course as the rest of the sample. Diversity orientation was introduced in Model 4; and was found to be positively statistically significant at a 1% level. With an odd ratio of 1.011, it suggests that each additional country has a roughly 1% effect on the likelihood that the social enterprise course is being introduced. H2 is therefore supported. In Model 5, a positive and significant correlation, together with an odd ratio of 2.277, suggest that universities with religious affiliation are more than two times as likely as those without to offer social enterprise courses to their business students. This provides support for H3. Model 6 introduced entrepreneurship, sustainability and diversity orientations along with all of the control variables. It is found that, although the levels of significance have dropped, all of the above relationships remain statistically significant at a 5% level. Similarly, the odd-

ratios remain largely consistent with the previous models when the independent variables were introduced separately. Model 7 incorporated all of the independent variables minus university type as control variable. As with the previous model, all independent variables, including now religious affiliation, are significant at a 5% level, and, again, with similar odds ratios. Models 6 and 7 therefore both reaffirm the support for all of our hypotheses.

DISCUSSION

In contrast with the existing literature where most studies predispose towards the pedagogies of social enterprise courses, our study focuses on a supply-side question, by examining the external and internal factors that affect a university's decision as to whether or not to offer these courses to their business students. Our findings suggest that the decision to offer such courses is not random, but rather, the outcome of a purposeful thought process based on the extent to which these courses are deemed to be aligned with the value orientations of the universities. In particular, our findings pinpoint two important factors in universities' decisions involved in offering social enterprise courses to their business students: first, whether a university has a strong emphasis of spirituality, and second, whether the university has a strong predisposition towards entrepreneurial behaviors. The former is reflected in the positive correlations between diversity, sustainability, religious orientations and social enterprise course offerings. It is likely that universities with strong spirituality emphasis would have developed a strong base of support for pedagogies and interventions that would help develop socially responsible citizens, with social enterprise courses being considered as one of the means to achieve such an end. The latter is validated through the positive correlation between the entrepreneurial orientation variable and social enterprise courses offerings. Such institutions would predispose towards an entrepreneurial based curriculum

which would place social enterprise courses as the preferred intervention in delivering their social mandates.

Previous studies such as Matten and Moon (2004) and Wu et al. (2010) point to the diverseness of courses on offer along the ethics, sustainability and social responsibility spectrum. Social enterprise courses fall within the spectrum as they intend to ignite local interests on community matters (Kwong et al., 2012). Its strengths lie within its entrepreneurial approach in delivery and thereby is more aligned with the business orientated pedagogies adopted by business schools and colleges (Tracey & Philips, 2007). However, the fact that only about 27.5% of universities with AACSB accreditation offer social enterprise courses to their business students suggests that this provision is far from universal. Our study offers an important contribution by highlighting where such courses remain underutilized. Our study suggests that universities without a strong emphasis of spirituality may struggle to see the need to offer such courses. In such cases, the issue is about convincing them that their role in developing socially responsible citizens amongst business students is an important one. Alongside the extensive literature discussing the benefits of such provision to the development of socially cohesive and responsible societies and communities, a growing literature is also highlighting its benefits specifically for graduates, employers and the universities themselves (Swanson, 2004; Mayhew & Murphy, 2009). Therefore developing, amongst academics, administrators and students, an understanding that the promotion of a social responsibility agenda can be mutually beneficial for all concerned would increase the supply and take up rate for these courses.

Our study also suggests that convincing universities without a strong entrepreneurial outlook to offer such courses could be a great challenge, as their limited experience of entrepreneurship could mean that these universities may have underestimated the benefits that social enterprises can make to the community and that they may have downplayed the

alignment of social entrepreneurship with the rest of their business curriculum. A course on social entrepreneurship, contrary to what many may have imagined, is not only about teaching students the skills to set up a social enterprise, but also to engage them to think about what they can offer to the society and contribute to entrepreneurship and social change. This may mean becoming a social entrepreneur or intrapreneur as well as becoming more aware of how one's actions in daily life can impact on the wider society (Kwong et al., 2012). Through the identification of entrepreneurial opportunities that could benefit local communities, social entrepreneurship could offer business schools, regardless of their value orientation, an opportunity to align their social concerns with a more business orientated approach in their implementation (Kwong et al., 2012). Reaffirming that social entrepreneurship could make a difference and to view social entrepreneurship as a keystone linking their business curriculum with their social mandates is crucial in the promotion of social entrepreneurship related courses at university level.

Social enterprise courses are often characterized as a mixed bag with various objectives, with some trying to support those who intend to start a social business and others to encourage social and civic awareness, or simply to increase student satisfaction through providing a different experience (Brock, 2008; Kwong et al., 2012). The different motives in offering social enterprise courses is something that we are unable to capture within our data and therefore further research along this line would further enhance our understanding of the supply-side of the social enterprise course provision. In relation to this, our study was unable to capture the different pedagogical approaches adopted by different universities as we were only able to examine the course description but not the content. Whilst a considerable amount of literature is beginning to emerge in relation to this, a systematic review of all courses available is still lacking. We also could not capture the length and the depth of these courses. In addition, as we focused only on formal social enterprise courses that are available to

business students, we were unable to capture universities adopting an extracurricular approach towards social entrepreneurship, such as organizing a social enterprise boot camp, social business plan competition, or offering service learning opportunities in social enterprises. More comprehensive studies including the above could enhance our understanding of the supply of social enterprise courses within universities. Further study could also examine the differences between undergraduate and postgraduate levels of provision to see whether different pedagogies may have emerged as a result of the different student groups.

REFERENCES

AACSB (2005). Why management education matters? Its impact on individuals, organizations and society. AACSB: Tempa, Fl.

AACSB International. (2013). Ethics/Sustainability Resource Center. Retrieved from http://aacsb.edu/resources/ethics-sustainability/ about.asp

Adams M. Bell, L. & Griffin, P. (1997) *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. Routledge: New York.

Alcaraz, J. Thiruvattal, E. (2010). The United Nations principles for responsible management education: A global call for sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9(3), 542-550.

Anand, S., & Sen, A. (2000). The income component of the human development index. *Journal of Human Development*, *1*(1), 83-106.

Aspen Institute. (2001). *Where will they lead? MBA student attitudes about business and society*. New York: Aspen Institute for Social Innovation Through Business.

Astin, A. W. (1998). The changing American college student: Thirty-year trends, 1966-1996. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(2), 115-135.

Baron, R. A. (2006). Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: How entrepreneurs "connect the dots" to identify new business opportunities. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *20*(1), 104-119.

Bird, B. (1993). Demographic approaches to entrepreneurship: the role of experience and background. *Advances to in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, 1, 11-48.

Bok, D. (2003) *Universities in the marketplace*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.

Brammer, S., Williams, G., & Zinkin, J. (2007). Religion and attitudes to corporate social responsibility in a large cross-country sample. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 71(3), 229-243.

Brint, S. G. (Ed.). (2002). *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university*. Stanford University Press. Standford, CA

Brock, D. D., & Steiner, S. (2009). Social entrepreneurship education: Is it achieving the desired aims?. *USASBE 2008 Proceedings*, Available at SSRN 1344419.

Bouckaert, L (2014) Spirituality: The missing link in business ethics. In Zsolnai, L. ed., 2014. *The spiritual dimension of business ethics and sustainability management*. Springer: Geneva. Pp.15-27.

Bouckaert, L., & Ghesquière, R. (2010). Faust and the magic of entrepreneurship. Heroes and antiheroes. In Ghesquiere and Junt (eds) *European literature and the ethics of leadership*, Garant: Antwerp. Pp.13-35.

Carroll, J. E. (2012). *Sustainability and spirituality*. SUNY Press, NY.

Carroll, J. E. (2016). The environment is a moral and spiritual issue, in Dhiman, S. and Marques, J., (eds) 2016. *Spirituality and sustainability*. Springer International Publishing, Geneva. pp. 49-65.

Carrithers, D. F., & Peterson, D. (2006). Conflicting views of markets and economic justice: Implications for student learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *69*(4), 373-387.

Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, *25*(1), 5-26.

Cheung, C. W. M., Fieldhouse, S., & Kwong, C. (2018). An exploratory quantitative study into the relationship between Catholic universities and the development of social entrepreneurship and non-profit management courses in the USA. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, *10*(2), 203-219.

Christensen, L. J., Peirce, E., Hartman, L. P., Hoffman, W. M., & Carrier, J. (2007). Ethics, CSR, and sustainability education in the Financial Times top 50 global business schools: Baseline data and future research directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *73*(4), 347-368.

Costa, D. L., & Kahn, M. E. (2003). Civic engagement and community heterogeneity: An economist's perspective. *Perspectives on Politics*, *1*(01), 103-111.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Davidsson, P. (2015). Entrepreneurial opportunities and the entrepreneurship nexus: A re-conceptualization. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *30*(5), 674-695.

Dalton, J. C. (2007). Community service and spirituality: Integrating faith, service, and social justice at DePaul University. *Journal of College and Character*, *8*(1). 1-9

Dhiman, S., & Marques, J. (2016). *Spirituality and sustainability*. Springer International Publishing: Geneva

Dhiman, S. (2016) The case of Eco-spirituality: everyone can do something, in Dhiman, S. and Marques, J., 2016. (eds) *Spirituality and sustainability*. Springer International Publishing: Geneva. pp. 1-15

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogical creed. *Dewey on education: Selections*. *The School Journal*, Volume LIV(3), pp. 77-80

Dewey, J. (1927). *The Public and its problems: An essay in political inquiry*. Penn State Press: PA.

Egerton, Muriel. (2002) Higher education and civic engagement. *The British Journal of Sociology* 53, (4), 603-620.

Evans, J. M., Treviño, L. K., & Weaver, G. R. (2006). Who's in the ethics driver's seat? Factors influencing ethics in the MBA curriculum. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*(3), 278-293.

Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(1), 8-24.

Frank, R. H., Gilovich, T., & Regan, D. T. (1993). Does studying economics inhibit cooperation? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *7*(2), 159-171.

Gallup Polls, Inc. (2009). *Religion*. Accessed from http://www.gallup.com/poll/1690/religion.aspx Accessed on: add here

Giacalone, R. A., & Thompson, K. R. (2006). Business ethics and social responsibility education: Shifting the worldview. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(3), 266-277.

Gibb, A. A. (1993). Enterprise culture and education understanding enterprise education and its links with small business, entrepreneurship and wider educational goals. *International Small Business Journal*, *11*(3), 11-34.

Giroux, H. A., & Penna, A. N. (1979). Social education in the classroom: The dynamics of the hidden curriculum. *Theory & Research in Social Education*,*7*(1), 21-42.

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(1), 75-91.

Harkavy, I (2003). Service learning and the development of democratic universities, schools and good societies in the 21st century. In Welsh M. and Billing, S. (eds). *New perspectives in service earning: Research to advance the field*. IAP Publishment: Greenwich, CT

Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *1*(1), 5-37.

Hill, P. C., & Pargament, K. I. (2003). Advances in the conceptualization and measurement of religion and spirituality: Implications for physical and mental health research. *American Psychologist*, 58, 64 –74.

Hillygus, D. & Sunshine. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior* 27 (1), 25-47.

Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (1989). *Applied regression analysis*. New York, John Wiley.

Howorth, C., Smith, S. M., & Parkinson, C. (2012). Social learning and social entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(3), 371-389.

Jackson, R. (2004). *Rethinking religious education and plurality: Issues in diversity and pedagogy*. Psychology Press: London

Kasser, T., & Ahuvia, A. (2002). Materialistic values and well-being in business students. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*(1), 137-146.

Kelderman, E. (2011). As state funds dry up, many community colleges rely more on tuition than on taxes to get by. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *57*, 23.

Kerr, Clark (1991). *The great transformation in higher education, 1960-1980*. SUNY Press: NY.

Kirby, D.A. (1971). *Entrepreneurship*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.

Kirzner, I. (1985). *Discovery and the capitalist process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kourie, C., 2009. Spirituality and the university. *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 30(1), 148-173.

Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 18, 91-91.

Kuh, G. D. (1999). How are we doing? Tracking the quality of the undergraduate experience, 1960s to the present. *The Review of Higher Education*, *22*(2), 99-120.

Kuh G. D. (2000) Do environments matter? A comparative analysis of the impress of different types of colleges and universities on character. *Journal of College and Character*, 1(4), 1-15.

Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2006). Spirituality, liberal learning, and college student engagement. *Liberal Education,* Winter, 40-47.

Kuh, G. D., & Umbach, P. (2004). *College and character: Insights from the national survey of student engagement.*

Kwong, C. C., Thompson, P., & Cheung, C. W. (2012). The effectiveness of social business plan competitions in developing social and civic awareness and participation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(3), 324-348.

Leslie, L. L., & Brinkman, P. T. (1987). Student price response in higher education: The student demand studies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 181-204.

Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, *41*(1), 36-44.

Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics,* 12(2), 52-64.

Mirabella, R. M. (2007). University-based educational programs in nonprofit management and philanthropic studies: A 10-year review and projections of future trends. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *36*(4 suppl), 11S-27S.

Lawrence, T., Phillips, N., & Tracey, P. (2012). From the guest editors: Educating social entrepreneurs and social innovators. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(3), 319-323.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1995). Cheating among business students: A challenge for business leaders and educators. *Journal of Management Education*, *19*(2), 205-218.

McGhee, D. (2003). Moving to 'our'common ground–a critical examination of community cohesion discourse in twenty‑first century Britain. *The Sociological Review*, *51*(3), 376-404.

Mahoney, L. S., & Thorn, L. (2006). An examination of the structure of executive compensation and corporate social responsibility: A Canadian investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69(2), 149-162.

Mayhew, B. W., & Murphy, P. R. (2009). The impact of ethics education on reporting behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86(3), 397-416.

Miller, T. L., Wesley, C. L., & Williams, D. E. (2012). Educating the minds of caring hearts: Comparing the views of practitioners and educators on the importance of social entrepreneurship competencies. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(3), 349-370.

Meyer, A. (1981) How ideologies supplant formal structures and shape responses to environments. *Journal of Management Studies*, 19: 45-61.

Nemetz, P. L., & Cameron, A. (2006). Higher education out of control: Regaining strategic focus in an age of diminishing resources. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*(1), 38-51.

Newman, J. H. (20142014). *The idea of a university*. USA: Assumption Press. (Original work published in 1852)

Newman, J. H. (2011). *Discourses on the scope and nature of university education: addressed to the Catholics of Dublin.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. (Original work published in 1852)

Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: reflexive isomorphism in a pre‑paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *34*(4), 611-633.

O'Neill, M. (2005). Developmental contexts of nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *16*(1), 5-17.

Palmer, T. B., & Short, J. C. (2008). Mission statements in US colleges of business: An empirical examination of their content with linkages to configurations and performance. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*(4), 454-470.

Pascarella, E.T. (1985). College environmental influences on learning and cognitive development: A critical review and synthesis. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol 1, pp. 1-62). New York: Agathon.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perel, M. (2003) An ethical perspective on CEO compensation. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 48 (4), 381-391.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 104-112.

Pfeffer, J. (2005). Why do bad management theories persist? A comment on Ghoshal. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *4*(1), 96-100.

Pope Francis (2015) Encyclical Letter Laudato So of the Holy Father Francis on Care for our Common Home (http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html).

Prior, M. K., & Quinn, A. S. (2012). The relationship between spirituality and social justice advocacy: Attitudes of social work students. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, *31*(1-2), 172-192.

Princeton Review (2014). *Sustainability tracking, assessment & rating system (STARS) Reporting Process.* Princeton Review: Framingham, MA.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1940). On social structure. *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland,* 1-12.

Rasche, A., Gilbert, D. U., & Schedel, I. (2013). Cross-disciplinary ethics education in MBA programs: rhetoric or reality? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12*(1), 71-85.

Rutherford, M. A., Parks, L., Cavazos, D. E., & White, C. D. (2012). Business ethics as a required course: Investigating the factors impacting the decision to require ethics in the undergraduate business core curriculum. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *11*(2), 174-186.

Schneiders, S. M. (1986). Theology and spirituality: Strangers, rivals, or partners? *Horizons*, *13*(2), 253-274.

Setó-Pamies, D., Domingo-Vernis, M., & Rabassa-Figueras, N. (2011). Corporate social responsibility in management education: Current status in Spanish universities. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *17*(5), 604-620.

Setó-Pamies, D., & Papaoikonomou, E. (2016). A multi-level perspective for the integration of ethics, corporate social responsibility and sustainability (ECSRS) in management education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *136*(3), 523-538.

Smith, I. H., & Woodworth, W. P. (2012). Developing social entrepreneurs and social innovators: a social identity and self-efficacy approach. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 390-407.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 339-358.

Stolle, D., Soroka, S., & Johnston, R. (2008). When does diversity erode trust? Neighborhood diversity, interpersonal trust and the mediating effect of social interactions. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 57-75.

Swanson, D. L. (2004). The buck stops here: Why universities must reclaim business ethics education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2(1), 43-61.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1-16.

Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *6* (2), 264-271.

Trow, M. (2007). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. *International handbook of higher educa*tion (pp. 243-280). Netherlands: Springer.

Tisdell, E. J. (2007). In the new millennium: The role of spirituality and the cultural imagination in dealing with diversity and equity in the higher education classroom. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(3), 531-560.

Uslaner, E. M. (2010). Segregation, mistrust and minorities. *Ethnicities*,*10*(4), 415-434.

Vogel, M. J., McMinn, M. R., Peterson, M. A., & Gathercoal, K. (2013). *Examining religion and Spirituality as Diversity Training: A Multidimensional Look at Training in the American Psychological Association. Faculty Publications.* Working Paper. Grad School of Clinical Psychology. 130. George Fox University. Newberg: OR.

Waaijman, K. (2002). *Spirituality: Forms, foundations, methods*. Peeters Publishers: Leuven.

Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1998). *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the earth* (No. 9). New Society Publishers: Leuven.

Weidman, J. C. (1989). Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. In C. Smart (Ed) *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research.* Agathon Press: New York. (pp. 289-322).

Williams, R. J., Barrett, J. D., & Brabston, M. (2000). Managers' business school education and military service: Possible links to corporate criminal activity. *Human Relations*, *53*(5), 691-712.

Wright, A.. (2003) *Religion, education and post-modernity*. Routledge: London

Wright, N. S., & Bennett, H. (2011). Business ethics, CSR, sustainability and the MBA. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *17*(5), 641-655.

Wu, Y. C. J., Huang, S., Kuo, L., & Wu, W. H. (2010). Management education for sustainability: A web-based content analysis. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *9*(3), 520-531.

Zemsky, R. (1998). Labor, markets, and educational restructuring. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 77-90.

Zsolnai, L. (Ed.). (2014). *The spiritual dimension of business ethics and sustainability management*. Springer: Geneva.

Zinnbauer, B. J., & Pargament, K. I. (2005). Religiousness and spirituality. In R. Paloutzian & C. Parks (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and religion* (pp. 21– 42). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Table 1. Correlation Analysis

	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Social enterprise course offering	0.27146	0.445	-							
Type of university	0.31537	0.465	0.233**	-						
AAU affiliation	0.11178	0.315	0.353**	0.073	-					
Log of endowment	8.107	0.942	0.360**	0.301**	0.475**	-				
Enterprise orientation	1.0319	0.800	0.324**	0.430**	0.295**	0.372**	-			
Sustainability orientation	0.9261	0.820	0.285**	0.061	0.349**	0.364**	0.300**	-		
Religion affiliation	0.16171	0.369	0.146**	0.635**	-0.104*	0.129**	0.227**	-0.40	-	

Diversity orientation	63.6862	35.643	0.262**	-0.121**	0.361**	0.386**	0.194**	0.353**	-0.178**	-

* p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01,

Table 2. Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Social Enterprise Course Provisions for Business Students

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)	B (S.E.)	Exp(B)
Type	0.640** (0.246)	1.896	0.358 (0.264)	1.430	0.689** (0.252)	1.991	0.912** (0.269)	2.489			0.671* (0.293)	1.957		
Log of Endowment	0.940ᴵ (0.208)	2.560	0.823ᴵ (0.212)	2.277	0.767ᴵ (0.215)	2.152	0.703** (0.220)	2.020	1.034ᴵ (0.198)	2.813	0.503* (0.227)	1.654	0.584** (0.218)	1.793
AAU affiliation	1.111** (0.403)	3.038	0.956* (0.405)	2.601	1.031* (0.409)	2.803	0.989* (0.404)	2.688	1.131** (0.400)	3.099	0.858* (0.414)	2.357	0.879* (0.410)	2.408
Entrepreneurship orientation														
Middle 33%			0.362 (0.332)	1.436							0.247 (0.338)	1.280	0.228 (0.340)	1.256
Upper 33%			0.966ᴵ (0.349)	2.627							0.789* (0.357)	2.200	0.872* (0.345)	2.391
Sustainability orientation														
Middle 33%					0.824** (0.301)	2.279					0.768* (0.308)	2.155	0.730* (0.311)	2.075

Upper 33%					0.906**	2.474					0.667*	1.948	0.695*	2.004
					(0.321)						(0.332)		(0.309)	
Diversity Orientation							0.11**	1.011			0.009*	1.009	0.009*	1.009
							(0.004)				(0.004)		(0.004)	
Religion Orientation									0.823ı	2.277			0.887*	2.428
									(0.277)				(0.309)	
Constant	-9.14ı		-8.57ı		-8.32ı		-7.98ı		-9.86ı		-7.04ı		-7.63ı	
	(1.677)		(1.694)		(1.709)		(1.707)		(1.627)		(1.726)		(1.689)	
N	501		501		501		501		501		501		501	
X²	101.832ı		110.737ı		112.072ı		107.077ı		103.645ı		121.812ı		124.698ı	
df	8		8		8		8		8		8		8	
%correctly predicted	78.2		78.0		77.4		76.7		78.7		78.5		78.3	
Nagelkerke R²	0.267		0.288		0.291		0.283		0.271		0.316		0.322	
Cox and Snell R²	0.184		0.198		0.200		0.196		0.187		0.219		0.223	

| -2 Log likelihood | 484.040 | | 475.135 | | 473.800 | | 473.657 | | 482.227 | | 459.589 | | 456.704 | |

* p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01. ¹ p < 0.001.