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**CSR and higher education**

- **Increasing importance of CSR in organizations**
  - To send a signal to the various stakeholders with whom they interact
  - To maintain their reputation
  - A new way to manage quality in organizations

- **New labour competences for future university graduates**
  - **Bologna process**: permanent adaptation of qualifications to the needs of the productive sector

---

**What to teach: The concept of CSR**

- **Antecedents** (until 1950)
  - Spontaneous, asistemathic

- **First debates and positioning** (1951-1960)

- **Formalization and consolidation** (1961-1980)

- **Especialization** (1981-2000)

- **New approaches and reconceptualization** (1951-1960)

- **Sistematic, Multidisciplinary**

- **Marketing**

- **Law and Accounting**

---
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CSR dimensions: The *Green Paper* (2001)

“…a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in the interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis”

European Commission 2001, p. 6

Two dimensions of CSR:

**Internal dimension:**
Consideration of employees (e.g., investment in human capital, health and safety, change management, etc), and management of natural resources used in the production

**External dimension:**
Consideration of other stakeholders, including business partners and suppliers, customers, public authorities, and NGOs representing local communities, as well as the environment

---

CSR dimensions: ISO 26000

---
**Objectives**

1. To analyze students’ perceived educational importance of CSR in their respective academic programmes

2. To analyze students’ desired educational importance of CSR in their respective academic programmes

3. To detect existing gaps between perceived and desired educational importance of CSR contents in higher education

**Sample**

- 400 last-year students at the University of León (Spain)
- Representativeness of 95% (being $e = \pm 5\%$; $p = q = 0.50$)
- Stratified sampling by academic area

**Distribution by Gender**

- 46% Males
- 54% Females

**Distribution by Academic Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Legal</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Procedure**

- Voluntary, collective self-administration of a questionnarie in timetabled university classes randomly selected by academic area
- Participants were asked to report perceived and desired educational importance of 13 CSR practices on a 5-point Likert type scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety at work</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of employees</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities for employees</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family conciliation</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair work conditions</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative management</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with partners</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with consumers</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with suppliers</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with competitors</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of environmental impacts</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of local communities</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with NGOs</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Perceived importance/external

- Relationships with partners
- Relationships with consumers
- Relationships with suppliers
- Relationships with competitors
- Environmental impacts
- Local communities
- Collaboration with NGOs
### Results: Desired Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety at work</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of employees</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities for employees</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family conciliation</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair work conditions</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative management</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with partners</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with consumers</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with suppliers</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible relationships with competitors</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of environmental impacts</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of local communities</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with NGOs</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results: Desired Importance/external**

- Health and safety at work: Perceived 3.26, Desired 4.47, Gap -1.44
- Empowerment of employees: Perceived 4.43, Desired 4.49, Gap -0.06
- Equal opportunities for employees: Perceived 3.29, Desired 4.32, Gap -1.03
- Work-family conciliation: Perceived 2.93, Desired 4.15, Gap -1.22
- Fair work conditions: Perceived 3.14, Desired 4.39, Gap -1.25
- Participative management: Perceived 3.16, Desired 4.06, Gap -0.90
- Responsible relationships with partners: Perceived 3.21, Desired 4.08, Gap -0.87
- Responsible relationships with consumers: Perceived 3.28, Desired 4.29, Gap -1.01
- Responsible relationships with suppliers: Perceived 3.15, Desired 4.05, Gap -0.90
- Responsible relationships with competitors: Perceived 3.34, Desired 4.15, Gap -0.81
- Management of environmental impacts: Perceived 3.42, Desired 4.31, Gap -0.87
- Development of local communities: Perceived 3.25, Desired 4.17, Gap -0.92
- Collaboration with NGOs: Perceived 3.14, Desired 4.01, Gap -0.87
Results: Existing gaps/Internal

Results: Existing gaps/external
Conclusions

1. Students perceive a general University’s commitment to the education of CSR contents at both internal and external levels, particularly regarding the promotion of adequate work conditions, the management of environmental concerns, and the fair relationships with competitors and consumers.

2. The main interests of students have to do with issues linked to the internal dimensions of enterprises, probably because of their future roles as professionals and employees.

3. Existing gaps between perceived and desired educational importance concentrate on aspects of internal CSR, showing a high demand of such a kind of contents to be included in university curricula.

Conclusions point out the need of incorporating CSR education in higher education, providing students with a more complete vision of both internal and external dimensions of enterprises’ social responsibility.