TEACHING ETHICS THROUGH A PEDAGOGICAL CASE DISCUSSION: THE MCDONALD’S CASE AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

Laura P. Hartman, Regina Wolfe, and Patricia H. Werhane
DePaul University and The University of Virginia

REACHING FOR INTEGRATION

The question of whether ethical issues should be integrated throughout an undergraduate or graduate business curriculum no longer warrants much discussion among these pages or within other journals of note; and it has become mundane to seek justification for such inclusion in recent events that have cluttered the front pages of newspapers and court dockets, alike. To the contrary, it is instead the urgency of how those challenges are most effectively addressed and where to find models of positive corporate performance that occupies our current attention. While no single organization exemplifies the entirety of “ethical” behavior, it is vital to consider models of conduct that have generated value through ethical means, both domestically and on a global scale. In particular, the AACSB’s Ethics Education Task Force explained that, at all levels,

... business schools must encourage students to develop a deep understanding of the myriad challenges surrounding corporate responsibility and corporate governance; provide them with tools for recognizing and responding to ethical issues, both personally and organizationally; and engage them at an individual level through analyses of both positive and negative examples of everyday conduct in business.1

In preparing students or workshop participants to engage in leadership decision-making, it is also effective to examine those ethical issues that cut across the silos of traditional academic disciplines. In so doing, we challenge participants to create decisions of integrity—referring to the etymology of the word, since it comes from the Latin, “integer,” meaning whole unit or one. Decisions of integrity are those that integrate, that consider implications across boundaries and create a stronger
whole. However, there is a restatement of the origins of the term that perhaps fits ethics teaching even more closely. Though surely the tale has prior history, it was shared by General Charles C. Krulak, USMC (Ret.) who explained,

> [t]he word integrity itself is a martial word that comes to us from an ancient Roman army tradition. During the time of the 12 Caesars, the Roman army would conduct morning inspections. As the inspecting centurion would come in front of each legionnaire, the soldier would strike with his right fist the armor breastplate that covered his heart. The armor had to be strongest there in order to protect the heart from the sword thrusts and from arrow strikes. As the soldier struck his armor, he would shout ‘integritas,’ which in Latin means material, wholeness, completeness, and entirety. The inspecting centurion would listen closely for this affirmation and also for the ring that well-kept armor would give off. Satisfied that the armor was sound and that the soldier beneath it was protected, he would then move on to the next man.

At about the same time, the praetorians or Imperial bodyguard were ascending into power and influence. Drawn from the best ‘politically correct’ soldiers of the Legions, they received the finest equipment and armor. They no longer had to shout ‘integritas’ to signify that their armor was sound. Instead, as they struck their breastplate, they would shout ‘Hail Caesar,’ to signify that their heart belonged to the Imperial personage - not to their unit - not to an institution - not to a code of ideals. They armored themselves to serve the cause of a single man.

A century passed and the rift between the Legion and the Imperial bodyguard and its excesses grew larger. To signify the difference between the two organizations, the legionnaire, upon striking his armor would no longer shout ‘integritas,’ but instead would shout ‘Integer.’ Integer means undiminished - complete - perfect. It not only indicated that the armor was sound, it also indicated that the soldier wearing the armor was of sound character. He was complete in his integrity . . . his heart was in the right place . . . his standards and morals were high. He was not associated with the immoral conduct that was rapidly becoming the signature of the praetorian guards.²

In teaching ethical decision-making through cases, it is the pedagogical intent to encourage the student to seek integrity through those decisions. From the identification of the stakeholders through the
cataloguing of alternative decisions, an awareness of the impact of each alternative on each stakeholder, and the exercise of ethical theory in this examination, it is the consistency of values application that creates the integration, and thereby maintains the integrity. The purpose of this discussion is to introduce one particular area of inquiry that serves this purpose well and to explore a several-part case as an example of a cross-disciplinary model.

**APPLIED INTEGRATION: THE MCDONALD’S CASE**

It is the emphasis on integration that is illustrated by the “promotion from within” strategy employed by McDonald’s as part of its global mission to infuse pride in starting from crew and then rising through its ranks. McDonald’s approach, while ultimately oriented toward sustaining the organization’s success, in fact and in practical application results in the present alleviation of poverty for those living at what has come to be known as the base of the economic pyramid.3

The McDonald’s case is significant because of its geographical relevance, as well. When we discuss poverty in our business schools, we often refer to it via models involving case examples in developing economies;4 but we must be certain to adequately prepare leadership decision-makers to effectively remediate the unfortunate—and inexcusable—circumstances within the developed nations of the globe. Though much current scholarship and global attention has focused on the challenges facing the unemployed poor,5 far less attention has been paid to the way that for-profit enterprises can reduce poverty through investing in business development within low-income working communities. One of the greatest dangers of addressing the problems of extreme poverty is the refusal to modify, adjust or abandon (where necessary) our current mental models in light of new information.

When examining a case, students will apply “mental models” or “mind sets” to the circumstances involved. These frameworks evolve from active interaction with the variety of experiences and stimuli to which each student is subject throughout her or his life. This interaction involves a selective filtering process by which each of us frames our experiences.6 Because we cannot possibly process every data bit to which we are exposed, our models are not only distinct but also incomplete and, in some instances, actually incorrect, biased or distorted.7 However, because we are constantly interacting and engaging new information and experi-
ences, we have ongoing opportunities to adjust our mental models on a regular basis. As one example, the McDonald's case helps us not only to re-frame a possible distorted mental model of the unproductive capabilities of the poor, but also a new mindset comprised of their potential: the extraordinary contribution that low income workers can make, and the *mutuality of value* that the worker and the organization gain from that relationship.

The case also helps us to reframe our mind set about McDonalds. There is a persistent and erroneous myth that McDonalds only hires low-wage part-time workers at its fast-food restaurants, and provides no opportunities for advancement within the organization. In fact, this perception is far from the truth and, for those low-wage workers looking for opportunities, McDonalds turns out to be a great place to work and to advance.

The McDonald’s case includes examples for the food service industry of effective, replicable labor practices that result in the relief of poverty conditions for those who are impacted by these efforts. McDonald’s diverse work force results from its professional development practice of promoting managers and executives *primarily* from within the organization; at least 40% of the top executives in the company began as “crew,” working in franchise restaurants, many of them beginning as part-time employees. As one McDonald’s worker explains in the case, “[t]he only thing that would hold somebody back is themselves, because the opportunity is there.” Faculty can use this set of cases in order to challenge students to identify the intersection of corporate objectives and individual needs. Because of the variety of issues addressed, the case is germane not only to courses that focus specifically on business ethics, but also to courses relating to principles of management, human resource management, training and development, leadership, strategy, economics, and labor, among many others.

The questions raised at the end of the case pose outstanding springboards for class discussion, with dilemmas delicately balanced between the organization’s responsibilities to its primary stakeholders and to the larger, secondary stakeholder community:

- Did McDonald’s have a responsibility to be more intentional about poverty reduction?
- Should it have rethought its business model so that poverty reduction became one of the filters in its strategic decision-making process?
- Did it have an obligation to raise other companies’ awareness of their ability to affect development and poverty-related issues?
- Could and should it have done more to raise public awareness of the impact of its policies and practices on employee growth and development, so that employees were viewed and treated with respect?
- Or, was it acceptable to maintain the status quo, and expect employees to accept the derogatory comments and attitudes toward their work the way that Calhoun came to do?

In analyzing the McDonald’s case and the actual experiences of two of its workers, students should be encouraged to challenge their mind sets about the food service industry and about McDonalds, in particular. They should be encouraged to explore the integrity of McDonald’s hiring and promotion process in connection with its mission and overall corporate objectives. Challenge them not only to identify the obvious stakeholders, but also those who might be more obscure and removed, such as the local communities served. Consider alternative methods of selection, such as hiring expertise from competitors, a strategy at play throughout the industry. What would be the impact of this and other alternatives on each stakeholder? Finally, what insights might students gain through the application of ethical theory in this process and how might theory allow us to understand more effectively the answers to the questions posed above, to the direction of our corporate decision-making and perhaps, therefore, our personal objectives?

Because leadership decisions are necessarily shaped by leaders’ values, and because values are necessarily influenced—or even dictated—by their mental models, it is vital that we, as educators, consistently challenge our students to challenge themselves. By offering opportunities to examine and to engage novel stimuli and data sets, we are encouraging our students to adjust their mental models to embrace new possibilities, to create greater consistency between their own values and actions, thereby generating enhanced integrity in their decisions. In this case, in particular, we are striving towards a more broad vision of the role of all stakeholders in the ultimate success of both the organization as well as the individuals who comprise it.
THE MCDONALD’S CASE

Started as Crew: McDonald’s Strategy for Corporate Success and Poverty Reduction

From the early 1970s to the beginning of the 21st century, multinational corporations (MNCs) had increasingly participated in the reduction of poverty as part of their business strategies. Such participation reflected an increasing awareness of the widening gap between rich and poor across the globe. It also revealed a growing understanding of the commercial potential of responding to the needs of those who lived at the bottom of the economic pyramid. As Stuart Hart pointed out, there was significant “potential for a new private sector-based approach to development that creates profitable businesses that simultaneously raise the quality of life for the world’s poor, respect cultural diversity, and conserve ecological integrity of the planet for future generations.”

UNDERSTANDING POVERTY

On the surface, poverty was a simple concept. MSN Encarta on-line Dictionary defined it as the “state of being poor: the state of not having enough money to take care of basic needs such as food, clothing, and housing.” Questions and debates arose almost immediately about the causes and appropriate measurements of poverty. Although not a comprehensive list, it was generally accepted that poverty resulted from some combination of the following: hunger, famine, and malnutrition; lack of education and illiteracy; gender; lack of land ownership; lack of access to clean water; and war and political instability.

Measurements of poverty focused on absolute poverty and relative poverty. Absolute poverty measurements were concerned with identifying a minimum standard of living below which an individual was deemed to be poor. Relative poverty attempted to identify income disparity and focused on the gap between rich and poor within economies or economic regions as well as across economies, in an effort to understand global poverty. The standard or threshold for absolute poverty was translated into a dollar amount and raised questions about the methods used to gather data and the adequacy of the threshold itself. In the United States, poverty thresholds were expressed in terms of household income. In 2008, the thresholds were $10,210 annually for an individual and $20,650 annually for a family of four.
Measures for global poverty were based on purchasing power parity (PPP). Though PPP was widely accepted as the standard measurement, efforts were ongoing to ensure that data obtained were seen as more accurate and reliable.\textsuperscript{14} In 2007, research conducted by Shaohua Chen and Martin Ravallion of the World Bank Development Research Group\textsuperscript{15} indicated that the number of people with a PPP of $1 a day or less “fell below 1 billion for the first time in 2004. However, progress has been slower for the $2 line. The number of people living below the $2 line actually rose over most of the period, only falling briefly in the mid-1990s and since the end of the 1990s.”\textsuperscript{16} More than 2.5 billion people—approximately 48% of the world’s population—had a PPP of $2 or less per day. Approximately 18% of the world’s population—969 million people—had a PPP of $1 or less per day.\textsuperscript{17} See Exhibit 1 for the geographical distribution of people living on PPP $2 or less a day in 2004.

Exhibit 1

STARTED AS CREW: MCDONALD’S STRATEGY FOR CORPORATE SUCCESS AND POVERTY REDUCTION

MNCs and Poverty Reduction

Though some progress had been made in reducing global poverty, many argued that it was too slow. Critics questioned whether traditional development efforts alone could make significant and timely inroads in poverty reduction. As noted above, many people were convinced that bringing the power of the market to bear on the issue of poverty was a more effective strategy in the fight against global poverty. In particular, they argued that MNCs were well suited for this task, given their economic power and transnational reach.

MNCs were, however, often perceived as suspicious partners in poverty-reduction efforts. Those traditionally involved in such efforts were often skeptical because of previously well-publicized patterns of exploitation by some business interests. Others considered poverty reduction to be tangential to core business interests and dismissed claims about the potential of the market to respond to these fundamental human needs.

In the face of this skepticism, it might have seemed counterintuitive that fast food giant McDonald’s Corporation was an unintentional but active participant in poverty reduction. After all, conventional wisdom seemed to dictate that, although most fast food industry jobs might provide some supplemental household income or pocket money, they offered few, if any, prospects for upward mobility. It was this belief that led to the coining of the term “McJob,” which Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary defined as “a low-paying job that requires little skill and provides little opportunity for advancement.” Though McDonald's strongly objected to this term as inaccurate and denigrating to its work force, the fact remained that an unwelcome consequence of being a “Quintessential American Brand” was the negative connotation given to words prefaced with “Mc,” such as “McMansion.” This same iconic status was “exactly what made the corporation a daunting target for human rights activists,” according to Michael Moore in a report on efforts by the Student/Farmworker Alliance (SFA) to raise awareness of the “near-slavery conditions” Florida farm workers were subjected to while picking tomatoes for the fast food restaurant.

Given these and other negative perceptions, how could a company in an industry historically known for low-paying, dead-end jobs make any contribution to alleviating poverty, especially as part of its business plan? Was it possible that conventional wisdom was wrong? Could a crew job at McDonald’s lead to career advancement for more than a select few? Was it possible for McDonald's to have a business strategy that was suc-
cessful by Wall Street standards and that also contributed to significant wealth creation, not just for shareholders, but also for employees and other stakeholders as well?

Groomed in the tradition of McDonald’s founder Ray Kroc, Jan Fields, executive vice president and chief operations officer of McDonald’s USA, Peter Breckenridge, development director of Southern Australia, and Darlene Calhoun, assistant supervisor of Lofton & Lofton Management, were among many employees whose stories demonstrated that it was possible to begin as crew and progress through the ranks to the highest corporate positions. What was it about McDonald’s business strategy that enabled the company to be successful in the industry and to contribute to the reduction of poverty? What were the challenges to the company’s business strategy, and how did McDonald’s meet them?

RAY KROC: MR. McDoNald’S

Ray Kroc lived the classic American rags-to-riches story. In 1954, the high school dropout and Multimixer milkshake-machine salesman approached the McDonald brothers and presented his plan to put Multimixer machines in their restaurants as a strategy for growth and expansion. To Kroc’s surprise, the brothers were uninterested in expansion, preferring simply to live off their single location and current limited franchising arrangements. Kroc pressed them, suggesting they find someone to manage their franchises rather than let the enormous potential of the restaurants go to waste. Still unconvinced, Dick McDonald wanted to know who they might find to open the additional franchises Kroc proposed. Kroc recalled his response in *Grinding it Out: The Making of McDonald’s*, his account of the rise of the restaurant chain: “I sat there feeling a sense of certitude begin to envelop me. Then I leaned forward and said, ‘Well, what about me?’”21

Seven years and more than 238 stores later, Kroc bought the rights to the McDonald’s name from the brothers and accelerated the expansion of the booming chain. In the same year, Kroc and Fred Turner, a former grill man who had risen through the ranks to become the vice president of operations, began sending store manager candidates to training courses in the basement of an Elk Grove Village, Illinois, restaurant. The training center, named Hamburger University, was one of the nation’s first “corporate universities.” In the years that followed, it continued to play an important role in fostering and enhancing the esprit de corps and passion for the business that explained both the success of so
many people who started as crew and the success of the company. By 2006, McDonald’s corporate-owned and franchised locations had expanded to more than 31,000 restaurants in 119 countries and catered to more than 54 million customers each day.

It was not just veteran employees of McDonald’s Corporation who recognized the impact that Ray Kroc had and continued to have on corporate culture. From the first day on the job, employees learned about McDonald’s hardworking culture—a culture that started with Kroc. “If you know anything about Ray Kroc,” Steve Russell, senior vice president for human resources, observed:

“You know he was a work-hard kind of person. When he went to a restaurant, he’d roll up his sleeves and he’d work. He literally would get the hose out and spray the parking lot, if the parking lot was not clean, and this was when he was the head of a big organization. It just wasn’t in the beginning.”

This work-hard attitude was coupled with an emphasis on performance and promotion based on merit. Fields was clear that it was “not relationships or who you are or your educational background or pedigree or anything like that” that determined your advancement in the company. It was merit. Russell confirmed this sentiment: “Individuals who work hard are the ones that advance within the restaurant, and advance beyond the restaurant.” That this merit-based attitude permeated McDonald’s culture was not surprising given Ray Kroc’s iconic imprint on the company. It was an imprint that went beyond the attention to detail and the systems and structures he put into place. “The four pillars on which Kroc built the McDonald’s empire were quality, service, cleanliness, and value,” but it went beyond that. It had to do with the man himself, with his energy and commitment, with his integrity, with his philosophy of life.

“If you work just for money, you’ll never make it,” Kroc was known for saying. “But if you love what you’re doing and you always put the customer first, success will be yours.” Krocisms, as they were fondly called, abounded: “Free enterprise will work if you will”; “If you act like a leader and feel like a leader, you are a leader”; “It’s not what you do but the way you do it.” The “McDonald’s Mystique” and the pervasiveness of Kroc’s influence, which was detailed in a 1988 Fortune magazine article, lived on. Employees who did not know Kroc personally still felt connected to him. Steve Eng, who joined McDonald’s after Kroc’s 1984
death, said he was “able to comprehend Kroc’s passion and spirit by word-of-mouth inspiration from other McDonald’s owner-operators.”

**ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS**

Although there were many factors that contributed to the success of McDonald’s, three were particularly vital: the company’s strong corporate culture, McDonald’s renowned training program, and its tradition of promoting from within. These same factors also played a role in the company’s ability to contribute to the reduction of poverty, not simply through its many philanthropic activities, but as a direct result of its business strategy.

Ray Kroc was without doubt the iconic figure within McDonald’s culture, but he was not the only person whose story shaped the culture of the company. Past and current CEOs Fred Turner, Charlie Bell, and Jim Skinner were legendary figures who each contributed to shaping that environment. Though they were the most well known, there were also other people and factors that continued to contribute to McDonald’s hardworking, service-oriented, people-centered culture. Darlene Calhoun was among them.

When Calhoun began working at McDonald’s in 1977, she was not looking for a career. The main attraction was flexible hours. She and her family were living in Portland, Oregon, where her husband, who was in the military, was stationed. Neither of them was comfortable leaving their child in day care. Her husband worked during the day, so she took a job as a cashier on the night shift, which ensured that one of them would always be home with their daughter. It was at a time when the family was relocated every six to eight months, and Calhoun soon realized that McDonald’s offered more than flexible hours. It offered mobility as well. Despite the fact that she continued to work at McDonald’s, she did not have any career aspirations. As she saw it at the time, her job simply provided a good opportunity for her to supplement the household income and meet the needs of her family.

Jan Fields, who after three decades at McDonald’s was well on her way to becoming another legend, told a similar story. Married right out of high school, she had decided not to attend college. With her husband in the armed forces, she needed to get a job to earn money for college tuition and to help support the family. It was 1977, and Fields was on her way to a job interview when she walked into a McDonald’s restaurant to get a Coke. While she sat in the restaurant killing time before her inter-
view, she noticed a sign on the milkshake machine. “Now hiring, flexible hours,” it promised. She asked the manager what flexible hours meant. As she recalled, he answered, “Whatever you want them to mean. We need people at lunchtime, we need people at night.” She filled out the application and started work the next day. In 2006, with almost 30 years of service, she became executive vice president and chief operations officer of McDonald’s USA.

For someone who was not an immediate fit with the McDonald’s environment, it was quite an accomplishment. Her first day as a “crew-member” left her doubting her potential at McDonald’s. “I literally cried when I got home,” she remembered. Afraid she would be unable to keep up with the rigorous pace of the shift and the strict rules governing the preparation of the company’s famous french fries, she told her husband she would not make it at McDonald’s. Then she got a call asking her to work the next evening. She agreed and found herself operating the cash register. At the end of the evening, she was asked to help close. “I didn’t know what that meant, so I asked and they said, ‘Do dishes.’ I’m a clean freak, even to this day, so I thought, ‘Yeah, okay,’ and the rest is history.”

Eventually Fields mastered each crew position, including the infamous french fries. She quickly learned the benefits of teamwork, particularly when she was helping to close and wanted to get home to her family. Her hard work and team spirit did not go unnoticed. Within months of starting at the restaurant, she was offered a management position.

At the time, Fields helped her husband support the family on a meager budget, but she did not consider herself poor. “You don’t know that you are … you just live on what you have.” Her husband, then an officer in the U.S. Air Force, made an annual salary of $5,600. As the primary shopper, Fields fed her young family on a $50 monthly grocery budget. The income from her job at McDonald’s helped with expenses, including her college tuition. She had decided to finish college and was promoted several times when, as she puts it, “it got to a point, after almost 10 years, where I finally ended up saying, I guess I’m making a career out of this. I’m here.”

**COMPONENTS OF VALUE**

As satisfying as it was on a personal level to have completed her degree, it was not the degree that led to Jan Fields’s success; rather, it was her willingness to work hard and her passion for the business. As Jack Daly, senior vice president of corporate relations, pointed out, “Some
people think it’s just tedious burger-flipping and some people catch the whole act. And if you catch the whole act, you’ll rise very quickly. There aren’t a lot of barriers; there aren’t a lot of educational barriers.”

Darlene Calhoun eventually caught the act. She had been a McDonald’s cashier for two years when her husband was transferred to San Diego, California. As she had in the past, she found a position with a local McDonald’s restaurant. This time it was not a franchisee restaurant; it was a “McOpCo,” the McDonald’s term for a company-owned restaurant (a McDonald’s-Operated Company). As a crew member in the San Diego store, Calhoun had the opportunity to participate in on-site training programs, which involved studying the management development books and working one on one with a restaurant manager to learn the skills needed to work the various positions. As Calhoun recalled, “You had to be a self-starter, you had to train yourself.” Her efforts did not go unnoticed. Within three months of starting in the San Diego store, she moved from cashier to shift manager. “I didn’t aspire to do that, but they saw something in me, and they sort of pushed me along,” she said.

When her husband left the service, the family moved back to Chicago. Once again, Calhoun found a neighborhood McDonald’s that was hiring. This time, it was back to an owner-operator store. The owner was a first-time operator, who had been advised by the field person that “this lady has some experience; maybe she can help you run the store.” Indeed, Calhoun did just that. Being in Chicago provided Calhoun the opportunity to participate in formal training programs and to attend Hamburger University. Eventually, she finished her classes and earned a promotion to store manager. She learned that the classes were accredited and remembered thinking, “Fine, I can use that toward something else.” She had been back in Chicago for five years and was a store manager, but still “hadn’t decided to make it a career.”

McDonald’s was serious about and valued education. But formal education per se was not an automatic passport to success. Richard Floresch, vice president and chief human resources officer, explained that despite regular interaction on a professional level, most of the top executives never discussed their educations. “Nobody ever talks about where they went to school,” he said, “even here in corporate. It’s not even talked about. It just isn’t part of our culture.”

In fact, it became evident that overemphasizing formal education had a detrimental effect on the corporate culture. In the late 1990s, companies placed a great deal of importance on MBAs. McDonald’s was no exception and the company hired a number of MBAs for high-level posi-
tions. Whether intentional or not, this conveyed the message that hard work and passion for the business were no longer enough; what was required was an MBA. “It was so countercultural,” according to legend-in-the-making Jan Fields, “I felt like I wasn’t going to go anywhere because of all these MBAs. I felt outclassed by them.” Many people who had risen through the ranks stopped mentioning this aspect of their McDonald’s career, which reinforced the perception that without an MBA, upward mobility was no longer possible. This undermined the strong focus on diversity.

At McDonald’s, Fields said, diversity was not simply about nationality, race, ethnicity, or gender. It was also about respect for and inclusion of people with different educational backgrounds, both formal and informal. Formal education was valued—after all, McDonald’s had made the effort to have many of the Hamburger University courses approved for college credit by the American Council on Education (ACE)32—but education based on experience and training was equally valued, as Darlene Calhoun’s success attested. The emphasis on and pride in having “started as crew” permeated McDonald’s culture and reinforced realistic hopes that upward mobility was available to all.

**HAMBURGER UNIVERSITY**

McDonald’s centralized training program, founded in 1961, grew to become one of the most globally recognized corporate training programs. The company invested $1.2 billion per year in training programs, which were an essential component of the corporation’s business model. The emphasis on and quality of training made it possible for McDonald’s to maintain consistently high standards of service and quality across the globe. Uniformly high standards were a hallmark of the company’s success. Wherever they found themselves across the globe, customers came to expect the same McDonald’s quality of service and food. The fact that customers were rarely disappointed was, in large measure, due to the systemized, continuous training that employees at all levels received.

Quality control was not the only benefit that came from emphasis on training. There were other benefits as well, though sometimes they were less obvious. The programs reinforced the McDonald’s culture and the team approach that was central to smooth restaurant operations. In addition, they left no room to doubt the diversity that was present throughout the company. The legal department with its staff of 140 attorneys was a good example. Of those, 50% were women. The figure
was higher in the United States where 60% of attorneys were women and 20% were minorities.\textsuperscript{33} Diversity was, arguably, most visible in the Hamburger University classroom.

Class sizes of 10 to 12 students in the 1960s boomed to 200 or more in 2008, as the value of corporate training was recognized as a means of personal and professional growth and more employees took advantage of the program and the upward mobility it offered. With campuses in cities across the world, including Sydney, Munich, London, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Rio de Janeiro, Hamburger University saw its enrollment grow from 14 in 1961 to approximately 5,000 in 2007. As of January 2008, approximately 80,000 McDonald’s employees from around the globe had graduated from the program.

Richard Ellis, vice president, U.S. communications, who hailed from Canada, stressed that the potential for growth and advancement was borderless. Visitors to Hamburger University’s Oak Brook, Illinois, campus saw, according to Ellis, “the people that we circle in and out of class every day, and the number of languages that are spoken. It’s crazy what we do. It’s so amazing, what we do. That’s a lot of the reason why people who hit their stride and understand what McDonald’s offers stay with the company.”\textsuperscript{34}

Part of that understanding was recognizing the need to take personal initiative. Regardless of a person’s position in the company or his or her background, it was clear that personal initiative and responsibility for growth and development was essential. Jan Fields was adamant: “You have an obligation, at every level, to do personal development. And it’s your personal responsibility. It’s not mine to teach you. It’s mine to provide opportunities for you, to pay for them, but the fact of the matter is that you’ve got to be the one. I can’t make you learn.” Ray Frawley, president of McDonald’s Korea, echoed this view, “You join McDonald’s in a part-time role or full time in the stores, but where it leads, who knows. What we need to do is to make sure we give people the opportunity. Once given the opportunity, the people really rise to the occasion to become really great long-term employees.”\textsuperscript{35} Calhoun agreed. “The only thing that would hold somebody back is themselves, because the opportunity is there,” she said. “If you want it, regardless of whether you’re in a McOpCo or a licensee [restaurant], the opportunity is there.”

The seriousness with which McDonald’s Corporation took this obligation to provide opportunities for employees was widely recognized. In 2005, McDonald’s UK received a profile award from Investors in People, a nondepartmental public body, sponsored by the U.K. Department for
Education and Skills. The Work Foundation, a London-based nonprofit research and advocacy group, also recognized the company for recruiting “young people for their qualities rather than qualifications and providing them with valuable skills to boost their position in the labour market.”

That same year, the Queensland Training Awards presented McDonald’s Australia the Large Employer of the Year Award at the regional finals. On the other side of the globe, “McDonald’s was ranked as a Best Employer in Latin America in both Mexico and Venezuela by América Economía business magazine and Hewitt Associates, and the Latin-American organization overall was cited by the Great Place to Work® Institute.”

There was no doubt that training and education was an integral component of McDonald’s overall business strategy, and individual employees appreciated the personal growth and development that it encouraged. Shelly Hicks, human resources manager for the Ohio region McOpCo, never felt like a college degree was a requirement for success. But when she realized that the classes she had completed at Hamburger University tallied up to a full year of college credits, she enrolled in University of Phoenix’s online program and earned a bachelor’s degree. Hicks went on to enroll in Penn State’s MBA program and was named Adult Learner of the Year for 2005 by ACE.

Although he had the same training as Hicks—completion of both the Hamburger University program and a traditional degree program—the path taken by Peter Breckenridge, development director of Southern Australia, had a different twist. Breckenridge, who was from Nunawading, Australia, was 16 when he began working at McDonald’s to fund his college tuition. The flexibility of a position at McDonald’s enabled him to keep pace with his studies in electrical engineering. Before he knew it, he found himself rising through the ranks and using his college breaks to attend classes at McDonald’s Sydney campus. By the time he finished his traditional degree in electrical engineering, he also held a diploma in management from Hamburger University. He put both disciplines to use in identifying locations for new store construction and worked to expand McDonald’s presence in his region. Asked about his long-term goals, Breckenridge, who attributed his success at McDonald’s to his Hamburger University training, was forward-thinking. “I hope one day to head up McDonald’s Australia,” he replied.

The stories of Hicks, Breckenridge, Calhoun, and other employees highlighted their awareness of and appreciation for the personal and professional benefit they gained from the company’s emphasis on training.
and education. But the strategic importance of this training could not be overlooked. These programs were responsible for the quality and uniformity of service at McDonald’s restaurants around the world. They strengthened the camaraderie and commitment to the corporate culture. They also provided a steady stream of skilled people who could and did advance to leadership positions in the company.

**Promotion from Within**

One might argue that the degree to which McDonald’s promoted from within was the company’s best-kept secret, given the perceptions that jobs at McDonald’s were dead-ends. In the United States, 70% of store managers began their careers as crew, as did 50% of corporate staff. In the United Kingdom, the rate was even higher, with 80% of store managers having started as crew.\(^{41}\) Even in India, 40% of the middle management team started as crew.\(^{42}\) The personal pride that came from having risen through the ranks was part of the McDonald’s culture. At executive meetings, the 40% of executive officers who began as crew-members wore bright red “Started as Crew!” pins, denoting the achievement they had made in climbing the organization’s career ladder. When defining the values that had created this atmosphere at McDonald’s, executives were often at a loss for words. Though they regularly invoked the images of Ray Kroc, Charlie Bell, Fred Turner, and other former crew-members, for the most part, they pointed to the stories of hundreds of owner-operators who began working at McDonald’s and became business owners themselves after learning the discipline and dedication required to run a restaurant through their careers at McDonald’s.

The tradition of rising through the ranks was obviously part of the corporate culture. It was, at the same time, an important component of the company’s success. Firsthand experience with the day-to-day operations of the restaurant was a valuable tool for management. It provided an understanding of how the basic product that brought the public through the doors was delivered. It raised an awareness of the workload and the level of skill required for each of the various functions, including dealing with the public. It also led to a better understanding of and appreciation for the values of the corporation and the people who were the backbone of the business.

Hands-on experience was so valued that when people who did not have that experience were brought into the company, one of the essential pieces of their orientation was working in a restaurant for a period of
time. This was true at all levels of management. Cesar Martinez, human resources officer for McDonald’s Latin America, remembered how impressed he was. “When you’re working shoulder to shoulder with the crew at the grill, you realize who the true heroes of this company are—the managers and employees in the restaurant.” All new corporate hires were assigned to a local restaurant. “They spend 30 to 90 days as crew persons, learning each of the restaurant’s stations and developing a respect for the difficulty of the position,” according to Russell. He sees this as crucial: “The process of placing new members of the McDonald’s team in stores ensures a dramatic enculturation that leaves little room for misunderstanding. An employee who cannot fit into the McDonald’s culture was very likely to crash.” Executives so valued the experience that many periodically went back to the stores where they trained. Indeed, as Russell reported, “some even take periodic breaks to work in the store again.”

Another strategic advantage of promotion from within was in the area of recruitment and retention of employees. Skilled, dependable, and enthusiastic workers were at the heart of the business. Many factors played a role in successfully recruiting and retaining them. One of these factors was providing possibilities for personal and professional growth and development. The “Started as Crew!” pins were a visible sign to potential and existing employees that at McDonald’s, those opportunities were real. Even more effective “signs” were successful employees like Darlene Calhoun.

Calhoun had been at the Chicago store for about seven years when it was sold. When word spread, she was offered positions by other operators in the area, but she decided to stick it out with the new owner, Ron Lofton. It was a tough transition year. Unlike her previous boss who only owned the one store, Lofton had a number of stores, which meant adjusting to new people and a new environment. It also meant new challenges, opportunities, and more responsibility. After a year or so, she said to herself, “Okay, I can do this.” It was only at that point that she recognized that she had a career at McDonald’s.

**CHALLENGES**

Rankings and ratings made it clear that McDonald’s Corporation was a successful company. As with any successful company, there were challenges. These included among other things facing MNCs negative perceptions about the business; recruitment and retention of employees;
and career opportunity differentials. Arguably, the most challenging of these was responding to the widely held negative perceptions of the company. The criticisms tended to be focused on resistance to the fast food industry in general and the nature of the work, in particular, which had come to be known pejoratively as the “McJob.”

At one level it was a mark of the company’s success that it became a lightning rod for criticisms of the fast food industry, though that was little comfort for employees and executives who were the target of such criticisms. The term “McJob” was coined by Douglas Copland in his 1991 best seller *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture*. Copland defined a McJob as “a low-paying, low-prestige, low-dignity, low-benefit, no-future job in the service sector.”

By 2003, the term “McJob” had become so accepted that it appeared in the new edition of Merriam-Webster’s collegiate dictionary. The reaction from McDonald’s was strong and immediate. Jim Cantalupe, then CEO of McDonald’s International, criticized the publisher for the entry, which defined the word as slang for “a low-paying job that requires little skill and provides little opportunity for advancement.” In an open letter to Merriam-Webster, Cantalupe said that the “the term is ‘an inaccurate description of restaurant employment’ and ‘a slap in the face to the 12 million men and women’ who work in the restaurant industry.”

As if including the term “McJob” in the dictionary was not enough of a challenge, its use in the media and elsewhere continued to vex employees and executives alike. On “The X-Factor,” a popular reality television show in the United Kingdom, judges used the phrase “You’re worth nothing more than a job in a McDonald’s” when insulting contestants. David Fairhurst, a McDonald’s UK vice president, claimed that there was “a huge gap [that] exists between the external perception and the internal reality of working for McDonald’s. The simple fact is our employer reputation isn’t justified.” Noting that Copland referenced the service sector in general, not McDonald’s in particular, Fairhurst, however, realistically acknowledged, “we have to accept that this association exists, and correct it.”

Chris Nichols, owner of two Colorado restaurants, asked, “How many teachers have you heard say, ‘you better study or you’ll be flipping burgers for the rest of your life’?” His response was, “I flip burgers for a living and I’ll match my salary against anybody’s.” There was no denying that the stereotypical image that the term “McJob” evoked was a difficult one to overcome. Ignoring the issue, however, was not an option,
given the effects that such negative stereotypes could have. Riding the greater wave of anti-fast-food sentiment and the upward-sloping trend of obesity in the United States and across Western Europe, the public contempt for a crew position at McDonald’s reached a critical mass in the late 1990s, with annual turnover for crew positions were between 300% and 400%.50

The industry as a whole faced challenges in recruitment and retention. Some were directly related to negative perceptions of the industry, but they were not the only concern. In the United States for example, “teen participation in the job market fell 4.1% to 44.1% compared with 48.2% a year ago [August 2004]. In July [2005], the level fell to an all-time low of 43.8% on a seasonally adjusted basis.”51 This presented a challenge given U.S. Department of Labor reports that one-fourth of the 6.5 million food-and-beverage workers were between the ages of 16 and 19 and that job openings would continue to increase through 2012.52

Another challenge for McDonald’s, at least in the United States, was the potential differential in compensation and other benefits as well as in career opportunities between company-owned and operator-owned stores. For example, McDonald’s USA had four different health plans. Employees in McOpCo restaurants could choose from all four of them. In operator-owned stores, the operators determined which benefits were offered; and some of them limited the plans they offered. But the vast majority of operator-owners were like Calhoun’s boss: “Ron doesn’t have to do these things, you know,” she reminded people. “But he provides for us well, with benefits, vacations, whatever.”

A related challenge, one that Russell viewed as a “real world” one, was addressing the needs of employees who chose to forego participation in the available health plans. “Although we’ve done a tremendous job leveraging our size and our scale to really deliver quality benefits at as low a cost as we can,” he said, “these individuals are in such an awful situation that they’re choosing between food and health insurance. Well we all know what somebody in that position would choose. I know what I would choose; I would choose food.” Russell and others wanted to move forward aggressively to tackle this situation.

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES

As a corporation, McDonald’s had been strategic in its response to these challenges. This was most obvious in the media campaigns launched to debunk the “McJob” stereotypes. McDonald’s UK created a
series of advertisements that highlighted the benefits of a “McJob.” Each ended with the tagline, “Not bad for a McJob.” There were 18 posters in the series, each with a counterclaim. Examples included:

- “McProspects—over half our Executive Team started in our restaurants. Not bad for a McJob;”
- “McOpportunity—two pay reviews in your first year. Not bad for a McJob;”
- “McFlexible—we’ve enough shift patterns to suit almost every lifestyle. Not bad for a McJob.”

In late 2005, following on the success of the “I’m lovin’ it” campaign, which increased sales and employee retention rates, the company kicked off its “My First” campaign, created by the Chicago-based ad agency Leo Burnett, to further respond to the negative perceptions about working at McDonald’s. Used in markets around the world, ads featured the likes of Olympic gold medalist Carl Lewis, Japanese artist Suguru Otake, late-night television talk-show host Jay Leno, Amazon.com CEO Jeff Bezos, and Grammy-award-winning singer Shania Twain. According to Larry Light, the executive vice president and global chief marketing officer who oversaw the “My First” ads, the “campaign is intended to inspire our employees, attract new ones, and show our customers that if you begin your career at McDonald’s, the sky is the limit.”

Although the media campaigns were helpful, strategies for meeting the recruitment and retention challenge went well beyond advertisements. The perception was that McDonald’s was a minimum-wage employer, but Ellis insisted, “That’s not true. We are not a minimum-wage employer. Does that mean we don’t sometimes pay minimum wage? Of course it doesn’t.” In any given region, wages were often better than average. Nichols, who employed slightly more than 100 people, says “midlevel managers can take home $35,000 a year and top managers in Craig and Steamboat [Colorado] make in excess of $70,000 a year including benefits.” “More than 80% of the chain’s U.K. staff received above the minimum hourly wage while half of restaurant managers earn [British pounds] GBP40,000 a year or more.” In 2003, McDonald’s employees earned approximately 29% more than the average wage paid by the Brazilian food industry. In addition, McDonald’s corporate-owned restaurants, as well as many franchised locations, took advantage of a large package of employee benefits aimed at training and retaining valuable employees. Many of the programs started regionally and, after some test-
ing within the company, spread throughout the 119 countries in which McDonald's had operations.

In the United States, McDonald's bolstered the incentive to participate in traditional employee programs such as health insurance and 401(k) programs. To ensure a slower increase in health care premiums for in-store employees, top executives in the company had, from the mid-1990s to 2008, accepted 25% to 30% increases in their own insurance premiums. This enabled the company to keep increases in premiums for store managers to 1% to 5% during the same time period.

When a study revealed a surprisingly low enrollment in 401(k) plans, the company began offering better incentives for participation. Realizing that the 1% salary commitment was keeping many employees from enrolling, McDonald's gave all eligible employees a one-time raise of 1% of salary; it then offered a 3% match to that 1% contribution. Employees could commit as much as 4% of their salaries to the investment program, which was met by McDonald's at 7%, an unheard of contribution in the foodservice industry. As employees become eligible, they were automatically enrolled in the program, although they were free to opt out. As a result of the changes, store managers’ enrollment in the program increased from 41% to 93%.

Other benefits offered included some that targeted “real-world” issues, which concerned Russell and other senior executives. Among these were the Gold Card and the McResource Line. The Gold Card, which could be used at more than 60 different retail stores, provided employees with discounts on products that ranged from footwear to prescription drugs. Russell saw this as a “real-life benefit” for the 365,000 McOpCo employees who participated in the program, which was free. The McResource Line, another free benefit for McOpCo employees, was “a resource that provides real-time telephone help to an individual—crew person or whomever—who needs help,” for example, finding babysitters, obtaining financial counseling, and locating housing.

Beyond traditional employee incentive programs, McDonald’s instituted several options for employees working with difficult schedules. In the United Kingdom, McDonald’s introduced the Family Contract. The program made it possible for family members who worked at the same location to switch shifts without having to give supervisors prior notice. Rita Cross and her two teenage daughters, who were from Cardiff, Wales, were the first to take advantage of the program. According to Cross, the entire family benefitted from “a better work and life balance.”

The pro-
gram led to less absenteeism and stress for employees, who appreciated the greater ability to juggle work and other commitments.

Students employed in some franchise locations in the United States were paid to do their schoolwork on the job. Whether in high school or college, students working at either of the two Michigan stores owned by Kathy and Jerry Olinik could “stay on the clock for an extra hour before or after their shifts.” The only condition was that they spend the time studying. As Jerry Olinik noted, “Kids are our future. Anything we can do to support that is the responsible thing to do.” The Oliniks were not alone. In Wisconsin, one owner “lets students stay on the clock to participate in a study group. Owners in North Carolina and Virginia allow employees to take English language classes as part of their shifts.” Ellen Galinsky, who was the president of the Families and Work Institute, pointed out the obvious: They not only benefitted students, they assisted with recruitment and retention.

Another recruitment and retention strategy focused on identifying applicants who were the right fit for the job and for the company. Given the focus on youth in entry-level positions, strategies were developed that recognized their cyberspace lifestyles. In Australia, McDonald’s was the largest employer of youth. In 2006, the company “launched ‘metime,’ a fully integrated online recruitment, induction, and training system for its 730 restaurants across Australia.” Frank McManus said, “‘metime’ allows a candidate to find out what McDonald’s has to offer from an employment perspective, if the restaurant of their choice was currently hiring and even allows them to apply to a number of restaurants in one hit thereby saving time.” The United States had a similar program called, Hiring to Win. “It’s built on selecting people that will succeed in our culture,” according to Russell. The response to both programs was positive.

For Russell, these and other benefits reflected the fact that McDonald’s is a company with true character. Whether it is a community disaster or whether it is a personal situation, McDonald’s is a company that continually, time after time, steps up to do the right thing for the individual. And I think that when you work in the company for a long time, or even a short time, you start seeing that, and it ends up really binding you to the company and the culture.
LOCAL ECONOMIES BENEFIT

The most obvious impact of McDonald’s business activities was the direct employment of 1.6 million people around the world. Each was offered the possibility to grow and develop personally. The minimal educational requirements for entry-level positions provided opportunities to a wide range of people from diverse backgrounds. All of them had the potential to rise through the ranks as Ray Kroc Award recipient Darlene Calhoun had done.

Almost 30 years after she took the job in Portland, Oregon, Calhoun, who now was responsible for a McDonald’s on Chicago’s west side, found herself among the top 1% of all managers in the United States. The Ray Kroc Award “was really a surprise,” she said, “because you don’t focus on trying to win awards.” She acknowledged that it took a great deal of work to rise to that level; to be among the top 1%, a store could not have any failures in any area, including food preparation and safety, cleanliness, and customer service. Site visits were often unannounced. And whether it was a scheduled two-day inspection or a shorter unannounced one, “they grade you from the roof to the basement,” she said. Calhoun said that even though her McDonald’s was in a “tough, tough area,” her goal was to make sure that the customers would get the same quality service as people who ate at a restaurant “downtown or Westmont or wherever.” She had a bit of advice for those who might want to take advantage of the opportunities McDonald’s offered: “They believe in integrity. They believe in high standards. If you want to work for them, you have to follow those high standards. You have to be able to have that commitment and be able to uphold the standards that they set forth and live it and walk it and breathe it every day.”

The education and training coupled with the wages and benefits that McDonald’s provided for its employees made it possible for countless individuals to rise through the ranks. As Ellis pointed out, “McDonald’s has produced more millionaire businesspeople within the African-American community than any other organization in the United States.” Those who took advantage of the career opportunities were able to provide for themselves and their families, as Vielka McCollum, manager of an Elk Grove Village, California, McDonald’s restaurant did. A Panamanian immigrant raising three children, McCollum, who started as crew in 1996, knew that opportunities abounded: “If it wasn’t for McDonald’s, I wouldn’t have everything I have.” She was passionate about her work and the company; “people say I have ketchup in my blood,” she said.
Although the economic contribution that resulted from McDonald’s ability to assist individual employees move into stable financial situations was considerable, Bob Langert, vice president, corporate social responsibility, argued that the total economic impact was much greater. “We have 1.6 million people that work for McDonald’s,” he said, “but if you add up our supply chain it’s more than that.” In Brazil, alone, McDonald’s activities generated more than 65,000 jobs. McDonald’s Brazil relied on more than 200 local suppliers for products as diverse as chicken, vegetable oil, flour, paper napkins, uniforms, and electricity. The company’s “supply chain added [Brazilian real] BRL$1.5 billion [USD772 million] to the economy in 2003.”

The wealth creation in markets in which McDonald’s operated provided opportunities for advancement to those who were directly employed by the company. Those same activities also provided opportunities for economic betterment to countless other stakeholders across the globe.

CONCLUSION

The call for MNCs to assist in the reduction of poverty as part of their business plans was based in part on the recognition of the enormous resources that such companies commanded. Prahalad, Hart, and others went beyond simply acknowledging the economic power and resources that these companies had. They made the claim that the companies could, and indeed did, play a vital role in addressing issues of poverty across the globe and that this could be done primarily through a company’s day-to-day business operations. As noted in the introduction, Prahalad, Hart, and the others were interested in “a new private sector-based approach” to addressing poverty-related issues. Though it was possible to point to companies that were making inroads and having success in this regard, skeptics remained. Some were doubtful because of a general distrust of MNCs. Some remained unconvinced because they did not believe that focusing on poverty reduction was an appropriate role for business. Others simply had not considered the possibility that there could be a relationship between their businesses and poverty reduction. Langert admitted that McDonald’s did not intentionally consider poverty reduction when it developed its business plans and implementation strategies. What was intentional, he said, was “that we work with people that are just starting. We don’t say that they’re poor or impoverished.”
In the face of the claims made by Hart and others, did McDonald’s have a responsibility to be more intentional about poverty reduction? Should it have rethought its business model so that poverty reduction became one of the filters in its strategic decision-making process? Did it have an obligation to raise other companies’ awareness of their ability to affect development and poverty-related issues? Could and should it have done more to raise public awareness of the impact of its policies and practices on employee growth and development, so that employees were viewed and treated with respect? Or was it acceptable to maintain the status quo, and expect employees to accept the derogatory comments and attitudes toward their work the way that Calhoun came to do? “Raised two kids, bought a couple cars, a home. I think I do pretty good,” she said. She was aware that many “still look at it as a mediocre-type job” and attributes that to the fact that people “don’t understand what goes on behind the scenes—the training that we get. All they see is flippin’ burgers and ‘Here’s your fries’; they don’t see that other side. So it doesn’t bother me.”
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