

Just old wine in new bottles?
Conceptual shifts in the emerging field of responsible management

Oliver Laasch
University of Nottingham Ningbo China

KEYWORDS

Responsible
Management

Responsible
Managers

Managing
Responsibly

ABSTRACT

While responsible management increasingly consolidates as a field of study, the question about the identity of this emerging field arises. Are there novel conceptual themes or is it all just ‘old wine in new bottles’? In this paper I propose a non-exclusive list of three conceptual shifts distinguishing responsible management from related discussions: A first shift moves the corporate sustainability, CSR, and business ethics discussions from the organizational to the individual level of the responsible manager and of her processes of managing responsibly. A second shift moves the responsible management learning and education discussion’s focus on academic practices to managerial practices. A third shift moves the discussion centered on responsible leaders, social entrepreneurs, ethics officers, or environmental managers, from unique specialized managers to every ‘normal’ mainstream responsible manager. In summary, the field of responsible management studies the integration of sustainability, responsibility, and ethics (SRE) into the managerial practice(s) of ‘normal’ managers. The conceptual shifts not only delineate the responsible management discussion, but also imply a potentially synergetic connection to related fields such as micro-CSR, humanistic management, and to the professionalization of management discussion.

Please cite this publication as: Laasch, O. (2018), Just old wine in new bottles? Conceptual shifts in the emerging field of responsible management, *CRME Working Papers* 4(1).

Just Old Wine in New Bottles?

A field of research and publication is emerging which centers on responsible management as a type of management that integrates sustainability, responsibility, and ethics into managerial practice(s) (Laasch & Conaway, 2015). This discussion features prominent contributions in mainstream journals like Harvard Business Review (Abrams, 1951; Prahalad, 2010) as well as vivid discussion in specialist journals, most prominently the Journal of Business Ethics (Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2013; Hilliard, 2013; Laasch, Moosmayer, Antonacopoulou, & Schaltegger, 2017; Nonet, Kassel, & Meijs, 2016). Various edited volumes (Buckingham & Venkataraman, 2016; Sharma, Csur, & Ogunyemi, 2017), monographs (Ennals, 2014; Ogunyemi, 2012), full-blown textbooks (Haski-Leventhal, 2018; Laasch & Conaway, 2015, 2016), and even a responsible management research handbook have been published (Laasch, Jamali, Freeman, & Suddaby, 2019).¹

All of these publications share an explicit reference to responsible management, but what's new? We have discussed topics of social and environmental responsibility and business ethics for almost 100 years (Donham, 1927a, b; Follett, 1927). The field of responsible management education has been flourishing for over a decade (e.g. Alcaraz & Thiruvattal, 2010; PRME, 2007; Waddock, Rasche, Werhane, & Unruh, 2010). We know much about responsible leadership (e.g. Lawrence & Beamish, 2012; Maak & Pless, 2006; Stahl & De Luque, 2014; Waldman & Siegel, 2008) and about the work of specialized professionals, such as ethics officers, environmental managers, and CSR managers (e.g. Adobor, 2006; Chaudhri, 2016; Friedman, 1992; Morf, Schumacher, & Vitell, 1999). Is there anything novel that distinguishes

¹ See <http://responsiblemanagement.net/responsible-management-literature-list/> for a continuously updated list of publications making explicit reference to responsible management.

the emerging responsible management discussion from these important streams of research, or is it just old wine in new bottles?

Conceptual Shifts Distinguishing the Responsible Management Discussion

The main argument of this paper is that the responsible management discussion has at least three distinctive characteristics illustrated in Figure 1. First, responsible management is distinct from *corporate* social responsibility, sustainable *business*, and social *enterprise* discussions as it moves the unit of analysis from the organizational level to the individual, group, and processual levels of responsible manager(s) and of managing responsibly. Secondly, responsible management is distinct from the responsible management *education* discussion, as it explicitly focusses on managerial practices outside the academic context. Third, responsible management is distinct from the study of specialized professionals, such as CSR managers or ethics officers, and from salient responsible leaders or social entrepreneurs. It is primarily interested in ‘normal’ mainstream managers’ efforts to manage responsibly. In the following brief sections, we will outline each shift at some detail.

Figure 1 Conceptual Shifts Characterizing the Field of Responsible Management Research



From Organizational to Individual and Processual Focus. There was a discussion of responsible management long before we talked about business sustainability, responsibility, and ethics (Laasch, 2016). As early as the 1920s, Wallace B. Donham, Harvard Business School's second dean highlighted an idealistic image of managers' social role and responsibility (Donham, 1927a, b). The same year, iconic management pioneer Mary Parker-Follett (1927) envisioned management as a profession with a key role in society's welfare through the efficient provision of needed goods. Such early calls for responsible management were echoed further by aspirational descriptions of the responsibility of the business man in the 1950s (Acquier, Gond, & Pasquero, 2011; Bowen, 1953), with a genuine concern for "management's responsibilities in a complex world" (Abrams, 1951). Even centuries before, ideals of responsible management have outlined responsible management conduct locally, such as Germany's 'honorable merchant' ('ehrbarer Kaufmann' in German) (Beschoner & Hajduk, 2015; Schwalbach, 2016; Schwalbach & Klink, 2012).

However, in the 1960s a consensus emerged that management was failing to fulfill its societal role and to act responsibly (Donham, 1962). In the 1970s, such behavior was further normalized by Milton Friedman's (1970) normative claim that managers should not engage into social responsibility and may therefore be expected to be irresponsible (Armstrong, 1977). Shifting attention from the individual to the organizational level, 40 years followed of construction of an eclectic research field discussing responsible organizations instead of managers. Prominent examples are the fields of *corporate* social responsibility, *corporate* citizenship, *corporate* sustainability, social *enterprise*, and *business* ethics (Carroll, 1999; Montiel, 2008; Schwartz & Carroll, 2008). Labels vary for this *business* and society field (Schwartz & Carroll, 2008), but the organizational level focus is apparent also in main

journal titles, such as, *Business & Society*, *Organization and Environment*, and the Journal of *Business Ethics*. Although the Academy of Management's Social Issues in *Management* (SIM) division's name would suggest otherwise, also here the main focus is organizational (Walsh, Weber, & Margolis, 2003).²

These discussions have produced considerable achievements for the institutionalization of sustainability, responsibility, and ethics and for their promotion on an organizational level. However, related discussions, while not denying the importance of sustainable, responsible, and ethical management, appear to have distracted from the original concern for the *individual* manager and her processes of managing responsibly (Schneider, Zollo, & Manocha, 2010). In a first conceptual move, the responsible management discussion distinguishes itself from such organization-level discussions, by its explicit focus on the individual and processual aspects of responsible managers and management. The emerging responsible management discussion puts "The Responsible Manager" front and center (Pralhad, 2010), for instance, by focusing on managers' "human nature" (Ogunyemi, 2012). It highlights processes and practices (Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2013; Palazzo & Wentland, 2011) of "managing responsibly" (Buckingham & Venkataraman, 2016; Sharma et al., 2017), across managerial occupations (Laasch & Conaway, 2015).

From Academic to Managerial Practices. Since the beginning of the new millennium, criticism of business schools has emerged, highlighting our failure to educate responsible managers, even fostering irresponsible management (Amann, Pirson, Dierksmeier, Von Kimakowitz, & Spitzeck, 2011; Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2010; Wang, Malhotra, & Murnighan,

² Ironically, Milton Friedman's (1970) observation that organizational responsibility was nonsense, as "only people can have responsibilities", supports the study of responsible management over that of responsible organizations.

2011). Accordingly, it is not further surprising that much of the last decade's efforts at strengthening responsible management have evolved in the context of business school-related initiatives. Arguably, the largest initiative is the United Nations led Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) network with over 700 signatories worldwide. Also, accreditations agencies such as EQUIS' emphasize the importance of SER (standing for sustainability, ethics, responsibility), as do individual initiatives like the managerial oath projects (De Bruin, 2016; Khurana, 2010; Khurana & Nohria, 2008).

The related discussion not only covers practices of educating managers for sustainability, responsibility and ethics (Forray & Leigh, 2012; Rasche & Gilbert, 2015). It also addresses a wide variety of other practices in the academic realm, such as (hidden) curriculum design (e.g. Blasco, 2012), examining students (e.g. Carteron, Haynes, & Murray, 2014), and faculty development (e.g. Solitander, Fougère, Sobczak, & Herlin, 2011). As a consequence, most of the research in the larger responsible management learning and education field has been directed towards a wealth of academic practices, but there is very little research on responsible management practices (Laasch, 2017).³

This kind of academic navel gazing puts the effectiveness of responsible management education in question: How can we believe to be able to teach students to become responsible managers, if we do not know what makes a responsible manager and have very limited knowledge about the processes and practices of managing responsibly? Accordingly, there is a need for the responsible management field to emancipate itself from its origin in the education

³ See <http://responsiblemanagement.net/literature-base/> for a continuously updated list of publications in the responsible management *learning and education* discussion.

field. We need more research to start studying responsible *management* practice(s) ‘in the wild’, in businesses, managerial workplaces, and through the eyes of practicing responsible managers.⁴

Therefore, the second move of this paper is to provide a line of delineation and to aid in an emancipation of responsible management as a managerial field from its origins in academic and educational practices. This means to talk about responsible management, without having to automatically imply an educational or academic link. Accordingly, most pioneering responsible management publications study responsible management in ‘working life’ (Ennals, 2014), interested in particular workplace-related aspects such as incentive systems or productivity (Hilliard, 2013), and by paying particular attention to responsibility-relevant constructs like dignity in the managerial job (Davila-Gomez & Crowther, 2012). Importantly, some responsible management publications have started studying learning in the managerial job without having to rely on the ‘crutch’ of formal education and academic practices (Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2013; Laasch et al., 2017). Others are still located on the boundary between responsible management and responsible management education, for instance, in the case of Nonet et al. (2016), who study definitions of responsible management through the eyes of students.

From Specialized to Mainstream Management. There is a wide variety of valuable individual-level discussions related to responsible practice(s) in the managerial workplace. These discussions fit well into the domain of responsible management implied by the first two shifts described above. Discussions include, among others, responsible leadership (Gond, Igalens, Swaen, & El Akremi, 2011; Lawrence & Beamish, 2012; Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011; Waldman & Siegel, 2008); social entrepreneurship (e.g. Dees, 1998; Ridley-Duff, Bull, & Laasch, 2015;

⁴Practice(s) here should be understood both ways, in the wide sense of practicing responsible management, as something that is done (praxis), or more specifically to the study of responsible management through the lens of theories of practice (Gherardi, 2012; Schatzki, 1996; Shove, Pantzar, & Watson, 2012).

Seelos & Mair, 2004; Simms, 2009; Siqueira, Ramos, Kelly, Mnisri, & Kassouf, 2015); and specialized environmental managers, ethics officers, or CR managers (Chaudhri, 2016; Cordano & Frieze, 2000; Morf et al., 1999; Osagie, Wesselink, Blok, Lans, & Mulder, 2016). However, all of these discussions describe responsible management practice(s) of somehow ‘special’ managers. For instance, formal leaders are special as they are often positioned in particularly powerful positions in the organizational hierarchy, or gain power through their followership. Social entrepreneurs, CSR managers, environmental managers, ethics officers, and the like are ‘specialized’ responsible managers with their main job being centered on sustainability, responsibility, and ethics (Laasch & Conaway, 2015). They are sometimes labelled as sustainability, responsibility, or ethics ‘professionals’ (Bootsma & Vermeulen, 2011; Visser & Crane, 2010; Willard et al., 2010).

Responsible management, however, has a stronger focus on the ‘normal’ manager who practices sustainability, responsibility, and ethics as part of their job in one of the ‘mainstream’ managerial occupations like marketing or accounting (Child, 2015; Laasch & Conaway, 2015; Maon, Swaen, & Lindgreen, 2010; Smith & Lenssen, 2010). Responsible management aims at making management responsible by deeply integrating SRE into every and any manager’s job, leading to a focus on such ‘mainstream managers’, all of them, not the (self-) chosen few responsible leaders, social entrepreneurs, and environmental managers. The resulting third move of responsible management is to refocus on the large number of ‘normal’ mainstream managers and on their efforts of managing responsibly, by integrating sustainability, responsibility, and ethics into their practice(s).

Conclusions and Discussion: Connecting to Related Streams of Research

Summarizing the three conceptual shifts and differentiators outlined in this short working paper we can outline our field of study as follows: *Responsible management studies the integration of sustainability, responsibility, and ethics (SRE) into the managerial practice(s) of 'normal' managers.*

Each of the three conceptual shifts contained in this brief definition not only imply delineations from existing fields of study, but also imply potential synergies with related discussions. For instance, the move from organizational level to managerial level has much in common with the vivid discussion of micro-CSR (e.g. Dillon, 2014; Glavas, 2016; Gond, El Akremi, Swaen, & Babu, 2017; Maak, Pless, & Voegtlin, 2015). The second shift from academic to managerial practices has much in common with the humanistic management discussion (e.g. Dierksmeier, 2016; Laasch et al., 2018; Lawrence & Pirson, 2015; Melé, 2003; Spitzbeck, 2011), dominantly focused on management practices in a business context, not on educational practices. The third shift from specialized to mainstream management relates strongly to efforts of management professionalization, implying the institutionalization of a widespread institutionalization of responsible management conduct for any manager (e.g. Khurana, 2010; Khurana & Nohria, 2008; Laasch & Moosmayer, 2016; Muzio, Brock, & Suddaby, 2013; Trank & Rynes, 2003).

Of course, these connections to salient streams of literature are not intended to be an exhaustive list. They rather are exemplifications meant to inspire readers' further reflection on the interconnectedness of the emerging field of responsible management with other promising discussions.

References

- Abrams, F. W. 1951. Management's responsibilities in a complex world. *Harvard Business Review*, 29(3): 29-34.
- Acquier, A., Gond, J. P., & Pasquero, J. 2011. Rediscovering Howard R. Bowen's legacy: The unachieved agenda and continuing relevance of social responsibilities of the businessman. *Business & Society*, 50(4): 607-646.
- Adobor, H. 2006. Exploring the role performance of corporate ethics officers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69(1): 57-75.
- Alcaraz, J. M., & Thiruvattal, E. 2010. An interview with Manuel Escudero The United Nations' principles for responsible management education: A global call for sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(3): 542-550.
- Amann, W., Pirson, M., Dierksmeier, C., Von Kimakowitz, E., & Spitzeck, H. 2011. *Business schools under fire: Humanistic management education as the way forward*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Armstrong, J. S. 1977. Social irresponsibility in management. *Journal of Business Research*, 5(3): 185-213.
- Beschorner, T., & Hajduk, T. 2015. „Der ehrbare Kaufmann “und „Creating Shared Value “. Eine Kritik im Lichte der aktuellen CSR-Diskussion. In A. Schneider, & R. Schmidpeter (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility: Verantwortungsvolle Unternehmensführung in Theorie und Praxis*: 269-280. Berlin: Springer Gabler.
- Blasco, M. 2012. Aligning the hidden curriculum of management education with PRME: An inquiry-based framework. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3): 364-388.
- Bootsma, M., & Vermeulen, W. 2011. Experiences of environmental professionals in practice. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 12(2): 163-176.
- Bowen, H. R. 1953. *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buckingham, J., & Venkataraman, N. (Eds.). 2016. *Managing responsibly: Alternative approaches to corporate management and governance*. London: Routledge.
- Carroll, A. B. 1999. Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & society*, 38(3): 268-295.
- Carteron, J.-C., Haynes, K., & Murray, A. 2014. Education for sustainable development, the UNGC PRME initiative, and the sustainability literacy test: Measuring and assessing success. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 79(4): 51-58.
- Chaudhri, V. 2016. Corporate social responsibility and the communication imperative: Perspectives from CSR managers. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53(4): 419-442.
- Child, C. 2015. Mainstreaming and its discontents: Fair trade, socially responsible investing, and industry trajectories. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(3): 601-618.
- Cordano, M., & Frieze, I. H. 2000. Pollution reduction preferences of US environmental managers: Applying Ajzen's theory of planned behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 627-641.
- Davila-Gomez, A. M., & Crowther, D. (Eds.). 2012. *Human dignity and managerial responsibility : Diversity, rights, and sustainability*. Surrey: Gower.
- De Bruin, B. 2016. Pledging integrity: Oaths as forms of business ethics management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(1): 23-42.
- Dees, J. G. 1998. The meaning of social entrepreneurship.
- Dierksmeier, C. 2016. *Reframing Economic Ethics: The Philosophical Foundations of Humanistic Management*: Springer.
- Dillon, P. J. 2014. Identity, justice, and social responsibility: Micro-foundations of CSR. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2014(1): 10425-.
- Donham, P. 1962. Is management a profession? *Harvard Business Review*, 40(5): 60-68.

- Donham, W. B. 1927a. The emerging profession of business. *Harvard Business Review*, 5(4): 401-405.
- Donham, W. B. 1927b. The social significance of business. *Harvard Business Review*, 5(4): 406-419.
- Ennals, R. 2014. *Responsible management: Corporate social responsibility and working life*. New York: Springer.
- Follett, M. P. 1927. Management as a profession. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *Business management as a profession*: 73-87. Chicago: A. W. Shaw Company.
- Forray, J. M., & Leigh, J. S. 2012. A primer on the principles of responsible management education intellectual roots and waves of change. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3): 295-309.
- Friedman, F. B. 1992. The changing role of the environmental manager. *Business Horizons*, 35(2): 25-28.
- Friedman, M. 1970. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Gherardi, S. 2012. *How to conduct a practice-based study: Problems and methods*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1): 75-91.
- Glavas, A. 2016. Corporate social responsibility and organizational psychology: An integrative review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(Art. 144).
- Gond, J.-P., Igalens, J., Swaen, V., & El Akremi, A. 2011. The human resources contribution to responsible leadership: An exploration of the CSR–HR interface. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(1): 115-132.
- Gond, J. P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. 2017. The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person - centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2): 225-246.
- Haski-Leventhal, D. 2018. *Strategic CSR: Tools and theories for responsible management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. 2013. Responsible management: Engaging moral reflexive practice through threshold concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(1): 177-188.
- Hilliard, I. 2013. Responsible management, incentive systems, and productivity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(2): 365-377.
- Khurana, R. 2010. *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Khurana, R., & Nohria, N. 2008. It's time to make management a true profession. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(10): 70-77.
- Laasch, O. 2016. *Business model change through embedding corporate responsibility-sustainability? Logics, devices, actor networks*. University of Manchester, Manchester.
- Laasch, O. 2017. Blurring the boundaries of responsible management, responsible management education and responsible management learning? A social practices perspective. *CRME Working Papers*, 3(2).
- Laasch, O., & Conaway, R. 2015. *Principles of responsible management: Glocal sustainability, responsibility, ethics*. Mason: Cengage.
- Laasch, O., & Conaway, R. 2016. *Responsible business: The textbook for management learning, competence, innovation*. Sheffield: Greenleaf.
- Laasch, O., Dierksmeier, C., Livne-Tarandach, R., Pirson, M., Fu, P., & Qu, Q. 2018. Humanistic management performativity 'in the wild': The role of performative bundles of practices, *32nd Annual Australian & New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM) Conference*. Auckland.
- Laasch, O., Jamali, D., Freeman, E., & Suddaby, R. (Eds.). 2019. *The research handbook of responsible management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Laasch, O., & Moosmayer, D. 2016. *Responsible management competences: Building a portfolio for professional competence*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Conference, Anaheim.
- Laasch, O., Moosmayer, D., Antonacopoulou, E., & Schaltegger, S. 2017. Responsible management learning: Change and innovation for sustainability, responsibility, ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Lawrence, J. T., & Beamish, P. W. (Eds.). 2012. *Globally responsible leadership: Managing according to the UN Global Compact*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Pirson, M. 2015. Economistic and humanistic narratives of leadership in the age of globality: Toward a renewed Darwinian theory of leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(2): 383-394.
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. 2006. Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society—a relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1): 99-115.
- Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Voegtlin, C. 2015. CEO Responsible leadership styles and the microfoundations of political CSR. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2015(1): 14505.
- Maon, F., Swaen, V., & Lindgreen, A. 2010. Mainstreaming corporate social responsibility: A triadic challenge from a general management perspective. In S. O. Idowu, & W. L. Filho (Eds.), *Professionals' perspectives of corporate social responsibility*: 71-96. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Melé, D. 2003. The challenge of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(1): 77-88.
- Montiel, I. 2008. Corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability: Separate pasts, common futures. *Organization & Environment*, 21(3): 245-269.
- Morf, D. A., Schumacher, M. G., & Vitell, S. J. 1999. A survey of ethics officers in large organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20(3): 265-271.
- Muzio, D., Brock, D. M., & Suddaby, R. 2013. Professions and institutional change: Towards an institutionalist sociology of the professions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(5): 699-721.
- Nonet, G., Kassel, K., & Meijs, L. 2016. Understanding responsible management: Emerging themes and variations from European business school programs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(4): 717–736.
- Ogunyemi, K. 2012. *Responsible management: Understanding human nature, ethics, and sustainability*. New York: Business Expert Press.
- Osagie, E., Wesselink, R., Blok, V., Lans, T., & Mulder, M. 2016. Individual competencies for corporate social responsibility: A literature and practice perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(2): 233-252.
- Palazzo, G., & Wentland, M. 2011. *Responsible management practices for the 21st Century*. Paris: Pearson.
- Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. 2011. Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2): 237-260.
- Prahalad, C. K. 2010. The responsible manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(1/2): 36.
- PRME. 2007. *Six Principles*. on <http://www.unprme.org/about-prme/the-six-principles.php>.
- Rasche, A., & Gilbert, D. U. 2015. Decoupling responsible management education: Why business schools may not walk their talk. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(3): 239-252.
- Ridley-Duff, R., Bull, M., & Laasch, O. 2015. Entrepreneurship: Value-added ventures. In O. Laasch, & R. N. Conaway (Eds.), *Principles of responsible management: Glocal sustainability, responsibility, ethics*. Mason: Cengage.
- Schatzki, T. R. 1996. *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, S. C., Zollo, M., & Manocha, R. 2010. Developing socially responsible behaviour in managers. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 39: 21-40.

- Schwalbach, J. 2016. Ehrbare Kaufleute als Leitbild verantwortungsvoller Unternehmensführung. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts-und Unternehmensethik*, 17(2): 216-231.
- Schwalbach, J., & Klink, D. 2012. Der Ehrbare Kaufmann als individuelle verantwortungskategorie der CSR-Forschung. In S. A., & S. R. (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility*: 219-240. Berlin: Springer.
- Schwartz, M. S., & Carroll, A. B. 2008. Integrating and unifying competing and complementary frameworks: The search for a common core in the business and society field. *Business & Society*, 47(2): 148-186.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. 2004. Social entrepreneurship-The contribution of individual entrepreneurs to sustainable development.
- Sharma, R., Csuri, M., & Ogunyemi, K. 2017. *Managing responsibility: A sourcebook for an alternative paradigm*. New York: Business Expert Press.
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. 2012. *The dynamics of social practice: Everyday life and how it changes*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Simms, M. 2009. Insights from a management prophet: Mary Parker Follett on social entrepreneurship. *Business and Society Review*, 114(3): 349-363.
- Siqueira, A. C. O., Ramos, D. P., Kelly, L., Mnisri, K., & Kassouf, P. 2015. Responsible management education: Active learning approaches emphasising sustainability and social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 9(2): 188-202.
- Smith, N. C., & Lenssen, G. 2010. *Mainstreaming corporate responsibility*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Solitander, N., Fougère, M., Sobczak, A., & Herlin, H. 2011. We are the champions: Organizational learning and change for responsible management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(6): 337-363.
- Spitzeck, H. 2011. An integrated model of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(1): 51-62.
- Stahl, G. K., & De Luque, M. S. 2014. Antecedents of responsible leader behavior: A research synthesis, conceptual framework, and agenda for future research. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(3): 235-254.
- Trank, C. Q., & Rynes, S. L. 2003. Who moved our cheese? Reclaiming professionalism in business education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2(2): 189-205.
- Visser, W., & Crane, A. 2010. Corporate sustainability and the individual: Understanding what drives sustainability professionals as change agents.
- Waddock, S., Rasche, A., Werhane, P. H., & Unruh, G. 2010. The Principles for Responsible Management Education: Where do we go from here? In D. Fisher, & D. Swanson (Eds.), *Got ethics? Toward assessing business education*: 13-28. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. 2008. Defining the socially responsible leader. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1): 117-131.
- Walsh, J. P., Weber, K., & Margolis, J. D. 2003. Social issues and management: Our lost cause found. *Journal of Management*, 29(6): 859-881.
- Wang, L., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. 2011. Economics education and greed. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(4): 643-660.
- Willard, M., Wiedmeyer, C., Flint, R. W., Weedon, J. S., Woodward, R., Feldman, I., & Edwards, M. 2010. *The sustainability profession: 2010 competency survey report*.