Emerald Journal of Management Development

Philosophical assumptions undermining responsible management education

Journal:	*Journal of Management Development*
Manuscript ID:	JMD-08-2013-0103
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Business Education, Business Schools, Philosophy, Moral responsibility

Philosophical assumptions undermining responsible management education

Introduction:

Despite many efforts to integrate ethics and sustainability into management education, research has shown that most initiatives meet with mixed success. Though most deans indicate that the courses, research centers committed to this area have increased over the past 10 years, the majority of faculty members still believe ESGE[1] issues remain relatively peripheral to management education (Hommel, Painter-Morland, Wang, 2012). It seems encouraging that ESGE-related courses doubled in the last decade, but unfortunately a large percentage of them are still offered as electives only, and as such they 'preach to the converted'. Furthermore, although many schools claim to have 'mainstreamed' ethics into the curriculum, there are no real evidence of it being integrated into disciplines such as accounting and finance (Rasche, Gilbert, Schedel, 2013, p. 72).

The ABIS-EFMD survey on 'Sustainability and the Future of Management Education', which was conducted in 2012, found that some of the blockages to making progress in this area include: there is disconnect between academia and practice around ESGE issues; tenure and promotion processes do not create incentives for research and teaching in this area; and initiatives seem to be more focused on perception, rather than substance (Brassey, Hommel, Lejeune, Painter-Morland, 2013). In this paper, we explore the possibility that these blockages may in fact result from some of the assumptions that currently underpin management education.

This paper is an attempt at understanding the difficulties that we may be experiencing from the perspective of deep-rooted beliefs about what "is" (ontological assumptions), and how we come to know this reality (epistemological assumptions). It will be argued that the ontological assumptions about what management education 'is', influence what we understand as 'responsible management education'. Furthermore, the tools and metrics that are considered to be rigorous and sound within management education research, display some epistemological assumptions that may undermine our capacity to study and teach the phenomena related to the responsible management agenda. We will therefore pursue an analysis of the relationships between certain ontological assumptions, and the epistemological results of such assumptions. Seen together, they allow us to get a sense of the implicit barriers that thwart our attempts at furthering responsible management education.

To get a better sense of what we are up against in promoting responsible management education, we must critically assess our assumptions about the central goal of education, the nature of wealth, and our own sense of self. We will also need to understand the relationship between these conceptions and certain normative

[1] ESGE issues refer to environmental, social, governance and ethics-related factors.

concepts. In order to do so, we will explore how certain normative concepts come into existence, and how they are related to our real embodied experience of the world. This may help us to gauge how difficult it would be to fundamentally challenge some of our long-held assumptions and their relationship to what we consider normative. Drawing on existing literature, the paper will end by proposing certain key competencies for delivering responsible management education, and illustrate that some of these competencies are unlikely to be attained within the current paradigm.

Ontological assumptions:

Wellbeing = wealth: wealth = monetary wealth > wellbeing = monetary wealth

The normative force behind arguing for a concern for ESGE issues within business is related to the belief that the promotion of human wellbeing is preferable to focusing solely on organizational profit-interest that work to the detriment of society. In what follows, we will come to understand that our normative evaluation is intimately bound up with deeply-held beliefs about what wellbeing entails, and that our tacit assumptions in this area create some constraints for responsible management education. If human wellbeing is still defined in predominantly ~~in~~ monetary terms, we are bound to be left with Friedmanesque beliefs that the single-minded pursuit of profit is ultimately good for society.

Lakoff and Johnson (1999) draw on cognitive science research to unearth the embodied roots of our moral metaphors. As such, they help us to identify some of our most basic normative orientations and to recognize some of the assumptions that underpin them. For instance, they point out that one of the most basic structures of our moral language is the "Wellbeing is wealth" construct. It is generally agreed that it is better to ~~be~~ increase one's wellbeing than to have it decreased, and that having the resources to do that is good, whilst not having it, is bad. From this perspective, an intricate system of moral accounting emerges that underpin our understanding of our moral obligations, responsibilities and rights. Our basic bodily need for wellbeing makes it inevitable that an increase in wellbeing is defined as a gain, and any impediment to wellbeing as a loss, or a cost. Consider how some everyday phrases, i.e. "investing in relationships", or "profiting from hard work", imply the normative importance of increasing one's wellbeing via a clear causal structure of input-output. A moral accusation, such as the claim that "Her insults robbed me of my dignity", clearly denotes a decrease in wellbeing, and designates someone as guilty of causing that decrease. When these metaphors are connected with event-structure metaphors, such as "He broke his mother's heart", a transactional structure emerges in which bodily affects are transferred from one person to another, causing some kind of loss, damage, or irritation.

Lakoff and Johnson (1999, Kindle edition Chapter 14 Location 7743) go further to argue that by that decreasing someone's wellbeing, one also incurs a certain moral debt, for instance you *owe* someone an apology for an insult. Just as economic transactions depend on financial bookkeeping, so our normative functioning relies on moral bookkeeping. This 'moral bookkeeping' system is made up of a few basic elements, i.e. expectations of reciprocation, the possibility of retribution or revenge, and restitution or reparations. It also informs our understanding of notions such as karma, 'turning the other cheek', or altruism, fairness or rights. A reliance on the notion of 'moral accounting' informs our acceptance of moral arguments regarding the acceptability of 'trickle-down economics' or beliefs in the power of the 'invisible hand'. As long as something works to increase wellbeing/ wealth, it is morally acceptable.

It should therefore come as no surprise that it is very difficult for us to get beyond instrumental thinking when it comes to moral notions such as 'responsibility'. The 'right' thing to do is to increase well-being, the 'wrong' thing to do is to diminish it. The way in which our normative metaphors rely on some notion of bookkeeping, in a profit-loss scheme, links our conceptions of wellbeing closely to ideas around financial transactions. When well-being is defined predominantly as monetary well-being, it should therefore come as no surprise that realizing 'responsible management education' will depend on our ability to demonstrate that responsible managers and their companies are also more financially successful.

[illegible]

In trying to unpack the existing worldview that characterize management education, Giacalone and Thompson (2006: 266) distinguish an organization-centered worldview (OWV) from a human-centered worldview (HWV). They argue that that business schools promote and engender is the organization-centered worldview (OWV). The OWV positions business at the core, and teaches students to align their decision-making with the 'natural' gravitational pull of the central force of the organization's profit-interest. As a result, OWV is characterized by the self-interested materialism, and a value-hierarchy in which power, status and the accumulation of wealth occupy the top positions.

Organizational self-interest also dictates that the self-interest of the individual manager must ideally be aligned with the profit-interest of the organization. Within executive compensation, this has created the rationale for performance-based incentives, stock options and golden parachutes, all of which are designed to motivate executives to prioritize the organization's profit-interest (Harris, 2008).

Even when business schools teach prospective managers and executives to take ethics into consideration, the financial needs of the organization are used as prime motivator. Within CSR and ethics management there are multiple attempts to justify ethical decisions and actions principally in financial terms (Giacalone and Thompson, 2006, p.268). Students are offered 'the business case for ethics and CSR, or encouraged to understand the financial implications of 'nonfinancial' performance in terms of reputation, staff turnover and retention, risk management etc. From the perspective of OWV ethics is a mere insurance policy that tries to prevent Sarbanes-Oxley related financial wrong-doing.

Unfortunately, the debate as to whether "ethical concerns pay" is far from concluded, and based on the interest in this topic in the literature, it will continue to puzzle researchers in the future. In recent publications, scholars found a very ambivalent relationship between responsibility and business performance (Valor, 2008; de Schutter, 2008; Bechetti and Ciciretti, 2009). There are others who argue for a downright positive relationship between financial results and social and environmental concerns, like Waddock and Graves (1999), Verschoor (1999, 2004; 2005) and Tsoutsoura (2004). Dissidents like McWilliams and Siegel (2000) claim no positive correlation between social and environmental agendas and business result, and dispute the methodology of scholars who argue otherwise. Margolis and Walsh (2000) took a more nuanced stance. They argue that although the overall impression of 95 studies over 30 years has been that there is a positive relationship between social (ethical) performance and financial performance, lingering questions remain about the validity and the diversity of measures that assess social performance. One of the problems is also that it is by no means clear what is exactly denoted by 'financial results'. Nonetheless, most scholars interested in the issue would, in spite of all these problems, probably concur with Carroll and Shabana (2010) or with Godfrey, Merrill, and Hanson (2009) when they argue in their reviews of the literature that there is growing support about a positive relationship between responsibility and business performance. As we saw above, the *wellbeing = wealth* constructs that underpin our normative orientations may make it even more important that they be proven right...

Yet there are others who follow Dewey in arguing that we need a more enlightened calculus of profit and loss than the purely economic (Starkey and Tempest, 2009, p. 580). Could this be accomplished by changing the focus of our investigation? The literature that attempts to establish the link between ethical performance and financial performance remains firmly focused on the organization as the center for the equation. Giacolone and Thompson (2006: 270) argue the OWV must be replaced with a HWV (human-centered worldview), which is characterized by a concern for human wellbeing. They argue that whereas the OWV inevitably reduces ethics-related content within management education to the avoidance of trouble, a HWV will offer students more than just a vision of doom and potential guilt. In fact, it could offer them a vision of themselves and the world that inspires them. From the perspective of a HWV, business is only one of many components in a system, not the goal around which everything else revolves. A HWV would prioritize the promotion of social wellbeing as the core educational goal of management education. This sounds like a wonderful ideal, but unfortunately, we will proceed to argue that another set of assumptions stand in the way of yielding the benefits of the HWV, namely the belief that human wellbeing is also implicitly related to individual monetary wealth.

[illegible]

The appeal of the idea that we need to undergo a kind of a Copernican reorientation from organization-centered worldview to a human-centered worldview lies in the promise that social wellbeing will be procured in the process. But the possibility of challenging the organization-centered worldview is undermined by the way in which individual self-interest has become fully bound up with organizational interest. This relationship seems to go beyond the incentive and performance management schemes that were mentioned above. In fact, the performance management schemes of corporations may be a reflection and solidification of this belief, rather than its source.

The true origin of this belief are to be found in the systemic assumptions about how capitalism functions. Consider here the multiple references in management literature to Mandeville's "Fable of the bees", which teachers us that the vigorous pursuit of self-interest also serves social well-being. This is echoed on Milton Friedman's belief that individual managers are solely responsible for profit-maximization and that the positive effects of this will trickle down to the rest of society via taxes, jobs, and individual charitable giving. From this perspective, the moral domain is seen as the private realm of individuals. While virtuousness is still seen as valuable in non-work environments, there seems to be an active stigmatization of goodness within companies (Giacalone and Promislo, 2013, p. 92). So much so that individuals who want to raise moral concerns are ridiculed as 'bleeding hearts', who are misguided or in some other way deficient (Giacalone and Promislo, 2013, p.89).

It will come as no surprise that there have been quite a lot of discussion of the role of self-interest and individualism within management education. Some unapologetically celebrate an Ayn Rand inspired view of the world and a viable alternative to altruism (Locke, 2006). In arguing for the individual rights against demands made by the collective, individualism and altruism are pitted against one another as if they were to be mutually exclusive (Audi, 2009: 266). There is also evidence that students in schools of management increasingly display narcissistic personality traits (Bergman, Westerman, Daly, 2010: 119). Zhu (2009: 292) points out that by both Eastern and Western standards, both organizational and individual value-sets lack the equilibrium, or balance between logos/reason and caring that most philosophers prescribe.

There is also increasing evidence that individual self-interest is understood in terms of the increase of a person's money and power. Giacalone and Promislo (2013, p. 88) describe the dominant languages within business schools as 'econophonics' and 'potensiphonics', which are clearly characteristic of a materialistic worldview. Within 'econophonic' language, money is used to dictate and justify all actions. Within 'potensiphonic' language, the emphasis is on power and supremacy. Aggressive business metaphors like "blowing the competition out of the water", is characteristic of this language. Schoemaker (2008, p. 199) also highlights the self-centered careerism that is implicitly supported by most contemporary management education. The focus of management education is on equipping the individual manager with the analytical and cognitive skills to fulfill certain managerial functions and to pursue individual career advancement. The importance of 'winning at all costs' and personal wealth-creation seem to come with the territory.

Schoemaker (2008, pp. 120-121) argues that this is the result of some historical developments within management education. Whereas business schools offered 'vocational training' in the early fifties, it started suffering from 'science-envy' and has since become preoccupied with displaying the scientific credentials of the hard sciences. Buchholz and Rosenthal (2008: 199) argue that the scientific model was adopted in response to two studies sponsored by the Ford and Carnegie Foundations in the 1950s, which were very critical of the 'practical wisdom' that formed the core of the vocational training that was dispended at business schools during that time. In a bid to restore their respectability, business schools adopted the scientific model, which privilege the use financial and economic models, statistical analysis and the occasional use of laboratory psychology.

Though some, like Bennis and O'Toole (2005) would make the case that we would be better served by business school if management could be reconceived as a profession, with the main goal of serving society, it seems an unlikely possibility. In the first place, management does not display the core characteristics of a profession: one cannot identify an accepted body of knowledge that has to be mastered to gain entry to the management field, management practitioners is not governed by a code of ethics, not subject to a certifying body, and most importantly, the most important goal of management is not to deliver a service to society that is directly related to the public good (Buchholz and Rosenthal, 2008, p. 203; Starkey and Tempest 2008, p. 384). Mintzberg (2009, Kindle Location 208 of 6324) also argues that management is not a profession because it is less of a science, and more an art, which is especially rooted in practicing a craft.

Furthermore, the way in which the business school system has come to function make it unlikely that the ethical parameters that characterize professional training could be fully integrated. Rasche, Gilbert and Schebel (2013, p. 79) point out that most business schools risk decoupling rhetoric from reality when it comes the integration of ethics-related education into the MBA. This essentially means that schools add ethics-related courses, or claim mainstreaming, while in reality shying away from structural change. These authors indicate decoupling is particularly likely in a competitive context, within which schools face rising external institutional pressures. Though the demand for ethics education has increased significantly since the accounting scandals in the early 2000s, this did not seem to change the tide significantly.

Another external factor is the pressure that comes from accreditation agencies. Though all three major agencies (AACSB, EQUIS and the Association of MBAs) have all emphasized the importance of the integration of ethics, their commitment still seems to be a matter of dispute (Swanson, 2005). This may be the result of the fact that these agencies do not prescribe *how* ethics-related content should be integrated, only *that* it should be integrated. Giacolone and Thompson (2006: 272) argue that despite its attempt to enhance the relevance of management education and improve its attention to ethics-related content, AACSB's focus is myopic. The authors argue that the reason for this is that it only deals with how to address external, financially oriented problems, rather than the ethical problems and opportunities that business schools create for the external environment.

There is also evidence that some aspects of the rankings and accreditation undermine a focus on ethics-related content. Schools need to show that they can attract the top applicants, and deliver the graduates that do them proud. For instance, within the FT ranking-system, the starting salary of the graduates of business schools is a significant criterion. One can see how the pursuit of skills or orientations that place a priority on anything besides enabling the student to further profit-generation, becomes difficult to justify.

In what follows, we highlight how the ontological beliefs about who we are as human beings and how wellbeing is created, impact the epistemological assumptions that underpin our pursuit of science and education.

The epistemological implications:

Utilitarian objectivism

One of the implications of an Ayn Randian individualist paradigm is the insistence on objectivism that characterizes a simplistic utilitarian calculus. As one of the main defenders of Ayn Rand's position argues, 'life' is the standard, and hence the individual must benefit from his/ her own moral code. Objectivism allows the individual to advance self-interest as moral (Locke, 2002, p. 195). Within metaphysics, objectivism holds that reality is real, independent from the observer, and that it obeys causal laws. From an epistemological point of view, objectivism asserts that all knowledge of reality comes from the senses and reason. Reason is the human faculty that integrates sensory material into concepts, and when they are formulated as such, concepts are objective (Locke, 2006, p. 196).

Objectivism has distinct implications for the study of what is moral. The ongoing calculation that is implicit in determining whether the individual still benefits from his moral code, dictates a quantification of what preserves his/ her 'life'. In the first place objectivism demands a clear-cut, objective definition of what constitutes 'life'. Furthermore, the teleological process that is essential to reaching this goal, also assumes the identification of strict cause-and-effect relationships. And thirdly, the strict correlation between input and output yields a conception of justice that is based on reward for individual effort. As a result, input has to be quantified so that the fair reward or output can be determined.

In terms of its implications for thinking through ethics and CSR in the corporate realm, it has implications on various fronts. In terms of performance management, it dictates individual performance review, based on clear metrics and measurement. In the CSR environment, each investment must be justified, either in terms of reputation value, staff morale, or otherwise by the displayed 'worth" of those who receive philanthropic help. Spence and Thomson (2009, p. 372) explain that within the corporate philanthropy discourse, the master metaphor of 'altruism' is always accompanied by mentions of 'the deserving poor'. One can clearly recognize the moral accounting that is at work in this contention, but it tends to have conceptually incoherent implications. The fact that charities have to prove themselves 'deserving' of contributions clearly contradicts the discourse of altruism. Within the realm of 'strategic philanthropy' this leads is also an intense preoccupation with measurement technologies. Furthermore, the way in which corporations extract surplus value from participation in philanthropic activities and mine the emotional commitment of various stakeholders to certain causes in order to build a certain brand, have to be questioned (Spence and Thomson, 2009, p. 385). But the overall result is that whatever cannot be measured and reported on, is deemed without value.

Fact versus value

The implications of the move from professional / vocational training to scientific training within management education are evident in the preoccupation with scientific credentials that many contemporary business schools pursue. In a response the negative evaluation that business schools received in the 1950, business schools increasingly started to draw their graduate students from the 'serious' disciplinary undergraduate programs pursuit of displaying scientific rigor. New faculty was also recruited from disciplinary training (Augier and March, 2007, p.134). The expectation was that these faculty members and their graduate students would produce research that could lead to fundamental scientific advances. In order to be published in leading journals, business school academics are forced to adopt positivist methodologies in their research and steer clear of any normative perspectives.

In viewing management more as a science, and less of a clinical art, as is characteristic of most professions, management education has fallen prey to a number of pitfalls. Schoemaker argues that it "has come to focus more on well-defined problems rather than the messy ambiguities of the real world". As a result, it suffers from an over-utilization of analytical techniques, an over-reliance on static economic models and a focus on stylized markets rather than on social networks. This has led many to question the relevance of business schools for offering students insight into the complex social and human factors involved in business decisions (Buchholz and Rosenthal 2008, p. 200).

It becomes clear that the rational reductionist mindset that is typical of much of management education serve firms well in terms of stability, but fails when discontinuity, complexity and crisis become pervasive. From the perspective of responsible management education, it in fact undermines responsiveness to change and to the messiness of the ethical dilemmas that business faces during these times. The fact that business school curricula are divided along functional lines undermines an integrative perspective (Currie, Knights and Starkey, 2010, p. S1)

times

The assumptions that fact is more important than value, that quantification is the more reliable way of measurement, and that scientific rigor trumps practical relevance has also been widely critiqued. A counter-revolution in the 1990s, led by the business press and certain elements of the business school community, critiqued the abstractions of academic knowledge and demanded business relevance (Augier and March, 2007, p. 137). However, it seemed to be impossible to truly turn the tide. Disciplinary rigor has since become too firmly institutionalized via journal ranking-systems and tenure and promotion processes.

Measurable = valuable

The epistemological assumption that is directly tied to the wellbeing = monetary wealth assumption, is that only that which can be measured, can be valued. From the perspective of Augier and March (2007, p. 138), the idea of utility suggests some kind of metric for business school 'relevance' that, in combination with a measure of likelihood, makes it possible to measure expected value, which would also allow comparisons of various alternatives. Unfortunately, this kind of preoccupation raises problems on all fronts: the definition of relevance is ambiguous, its measurement is imprecise, and its meaning ambiguous. In fact, utility, and the corresponding insistence of relevance, is often only possible within a myopic context. As such, it is ill-suited for advancing agendas that seek a long-term goals, such as sustainability and the pursuit of ethical business cultures.

The conflation between monetary wealth and moral wealth is clear in the kind of instrumental reasoning that is central to 'moral accounting'. It also breeds moral contempt for any form of unjustified expenditure, as this entails a loss of wealth and wellbeing. Furthermore, it breeds intolerance for anything that cannot be justified in instrumental terms from a monetary perspective. We see this preoccupation in attempts rationalize philanthropy as a form of 'enlightened self-interest'. This done by means of tying philanthropy directly to strategy, or by embedding philanthropic activities more explicitly within a defined CSR strategy. The paradoxical effect of this is that the more firms become "socially responsible", the more the discretionary scope of philanthropy is limited (Spence and Thompson, 2009, p. 373).

Building the desired competencies for responsible management:

Criticisms of the way in which business schools go about management education are in no way new. A lot of work has been done on critiquing the irrelevance of management education paradigm and suggesting solutions. Mintzberg's (2010) ongoing challenge to management education started already in the 1980s. In multiple books and articles he makes it clear that business schools' focus on disciplinary excellence and development of 'leadership' skills do not prepare students with the perspectives they need to navigate the world of management practice.

Other authors have attempted a challenge of the reigning assumptions that underpin management education. Audi (2009, p. 266) makes a convincing case that the Ayn Randian dichotomy between individual self-interest and altruism is untenable. Furthermore, the negative rights of individuals must be protected alongside their positive rights. They are not mutually exclusive, as some of the proponents of self-interest seem to suggest (Audi, 2009, p. 270-272). In fact, emphasizing the interconnectedness between realistic self-interest and interconnection with others lies at the heart of successful management education (Giacalone and Promislo, 2013, p. 96). In fact, scholars like Padgett (2008) try to make the philosophical argument that ethics is an essential element within the functioning of capitalism and should not be merely tangentially related to it.

Others have challenged the utilitarian preoccupations of management education and the myopic cost-benefit analysis that characterize it. Augier and March (2007, p. 140) argue that the tendency is to ignore the effects of things that are distant in time and space in order to attend to what is near impacts one's approach to problem-solving and learning. Spatial myopia makes it unlikely that ~~that~~ one can fully take account of altruistic concerns, and temporal myopia leads to a lack of self-control because of the focus on immediate experiences. Within problem-solving, long-term consequences are ignored in favor of short-term consequences, and learning from local and immediate experience tends to outweigh the ability to reflect more broadly. 4

The question that emerges, is why these challenges seem to have little success in affecting change within business schools. I would argue that it fails to come up with a comprehensive analysis of the various factors at play, and steers clear of offering a viable set of alternatives. The problem that clearly emerges is that the ontological and epistemological assumptions that currently characterize management education undermine the kind of orientation that in necessary to engage with sustainability and ethics-related issues within management. It becomes clear that a holistic, systemic understanding is central to responding to the sustainability agenda (Baets and Oldenboom, 2009; Werhane and Painter-Morland, 2010). This is where business schools fall short. The focus on organizational and individual self-interest typically fosters competitive behaviors rather than relationality. The scientific pretensions of management scholarship seek disciplinary depth rather than broad, systemic understanding. Utilitarian preoccupations dictate the measurement of current facts rather than interpretation of their effects and the implications of such effects for the future. 15

In a number of previously published articles (references removed for blind review), I have argued that the most effective way to foster moral responsibility and accountability within a complex business environment, is to promote and sustain [illegible]. In a fact-paced, ever-changing environment, the best way to ensure normative boundaries is not by top-down application of fixed rule, but by the relational checks-and-balances that promote a certain normative congruence within the system as a whole. Relational accountability is therefore closely aligned to [illegible]. Though systemic thinking is interdisciplinary in its orientation and inclusive in its scope, it does not compromise the importance of specificity in analysis. It pursues an understanding of the stakeholders within a specific system, and the contextual dynamics that impact the system in concrete terms.

Seen together, these relational and systemic thinking capacities promote [illegible]. In their research, De Dea Roglio and Light (2009: 159) describe the thinking competencies of the reflective executive as 1) connective thinking; 2) critical thinking, and 3) personal thinking. Connective thinking is based on systems thinking, and the focus is on linking specific elements that compose a specific problem, and identifying links between ideas and facts to come up with creative solutions. Critical thinking allows for the reframing of mental models, and as such, students have to be made aware of their own tacit mental models, question them, and identify and critique the dominant mental models of groups. Personal thinking relates to concepts such as personal mastery, the overcoming of illusions or misconceptions, and the capacity to overcome the gap between reality and one's own vision.

It has become clear that the challenges that contemporary organizations face demand a reorientation in management education. A rationalist, reductionist mindset served business in times of stability, but different capabilities are needed when business managers are confronted by ambiguity (Schoemaker 2008, p. 122). In fact, the challenges that businesses face make seemingly paradoxical demands, like being strongly committed to a direction, while keeping one's options open; maintaining focus, while scanning the periphery; competing, while at the same time collaborating; being committed to success, but accepting the possibility of failure (Schoemaker, 2008, pp. 123-125).

The conclusion that Hault and Perret (2011, p. 294) come to regarding management education, is that there is a need to balance authority and collaboration in the classroom. This can be done by embracing the principle of equality, as articulated by Rancierre, which allows the ability and intelligence of all individuals to be acknowledged and leveraged. This however does not mean that management education becomes the pursuit of consensus and collaboration. Instead, by making room for dissensus, the questioning of the existing order becomes possible (Hault and Perret, 2011, p. 295). The creation of open spaces for debate, contestation and mutual challenging is therefore crucial in various types of management education. This can be done in the classroom, within learning networks and communities outside the classroom, and also online. Ferreday, Hodgson and Jones (2006, p. 223) underscore the importance of dialogue in the construction of identity within networked management learning. The problem is that open dialogue is often not welcomed within a system preoccupied with scientific rigor and control. Instead, Starkey and Tempest (2009, p. 578-583) argue for the development of narrative imagination via dramatic rehearsals that engage with past, present and future and are actively engaged with others in seeking new interpretations.

It therefore becomes clear that fostering the desired competencies for responsible management will make a number of demands of management education. When dealing with any complex system, certain paradoxes have to be accepted, and it is no different in fostering responsible business management in complex corporate settings.

[illegible]

The hardwiring and soft-wiring that characterizes the wellbeing = wealth constructs make this assumption resistant to change. The question that may be more important to ask is whether it is possible to reevaluate our conception of wealth to include various other forms of 'value'. Also, it would be important to challenge the strict utilitarian calculus that underpins our thinking about the relationship between the individual and the system. It seems to me that more insight into the functioning of organizations as complex adaptive systems may offer us some hope here. Since the cause-and-effect relationships between various elements and dynamics within the system is not entirely linear and hence non predictable, it may be possible to steer managers away from simplistic cost-benefit analyses.

It may also allow us to preserve attention to empowering individuals within management education without making them individualist profit-maximizers. Insight into systemic leadership dynamics, and the role that individuals play within the emergence of normative congruence, may offer alternatives to demand-control leadership approaches, and individualist performance metrics.

[illegible]

To foster responsible management education, schools will have to be allowed to find the balance between the depth that specificity offers and the breadth of insight that interdisciplinary analyses foster. In this regard, allowing schools to focus on fostering responsible management in *specific industries* may offer a part of the solution. Instead of trying to be everything to everyone, the heads of programmes could arguably perform more detailed analyses of the normative challenges within a specific context and design a more coherent curriculum within which ethics-related content is not a mere elective, nor lost in the mainstreaming exercise. The goal would be infuse ESGE-related cases, materials, analysis and tools into the mainstream management disciplines in a way that would tie the normative elements of the programme together in order to enhance students' systemic insight into a specific industry's normative challenges. A related paradox is the need to balance long-term versus contingent evaluation within a complex system. This requires the gauging emergent patterns over time and the role that various individuals and groups play in this process over time.

Much of what we have read about business schools' preoccupation with scientific credentials is created, sustained, and reflected within the accreditation and rankings systems within which they function. If accreditation agencies focus on the general MBA, and disregard specialized MBAs, the balance between depth and breath will remain elusive. The problem that we face is that accreditation agencies demand a commitment to a generalist approach to the MBA, and pursue comparison on a few general scales, which does not allow recognition of specificity and contextuality.

[illegible]

There is little doubt that the scientific credentials of schools will remain an important criterion going forward, but it is clear that this will need to be combined with a concern for teaching and research that are practically relevant, reflexive, and creative. Much of the focus on scientific rigor over and against relevance and practical wisdom starts in how our doctoral programmes prepare the next generation of teachers and thought leaders. Giacalone and Thompson (2006, p. 273 - 274) argue that not only should business schools recruit new faculty from a broader range of disciplines, but all doctoral programmes should incorporate training in values, ethics and critical thinking. It should guard against promoting narrow, careerist thinking and reinforcing a destructive materialist orientation that spill over into how faculty will eventually teach their students and pursue their research agendas.

In terms of the accreditation agencies' assessment of how well schools do in promoting responsible management education, they seem to focus on the facts of what has been taught, rather than on the effect that this has on students' lives. In this regard, Giacolone and Thompson (2006, p. 273) argue that accreditation agencies should create a blue ribbon committee to enquire into the implications of teaching and engineer the discussion with interested parties to effect change. On the positive side, some important developments that facilitate the integration of the ESGE agenda in accreditation assessments are underway, and hold much promise. Industry associations could play an important role in assessing the consistency of the normative patterns emerging within their industry practice. More practical suggestions like these should be sought if the system is to be reoriented in meaningful ways.

Conclusion:

It seems that the only way in which the assumptions that underpin management education can change is if the broader system within which it functions precipitates this change. A complex array of push factors that lead to a redefinition of what is considered 'wealth' and by extension, 'wellbeing' is necessary. This will only happen when interactions with businesses, students, accreditation agencies, governments and peers create the necessary insights, pressures and incentives. This seems to be a typical chicken-versus-egg problem, because for these drivers to be activated, individuals, groups and organizations need to shaped and informed in different ways. Business schools have an important role to play, but as it stands the odds seem to be stacked against these institutions' ability to bring about systemic change. Someone has to take the first step, and unfortunately writing papers pleading for these first steps to be taken, may not suffice.

Bibliography:

Audi, R. (2009), "Objectivity without Egoism: Toward Balance in Business Ethics", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 263-274.

Augier, M. and March, J.G. (2007), "The Pursuit of Relevance in Management Education", California Management Review, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 129-146.

Baets, W. and Oldenboom, E. (2009), *Rethinking Growth: Social Intrapreneurship for Sustainable Performance*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Bergman, J.Z., Westerman, J.W. and Daly, J.P. (2010), "Narcissim in Managwmwnt Education", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 119-131.

Buchholz, R.A. and Rosenthal, S.B. (2007), "The Unholy Alliance of Business and Science", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78, pp. 199-206.

Carroll, A. and Shabana, K (2010), "The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research, and practice", *International Journal of Management Review*, Vol. 12 No.1, pp. 85-105.

Currie, G., Knights, D. and Starkey, K. (2010), "Introduction: A Post-crisis Critical Reflection on Business Schools", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, pp. S1-S5.

De Dea Roglio, K. and Light, G. (2009), "Executive MBA Programs, p. The Development of the Reflective Executive", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 8 No.2, pp. 156-173.

Ferreday, D., Hodgson, V. and Jones, C. (2006), "Dialogue, language and identity: critical issues for networked management learning", *Studies in Continuing Education*, Vol. 28 No.3, pp. 223-239.

Giacalone, R.A. and Thompson, K. R (2006), "Business Ethics and Social Responsibility Education, Shifting the Worldview", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 266-277.

Giacalone, R.A. and Promislo, M.D. (2013), "Broken When Entering: The Stigmatization of Goodness and Business Ethics Education", Academy of Management Learning and Education, Vol 12 No. 1, pp. 86-101.

Godfrey, P., Merrill, C. and Hansen, J (2009), "The relationship between corporate social responsibility and shareholder value: An empirical test of the risk management hypothesis." *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 425-445.

Harris, J.D. (2008), "What's wrong with executive compensation?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, pp. 147–56.

Hault, I. and Perret, V. (2011), "Critical management education as a vehicle for emacipation: Exploring the philosophy of Jacques Ranciere", *M@n@gement*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 261-309

Hommel, U. Painter-Morland, M. Wang, J. (2012)"Gradualism Prevails and Perception Outbids Substance", *Global Focus*, Vol. 6 No. 20.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999), *Philosophy in the Flesh: the embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought.* Basic Books, New York (Kindle edition)

Locke, E. (2002), "The epistemological side of teaching management, p. Teaching through principles", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 195-205.

Locke, E. A. (2006), "Business Ethics, A way out of the morass", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 324-332.

Madeville, B. (1997) [1714], "The Fable of the Bees", In: *The Fable of the Bees And Other Writings*, Edited, E.J. Hundert. Hackett Publishing.

Margolis, J. and Walsh, J. (2006), "Building the Business Case for Ethics", *Bridge paper by the Business Roundtable Institute for Corporate Ethics*, Roundtable Institute, Charlottesville.

McWilliams, A. and Siegel D. (2000), "Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Correlation or misspecification", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 603-609.

Mintzberg, H. (2009), *Managing.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Mintzberg, H. (2010), *Managers not MBAs. A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.

Paine, L. S. (2000), "Does ethics pay?", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 10, pp. 319-330.

Padgett, B.L. (2008), "Philosophical Foundations in Business Education", *Proceedings of the Academy of Educational leadership*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 39-44.

Rasche, A. Gilbert, D. U. and Schedel, I. (2013), "Cross-disciplinary ethics education in MBA Programs, p. Rhetoric or Reality?", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 12 No.1, pp. 71-85

Schoemaker, P.J.H. (2008), "The Future Challenges of Business: Rethinking Management Education", *California Management Review*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 119-139.

Spence, C. and Thompson, I. (2009), "Resonance Tropes in Corporate Philanthropy Discourse", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 18 No.4, pp. 372-388.

Starkey, K. and Tempest, S. (2008), "A Clear Sense of Purpose: The Evolving Role of the Business School", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 27 Issue 4, pp. 379-390.

Starkey, K. and Tempest, S. (2009), "The Winter of Our Discontent: The Design Challenge for Business Schools", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 8 No 4, pp. 576-586.

Valor, C. (2008), "Can consumers buy responsibly? Analysis and Solutions for Marketing Failures", *Journal of Consumer Policy*, Vol. 31, pp. 315-326.

Verschoor, C. (1999), "Corporate Performance Is Closely linked to a strong ethical commitment", *Business and Society Review*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 407-415.

Verschoor, C. (2004). "Does superior governance still lead to better financial performance?", *Strategic Finance*, Vol. 86, pp.13-14

Verschoor, C. (2005) "Is there financial value in corporate values?", *Strategic Finance*, Vol. 87, pp.17-18.

Waddock, S. and Graves, S. (1999), "Assessing the Link Between Corporate Governance and Social/Financial Performance", *International Association for Business and Society*, 1999.

Weaver, G., Trevino, L. and Cochran, P. (1999), "Integrated and Decoupled Corporate Social Performance: Management Commitments, External Pressures, and Corporate Ethics Practices", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, pp. 539-552.

[illegible]

Zhu, X. (2009), "Philosophical Underpinning for Equilibrium of Values and Implications for Management Education: A response to Harold Leavitt", *Academy of Management learning and Education*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 290-296.

PICOT
Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft
Köln – München
www.picot.de

Please scan so that
corrections are clearly
visible!

Thanks

Büro Köln
Ottoplatz 1 – KölnTriangle
50679 Köln
Tel. +49 (0) 221 3 55 88 99-0
Fax +49 (0) 221 3 55 88 99-9
cologne@picot.de

Büro München
Prannerstraße 6
80333 München
Tel. +49 (0) 89 1890 8278-0
Fax +49 (0) 89 1890 8278-999
munich@picot.de