



Call for Papers

Journal of Business Ethics Special Issue & Conference on **Ideologies in Markets, Organizations and Business Ethics**

Submission Deadline (conference): 31 March 2014
Submission Deadline (journal): 31 December 2014

Interest in corporate social responsibility (CSR) has increased exponentially over the last few decades. Many articles and special issues have been published that define and document the roles and responsibilities of business organizations in different contexts (see, for example, Fleming et al., 2013; Jack et al., 2012; Scherer et al., 2009). A large proportion of the research on CSR has addressed organizational dimensions such as motivation, internal processes, implementation challenges, and strategic aspects that focus on the integration of ethics and strategy (Behnam and Rasche, 2009; Singer, 2010) or the business case for responsibility (Porter and Kramer, 2006; Brammer and Millington, 2008; Carroll and Shabana, 2010; Schreck, 2011).

In this expanding body of CSR literature, insufficient attention has been paid to the role that ideologies play in the way corporate actors understand, design, and conduct business, and therefore indirectly define CSR. The 2008 financial crisis demonstrated the impact of ideologies on markets, organizations, and society. What appears prima facie as only a lack of governance, bankers' greed and malfeasance, or the irrationality of the financial markets cannot be understood without reference to ideologies, and the values or worldviews related to them (Padelford and White, 2009; Lusch and Webster, 2011; Davies and McGoey, 2012).

The relevance of ideology in the study of culture and institutions has been highlighted by scholars from different disciplines (Alverson, 1986; Denzau and North, 1994; Van Dijk, 1998). Based on the works of Cheal (1979), Schmid (1981), and Van Dijk (1998), we broadly understand ideologies as patterns or frameworks of ideas. Moreover, ideologies have far-reaching impacts on societies and societal institutions on the different inter-related levels of analysis. Ghoshal (2005) has pointed to the relevance of ideology to theory (e. g., in the form of ideas and values that play a part in management or marketing philosophies) (Nowotny, 1964; Brown, 1999) and everyday theory (e. g., in the form of ideas and values that play a part in business philosophies; see Jones, 1960). Ideologies also influence and shape business education (Ghoshal, 2005).

As part of the overarching structure of belief systems in a society, ideologies are social phenomena that constitute or inform the mental models of individuals. The effects of ideologies may unfold in an eclipsed or indirect manner; however, individuals can also play an active part in the way they consciously and unconsciously refer to ideologies or allow ideologies to shape their personal belief systems (DiMaggio, 2002; for an example, see Becker, 2011). Both the personal experiences of individuals and their social intercourse (i.e., the communications between individuals) play a part in this process (Bacon, 1902). Durkheim believed that “our basic mental architecture, those ‘categories of the understanding’ [...] were socially acquired” (Bergesen, 2004, p. 397; Durkheim 1912).

The effects of ideologies unfold on different levels of analysis:

On a macro-level, ideology has informed understandings of the different forms of capitalism (Hall and Soskice, 2001; Matten and Moon, 2008), which are used in turn to build or guide institutions. These institutions shape the context in which companies operate and expectations between business and society are formed, including interpretations of CSR. On a meso-level, ideologies influence the formal and informal structures of businesses and other kinds of organizations (Thérien, 2012), their institutional logic (Thornton et al., 2012), industrial and professional associations, cooperation and coordination schemes, as well as participation and decision-making rules (Chelli and Gendron, 2013). At an organizational level, ideologies are mobilized to shape ethics and justify internal policies and interactions within organizations. On a more micro-level, they are part of the belief systems of individuals and exert partly conscious, partly unconscious influence on their decision-making processes. This influence has been discussed in, for example, gender and family studies (for example, Kroska 2002), and has also found expression in business ethics (Forsyth, 1980; Barnett et al., 1994; Davis et al., 2001). Furthermore, ideology is used by agents and managers as a strategy to legitimize specific corporate stances and behaviors (Jackall, 2010).

Business ethics and CSR are academic fields of study that generate knowledge on the basis of ideas about the relationship between business and society, and the roles self-interested and/or ethically motivated behaviors play (and should play) in this regard (Barnett et al., 1994). The age-old debate regarding the contested notion of CSR, which devotes business to society, as promoted by Bowen (1953), and the neoclassical economic view of CSR, as advocated by Friedman (1962, 1970) (Husted and Salazar, 2006) has been a central feature in the construction of CSR as a field of study (Acquier et al., 2011).

This **Special Issue of the *Journal of Business Ethics*** provides an opportunity to challenge the assumptions around CSR, the functioning of business organizations, and the role of business organizations in society.

This Special Issue

This Special Issue will investigate the links and relationships between the business organization–society nexus and ideology. We welcome theoretical and empirical papers from various

disciplines on diverse levels and foci. The questions below are indicative of the scope of the Special Issue:

Society and history:

- What is the role of ideology in the creation of public policies that affect businesses?
- How do business representatives or associations explicitly or implicitly mobilize ideologies to enhance their interests and shape public policies in the context in which they operate?
- Long-term changes: How have ideologies regarding the roles and responsibilities of corporations in society evolved over a long period of time (the last 50 or 100 years)? How have these changes been brought about? What are the processes that have contributed to bringing about these changes?

CSR:

- Is CSR ideologically neutral or is it of “tainted origin”? To what extent does it contribute to the promotion of specific ideologies? What are the ideological underpinnings behind the different definitions of CSR?
- Professions and norms: To what extent are CSR norms and practices ideologically loaded/tainted?

Organizational:

- How do ideologies translate into organizational strategies and practices in functional areas, such as human resources management, finance, or marketing?

Business education and professions:

- To what extent do business education programs make ideological underpinnings explicit? What are the interactions between the ideologies underlying different academic disciplines? To what extent—and how—are these ideologies integrated between different disciplines or around the study of empirical issues?

Individuals:

- How do individuals decide what to believe in when facing ideologies that pull in different, and often contradictory, directions?
- How do individuals make sense of conflicting ideas and values?

We welcome submissions from various disciplines, including empirical and theoretical contributions related to this topic.

Calendar:

1. 2016 Publication of the Special Issue

The deadline for the submission of papers for the Special Issue is December 31, 2014.

2. Workshop

A workshop dedicated to the topic of the Special Issue will be held at Freie Universität Berlin (June 26.-28., 2014). Participation in this workshop is not obligatory for a paper submission to the Special Issue.

Submission of papers for the workshop: until March 31, 2014
Decisions: until April 30, 2014

Please forward your papers to the three editors:

Michaela.Haase@fu-berlin.de

Emmanuel.Raufflet@hec.ca

JReichel@uni.lodz.pl

Submission to the special issue – deadline December 31, 2014 – is required through Editorial Manager at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/busi/>

Please follow JBE guideline:

<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/applied+ethics/journal/10551>

for manuscript presentation

In their papers, all authors should express concern for the topic related to the Journal of Business Ethics.

This call for papers is supported by the International Working Group on Business Ethics Education (IWBEE), Freie Universität Berlin. The IWBEE is an international and interdisciplinary association of scholars, students, practitioners, and others interested in business and society, business and economic ethics, sustainability, or CSR. On the basis of its interdisciplinary and international composition, the group has a particular interest in the study of the cultural aspects of the relationship between *business ethics* and society on the one hand and *business ethics education* on the other.

http://www.wiwiss.fu-berlin.de/institute/marketing/International_Working_Group_on_Business_Ethics_Education_IWBEE_/index.html

Michaela Haase (Freie Universität Berlin), Emmanuel Raufflet (HEC Montréal), Janusz Reichel (University of Lodz)

References

- Acquier, A., Gond, J.-P. and 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.
- Alverson, H. (1986). Culture and economy: Games that "play people." *Journal of Economic Issues* 20(3), 661-679.
- Bacon, F. (1902). *Novum Organum*. P. F. Collier & Son, New York.

- Barnett, T., Bass, K. and Brown, G. (1994). Ethical ideology and ethical judgment regarding ethical issues in business. *Journal of Business Ethics* 13, 469-480.
- Becker, G. S. (2011). Economic Imperialism. <http://www.acton.org/pub/religion/liberty/volume-3-number-2/economic-imperialism>. Accessed July 5, 2011.
- Behnam, M. and Rasche, A. (2009). Are strategists from Mars and ethicists from Venus? – Strategizing as ethical reflection. *Journal of Business Ethics* 84(1), 79-88.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. Harper, New York.
- Bergesen, A. J. (2004). Durkheim's theory of mental categories: A review of the evidence. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30, 395-408.
- Brammer, S. and Millington, A. (2008). Does it pay to be different? An analysis of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 29(12), 1325-1343.
- Brown, S. (1999). Postmodernism: The End of Marketing? In D. Brownlie, M. Saren, R. Wensley, & R. Whittington (eds.), *Rethinking Marketing: Towards Critical Marketing Accountings*, (pp. 27-57). Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- Carroll, A. B. and Shabana, K. M. (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 85-105.
- Cheal, D. J. (1979). Hegemony, ideology and contradictory consciousness. *The Sociological Quarterly* 20(1), 109-117.
- Chelly, M. and Gendron, E. (2013). Sustainability ratings and the disciplinary power of the ideology of numbers. *Journal of Business Ethics* 112, 187-203.
- Davies, W. and McGoey, L. (2012). Rationalities of ignorance: On financial crisis and the ambivalence of neo-liberal epistemology. *Economy and Society* 41(1), 64-83.
- Davis, M. A., Anderson, M. G. and Curtis, M. B. (2001). Measuring ethical ideology in business ethics: A critical analysis of the ethics position questionnaire. *Journal of Business Ethics* 32, 35-53.
- Denzau, A. T. and North, D. C. (1994). Shared mental models: Ideologies and institutions. *Kyklos* 47(1), 3-31.
- DiMaggio, P. (2002). Why cognitive (and cultural) sociology needs cognitive psychology. In K. Cerulo (ed.), *Culture in mind: Toward a sociology of culture and cognition* (pp. 274–281). Routledge, New York.
- Durkheim, E. (1912, 1915). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. <http://ia600307.us.archive.org/35/items/elementaryformso00durk/elementaryformso00durk.pdf>. Accessed April 23, 2013.
- Fleming, P., Roberts, J. and Carsten, C. (2013). In search of corporate social responsibility: Introduction to special issue. *Organization* 20(3), 337-348.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39, 175-184.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *The Capitalism of Freedom*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine* September 13, 32.

- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4(1), 75-91.
- Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D. (2001). An introduction to varieties of capitalism. In P. A. Hall & D. Soskice (eds.), *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, (pp. 1-68). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Husted, B. W. and de Jesus Salazar, J. (2006). Taking Friedman seriously: Maximizing profits and social performance. *Journal of Management Studies* 43(1), 75-91.
- Jack, G., Greenwood, M. and Schapper, J. (2012). Frontiers, intersections and engagements of ethics and HRM. *Journal of Business Ethics* 111(1), 1-12.
- Jackall, R. (2010). *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers*. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- Jones, M. H. (1960). Evolving a business philosophy. *Journal of the Academy of Management* 3(2), 93-98.
- Kroska, A. (2002). Does gender ideology matter? Examining the relationship between gender ideology and self- and partner-meaning. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65(3), 248-265.
- Lusch, R. F. and Webster Jr., F. E. (2011). A stakeholder-unifying, cocreation philosophy of marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing* 31(2), 129-134.
- Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2008). "Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review* 33(2), 404-424.
- Nowotny, O. H. (1964). American vs. European management philosophy. *The International Executive* 6(3), 15-16.
- Padelford, W. and White, D. W. (2009). The shaping of a society's economic ethos: A longitudinal study of individuals' morality of profit-making worldview. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, 67-75.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society. *Harvard Business Review* 84(12), 78-92.
- Scherer, A. G., Palazzo, G. and Matten, D. (eds.) (2009). *Business Ethics Quarterly* 19(3). Special Issue: The Changing Role of Business in Global Society: New Challenges and Responsibilities.
- Schmid, H. (1981). On the origin of ideology. *Acta Sociologica* 24(1/2), 57-73.
- Schreck, P. (2011). Reviewing the business case for corporate social responsibility: New evidence and analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics* 103(2), 167-188.
- Thérien, J.-P. (2012). Human security: The making of a UN ideology. *Global Society* 26(2), 191-213.
- Thornton, P. H., Occasio, W. and Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- Singer, A. E. (2010). Integrating ethics and strategy: A pragmatic approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92(4), 479-491.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.