

Chapter 35

Reflections on Careers, *JBE* and Business Ethics

Alex C. Michalos and Deborah C. Poff (eds.)

To join us in celebrating the first 30 years of publication, we invited scholars who authored citation classics or distinguished papers, as well as those who had served on our Editorial Board and/or are recognized as leaders in the field to write short essays (600 words or less) for this volume. Those who authored citation classics or distinguished papers were invited to answer two questions.

1. What has been the impact, if any, of your citation classic (or distinguished paper) on your career?
2. What has been the impact, if any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the field of business ethics?

Current or former Editorial Board members and leading scholars were only asked the second question.

The essays that follow include all those sent to us, as sent to us, except for some standardizing stylistic changes. Some authors provided titles for their reflections and these have been retained. Those that did not have titles have simply been entitled 'Relections'.

We are grateful to all these authors for sharing their reflections with us. Some are particularly biographical and some are more academic assessments of the *Journal* and the field from a variety of very interesting and important perspectives.

A.C. Michalos (✉)

Professor Emeritus, Political Science, University of Northern British Columbia,
(home) 463 13th Street, Brandon, R7A 4P9, MB, Canada
e-mail: michalos@brandonu.ca

D.C. Poff (eds.)

President and Vice Chancellor, Brandon University, 18th Street,
R7A 6A9, Brandon, MB, Canada

Antonio Argandona

Some Challenges for the Journal of Business

The decision to launch the *Journal of Business Ethics* was undoubtedly an act of academic entrepreneurship, resulting, as it did, in a publication that has done great service to business ethics and management. Its founders therefore deserve our recognition and congratulations. At the same time, a quick comparison of the contents of the *Journal* today with the contents 30 years ago shows how our discipline has evolved. Here I shall venture to point out some of the future challenges of business ethics that I hope we will see reflected in the pages of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in the years ahead.

The first of those challenges has to do with what I consider to be one of the *Journal's* great strengths, namely, its multidisciplinaryity. The challenge now is to move beyond collections of articles, each representing a different approach, towards articles in which all, or several, of those approaches are combined. This is no easy task because in order to write in the overlap between paradigms you have to be an expert in all of them, and that is not readily compatible with the way in which our social scientists work. If any field can do it, though, it is the field of management, which is not the monopoly of any one discipline. And this is a fitting challenge for the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Which leads us to the second challenge. Business ethics is not an applied ethics that brings abstract principles to bear on a particular area. If economics is the science of human action, business must be the field in which decisions are made that are relevant to the manager, to other stakeholders, and to the whole of society. Beyond our arguments about the goals of companies, business ethics must start by asking how the woman or man to whom we attribute responsibility for managing a company acts. We cannot construct business ethics from outside the theory of human action, that is to say, from outside the manager's decision-making process. And this is a task precisely for business ethics because it adds the holistic dimension that marketing, finance or strategy otherwise lack.

And that brings me to yet another challenge for business ethics and the *Journal*. Although this is an academic journal, it must make an effort to offer guidelines, suggestions and recommendations to managers about how they can manage companies in a moral way. I am not proposing that it become a management journal; I am proposing that it make an effort to confront academicians with the question of how their theoretical and empirical studies can be converted into ideas that are useful to managers.

Finally, I shall point to two further challenges. One: that of restoring the ethical dimension that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has frequently lost, having become little more than a repertoire of techniques. No doubt there are many exceptions, but there is a danger that the practical dimension of CSR will defeat its purpose.

And two: the challenge of reigniting the debate about foundations, about the kind of ethics we are applying in companies. I realize that this is countercultural and perhaps even anti-academic, at least the way scientific research is currently

understood in our field. The new generations, however, will be grateful for some serious reflection on these topics. And the *Journal of Business Ethics* is undoubtedly the right place for it.

Richard F. Beltramini and Robert A. Peterson

Reflections

First author: Having our article identified as a “citation classic” by the *Journal of Business Ethics* is a large honor, and I credit its original publication with making a significant impact on my professional career. As the first empirical article published in *JBE*, the national survey employed allowed us to project our findings broadly, and to call attention to an important research area. In fact, feedback on its publication helped me identify my primary research focus, and encouraged me to conduct several additional studies published in *JBE* over the years, including our replication with extension in 1991.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* represents the leading publication of its kind on this topic, and consistently ranks quite highly among the rankings based on the *Social Sciences Citation Index*. This is due in large part to the editorial leadership of the *Journal*, and its rigorous manuscript review process. But additionally, it is worth noting the multi-disciplinary backgrounds of its Editorial Review Board members and of *JBE*'s contributors. Readers find a healthy mix of methodological techniques in each issue, coupled with solid coverage of both theoretical and practical direction supplied by the articles published. Seeing the importance of business ethics on the careers of future business leaders, I've incorporated coverage in all of my classes, and encouraged my colleagues to do the same.

While the field of business ethics has grown, recent industry abuses have underscored the ongoing need to focus more attention to the topic, both in classrooms and in boardrooms. As such, I guest edited a special issue of *JBE* on advertising ethics in 2003, and am currently guest editing a special issue of the *Journal of Advertising Research* as a “call to action” on the topic. I applaud *JBE* for 30 years of impact, and remain proud to have participated modestly over the years.

Second author: The impact of our 1984 *Journal of Business Ethics* article, “Concerns of College Students Regarding Business Ethics,” has been extremely gratifying. As one of the first articles to report empirical research results in the *Journal*, the article demonstrated the contribution that survey research could make when investigating ethics. Moreover, with its emphasis on college student study participants, the article was the genesis of two research streams that I have pursued the past quarter-of-a-century and that have led to numerous publications. One stream has been methodological in nature in that it has focused on when it is appropriate in general to use college students as study participants. The other research stream has continued the focus on ethical attitudes of college students and has resulted in several

publications, including a 2005 book (*Business Ethics: New Challenges for Business Schools and Corporate Leaders*) and a 2010 article in *JBE* (“Effects of Nationality, Gender, and Religiosity on Business-Related Ethicality,” *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 96, 573–587). The topic of college students’ business-related ethics remains one that needs to be objectively and robustly investigated, and I am pleased that our 1984 article has both catalyzed and stimulated research for more than 25 years.

John R. Boatright

What Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

As a member of that dwindling band of intrepid souls who were present at the beginning of the field of business ethics in the 1970s, I can recall my receipt of the first issue of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in February 1982. It still sits on my bookcase, high up at the beginning of five shelves of volumes, now numbering 104. The stapled spines of the first two volumes and their relative thinness are daily visual reminders of the distance the journal has come in 30 years of publication.

The founding of *JBE* was both a risky gamble on the future of a not yet established field and a critical step in assuring its establishment. At the time, business ethics was developing rapidly as a curricular area, with courses and textbooks abounding, but it had yet to make the all-important leap into academic respectability as a distinct subject for research. The Society for Business Ethics, which had been formed 2 years earlier, in 1980, was still largely a special interest group of philosophers, who found that the potential for publication in the few receptive philosophy journals was limited to a narrow range of philosophically interesting topics, which, even collectively, did not form the basis for a viable separate field of study. The earliest publications in business ethics, aside from textbooks, were edited volumes from conferences held in the late 1970s. Despite their significant contribution to the development of business ethics, these books could not substitute for a journal as a vehicle for scholarly output, which is the *sine qua non* for academic recognition. By 1980, everyone in the field recognized that business ethics had a future only if there was at least one journal devoted solely to the subject, and yet there was no recognized field to support such a journal.

We can be thankful to Alex Michalos for taking the initiative to found *JBE*. Without it, the field of business ethics would probably exist today, but not with the rapid development and solid respectability that it has experienced. In re-reading Alex’s editorial statement “Purpose and Policy” in the first issue, I am struck by his declaration that the journal would provide a “public forum” for debate among all people with an interest in business from “a variety of methodological and disciplinary perspectives.” He seemed to recognize at the time that this nascent field could not be merely a sub-specialty of philosophy but had to encompass diverse methodologies

and disciplines. Moreover, by omitting any mention of academic developments and emphasizing the public interest nature of the *Journal*, the statement of purpose and policy side-stepped any question of the “parentage” of business ethics and created space for a new, independent field of study. More than any other journal in business ethics – fortunately, there are now several good ones – *JBE* can lay claim to an instrumental role in the field’s development.

Over the years, I have been a close observer of the growth of the *Journal*, not only in my use of the research in its pages but also as an editorial board member of *JBE* and two of its rivals. Like a parent with more than one child, I find it difficult to compare journals with which one is closely associated. I am constantly impressed, however, with the broad range of contributors, many of whom are not primarily in business ethics; *JBE* has succeeded, more than other business ethics journals, in drawing researchers around the world to the field. Moreover, given that the preponderance of articles published today are empirical, which contrasts with the original theoretical bent of the field, *JBE* has succeeded in its founding vision of being a journal that makes business ethics a truly interdisciplinary field. So thanks should be given not only for the founding of this great journal and its role in launching a field, but also for what it has contributed in 30 years to the body of business ethics research. May it continue its fine work for many years to come.

Clive Boddy

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics

I write this essay about the impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the field of business ethics from the point of view of myself as a formerly successful business practitioner who has now gone into academia as a second career and only recently become a full time academic and only just been appointed to the editorial board of *JBE*. This viewpoint may therefore be different from that of a longer term academic. One of the differences is that I very strongly believe that business research should be relevant to business practitioners just as medical research is relevant to doctors and nurses, and this is, I think, one of the key strengths of the *Journal of Business Ethics*. It is relevant, it is accessible and it is current and up to date in the areas it covers.

For example, two nights ago in the UK there was a documentary on BBC2, as part of the “Horizon” series, about psychopaths in society and psychopaths as corporate leaders. The newspaper follow-up commentary and the on-line discussion stimulated by this debate about toxic managerial leaders was large and vocal, just as it always is when toxic leadership is discussed. Toxic leadership is directly relevant to all people in business because toxic leaders bully others, destroy careers, create emotional and psychological destruction, parasitically use the resources, savings,

investments and earnings of others for their own ends and destroy the long term feasibility of the businesses that they manage.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* is outstanding in reflecting this debate in society, in its pages, and it has certainly long been concerned with toxic leaders as unethical managers and in particular with the dark triad of narcissists, Machiavellians and psychopaths. Papers about Machiavellians have been appearing in *JBE* since at least 1996 and a search within the journal for Machiavellianism results in 160 papers being identified. Narcissists have been written about in *JBE* since 1997 in about 15 papers and psychopaths have been written about since 2008 with 17 papers about them. These types of selfish and unethical managers, although small in numbers, are destructive and damaging to everyone who works with them for any extended length of time and this is why their presence is so relevant to business and to business ethics. The *JBE* is one of the few academic journals that has kept itself up to date with these issues and with the public debate around toxic leadership.

Other elements of the mission and objectives of the *JBE* also add to its impact on business ethics and society. One of these is its objective to avoid jargon in favor of dialogue. *JBE* is not one of those management journals where the academic language used is so dense and academically colloquial as to obscure meaning and camouflage relevance. There is no language barrier and practitioners can pick up the journal, read it and understand it. It also aims to be all-inclusive and multi-disciplinary and this fosters a wide reach that extends across all areas of business and includes marketing, ethics, accountancy, economics, law and organizational behavior, among others. These factors of importance, relevance and accessibility make *JBE*, I believe, one of only a tiny handful of business journals that would be as highly ranked by business practitioners as it is by business academics.

The overall aim of the *Journal of Business Ethics*, to improve the human condition, marks the journal as one of the most noble in intent, ambitious in scope and important in substance of all business journals. It is this that marks the journal out as being important to society and to ethics. Articles are not chosen for publication merely because they are mathematically elegant or sophisticated in their statistical analysis, but rather because their content and substance is important to society and to the world in which we live. That is what makes the impact of *JBE* so outstanding.

Susan C. Borkowski and Yusuf J. Ugras

Reflections

The article, “Business Students and Ethics: A Meta-Analysis” was the second one that we collaborated on that specifically addressed the issues and concerns associated with business ethics. This was also the first meta-analysis we ever undertook. In order to actually collect the data for the meta-analysis, we had to first read and research as many of the existing studies on business ethics from the student perspective that we could locate. I do remember my surprise when I realized how much of the existing research we were analyzing had been published in prior issues of *JBE*.

Our study grew out of our mutual developing interest in ethics in the early 1990s. Borkowski's work in this area started with Mary Anne Gaffney at Temple University analyzing accounting codes of ethics, and led to studying ethics in the accounting publishing process from both the author and the editor viewpoints with Mary Jeanne Welsh at La Salle University. These early studies on ethics led to my [Borkowski] current interest in corporate sustainability reports, working with Welsh and Kristin Wentzel, also at La Salle University.

Ugras' early interest in ethics stemmed from his observations of the students' responses to ethical dilemmas, especially between traditional undergraduate and part-time adult learners. These observations led into a research inquiry with Borkowski, "The Ethical Attitudes of Students as a Function of Age, Sex and Education", which was also published in *JBE* back in December 1992. The literature review that we undertook for this first study was the impetus for the meta-analysis. When we realized the breadth and depth of existing research on business students and ethical behavior, a meta-analysis seemed the best approach to trying to make sense of all the varied and sometimes contradictory findings of prior researchers in this area.

Without understanding business ethics from the bottom up and undertaking the meta-analysis that led to our article, we would not have had the theoretical underpinnings to continue in this area. Did it help our careers? Well, one of us is a full professor (Borkowski) and the other a Dean (Ugras), so we would unreservedly say "Yes!"

For us, our interest in business ethics aligns with, and is reinforced and strengthened by our University's mission – "the free search for truth by teaching its students the basic skills, knowledge, and values that they will need for a life of human dignity...preparing students for informed service and progressive leadership in their communities and to fulfilling the immediate and final goals of their lives." Working together, our faculty and students embrace these values and strive to achieve these goals both on a personal and on a professional level. Articles published in the *Journal of Business Ethics* definitely shape how both faculty and students discuss and think about business ethics. Many articles have been used in our accounting, business law, and senior capstone strategy course to augment to traditional textbook material, bringing to the classroom an awareness of, and an appreciation for, the continued relevance of business ethics to our everyday business decisions. We would like to extend our gratitude for *JBE* and its specific focus on business ethics, which is needed now more than ever!

Norman E. Bowie

Relections

Although business ethics has a long history, this current wave of business ethics teaching and research began in the late 1970s with the publication of a number of textbooks in business ethics. However, at that time there was no organized business ethics society and no scholarly journal devoted specifically to business ethics. Under the leadership of Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff, the *Journal of Business Ethics*

(*JBE*) was created and began publication in 1982. For nearly a decade *JBE* was **the** journal for those of us writing in business ethics and a number of classic articles appeared there. Between 1982 and 1988 I published three articles in *JBE* including what I believe to be one of my better pieces “Fair Markets.” My most recent piece in *JBE*, “How Empirical Research in Human Cognition Does and Does Not Affect Philosophical Ethics” appeared in the tribute volume for my late dear friend Tom Dunfee in 2010. I dare say that all the founders of The Society for Business Ethics have published several papers in *JBE*.

But that was just the beginning. Several generations of business ethics scholars have gotten their start by publishing articles in *JBE*. As the number of papers submitted to scholarly journals has increased and the number of pages in scholarly journals has remained roughly the same, scholars in all disciplines have had an increasing difficulty finding an outlet for their scholarly work. *JBE* has been an exception and has steadily increased the number of pages over the years. As a result a number of scholars at non research institutions and young scholars have had a better chance at getting their research published.

In addition, *JBE* embodies a number of characteristics that we as business ethicists endorse. *JBE* is open to researchers who conduct business ethics research from a number of different methodological perspectives. Of course it has provided a major outlet for philosophical thinking. But at the empirical level it has been more open to survey research than many traditional management journals. Scholars interested in religion and management have had a voice.

From the beginning *JBE* has published work on international business ethics and has been open to business ethics scholars around the world. It has been the major outlet for scholars in developing countries. Thus *JBE* has contributed significantly to the development of a community of international business ethics scholars.

So happy 30th birthday *JBE* and congratulations to Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff for their contribution to this journal and to the field of business ethics in general.

Leonard J. Brooks

Thirty-Year Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics

For several reasons, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has played the dominant role in defining business ethics thought, education, and practice during the last 30 years.

From the beginning, *JBE* published articles that featured new ideas or practices from both academics and practitioners. Many of these articles were very creative and thoughtful, but not highly rigorous in a scientific or research sense – an approach that afforded an opportunity for new ideas to be expressed, broadly discussed by individuals and in classes, and nurtured. Over time, *JBE* has transitioned to include more rigorously researched articles, but continues to provide the most comprehensive source of business ethics ideas and topical discussion.

Without *JBE*'s editorial stance and accessibility, the pace of development and impact of business ethics would have been delayed significantly. When the number of submissions became too large, the editors and publisher expanded to almost a monthly publication schedule. Other journals have simply not been publishing enough articles to perform this nurturing role, nor have they been as widely read. It took foresight and fortitude on the part of the editors to formulate their vision and to stick to it – and I applaud them for it.

A list of 51 of the most highly cited of the 4,747 articles *JBE* published during the last 30 years appears elsewhere in this issue, and it demonstrates the breadth and significance of *JBE*'s impact. While there are other excellent journals for specific business ethics topics, none, either alone or in combination, have done as much to create the frameworks that now exist for our understanding of business ethics and its many dimensions. Indeed, the other journals – that publish scientifically rigorous studies that deepen our knowledge on many issues – have been enabled in their mandates by the exploratory and formative roles played by *JBE*.

In the years to come, as the business ethics field becomes more mature, *JBE* will modify its vision, but hopefully will continue to embrace the formative nurturing of ideas for the benefit of both academics and practitioners, and indeed for society as a whole.

It has been a welcome honour and privilege to serve as an early member of the *JBE* Editorial Board, and more recently as a reviewer. Most hearty congratulations to Alex and Deb on the first 30 years, and best wishes for the next.

Edmund F. Byrne

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

The precise impact that a purveyor of words has on a widely practiced field of study is not easy to determine. But there are clear indications that this journal has had a profound effect on both internal and external aspects of business ethics.

Internally, the journal has greatly facilitated the sharing of ideas in the field. This can be seen by noting the greatly expanded number of issues (regular and special) that are published even as the rejection rate remains high. Also noteworthy is the numerical and geographical expansion over time of its contributors, its readers via hard copy and increasingly via online availability, and its library subscribers. In these respects this journal is unsurpassed in the field, as may someday be its spinoff, the *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*. Equally significant, however, is the ever widening range of sub-specialties that have been assigned a section in the journal (now more than four times as many as the original four).

Important as are these developments to an appreciation of the field of business ethics, even more important is the identifiable role they represent in distributing the

content of *JBE* not only to but beyond the attention of academics. It would be hyperbolic to say that *JBE* has discernibly changed the business world as a whole. But failing this it has contributed to the falsification of two criticisms of business ethics: (1) that the discipline has no effect on business in the real world and (2) that it tends to focus only on large corporations.

As for the first criticism, *JBE*, in consort with scholars, activists, and concerned government officials, has helped stimulate the ever growing movement to impose responsibility standards on business institutions. Key among these are efforts to implement corporate social responsibility in the world via codes of ethics and social responsibility charters as well as adoption of business-oriented human rights in international law via governmental and UN documents. To say that these developments are controversial misses the key point that they are now a significant ingredient of ongoing debate, within and beyond this discipline, regarding acceptable business practices and regulatory concerns. Moreover, they are consonant with the undeniable fact that transnational corporations have become a major component of business in today's world and accordingly call for increased scrutiny.

This said, it is not the case that less global aspects of business are ignored in the pages of *JBE*. Even a casual perusal of its contents negates the assertion that business ethics overlooks issues more prevalent among middle-management, workforce, and small business owners and operators. For, in these pages will be found countless careful studies using diverse theories and methods to improve the ethical quality of work on all levels and in just about every part of the globe. Moreover, the journal provides an invaluable mechanism for understanding in depth and proposing solutions to problems encountered in the workplace. Theories proposed and tested in one setting become models for further research elsewhere, and over time the panoply of studies that result from this academic colloquy provides well intentioned business professionals with relevant and carefully reasoned suggestions for enhancing the ethical aspects of their business.

Allowing, then, that there is always room for improvement, I am persuaded that the *Journal of Business Ethics*, under the wise tutelage of its founding Editor and Editor in Chief, has done an awe-inspiring job of advancing the quality and the efficacy of business ethics.

Cam Caldwell

Meeting Today's Demands and Tomorrow's Hopes

As one of the top 45 journals used by the *Financial Times* (2010) to determine a business school's research rank, the prestige of the *Journal of Business Ethics* (*JBE*) is well acknowledged internationally – but the reason that the *JBE* has received this ranking is that it is bridging the gap between scholar and practitioner to confront values-based issues and challenge traditional thinking that have plagued academic thinking for decades (cf. Pfeffer and Fong 2004). In today's business schools where much of the

value of learning is “taken on faith,” (Pfeffer 2009) the need to provide a forum for examining new ideas about values, leadership, and ethical expectations has come to the forefront in a world described by David Callahan (2004) as “the cheating culture.”

JBE opens the door for considering new ideas that challenge the status quo while requiring that scholars demonstrate high standards of academic rigor. In a world characterized by change, chaos, creativity, and conflict (Buchholz and Rosenthal 2005), *JBE* has become a vehicle for identifying options for old and ineffective models (Pfeffer 1998) of thinking that are the underlying causes of many organization problems associated with leadership and governance (Covey 2004). The evidence has proven that businesses are in serious trouble when they are satisfied with simply trying to be “good,” since “Good is the enemy of great” (Collins 2001:1). Good, ironically, was probably never good enough – the clear lesson for the American economy over the past 50 years (Reich 2011).

JBE offers an opportunity to challenge the moral courage of those who wear the mantle of leadership, but whose performance has been stunningly inadequate at a time when we are desperate for great leaders and rational long-term decision-making (Friedman 2009). Whether at the organizational or the individual level, whether regarding business schools or the leaders of Wall Street, scholars who have written in *JBE* have questioned the status quo, challenged sloppy thinking (and worse conduct), and advocated for accountability.

Today’s business leaders and scholars need to heed the counsel offered by the University of Michigan’s Robert Quinn (1996:158), who wrote that whenever leaders “sacrifice their principles for pressure, both they and the system take another step toward slow death.” But, like Quinn, *JBE* provides an opportunity to challenge tomorrow’s leaders to “accept the necessary risk (of living by correct principles) because it is the right thing to do.... (and to) care enough to risk dying for the organization which would kill them for caring” (Quinn 1996:158). In the world of tomorrow, we are fortunate to have the *JBE* to enable us to be an ethical conscience and a forum for moral conduct in both business and education.

References

- Buchholz, R.A., and S.B. Rosenthal. 2005. Toward a contemporary conceptual framework for stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics* 58:137–148.
- Callahan, D. 2004. *The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead*. Orlando: Harcourt Books.
- Collins, J. 2001. *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Covey, S.R., and S.R. Covey. 2004. *The 8th habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York: Free Press.
- Financial Times. 2010. 45 journals used in FT research rank. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/bd9e8b74-fd17-11dd-1103-000077b07658.html#axzz1f3DPq14D>. Accessed 24 June 2010.

Friedman, T.L. 2009. *Hot, flat, and crowded: Why we need a green revolution... and how it can renew America*. New York: Picador.

Pfeffer, J. 2009. Leadership development in business schools: An agenda for change. *Stanford Graduate School of Business Faculty Working Papers*.

Pfeffer, J., and C.T. Fong. 2004. The business school 'Business': Some lessons from the US experience. *Journal of Management Studies* 41(8): 1501–1520.

Quinn, R. E. 1996. *Deep change: Discovering the leader within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reich, R.B. 2011. *Aftershock: The next economy and America's future*. New York: Vintage.

Joanne B. Ciulla

Reflections

Looking back through 30 years of the *JBE*, I was struck by the ways in which it is distinctive. At 30, the *JBE* is arguably the oldest journal that focuses on business ethics. It was born and nurtured over the years by the dedication and hard work of its editors, Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff. Editing a journal takes an enormous amount of time. Most editors perform the job for about 5 years – so to do it over a span of 30 years is extraordinary. All of us in the field owe our thanks to Alex and Deborah for their service to the journal and to business ethics.

Not only is the *JBE* old, it is also plentiful in terms of the number of articles it has published. The journal started with one volume, four issues a year in 1982 and grew to its current seven volumes (28 issues per year). At the end of 2011, the *JBE* had printed 4,747 articles. By opening up so much space for ideas, the *JBE* has provided the field with a bounty of food for thought that was vital to the development of business ethics.

In the 1990s, I served on the editorial board and as book editor. In the early days, the quality of the articles was not always great, but what was lacking in quality was offset by the variety of interesting topics. Today, academia is obsessed with journal statistics about rejection rates, impact scores, etc. One result of this is that many of the articles in the so-called “A” journals are not very interesting. As a matter of fact, I suspect that many academics only read the “top” journals when they are doing research, have an article in them, or are checking to see if their work is being discussed or cited in an article – but I digress. My point is that the diversity of approaches and topics in the *JBE* make it a journal that is appealing to read and welcoming to new voices.

The range of ideas in the *JBE* is partly due to the fact that its articles are by scholars from all over the world. Thirty years ago, most of the publications in business ethics were by North Americans. The internationalization of the *JBE* evolved with remarkable speed, which is testament to the quality and commitment of its editors

and reviewers. When necessary, they were willing to go the extra mile and help authors, who were writing in a second language, to effectively communicate their ideas. Without this help, many fine articles by non-native English speakers might not have seen their way into print. And without input from all corners of the world, the field of business ethics would be greatly impoverished.

Many of the articles that were written 20 or 30 years ago are still relevant today. In the first issue of the *JBE*, Alex Michalos wrote that the purpose of the journal is to examine all aspects of business from “the point of view of human action aimed at securing the good life.” As Europe and the US work their way through their financial crises, we still ponder some of the same questions about business and capitalism as vehicles for securing the good life. In this respect, one could say that the *JBE* and business ethics scholars have been fighting the good fight even if they have not won the war. Perhaps for this happen, we will have to wait and see what the next 30 years bring. Until then, happy birthday *JBE* and thank you!

Thomas Clarke

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics

The *Journal of Business Ethics* is a consistent and rigorous reminder that, “Business decision-making is a moral exercise.” Since the origin of commerce, the ethical basis of business has been in question. In the ancient Greek civilization Aristotle could readily distinguish between the basic trade required for an economy to function, and trade for profit which could descend into unproductive usury (Solomon 1992, 321). Most major world religions cast a skeptical eye on business including Christianity, Islam and Confucianism. Shakespeare immortalized the potential venality of business in *The Merchant of Venice*, “All that glitters is not gold.” Frentrop (2003) graphically records how greed, speculation, deceit and frequent bankruptcy punctuated the fortunes of the earliest of the great trading companies beginning with the Dutch East India Company.

Adam Smith in 1776 in *The Wealth of Nations* made a withering comment on company management that would echo through the ages: “Being managers of other people’s money than their own, it cannot well be expected that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance with which the partners in a private co-partner frequently watch over their own ... Negligence and profusion, therefore, must always prevail more or less in the management of the affairs of a joint stock company” (Smith 1976, 264–265).

As technological change advanced with the industrial revolution, there occurred a wider diffusion of ownership of many large companies as no individual, family or group of managers could provide sufficient capital to sustain growth. Berle and Means chronicled the profound implications of this *separation of ownership and control*: ‘the dissolution of the old atom of ownership into its component parts,

control and beneficial ownership' (1933:8). Berle and Means expressed hope that with this different concept of a corporation there might develop a much wider accountability to the community recognizing the significance of the diffusion of ownership and the concentration of control in the modern corporation: "The economic power in the hands of the few persons who control a giant corporation is a tremendous force which can harm or benefit a multitude of individuals, affect whole districts, shift the currents of trade, bring ruin to one community and prosperity to another" (Berle and Means 1933, 46).

However any hope of a wider sense of fiduciary duty in corporations was eroded away in the later decades of the twentieth century in the Anglo-American world, as capital markets became more aggressive and unstable, and executive compensation was propelled upwards by stock options. A succession of cycles of booming economies followed by market collapse and recession, culminated in 2007/2008 in the first global financial crisis, which was also a crisis in governance and regulation. The most severe financial disaster since the Great Depression of the 1930s exposed the dangers of unregulated markets, nominal corporate governance, and neglected risk management. What also appeared in stark relief was an economic system, corporations and managers singularly lacking in any moral compass.

It has been argued that the dominant logic in this era in both finance and law of *agency theory*, has reduced managers to mere agents of shareholder principals. Agency theory asserts *shareholder value* as the ultimate corporate objective which managers are incentivized and impelled to pursue: "The crisis has shown that managers are often incapable of resisting pressure from shareholders. In their management decisions, the short-term market value counts more than the long-term health of the firm" (Segrestin and Hatchuel 2011, 484; Jordi 2010). Agency theory has become "a cornerstone of ... corporate governance" (Lan and Heracleous 2010, 294). As governments, regulators, and financial institutions examined what had gone wrong during the crisis, a new sense of the importance of robust regulation, alert corporate governance, and stronger ethical guidelines became widespread. In effect what is now emerging is an integration of corporate governance, corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability which potentially offers a new framework for ethical business.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped us navigate through the moral dilemmas and ethical compromises of the last three decades. It has stared into the soul of business and not flinched from offering a courageous and principled account of what it sees.

References

- Berle, A., and G. Means. 1933. *The modern corporation and private property*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Frentop, F. 2003. *A history of corporate governance*. Brussels: Deminor.
- Jordi, C.L. 2010. Rethinking the firm's mission and purpose. *European Management Review* 7: 195–204.

Lan, L.L., and L. Heracleous. 2010. Rethinking agency theory: The view from law. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 294–314.

Segrestin, B., and A. Hatchuel. 2011. Beyond agency theory, a post-crisis view of corporate law. *British Journal of Management* 22: 484–499.

Smith, A. 1976. *The wealth of nations*. Chicago: Chicago University Press

Solomon, R.C. 1992. Corporate roles, personal virtues: An Aristotelean approach to business ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 2(3): 317–339.

Denis Collins

JBE: The Path to More Ethical Organizations and Societies

Journal of Business Ethics (JBE) fans, we have much to celebrate. More than 30 years of continuous publication! Because of *JBE*, thousands of excellent articles have been published that may never have seen the light of day in traditional management journals; thousands of professors are writing articles on relevant topics; thousands of professors have been tenured due to the presence of a high quality publication outlet; and hundreds of mainstream journals are now forced to publish ethics-related research. That is quality management-by-objectives!

Social change theory has long established that change is not dependent on 100% participation – the tipping point rests at around 20%. *JBE* provided those of us in that 20% with a vehicle through which we could share ideas with like-minded scholars – and with those who took a little longer to catch on.

JBE is within the core of capitalism. Successful capitalism requires ethical behaviors in the economic and political systems. Adam Smith conceptualized capitalism as an economic system to eradicate poverty. Under mercantilism, constant food shortages meant that my Irish ancestors ate tree bark in the 1700s to survive, which really didn't help matters. Try economic liberty, Smith insisted, bounded within an ethical legal system.

Led by *JBE*, our broad mission remains that of reform – of organizations and by extension society. As an academic field, we are committed to transforming organizations and stakeholders from their current moral status to one that generates even more ethical relationships while serving the interests of owners, employees, customers, suppliers, the community, and the natural environment. What more noble life can one aspire, as the earth spins on its axis and around the sun every day. Well, there is one other major task, personal improvement along Lawrence Kohlberg's levels of moral reasoning.

Remember that first acceptance letter from *JBE*? Mine came in 1987, for an article trying to rescue Aristotle from business ethics ignominy by contextualizing his writing, forgiving him for slavery, and noting that at the core of his writing is a full-fledged communitarian business model, with a central place for liberty. In 1989, *JBE* published my typology on legal condemnation and stakeholder retaliations,

which Tom Jones later reconceptualized as an issue's "moral intensity." In between, I published a well-grounded radical reinterpretation of Adam Smith; overlooked now because it was published in a now-defunct journal.

JBE truly blossomed under the guidance of those who gave it birth, Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff. Volumes appeared full of theoretical, empirical, and just overall interesting thoughts. If you wanted to create a special issue around a relevant topic you could do it. All you needed to do was ask, round up the scholars, and do the yeoperson's work of editing them to tell a story. Through this process I made new friends with like minded colleagues concerned about service learning (1996) and how to design and support an ethical economy in Mexico and Central America (2009).

I now look forward to the electronic *JBE* Table of Contents arriving regularly. The last one I received was yesterday – volume 103, issue 1 – which includes discussions and research on an innovative voluntary code of conduct to protect stakeholders; transnational corporate corruption and regulation fluidity; ethics and spirituality in the Latino-Hispanic American reality; and women being more likely to provide socially desirable survey responses; to mention a few.

What an amazing array of leading research! Where would these have been published if *JBE* didn't exist? How further maligned would management education be without these contributions?

We have indeed entered a new age of responsibility and accountability. *JBE* is one entry point on that path, constructed so that we can guide our colleagues from Business Schools and other academic disciplines through the entry ramp. Let's keep at it until ethics is sincerely integrated in all courses and in the design and implementation of all organizations.

Christopher J. Cowton and Russell Sparkes

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Distinguished Article on Your Career?

As co-authors, our careers have been very different. One (Sparkes) is an ethical investment/socially responsible investment (SRI) practitioner who also writes on the subject, while the other (Cowton) is an academic who has published on a wide variety of subjects but with a focus on financial ethics – though from that background he has also made some contributions to SRI practice.

The article – which was subsequently translated into Italian (Cowton and Sparkes 2005) – was published as part of a special issue on ethical investment and corporate social responsibility (CSR), edited by Grant Michelson, Nick Wailes, Sandra van der Laan and Geoff Frost. The call for papers for the special issue was a helpful prompt to consider the impact of SRI. We had both been involved in SRI from its early days in the UK and we both had, in separate but connected writings, tried to

lay the foundations for analysis of, and reflection upon, SRI. Thus the special issue provided an excellent opportunity for the two of us, with our differing career trajectories but closely allied interests, to collaborate and reflect on how SRI might fit into the “bigger picture” of corporate social responsibility (CSR).

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

The growth in the annual publication quantity of the *Journal of Business Ethics* mirrors, and has helped to make possible, the growth of business ethics as a distinctive and flourishing area of academic research and scholarship. Together with the appearance of other leading journals such as *Business Ethics Quarterly* and *Business Ethics: A European Review*, this growth, and the imposition of appropriate review procedures, has meant that business ethics as an academic field of study has achieved a level of output and sophistication barely imaginable a quarter of a century ago. Gratifyingly, the early commitment to the publication of papers from a wide range of perspectives, especially philosophy and the social sciences, has continued through to the present day, contributing to the vibrancy of business ethics scholarship.

With the continual advances in academic disciplines and evolution of business practices, many questions and opportunities lie before us and much work remains to be done. In the case of the practice of SRI, it has grown to a size where it has a significant impact on global capital markets; for example, 850 investment institutions, whose investment assets amount to \$25 trn, are currently signed up to the UN Principles for Responsible Investment. However, beyond assessment of the possible impact of SRI upon investment returns, there is relatively little rigorous academic scrutiny of this activity, and the high level of citation of our article demonstrates the value of the *JBE*'s work in this field.

In SRI and other areas of business ethics, thanks to the contributions of those who have made the *Journal of Business Ethics* what it is today – editors, reviewers and authors – the scholarly community is in a strong position to face the challenges and opportunities of the future. We are pleased that our own paper has been a small part of that process and are proud to have it cited alongside many other fine pieces in this celebratory issue.

Reference

Sparkes, R., and C.J. Cowton. 2005. ‘La Maturazione dell Investimento Socialmente Responsabile: Una Revisione del suo Legame con la Responsabilita Sociale d’Impresa’. In *Etica e Finanze*, eds. Signori, S., G. Rusconi, and M. Dorigatti, 222–244. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

Wesley Cragg

The Journal of Business Ethics: Contributions and Impacts

While there are many ways to assess the scholarly contribution the *Journal of Business Ethics* has made to academic research in general and business ethics in particular, one way is to look at the journal's impact on the development of business ethics research over its 30 year life span. Seen from this perspective, the journal's impact can be divided into three phases.

Phase one, the launch of the journal and its first years of operation were groundbreaking. The 1970s saw the first wave of post war scandals. Watergate investigations and related inquiries laid bare business practices involving the bribery of foreign public officials, e.g. the Lockheed and the Japanese government, attempted covert collaboration of business with government in pursuit of questionable foreign policy objectives, e.g. ITT and the CIA in Chile, and the exercise of covert and illegal political party funding via off-shore agents again in the United States. Passage of the American Foreign Corrupt Practices Act in response to raising concerns about the ethical standards of some of the world's largest and most prestigious multinational corporations was one response. Another was a growing realization of the need to explore, understand and critically evaluate the ethical dimensions of business conduct. What was lacking at the time, however, was a vehicle for publishing business ethics research. The *Journal of Business Ethics* was a response to that need. It therefore played a foundational role in creating business ethics as an academically and intellectually credible field of scholarly research.

With the launch of the journal came the need to define the scope of the field. Was the field to be understood as narrowly defined by normative methodologies or opened to a wide range of empirical and normative disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches? Were contributions to the field to be judged against narrow and conventional disciplinary criteria or against a broader range of both disciplinary and interdisciplinary criteria designed to encourage and publish a wide range of approaches? The editorial response was to open the door to a broad range of approaches and strategies judged against a broad range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary editorial guidelines and standards. This editorial stance was then (phase three) to have a decisive impact on the eventual infiltration of business ethics into management education.

Equally important was whether contributions and contributors to the journal would be restricted to narrow geographical, e.g. North American or western, boundaries? Or would it welcome contributions from diverse geographical and cultural backgrounds? Again the editorial decision to choose the latter path played a leadership role in internationalizing the field and discipline of business ethics. These were its central contributions and impacts in phase two.

In its third and current phase, the journal has played a central role in broadening the field of management education to include a focus on values, value based management assumptions and ethics. Over the past two decades, the need to sensitize corporations and their managers, boards of directors, and investors to think more

explicitly and articulately about the role of ethics in good management has become increasingly evident. Over the same period it has also become increasingly clear that business schools had an important role to play in this regard. The integration of ethics into management education, however, required an expansion of professional knowledge and skills to include ethics on the part of a broad cross section of management faculty. It also required access to publishing opportunities in recognized scholarly journals willing to publish management oriented business ethics research. Over the past decade, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has provided that vehicle. Its status as a leading research journal in the field has provided the credibility required to ensure the inclusion of business ethics research in the international ranking of business schools, in hiring decisions and in tenure and promotion decisions. Had that not happened, persuading business school faculty to take the field seriously would have been and would continue to be much more difficult.

In summary, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has played a decisive role in launching business ethics as a field of research, defining its boundaries and finally opening the door to the integration of business ethics into the field of business and management education. For all of this, the editors and the Journal are to be congratulated for a remarkable contribution to the world of teaching and scholarship.

Richard T. DeGeorge

Reflections

Some articles that are frequently cited make the reputations of their authors. Some become the publication by which the author is known. This article [The Status of Business Ethics – Past and Future (1987)] was neither in my case. But it did mirror my career and was something of a blueprint for it. The article was published in a Japanese translation, in an Italian translation, in a German anthology on business ethics, and in an American anthology. So it had some international appeal. It was written 25 years ago when business ethics as an identifiable area was only about 10 years old. It presents the history of those 10 years; it claims business ethics is a distinctive field of academic research and attempts to define what the field is and what its limits are; and it outlines what remains to be done. It claims that by 1987 business ethics had reached a plateau. During the previous 10 years a relatively small group formed what was to become the field. The time was obviously ripe because a number of us independently hit on the same ideas and came out with the first textbooks. They all sold well which shows there was a market, and with texts available courses proliferated across the country both in business schools and in philosophy departments. The core group amounted to no more than 20, and those active in the field other than teaching numbered perhaps 50. We soon came to know one another. Despite the cool reception we received from the establishment, those of us working in the area found it exciting. Everything was new, the territory was

virgin land, and without consciously doing it we were setting the bounds of the emerging field. The legitimacy of the field was still somewhat in question in 1987 when I wrote the article, and by describing and defining the field of business ethics I was defending what I knew was a controversial claim. My book *Business Ethics* was an attempt to cover the whole field as I described it. I think it is correct to say that by 1987 the field had been defined, the basic work had been done, and that since then development has been incremental, with no big discernible leaps in the academic realm. For businesses the leap probably came in 1991 with the U. S. Federal Sentencing Guidelines for Corporations, which led to wholesale adoption of codes, training programs, corporate ethics officers, and so on. The article describes what I then saw as tasks to be done in the future, and those formed a blueprint for what I did in the ensuing years.

I was on the Editorial Board of the *Journal for Business Ethics* from 1982 to 1992 and appreciate the contributions it has made to business ethics from the start. The *Journal* immediately became the major outlet for those writing in the area and essential reading for all interested in it. The *Journal* grew from one volume (four issues) a year to seven volumes (28 issues) per year. It helped define business ethics, and from the start it has been open to all orientations and disciplines in our multidisciplinary field. It has also filled a gap by publishing the best papers from conferences and meetings as university presses came to shy away from them. Alex Michalos was one of the early pioneers in the field. That he is still editor-in-chief 30 years later proves that he is a marathon runner rather than sprinter. He deserves our thanks and awe.

Robbin Derry

Essay for the Journal of Business Ethics, Citation Classics Celebration

This award of distinction falls on my first published article, "An Empirical Study of Moral Reasoning Among Managers". The article, reporting my dissertation research, challenged both Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theories on gender and moral reasoning. Launching into the research, I was eager to hear the voices of women and men describing their experiences of moral conflict and considered moral reasoning at work. The results surprised me, as a third of my interviewees described work lives with no moral conflicts, while those who faced conflicts reported moral reasoning that defied gendered explanations. As I struggled to understand this pattern of unexpected responses, I was forced to disagree with theories I loved and counted on. In doing so, I grew up intellectually, taking responsibility for my findings and interpretations, and making meaning out of confusion. In writing an article from this experience, I staked my claim as an academic. The publication of this article convinced me that I was an accepted member of a community of scholars who shared my interests. This conviction and the sense of belonging, gave me essential

confidence as I moved into job interviews, conference presentations, and future research projects. I had an article published in *THE* journal in my field! For these reasons, this article was certainly the most important of my career, letting me know that I could succeed in meeting the initial standards of the academic world.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* was launched just as I began working on my PhD. I had been trying to figure out how and where I could study business ethics for several years. Even the question of who to talk to about ethics in business was a challenge. The *JBE* was for me a lifeline. Its presence announced the existence, however tenuous and strung out, of a network of people who were sufficiently interested to call themselves business ethicists. For many of us, alone within our academic institutions in studying ethical issues, the arrival of the *JBE* was akin to the delivery of an occasional newspaper to a household on the prairies in the early 1800s. Its reminder of not-aloneness was received with joy and relief. Over the decades since its debut, *JBE* has accepted and published research from authors in dozens of countries, providing each of them perhaps with a similar lifeline connection to the growing community. The role of the journal in establishing the field of business ethics can be described as pioneering, leading, innovating, diversifying, outreaching, and teaching. As it has grown in stature, recognition, breadth and quality, it has continued to make a name for outstanding scholarship in business ethics. I am proud to have been sustained by *JBE* for so long.

Tom Donaldson

What Sex and Business Ethics Have in Common?

It seems odd to compare the field of business ethics to that of human sexual behavior. In the popular imagination one field is topped by a halo of supererogatory, perhaps even “impossible,” idealism; while the other is weighed down by popular conceptions of “lower” instincts. But at least in their genesis, key similarities between the two fields are striking. Both fields at their inception were subordinated to the status of non-academic interest. Both were dismissed as popular topics fit for media attention and casual conversation, not for high-level empirical and theoretical research. Both were subject to entrenched prejudices that covertly blocked inquiry. And both in the ensuing decades have proven conclusively how silly that prejudice was.

The catapulting of both fields into serious consideration demanded singular initiatives, ones that galvanized the attention of serious researchers and pointed the way to their possible future. In the instance of sexual behavior, it was the *Kinsey Reports*, two books on human sexual behavior that appeared in 1948 and 1953 (Institute for Sex Research and Kinsey 1953; Kinsey et al. 1948). In the instance of business ethics, it was the launching of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in February of 1982.

The significance of the appearance of a journal devoted to business ethics that immediately attracted hundreds of submissions from academic scholars is difficult to exaggerate. To be sure, other attempts at publication and research in the area of

business ethics had been mounted; and to be sure, some scholars had already published business ethics research in other scholarly outlets. But the climate in 1982 inside philosophy departments and sociology departments was inhospitable to novelty, especially novelty addressing commercial motives. Most philosophers and sociologists were disdainful of business ethics largely because of their unexamined assumption that business must march to the drum of profit and nothing else. Interestingly, it was this naïve assumption about business ethics that researchers rigorously put to test in hundreds of later pieces of research published in *JBE*. Inside business schools, the climate was similarly stifling, but for different reasons. Business schools saw “business ethics” as tantamount to business bashing; anyone who believed that business ethics needed special study must be someone who sought to shame business.

Just as now, in 1982 there were four main academic stakeholders in business schools: deans/administrators; students; alumni; and faculty. The first three categories were, and still are, welcoming. The last category, however, i.e., the business school faculty, rallied against business ethics; and as any thoughtful person knows, without faculty support, a field is dead. I recall painfully a day in 1981 when, having been invited by the MBA students of the business school of the University of Chicago, I debated the school’s Dean on the question of “Should Business Ethics be taught in Schools of Business?” The dean steadfastly denied that business ethics should be admitted to the business school curriculum; he insisted that its mere teaching reflected a bias against the practice of business. Oddly enough, he also offered the view that teaching business ethics was unnecessary because graduate business schools attracted on average more ethical people than other areas. Throughout, the dean’s arguments reflected the prevailing attitudes of business school faculty members that business ethics could never rise to academic maturity.

The only way to persuade some people that a thing *can* be done is to *do* it. The *Journal of Business Ethics* did it, and showed business school faculty that business ethics could come of age by publishing hundreds of pieces of insightful research over the next three decades, both empirical and theoretical. Indeed, the *Journal of Business Ethics* not only succeeded in lowering faculty resistance to teaching and research in business ethics, but opened the door to the appearance of other scholarly journals in the area.

Much has changed since the day in 1981 when I debated the dean at the University of Chicago. Faculty resistance to the study of business ethics in business schools remains but has long since passed the tipping point of barring tenure. And while much remains to be done; we this year celebrate one of the seminal achievements of academe in the last half century: the launching of the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

References

- Institute for Sex Research., and A.C. Kinsey. 1953. *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Kinsey, A.C., W.B. Pomeroy, and C.E. Martin. 1948. *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co.

Paul Dunn

Corporate Governance Research and the Journal of Business Ethics

The *Journal of Business Ethics* allows researchers to explore non-traditional aspects of business behaviour. It is a forum to “bring something new or unique to the discourse” by approaching the topic “from the moral viewpoint.” In the area of corporate governance, for example, this has allowed researchers to focus on the ethical aspects of governance. Furthermore, by having a specialized journal it has allowed the quantity and quality of ethical research into corporate governance to keep pace with the general increasing interest in the field as a whole.

The Web of Science lists 5,394 articles on the topic of corporate governance that have been published in scholarly journals since 1980, 2 years before the *Journal of Business Ethics* began. At that time, the focus was on the legal, financial and economic aspects of corporate governance. In the 1990s, there was an expanded interest in the topic. From 1992 onwards there was a dramatic increase in the number of articles and the number of citations. In 1992, for example, there were 185 citations; in 2010 there were 11,149. The articles that were cited the most were from the *Journal of Political Economy*, the *Journal of Finance*, and the *Journal of Financial Economics*.

Prior to 1992 there were only a handful of cited articles that addressed the social and ethical aspects of governance. But then, as the general interest in governance increased so too did the interest in examining this topic from social and ethical perspectives. The number of articles and citations that focussed on the social aspects rose substantially from only two in 1992 to 1,207 in 2010. A similar pattern occurred with respect to published research that examined ethics and corporate governance. In 1992 there was only one citation; in 2010 there were 329. However, the influential articles that addressed these aspects of corporate governance were not published in the traditional mainstream law, economic and finance journals. Instead the cited articles that adopted a social perspective tended to appear in such journals as *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *The Academy of Management Review* and *The Academy of Management Journal*. The articles that address the ethical aspects of corporate governance were published in the more specialized journals such as *Journal of Business Ethics* and *Business Ethics Quarterly*, as well as *The Academy of Management Review*.

Topics such as corporate governance are many faceted. It is essential that we have a firm understanding of the legal, economic and financial aspects of governance. This is the bedrock for most of our studies. This is why these articles are so well cited. In turn, by standing on their shoulders, we have enlarged the field of study. We have, since 1992, greatly expanded our understanding of the social and ethical aspects of corporate governance. This has been facilitated by having specialized journals that publish new and non-traditional research. The number of quality papers published in *Journal of Business Ethics* on corporate governance has kept pace with

the general increase in the number of high quality papers that are published on the topic of corporate governance in general. Hence, there is a critical need for both the traditional journals and the specialized ones. Specialized ones, such as the *Journal of Business Ethics*, enrich our understanding of a variety of business topics. By adopting an ethical perspective we develop a more holistic understanding of business.

Dawn R. Elm

What Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

In the 30 years since its inception, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a substantial impact on the field of business ethics. The journal started when the field was beginning to move past mainstream publications in the field of management. There was an increasing need for a journal that reflected the focused research on ethics in business organizations from a philosophical and social science perspective.

Although there continued to be articles on business ethics published in *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Organizational Dynamics* and *Human Relations*; the value of having a journal that was specifically dedicated to business ethics research was a milestone for the field. It started with articles on topics that were still related to mainstream management research such as organizational influences on individual ethical behavior in public accounting; the ethics of purchasing professionals in government; and the relationship between ethics and job satisfaction. These “bridging” types of articles began a pathway for more targeted research in business ethics which helped to articulate the field as a distinct and valuable realm of study.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* became a primary publication outlet for the research in business ethics and corporate social responsibility with a specific focus on the ethical dimensions of the business world. The scope of the articles moved from bridging management and business ethics to research at the forefront of the field. We began to see articles on the theory of moral personhood, the role of ethics in global corporate culture, and the moral reasoning of managers. The accessibility of these types of articles helped to expand and further define the field.

The journal was instrumental in delineating crucial distinctions within the field of business ethics. By publishing empirical studies, social scientifically oriented studies, philosophical articles and combinations of social science and philosophical articles, the field evolved to consider a wide range of potential research streams that could contribute to continued learning in business ethics.

Today the *Journal of Business Ethics* is one of the top journals in a field which now has several publication outlets. Articles today reflect the evolution of the field to include recent research on meaningful work, corporate citizenship

and social responsibility, ethics and aesthetics, moral disengagement, values assessment, and ethical decision making across industry and global dimensions. The evolution and impact of the field is related to the continuing quality of research and the increasing scope of the journal as we move forward from the past 30 years.

Georges Enderle

Four Achievements and One Hopefully in the Making

When Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff started the *Journal of Business Ethics* in February 1982, there was little public discussion about business ethics. If it was not ignored, it was dismissed as an “oxymoron” or a contradiction in itself. As I remember, those working in the field of business ethics had to defend and justify their endeavor, and for those in Europe, the reference to North America that business ethics as an emerging academic field actually existed, did not help much. Over the past 30 years, however, this situation has changed considerably. Ethical issues related to business have become a widespread public concern all over the world.

Obviously, it would be presumptuous to assume that the *Journal of Business Ethics* has brought about this change. Many factors have contributed to this change, not the least corporate scandals, the downsides of globalization and the financial crises in the plural. Nevertheless, it is astounding that the scope of the *Journal* defined by the editors has remained the same and the purpose and the policy set up at the beginning are still relevant today.

What impact has the *Journal* had on the field of business ethics? As such an assessment is quite difficult to make, I would like to highlight four achievements. First, the *Journal*, certainly, has contributed significantly to the promotion and strengthening of public discussion and debate on ethical issues related to business. This is true for academia where the *Journal* with its A-ranking is a crucial publication site for tenure track professors of business ethics in business schools and other academic institutions. But it also holds, to some extent, for the media and business and other organizations searching for clarification and guidance on ethical matters in business. Online access to over 100 volumes provides an immensely rich source of information.

Second, from the beginning, the concept of business ethics has been defined by the *Journal* in a broad sense including “all systems involved in the exchange of goods and services”, which are studied from a moral point of view that encompasses “all human action aimed at securing a good life.” This means that business ethics has not been reduced to individual ethics as it tends to be in many Anglo-American business ethics discussions. Nor has the *Journal* focused exclusively on ethical issues of the economic system as Continental European traditions used to define business ethics during most of the twentieth century. Rather, this broad understanding

proposed by the *Journal* has provided sufficient conceptual room for individual, organizational and systemic ethics in the context of globalization.

Third, the *Journal* has struck a fair balance overall between conceptual, theoretical and empirical articles and advanced a wide variety of methodological and disciplinary perspectives. This ambitious goal is not easy to achieve and, admittedly, has not always been successful. But the *Journal* has not stifled the emerging field of business ethics; it has helped it to grow and has been a trail-blazer over many years.

Fourth, as for the geographic spread represented by the members of the editorial team, the leadership of the *Journal*, first, was located predominantly in the USA and Canada. By 2009, the North American part remained strong, with a substantial increase of Canadian and European members. However, compared to 51 North Americans and Europeans, only five members represented the rest of the world. So Alex and some Asian friends thought the time had come to help fill this gap (along with the *Business Ethics – A European Review* and the *African Journal of Business Ethics*) and launched in 2011 the *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*. All those engaged in the global business ethics movement can only wish that this child will grow as strong and productive as its parent.

Loren Falkenberg

The Evolution of the Journal of Business Ethics

In 1982 the first issue of the *Journal of Business Ethics* was published, and I had my first and only MBA class in business ethics. In the first issue Hoffman and Moore (1982) reviewed a survey sent to over 1,200 colleges and universities, and they found less than 14% of the responding institutions offered business ethics courses. Prior to the launch of the *Journal of Business Ethics* there were only two other journals with a stated mandate of publishing articles on ethical issues: *Business and Society* and *Business and Professional Ethics Journal*.

The minimal level of journal activity in 1982 reflects the level of instruction and discussion that occurred in my single business ethics class. The assigned case was “Nestle Infant Formula”, and the class was an unstructured discussion of sales practices by Nestle. The professor ended the discussion by commenting that each of us would have to monitor for potential ethical issues and respond on the basis of our gut feelings. At the time there was not an electronic retrieval system for the professor to access relevant articles from the two available journals. So I am giving the professor the benefit of the doubt, and conclude a lack of access to academic articles and cases limited the introduction of business ethics into my MBA program.

Since my MBA class in 1982 the evolution of the *Journal of Business Ethics* has paralleled the increased value placed on academic research and teaching in business ethics. The number of journals focusing on business and professional ethics has

expanded from three in 1982 to greater than 20 journals in 2011. Two journals in 1982 were published in the United States, while *JBE* was published in the Netherlands. The first volumes of the *Journal of Business Ethics* were dominated by American authors, and it wasn't until after 2000 that there was a significant contribution from European researchers. The globalization of the field and the journal are reflected in the balance of authors from Europe, Asia and North America in the 2010 volume.

I examined the growth trajectory of the *Journal of Business Ethics* by reviewing the table of contents of the first issue of each volume. A number of trends in this analysis illustrate the key role the journal has played in the expanding interest and demand for academic articles in business ethics. First, the rapid growth in published issues reflects both the need and interest for articles that further our understanding of the complexities of decision making in business, and the growth in society's expectations for business leaders. The number of articles published per year rapidly expanded, with the journal having only four issues per year in the first 2 years, followed by six issues per year, and increasing to 12 issues (3 volumes) per year in 1988. By 2011 the *Journal of Business Ethics* was publishing seven volumes per year (28 issues) and had published a total of 103 volumes.

The leadership role of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in this evolution is reflected in a recent review of the classification of professional and business ethics journals. Serenko and Bontis (2009) found *Journal of Business Ethics* was one of only two journals classified as "A" level journals; and the *Journal of Business Ethics* is the only business ethics journal on the *Financial Times* top 45 journals list. The parallel in the growth of the *Journal of Business Ethics* and the expansion of business ethics courses is noted in a recent survey of the top 50 global business schools. Over 84% of the top 50 business schools require students to take courses in business ethics, corporate social responsibility and/or sustainable business.

There are many benchmarks one could use to analyze the role a journal plays in the evolution of a field. It only requires a small snapshot of the publication history of the *Journal of Business Ethics* to conclude that the journal has led the field from a nascent academic area in 1982 to a critical field in the study of business decisions.

References

- Hoffman, W.M., and J.M. Moore. 1982. Results of a business ethics curriculum survey conducted by the Center for Business Ethics *Journal of Business Ethics* 1: 81–83.
- Serenko, A., and N. Bontis. 2009. A citation-based ranking of the business ethics scholarly journals. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics* 4: 390–399.

Marilynn Fleckenstein

Reflections on the Journal of Business Ethics

For many years, early in my career, the thought of working in the field of ethics was absolutely frightening. Ethics was messy; metaphysics was much more structured and therefore more appealing to my mind. However, ethics which deals with human behavior has held a prominent, if not central place in the thought of such great intellectuals as Plato, Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas.

In the early 1970s, in the light of the war in Vietnam, the woman's movement and civil rights movement, questions began to be asked about the role and responsibility of business in these social movements. In particular, the questions focused on the production of materials of war, especially chemicals such as Agent Orange. It was in this era that the discipline of business ethics moved to the forefront and began to evolve. However, very few philosophers paid much attention and for the most part, any discussion of ethical concerns was hidden in the business courses themselves.

It was not until the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business insisted that ethics become an integral part of the curriculum that a diverse and sophisticated body of literature began to be formed. The *Journal of Business Ethics* played a significant role in this development as it came to be recognized as providing a high quality venue for the research of scholars.

It was then, that I along with my students were interested in pursuing these questions. But it seemed that the disciplines of management and ethics were worlds apart. How could these be brought together in a coherent and meaningful way? What could ethics contribute to the study of management and what could management say to ethics?

Ethics could provide language and a conceptual framework which one could utilize to discuss the ethical issues that arise in the practice of business management and in the world of business. Ethics teaches through careful reasoning on how one ought to make distinctions and avoid fallacies. Ethics also offers an opportunity to think through complex ethical issues. The study of management introduces one to specialized areas such as employment, intellectual property and international business. It can, then be said that the function of the discipline of business ethics is to delineate the duties and obligations that business persons have precisely as business persons.

Recognizing the growing interest in and importance of the field of business ethics, the three Vincentian universities in the United States, DePaul University, Niagara University and St. John's University, embarked on a collaboration focused on bringing together scholars from business and the humanities with business practitioners for open discussion of the ethical issues involved in the practice of business. An annual conference was begun in the fall of 1994. This conference was conceived as a natural extension of the basic mission and values of these institutions which share a commitment to the vision of St. Vincent DePaul and his dedication to education and service. The annual conference seeks to promote business ethics through excellence in academic research and the practical application of that research to business situations.

The dissemination of the work of this conference has been primarily through *The Journal of Business Ethics*, which generously publishes a special issue each year composed of articles developed from the work of the conference participants. Without this vehicle much of the work produced from the conference might never have found an audience. As we prepare for our 18th conference we are grateful to have this relationship with *The Journal of Business Ethics* and look forward to this collaboration for many years to come.

Gary M. Fleischman

JBE: 30 Years of Enhancing the Public Good of Business Ethical Behavior

Few could have imagined in 1982, *Journal of Business Ethics* (hereafter “*JBE*”), would so transform the literature. It is clear that the goals, purposes, and policy that Alex Michalos championed in his 1982 editorial have been achieved, namely that *JBE* has provided a highly effective public forum for sustained public scrutiny of all ethical issues related to the pure public good of business ethical behavior. In 1982 business ethics was considered a specialized, fringe topic that was mostly ignored. However *JBE* has been instrumental in transforming, developing, and incorporating business ethics into the academic mainstream. Specifically, *JBE* has fostered empirical assessment of the gap between normative ethical rhetoric versus reality in organizations.

The purpose of this essay is to elucidate noteworthy arenas of business ethics inquiry where *JBE* has been especially proficient. Specifically, I focus on *JBE*'s noteworthy contributions relating to (1) ethical dilemmas relating to employee-specific as well as employee-manager interactional dyads; (2) implications for the organizational ethical context; and (3) the impact of business ethics on stakeholders and society as illustrated by contrasting an ethical versus unethical organizational environment.

JBE has transformed our understanding of ethical dilemmas that employees experience in the workplace.

Specifically, much literature has utilized Rest's (1986) moral reasoning framework that involves investigation of ethical sensitivity to recognize ethical dilemmas, ethical judgments about these dilemmas, and intentions to act out ethical judgments. This research underscores the tension between knowing what is moral versus acting morally due to moral agent internal conflicts that may vary based on relativistic versus idealistic ethical ideologies. Conflict may also emanate from the ethical context. Studies have augmented this inquiry with ethical dilemmas that highlight the employee-manager dyadic relationship. In short, literature promulgates that management has a nontrivial impact on subordinates, and the “tone at the top” is key to institutionalizing the organizational ethical context.

JBE has made a superlative impact on the field by using empirical finding implications to pragmatically offer solutions to management. *JBE* therefore bridges the academic versus professional chasm by offering pragmatic training suggestions to enhance the ethical context, including ideas relating to the content and enforcement of codes of conduct. These implications may involve building organizational focus on corporate social responsibility, sustainability, and corporate governance initiatives.

JBE has elucidated the interactive relationships among employees, management, and the organizational environment, which ultimately impacts stakeholders and society. For example, research involving employee deviance provides excellent contrast in terms of these interactions compared with those of ethical organizations. Contexts tolerant of bullying, narcissism, or Machiavellianism are often characterized by turnover, low productivity, and poor job satisfaction and employee emotional and physical health, ultimately impairing stakeholders and society. Contrast employees who shape quality ethical contexts and harmonization of individual and organizational morals by exemplifying extra role and altruistic behaviors. Research concludes these employees are healthier, happier, have high job satisfaction, and are productive, leading to business profitability, greater philanthropy and corporate social responsibility, and reductions in poverty, all benefiting stakeholders and society.

During the past 30 years *JBE* has fostered a forum of sustained public scrutiny that has encouraged research to bridge the gap between normative ideals versus reality. Implications of this research provide management tools to enhance the ethical environment and behavior. Future research should focus on managerial decision-making ethical dilemmas, because managers are key drivers of moral behavior in the workplace, and are responsible for the ethical tone. Strengthening the ethical context makes employee's lives better and more productive. This enhances the pure public good of business ethical behavior, which benefits society, the ultimate goal of *JBE* for the past 30 years.

Robert C. Ford and Woodrow D. Richardson

Reflections

In the late 1980s, Woody and I were teaching and researching social responsibility, business ethics, and decision making at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Since I was interested in the intersection of ethical and decision theories, I had sought out and organized the literature on ethical decision making. In early 1990, my review of this literature led me to develop a model of ethical decision making that I submitted to the *Academy of Management Review*. Unfortunately, the same month I submitted my paper, *AMR* published an article by Thomas Jones that had many overlapping points with my work. The reviewers rightly stated that my paper did not add enough new to the literature to justify publication. Nonetheless, I felt that the review of the literature done to support its arguments was so extensive that others interested in this topic might benefit from the work. Woody had been working

along a similar line of research, and with his assistance we updated and organized this literature into the article that appeared. This article marked the end of our intense interest in the topic as we moved to new universities (me as chair of hospitality management at University of Central Florida and Woody as faculty at Ball State) and different research agendas (me as author of multiple works on service management and Woody as a case writer).

We are pleased to learn of the value of the article to other scholars who have benefited from the effort we put into accumulating and categorizing this still growing literature. The 550 plus cites reported by Google Scholar as of this writing is a rewarding testimonial to its value. In the concluding section of the article we noted that the review of literature revealed many interesting research opportunities and issued a call to scholars to investigate them. It is clear that many took advantage of that call. We are delighted that so many colleagues have benefited from our work.

R. Edward Freeman

The Importance of the Journal of Business Ethics

The Journal of Business Ethics has had a profound impact on the teaching and scholarship in business ethics, and in business schools. From its inception the *Journal* has taken a rather broad approach to what counts as business ethics. It has always published more than simply the latest analytic philosopher's analysis of a particular problem in business. The *Journal* has encouraged empirical research as well as theoretical work for many years. Today we see other business ethics journals also taking up this approach that was pioneered by *JBE*.

As the ratings mania has swept business schools, especially in the US and Canada, *JBE* has maintained its place as a premier publication outlet in the *Financial Times* and *Business Week* rankings. It also counts for a number of schools who have very strict rules about publications "counting" for academic issues such as grants and leaves.

A third way that *JBE* has been important to the development of our discipline is through the publication of special issues that are often the result of conferences all over the world. I have benefited greatly from reading the work of scholars from all over Asia. I'm afraid I would not have such access to their work if not for *JBE*. Conference publications can be a tricky business, but erring on the side of providing a voice to many, is a great contribution, that few journals are willing to undertake.

Finally, *JBE* has been an important outlet for me personally. Here I mean not only the papers that I have been fortunate enough to publish there, but also that some of the most sharply critical papers on stakeholder theory have appeared in the pages of *JBE*. These papers have often moved my colleagues and I to write responses, and even where we have not, the papers have made the development of stakeholder theory much more interesting and exciting. In a recent book, *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art* (Cambridge 2010), my colleagues (Jeffrey Harrison, Andrew

Wicks, Bidhan Parmar, and Simone DeColle) and I referred to more than 20 papers from the pages of *JBE*, and there were many more references that were connected to research programs that have appeared in the *journal*. In an even more recent book, *Stakeholders Matter: A New Paradigm for Strategy and Society* (Cambridge 2011), Sybille Sachs and Edwin Ruhli refer to more than 30 articles from *JBE*. That the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a remarkable impact on the development of stakeholder theory is unquestionable.

Donelson R. Forsyth

Judging the Morality of Business Practices: The Influence of Personal Moral Philosophies: 20 Years Later

The theory of personal moral philosophies stole quietly into the world of ethics in the early 1980s. At that time most psychologists who studied morality were cognitive developmentalists interested in age-related changes in morality. The theory of ethics positions, in contrast, focused on adults' moral thoughts, actions, and judgments, but most of the initial empirical work was conducted with young adults in laboratory settings. These early studies tested basic predictions about the relationship between individual differences in idealism and relativism and morality and were published in good journals in the field of social psychology and personality, but the theory gained few adherents and generated little empirical attention.

That changed in 1992 with the special issue of *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* edited by Robert Giacalone dealing with the behavioral aspects of business ethics. Dr. Giacalone was intrigued by the laboratory-based studies of ethics positions and believed that the theory could be usefully applied in organizational and business situations. Buoyed by his optimism, I wrote "Judging the Morality of Business Practices: The Influence of Personal Moral Philosophies" to describe the basic theory, summarize the evidence up to that point, and point out possible applications.

That publication gave the theory new life. The paper offered investigators a way to deal with a fundamental problem in ethics: moral diversity. Even people who agreed on such matters as politics, fine dining, and the weather often disagree when the conversation turns to issues of ethics. Investigators searching to explain some of this variance among individuals in terms of moral outlook turned to the pages of *JBE* and found the Ethics Position Questionnaire (EPQ). The EPQ provided one way, of many, to conceptualize this variation and researchers used it to explain differences in moral thought and action in various business contexts, workers' responses to a peer's wrongdoing, variations in codes of ethics in different cultures and corporations, sex differences in moral outlook, the use of relatively unscrupulous accounting practices, consumers' reactions to various marketing ploys, leaders' moral values, and so on. By 2008, when my colleagues and I collected up the

findings from various studies for a meta-analytic review (Forsyth et al. 2008), we identified over 200 publications that cited the original 1992 paper and used the EPQ to study over 30,000 people in 29 different countries. The publication of the theory in *JBE* was a career highlight, for it proved to be the catalyst that transformed a relatively unknown theory into a familiar and well-studied one.

The secret to the paper's impact lies in the scope, defined focus, and quality of the *Journal of Business Ethics*. Previous publications in psychological journals interested only a few researchers, whereas *JBE*'s boundary spanning reach across disciplines pushed the theory into prominence in the field of ethics. *JBE* is theoretical yet applied, both conceptually and empirically rigorous, and open to new ideas and orientations. Its focus is narrower than any disciplinary journal – on ethics, specifically – but it is this focus that heightens its impact. When *JBE* first began publishing papers, those who studied ethics published their results in various professional journals, for there was no one primary outlet for the field. Now, the empirical study of ethics has emerged as a field in its own right, in part in response to growing interest in the business world in issues of integrity, justice, and ethics, but also because of the existence of an excellent journal that “brings something new or unique” to the study of ethics.

Reference

Forsyth, D.R., E.H. O'Boyle, and M.A. McDaniel. 2008. East meets West: A meta-analytic investigation of cultural variations in idealism and relativism. *Journal of Business Ethics* 83: 813–833.

Elisabet Garriga and Domènec N. Mele

Reflections

First of all, Prof. Elisabet Garriga and Prof. Domènec Melé would like to congratulate the *Journal of Business Ethics* for its 30 years and they hope that it will have another 30+ years, and so, they will have more opportunities to contribute to the dialogue about business ethics by publishing there.

Both authors think that the *Journal of Business Ethics* has a high impact on the business ethics field for its rigorous, relevant and diverse ethical research, with both theoretical and empirical approaches, tackling the central and main ethical debates. In their view this journal contributes to building a serious discourse and dialogue in business ethics. Regarding the field of Corporate Social Responsibility, this journal has tried to emphasize its ethical perspective, and hopefully it will continue in this way.

Due to the journal's great impact, the article "Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory" (Garriga and Melé 2004) has had a big influence on the professional career of the authors. The main impact on the first author's career, Professor Elisabet Garriga, has been at the level of acknowledgement, reputation and expertise in the CSR field. In her own words:

"Since its publication, the paper has given me a great amount of recognition. When I am attending a conference, it is always a pleasure to find a doctoral student who says to me "Thank you for your paper, it helped to make sense of the field of CSR" or simply a Professor telling me "I liked your paper a lot". It truly makes me happy. Nevertheless, my main source of satisfaction is when I notice that my research has helped others to develop their own research agenda, which consequently has helped to move the CSR field forward".

This paper also gave Professor Garriga a reputation in the field of CSR and the privilege to work with some important authors of CSR theories and to continue this integrative approach based on a relational view of the CSR concept (accepted paper for publication forthcoming). Furthermore, the first author has been frequently invited to review articles on CSR and to become a reviewer of several journals; the first journal in doing so and the most appreciated was the *Journal of Business Ethics*. In addition, this paper helped her to advance her research agenda by identifying new innovative areas of research in the field of Corporate Social Responsibility, and new opportunities for publishing have arisen. For example, her article "Cooperation in Stakeholder Networks: Firm's 'Tertius Iungens Role'" (2009) presented a new approach to stakeholder cooperation based on network theory where the research up to then was scant.

The article has provided the second author, Professor Domènec Melé, a reputation as an expert on Corporate Social Responsibility Theories. He was invited to write a chapter on this topic in *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility* (2008a) and has often been invited to review papers on the theoretical foundations of CSR. The idea of an integrative approach, suggested in this article, has inspired his further work, including a special issue of the *Journal of Business Ethics* (see Melé 2008b, for the introductory editorial) and two books (Melé 2009, 2012), in which ethics is at the core of corporate responsibility.

References

- Garriga, E., and D. Melé. 2004. Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics* 53(1–2, August): 51–71.
- Garriga, E. 2009. Cooperation in stakeholder networks: Firms' 'Tertius Iungens' role. *Journal of Business Ethics* 90:623–637.
- Melé, D. 2008a. Corporate social responsibility theories. In *The oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*, eds. Crane, A., A. Williams, D. Matten, J. Moon, and D.S. Siegel, 47–82. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Melé, D. 2008b. Integrating ethics into management. *Journal of Business Ethics* 78(3): 291–297.

Melé, D. 2009. *Business ethics in action. Seeking human excellence in organizations*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Melé, D. 2012. *Management ethics: Placing ethics at the core of good management*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Robert A. Giacalone

On the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics

The impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* has been significant, for it has engaged in a systematic expansion of the field, primarily by focusing on three areas: behavioral business ethics, interdisciplinary research, and internationalization of the journal.

First, at a time when business ethics was primarily philosophically driven and focused on ethical theory, it took the courageous and ground-breaking approach of accepting papers on behavioral business ethics. This approach has had considerable implications on the development of the field in that it shifted the focus from a strictly philosophical to a behavioral approach. In turn, this shift is now witnessed in other journals and in how we view business ethics inquiry. More critically, with this behavioral approach, we see a closer alignment with what organizations want. With no intent to undermine philosophical approaches, the reality is that philosophical approaches without the ability to alter and measure behavioral change would leave us far removed from the realities of organizational life. Because measurement has become a reality in the field, we have legitimized our discipline with practitioners by speaking the assessment language that organizations understand. But with this shift has come an underlying concern, however, that a great deal of what we now see as business ethics is often heavily focused on organizational behavior and psychological concepts that ultimately may turn the study of business ethics into a kind of “ethics light,” where organizational behavior and psychology are really the focus.

Second, what has characterized the *Journal* over the years is the breadth of its offerings. In it, business ethics grew to be more broadly defined, to include areas of research and practice that were beyond the traditional strictures. Indeed, what we have seen is an interdisciplinary compendium of business ethics work in which both the criterion and the predictor variables have been expanded. It is a field now where, for example, one can easily recognize that the unethical components of deviance, the predictive values of positive organizational scholarship variables and spirituality are connected to business ethics concerns. Here, too, a bit of unease emerges because the major focus so often may not be business ethics criterion and predictor variables, but variables largely in other research disciplines. For example, articles focused primarily on organizational approaches to justice, using mostly citations from

non-ethics journals, are more about organizational behavior and less about ethical issues. Striving for a true interdisciplinary integration will be essential.

Finally, at a time when research on organizations had a more North American slant, the *Journal* remained steadfast in publishing the work of researchers across the world. This has had the important impact both of internationalizing the field and of expanding the worldview of what business ethics and social responsibility are all about. With the different religious, cultural, economic, language, values, and historical approaches emergent in the *Journal*, a confluence of what the field could be has emerged in the often disparate approaches of these international authors.

Where does the *Journal of Business Ethics* go from here? The answer to that question will be the challenge for the *Journal* over the next 30 years and 100 volumes. Other journals in the area have increasingly emulated the pattern that the *Journal* proffered for the field. So the issue will be what distinctive additions the *Journal* will bring forth to lead the field. How it evolves to be different, and in so doing, challenges researchers and educators in business ethics and social responsibility to grow, should be the central question that guides it.

Kevin Gibson

Reflections

The *Journal of Business Ethics* by itself may not have made the corporate world more moral: However, it has provided us with language and frameworks that have changed the narrative about business actions and leaves me optimistic about the future. At the time the *Journal* was first published, the term Ethics had a whiff of remedial Sunday school. The emergent texts in the area concentrated on the philosophical foundations and some of the special problems for people in business, such as insider trading, bribery, coercive sales techniques and whistleblowing, with a strong implication that judicious application of an appropriate moral theory would solve the issue. While those sorts of problems are still with us, we now have a much richer and sophisticated moral discourse about business activity that draws on empirical research, systems approaches, post-modern and feminist literature, and a broader philosophical base that recognizes the importance of metaphysics and epistemology in these discussions. Moreover, the dialogue now actively involves non-Western voices. For example, 20 years ago, the corporate mission statement, if there was one, probably had no references to stakeholder welfare, sustainability, or social responsibility, whereas they have now become an integral part of business thinking. The change in the story we tell ourselves about business has expanded in no small part due to the wide mission and scope of *JBE*. The *Journal* has been a valuable asset in providing an integrative forum that brings together the quantitative and qualitative research which grounds speculative ideas. Indeed, the legitimacy of the *Journal* now underwrites a discourse in business, professional training and scholarship that has emerged during its history.

The *Journal* also has a direct impact on my professional life. I am employed at a University that maintains its faculty should be teacher/scholars. This description is not exclusive: it means that the institution expects that research should be incorporated into the classroom – that is, research from across the field, not just my personal interests. Not unusually, administration demands effectiveness in teaching in a subject that is notoriously hard to evaluate. The fact that the *Journal* includes pedagogical articles along with research means that it is my resource of first resort.

Dennis A. Gioia

Pinto Fires and Personal Ethics: 20 Years Before and After Publication

If you have read my tale of the Pinto Fires saga, published 20 years ago in *JBE* in 1992, you might remember that the story actually began 20 years before that, when I joined Ford in 1972. The fact is that it took me until 1982 to come clean and acknowledge to my Penn State colleagues that I was a central figure in the case. Then it took until 1986 to write up the teaching case about it, and yet another 5 years to write the *JBE* article about the experience. You might say I was a little slow in coming out. So, what has happened since the publication of the public confession?

In the wake of the article, what happened initially was akin to a small public hanging. The piece received quite a bit of attention from fellow academics – people attuned to a juicy story, especially if it has a whiff of corporate misdeed. Some were appalled at my decisions, disappointed in my actions, and took the occasion to make a few (somewhat sanctimonious) pronouncements. One even threw me in the same rogues' gallery as fraud artists like Joe Jett and Michael Milken. Some others thought my analysis in terms of cognitive scripts that were missing an ethical component, thus leading to a lack of ethical awareness, was disingenuous, self-serving and evasive. Others thought the description of how decision making in organizations actually happens was revealing, if troubling. To be fair, though, many thought the account compelling and the explanations enlightening, particularly because they revealed the complex interplay of cognition, information overload, organizational culture/knowledge/learning, and corporate ethics and social responsibility. The academic conversation was pretty spirited for a while. Then, after about 2 years, Pinto Fires dropped out of sight, its half-life apparently exhausted, my 15 min of fame (infamy, actually, in some peoples' eyes) apparently over.

Around the year 2000, the damn thing came roaring back. I started getting calls from all kinds of journalists wanting my commentary on recalls – and not just car recalls, all recalls (hair dryers!). I became a go-to guy – an instant expert reincarnated to feed the media beast. Why? Why all this sudden new interest? Initially it was a mystery... until I realized that all the renewed attention was because of the

rise of the Internet and Google's little invention. All you had to do was google "Pinto fires" and my name popped up. Now everybody knew my name. Lord, what had I done with a well-intended, unwitting publication in *JBE*?

Then in 2005 *Fortune* magazine was celebrating its 75th anniversary. As part of their historical coverage, they formed an editorial team whose charge was to nominate the 20 most significant decisions – good or bad – in *Fortune's* 75 years. Their list was filled with stunningly successful decisions (e.g., Sears' big box stores; Pan Am's initiation of international flights, IBM's 360 computer, CitiBank's ATMs, etc.). Only a very few decisions were nominated as debacles, one of which was ... Ford's decision "to let the Pinto explode." Oh, good grief. Predictably enough, the editors googled Pinto and got two insider names: Lee Iacocca (President of Ford at the time of the Pinto case) and me. Iacocca had some savvy and declined to comment when contacted. Not me. I sang like a canary. At one point, I let slip that when I was at Ford, we referred to the depot where failed parts were returned as the "Chamber of Horrors." My, how they dearly loved that quote. In the end, though, *Fortune* treated me fairly (and even cited *JBE* in the article), but it was quite the experience.

Around this same time Linda Trevino arranged to videotape me teaching the Pinto Fires case to a class. So now if you google "Pinto Fires, the Living Case," you can get the whole story on DVD too. And to think, I owe it all to *JBE*. Was it worth it? Maybe. Perhaps. Probably. Even if I still get calls from people who, 40 years after the fact and 20 years after the article (but who only recently read it), still want to take me to task for my role in this damnably visible case.

Kenneth Goodpaster

Reflections

RE: What, if any, has been the impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the field of business ethics?

JBE has been a venue for practical reflection and reflective practice

For the past 4 years, I have been shepherding an ambitious book project, a history of corporate responsibility in the United States, to be published by Cambridge University Press during 2012. One of the most profound "takeaways" from this philosopher's journey through more than two centuries of business history is the *tenacity* of the American mindset when it comes to the moralization of the modern corporation. Despite numerous occasions for disappointment and discouragement over the behavior of business toward its stakeholders, and despite clearly articulated alternative social arrangements from Marxism in the nineteenth century to democratic forms of socialism in the twentieth, the pursuit of *business ethics* by thought-leaders and practitioners in America is remarkable. For the very idea of business ethics as a field of thought and practice *presupposes* a shared conviction that the institutions

inhabiting a market economy are *capable* of ethical responsibility, not simply legal compliance. In the United States, business scandals and tragedies involving workers or consumers or local communities have always given rise to protests, regulations, legislation, and judicial discipline; but it is significant that they have *not* led to revolution or to the dismantling of the private sector. Instead, the American public has demanded higher levels of business ethics. This persistence appears to be culturally embedded in ways that are less evident in other countries.

By the end of the 1970s, the field of business ethics had taken on new energy with the academic alliance of empirical work on corporate responsibility by management scholars and normative work by philosophers, theologians, and others in the humanities. This new energy needed a multi-disciplinary outlet for peer-reviewed research, for “engaging the profession.” The founders of the *Journal of Business Ethics* responded to this need with courage, generosity and a spirit of servant leadership. Over the past 30 years, *JBE* has displayed noteworthy breadth in its editorial criteria, providing a venue for professional contributions from an array of disciplines including all of the social sciences, the liberal arts, and professional studies. Without gatekeepers for the exchange of practical reflection and reflective practice, a hybrid field like business ethics could not have matured and cannot continue to grow. The contribution and impact of *JBE* lies in this “exchange” space. I have seen in its regular and special issues innovative work that would not have found entry into the business ethics conversation but for the existence of this journal’s editorial philosophy and publication criteria.

Speaking as a subscriber since Volume 1 Number 1, as an editorial board member and manuscript reviewer for well over 20 years, and as a contributing author of several articles in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, I can say with confidence that *JBE*’s impact has been salutary. Formidable competitors have emerged, to be sure, with distinctive strengths and standards, but these rivals are not threats to *JBE*; indeed, they represent its legacies. Congratulations!

Irene M. Gordon

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics

Several of us, long associated with the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)*, have been asked to address the question: “What impact has the *JBE* had on the field of business ethics?” I suspect our collective answers will reflect common themes. From my perspective, there are three important effects.

Perhaps the most visible effect is *JBE* being listed on the *Financial Times* 45 (previously the FT 40). The *JBE* provides a respected outlet for business ethics research that is cross-, multi- and inter-disciplinary. *JBE* is a journal that allows people from inside and outside of business academe to publish ethics related articles. As evidence to support my statement, I looked at my own university for the period

November 2008 through October 2011. From a library database search, I found eight articles published during this period (Robinson et al. 2011; Gordon 2011; Abramson 2011; Barnea and Rubin 2010; Herremans et al. 2009; Boutilier 2009; Poitras and Meredith 2009; Peloza et al. 2009). These eight Simon Fraser University contributions came from the disciplines of accounting (Gordon), finance (Poitras and Rubin), marketing (Meredith and Peloza), strategy (Abramson), technology and operations management (Bertels) and from one non-business discipline (Boutilier). The breadth of disciplines represented reflects the interest in ethics and the existence of the *JBE* clearly meets an important function and need within the community of business researchers working on business and ethics.

More specifically related to my field of accounting, the *JBE* has provided many of us interested in both accounting and business ethics an important outlet for our research. I find that some accounting research questions of interest to me are unlikely to be published in some of the accounting discipline's journals. *JBE* allows for broader types of accounting-related research to be published.

JBE supplies articles that serve as valuable sources of educational material that may be included in our teaching. I have personally used *JBE* articles in preparing for seminars and for assigned course readings. In particular, I have used articles directly related to ethics as well as articles specifically focused on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Students have benefited from the quality of the research and the types of questions *JBE* researchers ask. The chosen articles offer areas for debate and questions that make students think beyond disciplinary boundaries. These challenges allow our business students opportunities to grow and expand their knowledge and understanding of business ethics.

Without the *JBE* business ethics research would have been poorer over the past 30 years. We have benefited from the *JBE* as a respected research outlet and an important source of educational material for business students.

References

- Abramson, N.R. 2011. Kierkegaardian confessions: The relationship between moral reasoning and failure to be promoted. *Journal of Business Ethics* 98(2): 199–216.
- Barnea, A., and A. Rubin. 2010. Corporate social responsibility as a conflict between shareholders. *Journal of Business Ethics* 97(1): 71–86.
- Boutilier, R. 2009. Globalization and the careers of Mexican knowledge workers: An exploratory study of employer and worker adaptations. *Journal of Business Ethics* 88(Supplement 2): 319–333.
- Gordon, I.M. 2011. Lessons to be learned: An examination of Canadian and U.S. Financial accounting and auditing textbooks for ethics/governance coverage. *Journal of Business Ethics* 101(1): 29–47.
- Herremans, I.M., M.S. Herschovis, and S. Bertels. 2009. Leaders and laggards: The influence of competing logics on corporate environmental action. *Journal of Business Ethics* 89(3): 449–472.

Peloza, J., S. Hudson, and D.N. Hassay. 2009. The marketing of employee volunteerism. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85(Supplement 2): 371–386.

Poitras, G., and L. Meredith. 2009. Ethical transparency and economic medicalization. *Journal of Business Ethics* 86(3): 313–325.

Robinson, M., A. Kleffner, and S. Bertels. 2011. Signaling sustainability leadership: Empirical evidence of the value of DJSI Membership. *Journal of Business Ethics* 101(3): 493–505.

Michelle Greenwood

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

In the academic area of business, dominated by empirical and positivistic journals, the *Journal of Business Ethics* (affectionately known as *JBE*) offers a crucial alternative: the exploration of philosophical and normative interpretations of business dilemmas. Unique amongst journals, it deals with a broad range of ethical issues as they pertain to business, offering opportunities to emerging scholars and those new to the business ethics, whilst at the same time attracting senior and expert specialists from the field.

JBE is frequently characterized in terms of both its breadth and its proliferation. The journal embraces expansive and liberal interpretations of ethical theories; diverse methodological approaches and heuristics; and wide-ranging praxis in varied organizational settings. The journal publishes many regular and special issues each year, has raised the profile of business ethics in the broader academy, and is widely cited both within the field business ethics and more broadly. However, as noted by Phillips et al. (2003) with regard to one of the major subjects of *JBE* – stakeholder theory – such exposure can be at once a project’s making and its weakness.

It is frequently commented that the best articles in *JBE* surpass those published elsewhere, but that they are diluted by the publication in the journal of many less significant papers. Yet, it is the accessibility of *JBE* that allows for varied, non-traditional and dissenting voices. Based, in part, on well-positioned rankings (especially its FT45 listing) and impact factors, *JBE* has become a magnet for scholars subjected to the vicissitudes of journal ranking for research assessment exercises. Research not conceived or framed in relation to business ethics is now commonly submitted and in many cases published. The manner in which this further opening of the gates strengthens or dilutes the journal – and the field more generally – remains to be seen.

Whilst the sheer quantity of *JBE* issues published per year is a conversation stopper, what rarely gets mentioned is the large number of special issues the journal supports. Special issues allow for deep exploration of hitherto neglected topics and

involvement in the editorial process of scholars with fresh or atypical perspectives. The forthcoming special issue on Ethics and HRM (human resource management) provides a case in point. As an ethical laden project within business and society, and a positive discipline within academia, HRM requires comprehensive and rigorous ethical analyses. *JBE* is laying the groundwork for this endeavor, bringing critical and ethical exploration to both scholarship and education in HRM.

JBE has shown leadership in specific areas of business ethics scholarship. Although every commentator is likely to have his or her own favorites, the areas of religious ethics, codes of conduct, and geographically specific studies have been identified as particular strengths of the journal. On a personal note, I regard highly *JBE*'s support of two important developments in the field of business ethics: the refinement of stakeholder theory, in particular considerations of the moral treatment of stakeholders (Freeman 2010; Freeman et al. 1988); and the development of CSR theory, in particular the political conception of corporate social responsibility (Palazzo and Scherer 2006).

Being involved with *JBE* is synonymous with being part of the study of business ethics. It is hard to imagine that there is one researcher, one student, one syllabus, one (academically-read) practitioner with interest in the field that has not in some way been impacted by the journal.

References

Freeman, R.E. 2010. Managing for stakeholders: Trade-offs or value creation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 96(0): 7–9.

Freeman, R.E., D.R. Gilbert, and E. Hartman. 1988. Values and the foundations of strategic management. *Journal of Business Ethics* 7(11): 821–834.

Palazzo, G., and A. Scherer. 2006. Corporate legitimacy as deliberation: A communicative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics* 66(1): 71–88.

Phillips, R., R.E. Freeman, and A.C. Wicks. 2003. What stakeholder theory is not. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 13(4): 479–502.

Sally Gunz

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on Business Ethics

These observations consider the impact of the *Journal* on the academic community. While the *Journal* undoubtedly influences business practice, I am simply ill equipped to measure that effect.

When asked to contribute to this collection I sought counsel from those whom I admire in the accounting ethics discipline. It is remarkable the consistency in response

and how these coincide with my own thoughts. To understand the observations, we must begin by acknowledging a key underlying tension. Most (perhaps all) business and professional programs report the examination of ethical issues to be an important element of their curricula. However, consider more closely the two critical exemplars of ‘commitment’ in an academic environment: mandatory courses and tenure track positions. Now examine the woeful evidence of either in a large proportion of business and professional programs at least across North America. Business ethics is really important, but not *so* important as to replace a course or tenured position in marketing, or accounting, or operations research, etc. Instead we ‘integrate’ ethics across many courses – not a bad idea if done right, but is it? The alternative to ‘right’ is a class that is abandoned when time is tight or subject matter that is signaled to be secondary to primary course content.

The above tension is reflected in leading academic business journals. Until recently, few would accept an ethics article to be relevant to their mandates. Advice to junior faculty interested in ethics was consistently: ‘wait till after tenure’ and even then understand your work may be marginalized by your colleagues. In this context, consider the insight of Deborah Poff and Alex Michalos in establishing the *JBE* and thereby giving business ethicists a legitimate arena for their work. Looking back at my own CV, I see a *JBE* article as one of my first. And I remember with real gratitude the encouragement from Alex to submit a paper, ironically entitled “Are Academics Committed to Accounting Ethics Education?” 1998.

This is, however, part only of the contribution made by the *JBE*. It is genuinely international where many of the leading business academic journals are unashamedly North American-centric. It continues to defend a broad subject mandate. And perhaps most importantly, it is effectively overseeing a mandate for increased quality without discouraging innovation or creativity. The inclusion of the *JBE* in the Financial Times 40 (now 45) was a landmark in the *Journal’s* history. This ranking signals value to even the most reluctant academic administrator.

Two fields of scholarly interest further illustrate the *JBE* contribution. In the past decade academic interest in corporate social responsibility has increased dramatically. A more hidebound journal would require submissions in an emerging field to fit within the constraints of an existing one. The *JBE* created first one and then two sections to address the demands of the academic community. Recent financial crises have led to a renewed interest in ethical behaviour at both reporting and market levels and the increased volume of submissions resulted in a separate finance section. This, however, is not a journal jumping on academic ‘bandwagons’ with no respect for quality. The demands on authors for improved theory and methodology are constant and the days of applying one successful tool to a variety of contexts with little thought to relevance are long since gone.

In sum: the impact of the *JBE* is immeasurable to those working in the business ethics discipline. This journal is our academic ‘home’ and one that tests us and demands much of us. It has earned its FT ranking and for this we have all benefited. It is an important step to establishing business ethics as an accepted component of all business and professionals programs, not just in thought but also in actuality.

Christine A. Hemingway and Patrick W. Maclagan

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career? And What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

An apparent dualism between structure and agency, reification or voluntarism, is at the essence of what has exercised the minds of philosophers since the ancients (Rabinow 2000). And whilst the philosophy of critical realism regards this as a non-duality, with structural and agential forces, in turn, informing and transforming the other, our own presupposition regarding personal values as a driver of CSR was congruent with this epistemological perspective. We have always regarded the impact of personal values as an operating mechanism which, despite structural pressures, is causally efficacious through judgemental rationality and reflexivity (Archer 2000). Social change *is* possible, albeit tremendously difficult. Thus, in the context of CSR, this focus on individuals' actions could range from senior managers' influence over policy formulation to the opportunities which may be open to all staff for the exercise of discretion, despite their position in the organisational hierarchy.

Indeed, we both felt that personal values as a driver of CSR had largely been overlooked in the CSR literature, which has tended to emphasise the more obvious economic drivers of both governments and corporate reputation management. It cannot be a coincidence that both of us – at an earlier stage in our respective careers – were employed for a decade or more in industrial management. Perhaps this has inclined us to empathise with individuals and the situations which they face in corporate life, and encouraged us to address matters accordingly. This was certainly the case for the first author and as such, this paper represented an initial step in the articulation of an intellectual position regarding CSR which she has since developed further. As a consequence, she was awarded a Visiting Fellowship from the Nottingham University Business School, U.K. She has also recently accepted a nomination for a Fellowship of the Royal Society of Arts (FRSA). The second author, now at a late stage in his career, was already widely published, including the authorship of a book on *Management and Morality* (Maclagan 1998) in which, although the primary focus is on individual action, questions of structure and agency are recognised (as noted by Pataki 2000). He regards the success of this paper [Managers' personal values as drivers of corporate social responsibility] as vindication of his view, held for several decades, that the role of the individual should be emphasised more than is often the case in the literature on CSR.

And so we turn to the impact of *The Journal of Business Ethics*. With its broad coverage of the field, it is well positioned to address matters such as the complex relationship between individuals' values, judgements and corporate behaviour. As interest in the subject (not least in the pedagogical context) has grown, so the *Journal* has made a significant contribution, especially since 1998 when the annual number of articles published was increased. Indeed, this has provided a platform for more

academics to present their work. Nevertheless, the impact of the *JBE* remains high with a factor of 1.125 according to the Thomson Reuters *Journal Citation Reports* (Web of Knowledge). This is a highly regarded measure of quality and we would support the *Journal* in its efforts to retain its reputation as a leading international journal in the field of business ethics.

References

Archer, M.S. 2000. *Being human: The problem of agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maclagan, P.W. 1998. *Management and morality: A developmental perspective*. London: Sage.

Pataki, G. 2000. Patrick Maclagan: Management and morality: A developmental perspective. Book review. *Organisation Studies* 21(4): 836–841.

Rabinow, P. 2000. *Michael Foucault, ethics: Subjectivity and truth*. London: Penguin.

W. Michael Hoffman

Business Ethics: The Beginnings

A Brief Essay for the *Journal of Business Ethics* in Celebration of 30 Years of Publication

Most scholars mark the beginning of the formal discipline of business ethics as the 1970s. It was then that courses and conferences began to emerge, textbooks and articles began to be published, and centers for business ethics were founded in universities such as Bentley, Delaware, and Virginia and outside the academy in institutions such as the Ethics Resource Center in Washington, DC.

What gave rise to this sudden flurry of activity is multifaceted. One might mention the ongoing maturation of the field of applied ethics generally along with particular events such as the Watergate scandal, high profile corruption cases in which bribes were paid in order to secure foreign contracts, and the passage of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act in 1977, among others.

When I founded the Center for Business Ethics (CBE) at Bentley University in 1976, social circumstances were ripe for growth in the field. Despite the skepticism and occasional derision, there was an expanding awareness that given the ever increasing influence of business on society, progress was needed in articulating its ethical context. One thing, however, was missing... a professional journal. It is essentially impossible for a field to be accorded credibility without at least one

respected academic journal that serves as the reservoir of the best in professional research and reflection. Back in 1982, the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* was created to serve that function. And ever since, it has had an indispensable role in the flourishing of the field. I can speak from experience because back in May 1982, along with my colleague Jennifer Moore, I served as the guest editor for *JBE*'s second issue. There we published a collection of articles drawn from the first three Bentley national conferences on business ethics, organized by CBE. It was an important event, and *JBE* was just the publication needed to provide a forum for these views.

It will come as no surprise to note that the period since the founding of *JBE* has been one in which the world of business has undergone unprecedented change. In 1979, the United States established diplomatic relations with the then poor underdeveloped country of China. The personal computer was introduced in 1981 to be followed by the creation of the internet. The term "globalization" was coined in the 1980s around the time when the interests of shareholders was challenged by a broader notion of "stakeholder" interests. *JBE* was founded before both Enron and WorldCom came into being and disappeared under the weight of their own corruption. These and many other developments changed the context of business and even helped to change our understanding of what a business is.

Changes such as these brought with them new ethical dilemmas and new challenges to our understanding. Throughout this amazing period, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has been both the guidebook to the ever-changing ethical landscape of business, as well as the town square where the global community of scholars could come together to share ideas and discoveries, and engage in debates and disagreements. Ultimately, *JBE* has been where scholars have sought to shine a light on the vital importance of infusing the practice of business with something more important than the drive for profits – a social conscience.

And while the world of business has its hub in the United States, it took two brilliant and tenacious Canadians, Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff, to hold the reigns and guide this journal through this remarkable, tumultuous period. The business ethics community is indebted to *JBE* for providing the forum that has been indispensable for the flourishing of our field.

Bryan W. Husted

The Impact of National Culture on Software Piracy

This article is part of a stream of research dealing with the antecedents of ethical behavior at a macro-level. This particular paper focuses on software piracy and adds to a series that also includes corruption and environmental performance. This particular article was especially well received by scholars in information technology and has been cited in relevant journals in the field. In part I think this response has been due

to the fact that this article was one of the first, if not the first, to examine how culture relates to an ethical behavior of interest into information technology using a quantitative methodology based on data available through the Business Software Alliance. This paper continues to attract attention because of the increasing prevalence of software piracy around the world. It offers the message that solutions must be consonant with the cultural context in which piracy occurs.

Clearly the *Journal of Business Ethics* has played and continues to play a major role in business ethics research. For many years it was the only scholarly outlet dedicated to research in the field. Although competition among journals has increased, the *Journal of Business Ethics* remains an important outlet for scholars from around the world. I know of no other outlet that regularly publishes research from such a diverse group of business ethicists. It has displayed an openness to theoretical and empirical approaches that is difficult to find elsewhere. In addition, it publishes much research from new scholars just beginning their careers in the academic world and provides a vital space for communicating heterodox ideas and using new methodological approaches. For many schools, publication in *JBE* is prized because of its privileged position in the journal list of the *Financial Times*. Hence its past is very rich and its future looks quite bright.

Po-Keung Ip

JBE – Celebrating 30 Years of Accomplishments

The Journal over the last two decades has witnessed a steady increase of publications on business ethics in Greater China, a region that covers China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau. The bulk of these papers are authored by scholars and researchers in this region, reflecting a solid growth of interests and competence in this area. The issues tackled by these publications comprise a diverse lot, ranging from corruption, work values, environmental issues, corporate governance, consumer ethics, corporate culture, financial ethics, CSR, ethical perceptions, and accounting ethics to general business ethics. Many of these publications are of empirical nature reporting and interpreting data collected in the field, while a few are theoretical work focusing on the conceptual and normative dimensions of business ethics in this region.

Among this bulk of publications, two subject matters that have received extensive discussions conspicuously stand out. They concern issues about *guanxi* (Chinese version of social relationships) and Chinese values in business. Researching on these uniquely Chinese elements surely helps unravel the subtle yet entrenched social and cultural foundations of Chinese business ethics. As Chinese business is gaining global influence and attention in the wake of China's spectacular rise, to understand the nature of its culture and practices not only is imperative in academia but the world at large. The four Chinese societies in the region share some core Chinese-ness, however they also demonstrate discernable differences in institutions, cultures and collective preferences.

Taiwan is a newly developed democracy with a state-driven market economy and a globally influential high-tech sector. Hong Kong is China's Special Administrative Region that has a strong tradition of rule of law and free market, and is practicing a diminished form of democracy. Similar arrangements can be found in the tiny city of Macau, another China's SAR. And China is a one-party state with an evolving market socialism introduced some three decades ago, and is now the second largest economy in the world.

How business ethics is practiced in these four diverse Chinese societies with their different social, economic and political systems itself is a worthy topic of investigation. The *Journal* has been effective in providing a platform for discussing these issues and thus helps both strengthen the richness and diversity of the discourse and extend the research horizon of business ethics. In today's globalized world, business ethics is no longer confined to the Anglo-Saxon or European countries, but includes the increasingly important Asian region. By embracing the Chinese (and Asian) aspect of business ethics in its fold, the *Journal* has succeeded in making the scope of business ethics discourse authentically global and relevant, as it should be. This positive impact on knowledge and understanding that enriches the world is beyond measure.

The value of a good academic journal depends on its ability to facilitate the creation and dissemination of timely and useful knowledge and ideas that help make the world a better place. Over the last 30 years the *Journal* has been realizing this value to the full. Last but not least, a *Journal* of this significance is not possible without good leadership. It is through the leadership of its Founding Editor, Professor Alex Michalos, with his foresight, inclusiveness and steady execution that the *Journal* has achieved this crowning success. It is time to celebrate these remarkable accomplishments.

Jay J. Janney

Reflections

I tend to be a pretty lucky scholar. I stumbled onto my dissertation topic by accident, during the first 6 weeks of my first semester in the Doctoral program (at the University of Kentucky). Similarly, I'd have to classify this paper [An empirical investigation of the relationship between change in corporate social performance and financial performance: A stakeholder theory perspective] as another exemplar of my scholarly luck. Here's the quick story. I had just completed an independent study with Greg Dess (now at University of Texas-Dallas), creating an extensive literature review on the Resource – Based View of the firm. I was looking for gaps in the literature. The next day, Krish Muralidhar (one of the paper's co-authors) stopped by to chat with Greg. He and the other three co-authors wanted to frame the theory for their work using RBV, but hadn't studied RBV in depth: could Greg help?

Greg had a tight book deadline approaching, and had to decline. But with my RBV literature review in his hand, Greg recommended that they bring me on-board as a co-author, which they did. What a lucky break!

Overwhelmed at first, I read the paper, and liked it as is. I felt my co-authors had developed an excellent method for CSR that made a real contribution. It occurred to me, however, that the draft pointed to a gap in the literature that we could fill. There had been work on reputation and ethics, signaling theory, and reputation and RBV, but not (in my opinion) a tight integration of business ethics and RBV. While retaining the focus on the methods, I wanted to emphasize how perceptions of ethics matter (using RBV). We submitted it to the *Journal of Business Ethics*, where it was warmly received.

Professionally, the paper opened doors for me; this being my most heavily cited paper. I went onto the job market shortly after the paper was accepted (always a good thing), and the University of Dayton wanted to hire strategy/entrepreneurship faculty who were grounded in the ethics literature. The faculty liked the integration of the multiple domains. Hence this work differentiated me in their eyes and I joined the faculty in 2001, where I happily remain. Since then, I have published additional work on ethics, including a second paper (2009) in the *Journal of Business Ethics*. I also re-framed my dissertation to emphasize signaling, from which I published four journal articles.

In my humble opinion, most academic domains start as a phenomenon, where people describe what exists. At the next level, domains begin to appear as special cases in other domains. That is, people apply an existing theory to (in this case) a business ethics example. It is still descriptive work, but richer. Finally, at a maturity stage, insights from the domain begin to influence theory in other domains, and work is much more integrative. I think our work is an example of that with the *Journal of Business Ethics*, as are many of the “citation classics and distinguished papers”. I believe the *Journal* itself leads the domain in integrating multiple theories. As a result, the *Journal's* scope offers a breadth and depth that in my opinion makes it the premiere business ethics outlet.

Muel Kaptein

Business Codes of Multinational Firms: What Do They Say?

I am honoured that an article I wrote has been selected to be included in this volume of citation classics. Being classified as a citation classic suggests that at least a few of my colleagues regard – or, at least, regarded – the article as meaningful, noteworthy and relevant to their own research. That the article was published less than a decade ago in 2004 shows that it has been taken up in a relatively short space of time.

The article contains the results of a study of the business codes of the 200 largest corporations in the world. What is unique about this study is that it was the first time that such research was conducted. It shows not only in which countries and

continents the largest companies have a code, but also the content and the differences between them.

With regard to the editors' question about the impact of the article on my own career, my answer is as follows. Firstly, the article strengthened my view that considerable research into codes was still needed. Why is the content so diverse, and is this a positive or negative feature? And what, subsequently, determines the effectiveness of codes? Since then, I have conducted research on the effectiveness of business codes. Accordingly, I carried out a meta-analysis of studies of the effectiveness of business codes, and conducted empirical research into the factors that influence the effectiveness of business codes. I have also used the inventory of items from the business codes of the Global 200 to develop a generic, multidimensional scale to measure unethical behaviour within and by organizations, which was published in the *Journal of Management*.

Secondly, the article assisted me in my capacity as business consultant. Companies struggle with questions such as, 'What is a good business code?', 'Which issues should we include?', and 'How do we describe each issue?' The study provided me with broad insight into the content of codes which assisted me in advising clients. In addition to my own consultancy work, I know of other companies in different continents that have used the article as a benchmark in the development and actualization of their own codes.

In my view, this also illustrates the influence of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in the field – the second question the editors of this volume asked me to respond to in this short essay. The *Journal of Business Ethics* does not only have an impact in academia but also in practice. That is not only a welcome bonus but it is also a moral obligation. I have full confidence that the *Journal of Business Ethics* will continue to do so successfully. On the next 30 years!

Adam Lindgreen, Jon Reast and Joelle Vanhamme

Business Ethics: Fact or Fiction?

When international business schools that offer MBAs and executive MBAs voted to include the *Journal of Business Ethics* (*JBE*) in the *Financial Times*' list of the 45 top academic journals in business, it sent a strong sign that our journal exerts a strong impact. The *Financial Times* also compiles rankings of the best MBAs in the world, using as one of its criteria a business school's research rank, or the number of faculty publications in top academic journals. Since joining the list of top journals, we have enjoyed a growing number of manuscript submissions.

These developments imply that faculty in business schools are interested in publishing their best work on ethics in *JBE*. In turn, future managers may adjust their MBA school choices based indirectly on the university's publications in *JBE*. That is, schools with faculty publishing in top journals earn better rankings, and those rankings are utterly critical for attracting MBA students.

The ranking of *JBE* by renowned sources such as *Financial Times* also helps raise the profile and importance of business ethics for current and future managers. University curricula reflect the growing prominence of journals such as *JBE* and the associated interest in business ethics. For example, in many schools, specialized ethics-based modules constitute a key feature of degree programs. The most forward-looking institutions ensure that business ethics represents a constant, clearly visible theme in all business-related modules and programs, as well as a clear element of any interactions with business community members.

Alongside the increasing success of *JBE* and the development of the business ethics field (and related corporate responsibility research), universities in Europe, North America, and Australasia have been establishing research centers and institutes to encourage and support research and corporate engagement with business ethics. Such centers play their part in developing the field, according to aims such as:

- To build a stronger link between business ethics theory and practice.
- To promote knowledge sharing and partnerships within the business ethics field and across private, governmental, voluntary, and academic sectors.
- To strengthen business ethics education for present and future managers.
- To identify and disseminate exemplary business ethics policies and practices.

Some business schools go even further and explicitly work to move businesses along on their journey toward more ethical business. For example, Edhec Business School recently created an International Ethics Board “that seek[s] to encourage businesses to increasingly incorporate the value of Responsibility into all their actions.” This board includes members of the academic community, but the majority of its members are prominent business leaders, including the chairpeople of Michelin and Auchan.

Such progress is encouraging, but it remains important to influence the thinking of current and future managers. Why? Even after the widely reported Enron (U.S.) and Bank of Credit & Commerce International (U.K.) scandals of the 1990s, recent events, such as the Parmalat (Italy), Sanlu baby milk (China), and Lehman Brothers (U.S.) scandals, indicate that business ethics-related problems are not abating. The search for profit maximization must be balanced by questions of ethics and, at a minimum, adherence to laws and regulations. Instead, a cynical balance of law breaking for enhanced profit versus fines, if caught, has become too prevalent. We cannot ignore the organizations that have, in a relatively short space of time, embedded business ethics into their culture and behavior, but too many just keep paying lip service to the principles, without altering their actual business ethics. Thus there is still work for journals such as *JBE* to do, not only in developing the field but also in disseminating business ethics throughout practitioner circles to change the values and behaviors of corporate entities worldwide.

The overriding message of this short essay needs no sugar coating: Business ethics is not fiction but a fact that managers absolutely must take seriously. The smart money is on organizations that make business ethics the very heart of their existence. If Shakespeare was right, and all the world is a stage, these are the organizations that will be neither the spectators nor the players, but rather the scribes who take charge of the script.

Jeanne M. Logsdon, Judith Kenner Thompson and Richard A. Reid

Reflections

Software piracy was emerging as a critical ethical and economic issue in the early 1990s, and college students were thought to engage in this questionable practice quite frequently. Thus, it provided an excellent topic for the three authors to collaborate on an empirical research study that appeared to have some important theoretical and practical implications. The research question was whether an individual's moral reasoning capability was related to attitudes and behaviors about using pirated software. This empirically-based study provided a great opportunity for us to learn much more about a number of research issues, including debates about various measurements of moral reasoning as well as the social desirability response bias.

The findings of the study were important because level of moral development, as measured by Rest's Defining Issues Test, was only weakly correlated to software piracy attitudes and behavior. This result was contrary to our working hypothesis, but not wholly unexpected. Our article concluded with a number of possible explanations for the findings, including the low level of "moral intensity" of the piracy issue, and this is what launched quite a large number of subsequent empirical studies, many of which have been published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

In terms of impacts on our careers, in the short term we were recognized favorably in our home institution for designing a scientifically rigorous study. Over the longer term we remained active in research productivity on separate projects for a number of years following publication of the software piracy paper. While we did not conduct any follow-on studies to this one, we did find inspiration in what we learned during this investigation. For example, later research often made reference to level of moral development, social desirability response bias, and the nature of issue moral intensity. We also have had the satisfaction of seeing the value of our work as inspiration for later scholars because we identified an important research question and established a sound empirical foundation upon which future investigative efforts could be based.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a very significant impact on the field of business ethics by providing a widely-distributed and high-quality journal for dissemination of all types of research results related to business ethics. No other ethics-related journal has the breadth of coverage of *JBE*. Virtually every type of applied business ethics topic has appeared here. Both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies have been welcomed. There is broad geographical coverage – studies from just about every part of the globe have been published. Practitioners as well as scholars can find valuable contributions in the *Journal*. We can personally attest that selection of our article for publication by the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a profound impact on nurturing this future research stream because of its focal position across a wide spectrum of business ethics scholars.

S. W. Kelly, O.C. Ferrell and S. Skinner

Reflections

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classics on Your Career?

Throughout our careers, we have been involved with a number of research projects associated with marketing research ethics. This article was a building block for several studies in the marketing ethics area for the coauthors. All of our careers have been enhanced by selecting this topic for research and publication.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* provided the best outlet for this article because of the diversity of audience in the business ethics arena. The coauthor team has gained visibility and the opportunity to network with those scholars interested in marketing research ethics. Being in the distinguished category in citation classics will continue to enhance our reputation in marketing ethics and increase the number of scholars that use this article in their research. We are also hopeful that this recognition will be a benefit to practitioners as they try to understand frameworks that can improve marketing research.

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

Over the past 30 years, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has been the premier journal advancing knowledge in this field. In many ways, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped pioneer and advance business ethics from an academic and a practitioner perspective. Its articles have reflected the many changes in academic research, regulation of business ethics, and the development of corporate business ethics programs. In the early years of the *Journal of Business Ethics*, there appeared to be much more concern for individual ethics and philosophical orientations that could affect ethical decision making. Today there is a greater focus on organizational ethics, ethical culture, and the social influences of ethical decision making in an organizational context.

Without the *Journal of Business Ethics*, academic researchers would not have a common outlet to share their research and knowledge in advancing the discipline. The journal has covered a wide range of topics such as the impact of moral philosophy on ethical decision making, the role of organizations in developing ethics programs that are effective in preventing misconduct, the social and psychological characteristics of decisions makers, and many macro ethical issues related to social responsibility and sustainability.

We feel that the future of the *Journal of Business Ethics* is very bright. The journal has established its leadership position and is listed as a top journal in most rankings.

Its ranking in the *Financial Times* list of Top 40 Publications worldwide has given authors a significant ability to emphasize the value of their publications to their peers. The journal is leading the charge in institutionalizing business ethics in schools of business.

Ans Kolk

Reflections on Impact

To say something about the impact that a journal has had on a field, as this volume aims to do as part of the celebration of 30 years of publication of the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)*, looking at citations is a logical and first step. This is indeed what the introductory chapter does, with interesting results. However, it also lists over 30 limitations of using citations, and the results clearly show the long time lag, with the ‘newest’ article in the top 20 articles dating back to 2006. This in itself illustrates the limited value of impact factors as other studies have underlined as well. Considering these caveats, what can we say about the impact of *JBE* beyond citations? And what may be perspectives for the future, if we do not look backward but forward?

As to the first question, in my view a further broadening of *JBE*’s scope and coverage has taken place in the period since those articles in the most cited list were published. Business ethics as framed by *JBE*, and as reflected in the articles in recent years in particular, seem to have become rather eclectic, covering corporate governance, sustainability, development, partnerships, peace and conflict, to name just a few of the topics that received attention in the journal. While the citation classics give an impression of the state of the field and the impact of *JBE*, it is about the development and the history to a large extent.

What also remains underexposed when looking at citations is the peculiar function that *JBE*, as a relatively specialised outlet, appears to have in the landscape of journals that cover ‘mainstream’ business disciplines. This relates to critical observations made in and about various mainstream journals regarding the lack of relevance and of insufficient attention to new ideas that are still messy. Several authors have attributed this absence to mainstream journals’ almost exclusive focus on methodological and technological sophistication, as well as to the difficulties of examining topics that cross boundaries and are at the margins of disciplines (McAlister 2005; MacInnis 2005; Miller 1998; Stealin 2005). It has also been noted that social science journals tend to be most concerned with the ‘accuracy of the present’ – in contrast to science journals that are more attentive to publishing potential path-breaking studies even if these are not yet fully perfect (Hopwood 2007, p. 1371). It is here where there has been a role for journals like **JBE** to add insights ‘at the margins’ (cf. Miller 1998) and across disciplines with emergent issues.

One might hope that at some point this function will be taken over by the mainstream journals in business, including most notably accounting, finance and marketing

(Hahn et al. 2010). In management studies, attention to business ethics, broadly defined, can be seen, although so far mostly written by those authors that are specialised in these topics and also publish in *JBE*; it is unclear to what extent this will spread to others. Such a development towards further mainstreaming may require a reconsideration of rigour and relevance, of the very notion of impact, and of the role of research and scholarly outlets in academia, business and society. Until then, a journal such as *JBE* will continue to be important, regardless of citation counts, to help set the agenda with novel ideas and approaches. While this may come with variability in terms of the quality of the research and the output at times, it can lead to “approximate answers to important problems or issues” that “are just as useful (if not more useful) than precise answers to wrong, well-defined, narrow problems” (Raju 2005, p. 18).

References

- Hahn, T., A. Kolk, and M. Winn. 2010. A new future for business? Rethinking management theory and business strategy. *Business and Society* 49(3): 385–401.
- Hopwood, A.G. 2007. Whither accounting research? *The Accounting Review* 82(5): 1365–1374.
- MacInnis, D.J. 2005. Them versus us: Woes on the bifurcation of the academic marketing discipline. *Journal of Marketing* 69(October): 14–16.
- McAlister, L. 2005. Unleashing potential. *Journal of Marketing* 69(October): 16–17.
- Miller, P. 1998. The margins of accounting. *The European Accounting Review* 7(4): 605–621.
- Raju, J.S. 2005. Revitalizing the role of marketing in business organizations: What can poor academics do to help? *Journal of Marketing* 69(October): 17–19.
- Stealin R. 2005. Influencing the practice through big new ideas. *Journal of Marketing* 69(October): 21–22.

Terry W. Loe, Linda K. Ferrell and Phylis Mansfield

Relections

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

The review of empirical studies assisted us in gaining an understanding of the multitude of empirical studies on organizational ethics and how they supported well known frameworks of ethical decision making. This article, early in our careers, provided strong visibility and awareness of our interest in the ethics area. The fact the article was so heavily cited, confirms our experience that the study became a

nice reference piece for work to understand organizational ethical decision making. The article, according to Google scholar, has been cited over 285 times. The work allowed us to review hundreds of articles and extrapolate commonalities in the findings to assist us in our future research, as well as to support others working in the area. We have also taken the insights gained from our study and applied them to businesses and also in the classroom to enhance future business leaders' appreciation and application of ethical principles in their careers. On a more personal note, we had a great time working on this article-sometimes we laughed so hard we cried. In reconnecting to discuss its impact and the *Journal of Business Ethics*, we renewed our connections and are planning to work together again on some future research projects.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has provided guidance to academics and industry. The goal to enhance the overall understanding of workplace ethical climate and culture as well as improving corporate and organizational interaction with society. There is no other journal systematically dealing with organizational ethics issues in a committed and pervasive fashion. There are competitor journals in the discipline which broaden their perspective to include more philosophical topics, or represent specific sub-discipline areas such as management, marketing, accounting and finance. But, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has remained squarely at the center of advancing our understanding of organizational ethical decision making. By providing the premier journal in the business ethics arena, the *Journal of Business Ethics* continues to have a significant impact on our careers as both a research resource and a publication outlet.

Steven Lysonski

Reflections

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

The catalyst that fueled my inquiry into the ethics of business students was the experience I was having in class when discussing marketing decisions with ethical implications. I witnessed a shift from the late 1970s to the late 1980s in sentiments by students regarding business. It appeared as if students were becoming less ethically minded or at least more accepting of some questionable business practices. I decided to examine cross cultural differences among business students in New Zealand, Denmark and the USA – countries in which I had taught marketing.

To my surprise students were not so different regarding ethical decision making when confronted with business problems. This realization stimulated my interest in understanding how students deal with ethical problems in a business context. The study, therefore, set the stage for the interest I would have in the topic for the next 20 or more years. Publishing that study gave me an entry point into other studies that I would conduct on ethical areas including the stereotyping of women in advertising, the influence of alcohol advertisements on college students, the downloading by students of MP3 music files illegally, among other topics.

The procedure of asking students to respond to actual scenarios with ethical dilemmas would be an approach that I would use in other studies during my career. Hence, this initial study affected my career in various indirect ways that only would become apparent to me as my career unfolded. The study also gave me various insights that would influence how I would teach some topics that relate to ethics. If you wish to conduct a small experiment of your own, ask students if there is an ethical implication regarding the conversion of corn into ethanol given that the diversion of corn from food products has resulted in higher prices of grains and even tortillas in third world countries. You will be surprised in what you hear. Hence, the study I conducted in 1990 continues as a work in progress as my career continues to explore the reactions of young people to ethical issues or dilemmas.

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

We live in a world that surrounds us with increasing complexity, diversity and dynamism. As capitalism has diffused throughout the world in the form of globalization, ethical issues have become even more poignant and worthy of discussion. When I began my career in 1980, teaching business ethics was more of a side show in business school and clearly not mainstream. In marketing, we addressed the issue of business ethics in the area of macro-marketing, but the field was only in its infancy. There was no forum or journal that was devoted to unraveling, explicating or illuminating ethical issues in business.

JBE represents a beacon that has illuminated many areas of ethical understanding in business. There is no other journal that is committed to this singular goal. Its interdisciplinary nature gives readers a wide exposure to the gamut of ethical inquiry. Business ethics has emerged as a field with multiple and varied constituencies or stakeholders; it is no longer a backwater area. *JBE* serves as a mouth piece in this regard.

JBE has developed an international following with authors from around the world offering their research either conceptually or empirically. Hence, *JBE* has clearly had an impact on scholars in the academic community. Its articles are used in classroom settings, meaning that students are exposed to enlightening issues. It is likely that seeds are being planted in our students' young minds that may someday sprout in desired ways. Raising the consciousness of students and faculty to ethical issues is a good thing for obvious reasons. The commitment of *JBE* to guide our

thoughts with ethical inquiries relevant to business is meritorious. The journal has evolved over the years with more attention being given to the theoretical underpinnings of empirical research. It has laid a foundation upon which others can add their building blocks in our development and understanding of business ethics.

Dirk Matten, Andrew Crane and Wendy Chapple

Reflections

To Question 1: By hindsight, we occasionally had to smile about the slight pretence in the title of this paper. In fact, it was the first publication of a new stream of research which we developed, together with Jeremy Moon, over the years into a broad stream of publications. The paper [Behind the mask: revealing the true face of corporate citizenship] then contains a first layout of a nascent research area which subsequently led to a number of papers in top ranked academic outlets, which in turn had a significant impact on the author's careers.

To Question 2: As the first academic journal specifically focusing on business ethics *JBE*, over the years, has published quite a number of classics. In particular in the first two decades many of the seminal, high quality, contributions to the field of business ethics and corporate social responsibility were published in *JBE*. As such *JBE* has been a seminal journal in adumbrating the academic field of business ethics. This is reflected in the inclusion of *JBE* into the criteria of assessing performance and quality of academic work in business schools by major ranking and evaluation bodies (e.g. the so-called *Financial Times* 45 List).

This success in defining a new sub-discipline in management in some ways has led to the emergence of more journals in the field and a growing openness of mainstream management journals for business ethics-related topics. Consequently, *JBE* now shares its role as an outlet for business ethics research with a number of other journals. It appears that *JBE*'s unique role now has shifted towards providing a wide base for scholars from various backgrounds to engage in the debate on business ethics. With now a nearly weekly publication schedule (e.g. 39 issues in 2010) it seems that *JBE* is certainly the leader in terms of quantity of published material in the business ethics field.

Joseph A. McKinney

Reflections

Our article, *Ethical Attitudes of Students and Business Professionals: A Study of Moral Reasoning*, was among the earlier articles on business ethics published by the co-authors. The reception given the article provided important incentive for the

co-authors to do further research in the area of business ethics. We subsequently wrote and published about 10 additional business ethics articles on a variety of subjects.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has provided an extremely valuable outlet for researchers from a wide variety of disciplines who are engaged in investigation of business ethics issues. It is the source that I most frequently consult when doing research in business ethics, and also is a most valuable resource for information on ethical issues that relate to my teaching. The field of business ethics would be much poorer and less developed without it.

Marcia P. Miceli

Reflections

Our essay concerns: Greenberger, D., M.P. Miceli, and D.J. Cohen. 1987. Oppositionists and group norms: The reciprocal influence of Whistle-Blowers and Co-Workers. *Journal of Business Ethics* 7: 527–542.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

The publication of our article by the *Journal of Business Ethics* provided opportunities for us to connect with researchers and others in a variety of fields outside of business ethics, including management, social psychology, law, public policy and public management, and many others. For example, it provided a basis for discussing how co-workers' pressures for conformity may inhibit whistle-blowing and how observers of perceived wrongdoing could break those pressures, and under some circumstances, could influence others. Faculty and students at all levels (doctoral, masters', undergraduate), from around the world, have contacted us over the years. In addition, individuals with a practical stake in whistle-blowing, such as whistle-blowers and their attorneys, journalists, and support network representations, have expressed their interest and have shared information with us.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

As noted in another essay (for (Near and Miceli 1985)), the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had substantial impact on the research on whistle-blowing, as evidenced by research published in the journal and in other journals (e.g., where articles cite whistle-blowing research appearing in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, such as (Gundlach et al. 2003), published in the top-rated *Academy of Management Review*). This impact extends well beyond North America. One indicator of the international impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* is its inclusion among the 45 representative

leading journals that *The Financial Times* uses in assessing the research productivity of faculty. In summary, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a clear influence in stimulating, supporting, and shaping international interest in – and greater understanding of – whistle-blowing.

References

- Gundlach, M.J., S.C. Douglas, and M.J. Martinko. 2003. The decision to blow the whistle: A social information processing framework. *Academy of Management Review* 28: 107–123.
- Near, J.P., and M.P. Miceli. 1985. Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics* 4: 1–16.

Morgan P. Miles and Jeffrey G. Covin

A Note on the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on Practice and Theory

Impact on Practice

One measure of the significance of an academic journal is that it provides relevant guidance for decision making. By this measure the *Journal of Business Ethics*' (*JBE*) impact is significant as highlighted by its inclusion in the *Financial Times* annual list of the 45 most important academic journals for business leaders. *JBE* addresses the complex issues that surround businesses' relationship to ethics, sustainability, and cultural values. *JBE*'s authors and audience include not only academics but business thought leaders and policy makers whose contributions greatly enhance its relevance. Papers published in *JBE* do impact practice and that is one of the most satisfying aspects for many scholars – that their work might influence the perspectives and practices of business and policy decision makers. Articles from *JBE* have helped stimulate discussions on issues as diverse as the value of “environmental marketing,” the cost of social accountability certification, and the relevance of explicit ethical guidelines for firms, among many others relevant to ethical business practice.

Impact on Theory

Another measure of the relevance of an academic journal is its recognition as a forum for rigorous theory development and testing. *JBE*'s contribution to business ethics theory is recognized by the tremendous number of its articles that are fundamental in other studies and journal articles, monographs, PhD courses, and dissertations.

JBE is included in the ISI citation index, the most prestigious index of the significance of social science scholarship, used by both universities and granting agencies to assess academic merit. Likewise, *JBE* is widely recognized as an “A grade” journal by many recruitment, merit, and promotion/tenure committees due to the reputation of its academically rigorous papers. *JBE* is a journal that has provided a very high quality open forum for scholars working on issues pertaining to a wide scope of topics at the business ethics and corporate social responsibility/sustainability interface.

What distinguishes *JBE* from many other scholarly journals in the business ethics space is that *JBE* has encouraged critical and *timely* academic discussions of the complex issues through its long-standing initiatives of special issues. Among scholars *JBE* has the well deserved reputation of allowing authors holding different perspectives on a topic the opportunity to contribute to a meaningful conversation on business’s role in our society.

Impact on Academic Careers

Publishing in *JBE* has been one of the most important achievements in many academic careers, and it certainly was for me [Miles]. *JBE* has provided a needed high quality and relevant venue for exploring the role of values and ethics on business and society. The article that I feel may have been my most significant scholarly contribution to date was published in *JBE*. Over my two decade long career at universities I’ve been fortunate enough to publish in *JBE* several times and in every case it was always a great experience from submission, to revision, to the joy of ultimately seeing the paper in print. The editors should be proud that publication in *JBE* has enhanced the career opportunities for their authors. There is no other journal that I enjoy more as a reader, reviewer, or author, and none that is more important to business ethics scholars that seek to contribute to both practice and theory.

Sara Morris and Rob McDonald

Reflections

It is gratifying to discover that our article on the role of moral intensity in moral judgments is considered a classic by the *Journal of Business Ethics*. This is especially satisfying in light of *JBE*’s prominent position in the field both now (see Serenko and Bontis’s (2009) study of citation rates in *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*) and over the years. Publication outlets play a crucial role in the development of academic disciplines and, cutting across content areas and national contexts, *JBE* has certainly provided the most inclusive journal home for scholarly research in business ethics/business and society over time.

Our publication on moral intensity is a tribute to synergy between co-authors. When I was an assistant professor and Rob McDonald was a doctoral student, his innate curiosity about research methods prompted him to search for opportunities to apply various techniques. I introduced him to some of the questions I had been studying in business ethics/business and society and we wrote conference papers that tweaked Brady's (1990) utilitarian/formalist aptitude scale and Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield's (1985) corporate social responsibility orientation instrument. I was impatient to do more than test possible marginal refinements in established measures, however, and wanted to examine theoretical constructs more than methods. Jones's (1991) new perspective on ethical decision making presented an attractive prospect as a compromise for our interests. Nevertheless, we had no funding to conduct an investigation among business practitioners and I had reservations about whether journal reviewers would accept a student sample. It was Rob's enthusiasm, not to mention persistent pestering, that prompted me to give it a try. Luckily, my fears were unfounded and now we have a classic.

As I reflect about how *JBE's* publication of "The Role of Moral Intensity in Moral Judgments" affected us as individuals, several things come to mind. This piece was Rob's first published article and I am pleased to report that his interest in business ethics research methods continued for the rest of his life, which ended too soon. As it turned out, this article was a vital part of my tenure packet and I have subsequently benefited from the reputational halo of *JBE's* inclusion in the *Financial Times* 45. I can't believe that my experience is atypical or that I am singular in my appreciation of the editorial workload carried out at the *Journal of Business Ethics* during the past three decades.

References

- Aupperle, K.E., A.B. Carroll, and J.D. Hatfield. 1985. An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal* 28(2): 446–463.
- Brady, F.N. 1990. *Ethical managing: Rules and results*. New York: Macmillan.
- Jones, T.M. 1991. Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review* 16(2): 366–395.

Patrick E. Murphy

Implementing Business Ethics in the Twenty-First Century

In examining my article from nearly 25 years ago, some aspects of it are timeless such as the following quote: "Recent events concerning unethical business practices not only on Wall Street, but also in many other places, appear to highlight the lack of attention to implementation of ethical policies." Several of the corporate examples did not stand the test of time such as Mc Donnell Douglas (acquired by Boeing in 1996). Furthermore, positive references about the following companies would now

be questioned: Dow Corning (breast implant problems), Hewlett-Packard (board and top management failings) and Johnson & Johnson (product safety and recalls – Voreacos et al. 2011).

This article has had a significant impact on my career in several ways. First, the overall model for organizing and executing ethical policies proposed in the article was adapted for use in two textbooks that I coauthored on marketing ethics. In fact, the last chapter of both of these books is titled “Implementing Marketing Ethics”. Second, the importance of ethics statements has been a focal point of my work since that article was published. I conducted a series of three separate empirical studies on the existence of and impact of ethics statements (values, credo, code and privacy policy) on ethical decision making in large corporations. The results of two of these three studies were published in the *Journal of Business Ethics* (Murphy 1995, 2005). Third, using both the original article and the empirical work as background, I assembled a number of ethics statements in a book – *Eighty Exemplary Ethics Statements* – and provided a commentary on each of them (Murphy 1998). Fourth, some of the topics in this article are still used in lectures that I give on ethical business practices. In particular, the four implementation responsibilities that were discussed in the article are paired with moral values – leadership with integrity, delegation with trust, communication with transparency/openness and motivation with reward/punishment. Finally, the essential aspect of corporate culture and its influence on the ethical posture of any company is a frequent topic of discussion in my business and marketing ethics courses.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has been influential in the advancement of theoretical, empirical and practical components of the field. The journal has published the most extensive body of work on business ethics and the many sub-fields that it has spawned during its 30 years. *JBE* has been open to philosophical treatises, empirical studies, and more practically-oriented articles like mine. The specific area that I would like to focus on here is marketing ethics. *JBE* is to be complimented for having a section editor, Scott Vitell, for marketing ethics for many years. I know the *Journal* has devoted several special issues to marketing ethics over the years. The impact of *JBE* on the marketing ethics literature was chronicled in a recent review article (Schlegelmilch and Oberseder 2010) which found that over 160 articles out of nearly 550 have been published in *JBE* on marketing ethics, four times as many as the second ranked journal. Thus, the growth of the field of marketing ethics owes much to the receptivity of *JBE* to examinations of many aspects of the marketing field.

In conclusion, both my subsequent research and hopefully that of others has benefitted from the publication of this well cited article.

References

- Murphy, P.E. 1995. Corporate ethics statements: Current status and future prospects. *Journal of Business Ethics* 14: 727–740.
- Murphy P.E. 1998. *Eighty exemplary ethics statements*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press.

Murphy, P.E. 2005. Developing, communicating and promoting corporate ethics statements. *Journal of Business Ethics* 62: 183–189.

Schlegelmilch, B.B., and M. Oberseder. 2010. Half a century of marketing ethics: Shifting perspectives and emerging trends. *Journal of Business Ethics* 93: 1–19.

Voreacos, D., A. Nussbaum, and G. Farrell. 2011. Johnson & Johnson fights to clear its once- Trusted Name. *Bloomberg Businessweek* (April 4–10): 64–71.

Samuel M. Natale

A Roadmap for Our Times

“Cheshire Puss, asked Alice. Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here? That depends a good deal on where you want to go, said the Cat. I don’t much care where, said Alice. Then it doesn’t matter which way you go, said the Cat.”

Charles “Lewis Carroll” Dodgson 1832–1898, English writer and mathematician, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, 1865

“To see what is right and not to do it is want of courage.”

Confucius 551 – 479 B.C., Chinese philosopher, *The Analects*, Book II, Chapter XXIV

One only has to read the papers to sense the conflicting forces that appear to be driving our lives. From the personal to the economic, arguments rage on ethical issues as disparate as gay marriage to what constitutes an ethically appropriate investment. Given the diversity that is now our everyday culture, agreement seems unlikely in the near future.

What are the duties and obligations of corporations? What are the factors of accountability? What are the norms or rules that might assist us in developing an honorable sense of direction? How do norms vary (or do they?) in variant geographies? In our current context, can anything be declared universal?

The dispute has continued for millennia as the briefest of literature searches will attest. In my experience, it was only with the emergence of the *Journal of Business Ethics* that the varied and sundry arguments could be more or less located in one place. For those of us who have been life-long academics and consultants, this publication has been a significant gift. Beyond locating the major points of view in one place, the *Journal’s* rigorous, blind review process assures the reader that the work has been scrutinized carefully and vetted as internally integral and a contribution to often bewildering discussions.

The reader’s response may vary from annoyance to delight but one thing has always been certain: the *Journal of Business Ethics* is a fountain of information to add to one’s store of knowledge as well as data. Over the years, the journal has created a vast tapestry of various points of view to the benefit of many. There are, of

course, increasing articles in the area of business ethics in many excellent journals but the foundational and encyclopedia foundation remains the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

An often unsung virtue of the *Journal of Business Ethics* is that it can be used in virtually any situation and materials can be found within its pages that examine an incredibly diverse geographic and cultural venue...no easy task in the contemporary scene. From classic authors to post modernists thinkers, the *Journal* continues to herald the diversity, quality and strength of our growing knowledge of one of humanity's greatest challenges.

A further intrapersonal gift that the journal offers is that it provides us with the data, information and wisdom that stokes the fires of courage...to empower individuals and organizations to make careful, ethical and directed decisions with clarity and conviction.

Janet P. Near and Marcia P. Miceli

Reflections

Our essay concerns: Near, J.P., and M.P. Miceli. 1985. Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics* 4: 1–16.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

The publication of our article by the *Journal of Business Ethics* enabled us to connect with researchers around the world. It also helped facilitate the exchange of information with parties with a practical interest in whistle-blowing, such as journalists, whistle-blowers, their representatives, and individuals in organizations interested in promoting more ethical management, better public policy, or better practice in supporting valid whistle-blowing. For example, defining “whistle-blowing” has proven quite contentious: in 1985 we suggested a preliminary operational definition and this has led to a continuing debate, which in turn pushed us to empirically assess potential differences among types of whistle-blowers. Thus, our subsequent research was informed and guided by the work of many researchers who cited our *Journal of Business Ethics* article, and by inputs from non-academic researchers as well.

The cross-disciplinary nature of *Journal of Business Ethics* is invaluable. As with many papers it has published through the years, the topic of whistle-blowing is interdisciplinary, and relevant literature exists in multiple fields outside of business ethics, e.g., accounting, finance, information systems, law, business management, psychology, public policy and public management, and sociology. Popular and

practical interest in the topic is evidenced by many newspaper and online articles that raise empirical questions. Without journals that embrace interdisciplinary work, knowledge of many topics such as whistle-blowing cannot advance as extensively or as richly.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

We see international influence of the *Journal of Business Ethics* specifically in research on whistle-blowing, as evidenced by research published in the *Journal*. Early research was conducted primarily in North America (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran 2005). Research not only continues there (e.g., MacNab and Worthley 2008), but also has been undertaken in many other countries, including several in Europe (e.g., Hassink et al. 2007; Tavakoli et al. 2003), Korea (Park et al. 2005), and China (e.g., Zhang et al. 2009).

A more general indication of its international impact is that the *Journal of Business Ethics* is among the 45 representative leading journals that the *Financial Times* uses in assessing the research productivity of faculty, as it updates its rankings of business curricula. Clearly, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has had a positive, respected influence in stimulating scholarly and popular interest in, and knowledge about, whistle-blowing.

References

Hassink, H., M. de Vries, and L. Bollen. 2007. A content analysis of whistleblowing policies of leading European companies. *Journal of Business Ethics* 75: 25–44.

MacNab, B., and R. Worthley. 2008. Self-efficacy as an intrapersonal predictor for internal whistleblowing: A US and Canada examination. *Journal of Business Ethics* 79: 407–421.

Mesmer-Magnus, J.R., and C. Viswesvaran. 2005. Whistleblowing in organizations: An examination of correlates of whistleblowing intentions, actions, and retaliation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 62: 277–297.

Park, H., M.T. Rehg, and D. Lee. 2005. The influence of Confucian ethics and collectivism on whistleblowing intentions: A study of Korean public employees. *Journal of Business Ethics* 58: 387–403.

Tavakoli, A.A., J.P. Keenan, and B. Crnjak-Karanovic. 2003. Culture and whistleblowing: An empirical study of Croatian and United States managers utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics* 43: 49–64.

Zhang, J., R. Chiu, and L. Wei. 2009. Decision-making process of internal whistleblowing behavior in China: Empirical evidence and implications. *Journal of Business Ethics* 88: 25–41.

Richard P. Nielsen

Praxeology and the Journal of Business Ethics

From a classical perspective, philosophical reflection can include ontology, epistemology, theoria, and praxeology (James 1911; Winch 1958; Toulmin 1992; Nielsen 1993; Tsoukas and Chia 2011). While most professional ethics journals as well as the *Journal of Business Ethics* regularly include articles about ontology, epistemology, and theoria, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has been unusual in its foundational concern for and continuing inclusion of action oriented praxeological work in organizational and business ethics. As illustrated and explained below, an action/praxis dimension is different from ontology, epistemology, and theoria; and, has been central to the mission and praxis of the *JBE*. As the founding Editor Alex C. Michalos (1982) explained in the very first issue of the *JBE*, “Ethics is ... interpreted broadly to include all human *action* aimed at securing a good life.... In short, our basic concern is the study of business *activity* from a moral point of view [italics added].” This is a very important contribution both from the perspectives of service to practitioners and praxeological theory building. Praxeological work is not the same as work in ontology, epistemology, and theoria.

Ontological work in business and organizational ethics refers to how we categorize and identify the phenomena we study. An early *JBE* example of this type of article is the DeGeorge (1989) article, “There is ethics in business ethics; but there’s more as well” that considered the different types of phenomena that can and should be studied in business ethics. Another example of this type of article is the Ashkanasy, Windsor, and Trevino (2006), “Bad apples in bad barrels revisited.” In this article, the authors explain how it is important to identify and consider both individual (bad apples) and organizational (bad barrels) types of phenomena. A further example of a study that includes ontological dimensions is the Campbell (2007) article, “Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways: An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility.” This article explains how it is important to also consider more macro institutional phenomena as well and organizational and individual level phenomena in business ethics.

Epistemological work in organizational ethics refers to the types of questions we ask and how we know what we claim to know in the subject matter of organizational ethics. An early *JBE* example of this type of work is the Wilson (1982) article, “Mill’s proof that happiness is the criterion of morality.” In this article Wilson considers the question of how we might know whether it is true that happiness is the criterion of morality. Another example of this type of work is the Sandberg (2008) article, “Understanding the separation thesis” that considers whether we should ask ethical questions in our social science considerations of business phenomena or whether ethical questions need to be separated from business and social science questions. An example of an article that considers the epistemological limitations of ethical reasoning is Nielsen’s (1988) “Limitations of ethical reasoning as an action (praxis) strategy.”

Business and organizational ethics *theoria* focuses on understanding and explaining what behaviors and decisions are more and less ethical in organizational contexts and situations (Nielsen 1993). Tsoukas and Chia (2010) further explain: “The etymology of *theory* is revealing. As Toulmin (1982: 239) notes, the word *theoros* in classical Greece was mainly used to indicate the official delegate who was dispatched from the city-state to attend intercity athletic Games, especially the Olympic Games. He was not meant to take part in those games, only to observe them. Gradually *theoros* was used to refer to any spectator at the Games ... in contrast with a participant. Eventually the abstract noun *theoria* acquired the meaning of spectating, in contrast to participating. With Aristotle, *theoria* came to refer to the philosopher’s detached intellectual inquiry... Theoretical conjectures are in effect ‘organized’ collections of propositional statements making claims regarding the phenomenon under investigation that renders them plausible and logically coherent to a community of inquirers [scholars].”

An early *JBE* example of this type of conceptual work is the Goodpaster (1983) article, “The concept of corporate responsibility” in which Goodpaster, from the perspective of a scholar and the ethics literature, speculates and theorizes about what the idea of “corporate responsibility” could and should mean. A similar concept development article is Donaldson’s (1985) *JBE* article, “Multinational decision making: Reconciling international norms,” where Donaldson, again from the perspective of a scholar and the ethics literature, develops a conceptual scheme for integrating international and cross-cultural difference in norms and values. A related example of this type of work is Bowie’s (1998) *JBE* article, “A Kantian theory of meaningful work” in which Bowie considers how Kantian ethical concepts might apply to the idea of “meaningful work” in business organizations. The focus of these types of *theoria* articles are concepts and ideas from the point of view of the more or less outsider, observer-scholar, and the ethics literature.

The difference between *theoria* and *praxeology* is not the difference between theory and practice (Bernstein 1971; Nielsen 1988, 1993, 2010; Toulmin 1992; Tsoukas and Chia 2010; Sandberg and Tsoukas 2011). According to Bernstein (1971, ix), “The Greek term ‘praxis’ has an ordinary meaning that roughly corresponds to the ways in which we now commonly speak of ‘action’ or ‘doing’ and it is frequently translated into English as ‘practice.’” Bernstein further explains that *praxis* in a philosophical sense has a deeper meaning, “Praxis ... signifies the disciplines and activities predominant in man’s ethical and political life” within the polis, within the community, within the organization. The end of the *praxis* dimension of life is living well, appropriately, within the polis, within the community, within the organization. In contrast, the end of the *theoria* dimension of life is knowing or wisdom for its own sake. Within the whole person, both dimensions and perspectives are important, can, and should inform one another.”

Praxeological theory building is developed inductively from the situations and perspectives of practitioners rather than deductively from the literature and perspectives of scholars who are trying to apply literature based theories to practice. Similarly, Sandberg and Tsoukas (2011: 339) explain that: “If practical rationality better captures the logic of practice ... it is not because practical rationality deals

with practice while scientific rationality allegedly does not Instead, it is because practical rationality ... makes theory a derivative of practice.... In contrast, scientific rationality ... makes practice derivative of theory....”

For example, in the first issue of *JBE*, Ellison (1982) in his article “Civil disobedience and whistleblowing: A comparative appraisal of forms of dissent,” considers and theorizes from the perspective of practitioners the choices some make to maintain personal ethical integrity by acting as whistle-blowers that have important similarities to and implications for organizational citizenship and civil disobedience. An example from the 1990s is the Tsalikis and Latour (1995) article, “Bribery and extortion in international business: Ethical perspectives of Greeks and Americans.” The authors examine, from the different perspectives of Greeks and Americans living and working in their different realities, how they perceive and respond to bribery and extortion problems differently. An example from the 2000s is the Taskin and Devos (2005) article, “Paradoxes from the individualization of human resources management: The case of telework.” The authors consider from the ethical perspectives of individual employees working from home as well as the ethical perspective of human resources managers who try to serve these physically isolated employees, how the work life, activities, and satisfactions of these people are different and need to be managed and served differently. In a more recent article from 2010, Giacalone and Promisio (2010), “Unethical and unwell: Decrements in well-being and unethical activity of work.” The authors examine the perspectives and experiences of practitioners who suffer severe, physiologically negative effects from the stress and trauma they experience in dealing with unethical behaviors at work.

As referred to above, an action, praxeological dimension has been central to the mission of the *JBE* as the founding Editor Alex C. Michalos (1982) explained and hoped for in the first issue of the *JBE*, “Ethics is ... interpreted broadly to include all human *action* aimed at securing a good life.... In short, our basic concern is the study of business *activity* from a moral point of view [italics added].” As illustrated and explained above, there are many and continuing examples of articles with praxeological dimensions in the *JBE* that are different from the ethics work in ontology, epistemology, and theoria. Further, almost every issue of *JBE* includes articles with praxeological dimensions. This espoused mission of *JBE* to include the praxeological dimension has and is being fulfilled. Many thanks and great appreciation for the good work of the editors, authors, reviewers, and publisher of the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

References

- Ashkanasy, N.M., C.A. Windsor, and L.K. Trevino. 2006. Bad apples in bad barrels revisited. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 16(4): 449–473.
- Bernstein, R.J. 1971. *Praxis and action*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bowie, N. 1998. A Kantian theory of meaningful work. *Journal of Business Ethics* 17(9): 1083–1092.

Campbell, J.L. 2007. Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways: An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review* 32(2): 946–967.

DeGeorge, R. 1989. There is ethics in business ethics; but there's more as well. *Journal of Business Ethics* 8(5): 337–339.

Donaldson, T. 1985. Multinational decision making: Reconciling international norms. *Journal of Business Ethics* 4(4): 357–366.

Ellison, F.A. 1982. Civil disobedience and whistle-blowing: A comparative appraisal of forms of dissent. *Journal of Business Ethics* 1(1): 23–28.

Giacalone, R.A. 2010. Unethical and unwell: Decrements in well-being and unethical activity at work. *Journal of Business Ethics* 91(2): 275–297.

Goodpaster, K.E. 1983. The concept of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 2(1): 1–22.

James, W. 1911. *Some problems of philosophy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Michalos, A.C. 1982. Editorial: Purpose and policy. *Journal of Business Ethics* 1(1): 1.

Nielsen, R.P. 1988. Limitations of ethical reasoning as an action (praxis) strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics* 7(10): 725–735.

Nielsen, R.P. 1993. Organizational ethics from a perspective of praxis. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 3(2): 131–151.

Nielsen, R.P. 2010. Practitioner-based theory building in organizational ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 93(3): 401–406.

Sandberg, J. 2008. Understanding the separation thesis. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 18(2): 213–232.

Sandberg, J. 2011. Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality. *Academy of Management Review* 36(2): 338–360.

Taskin, L., and V. Devos. 2005. Paradoxes for the individualization of human resources management. *Journal of Business Ethics* 62(1): 13–24.

Toulmin, S. 1982. *The return to cosmology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tsalikis, J., and M.S. Latour. 1995. Bribery and extortion in international business: Ethical perspectives of Greeks compared to Americans. *Journal of Business Ethics* 14(4): 249–264.

Tsoukas, H., and R. Chia. 2010. Introduction: Why philosophy matters to organization theory. In *Philosophy and organization theory*, eds. Tsoukas, H., and R. Chia, 1–21. United Kingdom: Emerald.

Wilson, F. 1982. Mill's proof that happiness is the criterion of morality. *Journal of Business Ethics* 1(1): 59–72.

Winch, P. 1958. *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy*. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Michael O'Fallon and Kenneth Butterfield

Reflections

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

This article began as a paper that the first author, Michael O'Fallon, was using to fulfill a seminar requirement while he was in the Ph.D. program at Washington State University. Michael and his advisor, Ken Butterfield, believed that since a number of years had passed since the last major review of the ethical decision-making literature was published, a review was timely and could make a contribution to the field. Ken also thought that a review would be an ideal way for Michael, then a second-year doctoral student, to get his arms around the ethical decision-making literature. We cannot help but reflect with some amusement that the seminar instructor, upon learning of Michael's fairly ambitious plan to review the empirical research in ethical decision making, warned him against writing such a paper, commenting that "it would never get published." Obviously we disagreed, and so Michael moved forward on the rather large task of gathering, summarizing, and categorizing the 174 articles that met the inclusion criteria. Approximately 1 year later, the manuscript was completed and submitted to *JBE*. Michael was pleased and somewhat surprised when the article was accepted, making it the first publication of his academic career.

Without question, this article holds significant meaning to us, and particularly to Michael. Beyond it being his first publication, he believes that it gave him an advantage when he began searching for an academic position. Although we did not know what impact, if any, the review would have on the field, we began to receive some acknowledgement of the article shortly after it was published. Michael remembers attending the Academy of Management annual meeting while on the job market and being approached by a fellow graduate student from another university. She asked if he was the Michael O'Fallon who had co-authored the ethics review article. When he responded that he was, she mentioned that her advisor had given her the article and told her that reading it would provide her with a good understanding of where the research in ethical decision-making stood at the time. Michael recalls it as one of the most humbling experiences of his life. To this day, Michael considers himself fortunate to have launched his publishing career with this article.

Although it was gratifying to see that Michael's efforts had paid off, we certainly would never have guessed that the paper would become one of *JBE*'s "Citation Classics." We have appreciated the generally positive response that this article has received.

JBE has made a significant mark in the field of business ethics. Due to its large number of published articles, in 2010 *Journal Citation Reports* ranked *JBE* #1 in total citations among all 38 ethics journals by a wide margin, and

11th out of 101 among all business journals in total citations. Recognition of *JBE*'s importance is also seen in its inclusion among the 40 journals in the prestigious *Financial Times* Business School journal list. In our opinion, some of the best and most influential business ethics articles ever written have appeared in *JBE*.

Mark Pastin

Reflections

The topic is the impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the field of business ethics. I have had several relationships to the *Journal* – author, member of editorial board, and subscriber. I was one of the “early adopters” of business ethics and it seems like the *Journal* has been there every step of the way. I started out as a professor in a liberal arts college; became a professor in a business school; and left academia altogether to run the Council of Ethical Organizations and its related entities.

When I was in academia I was struck by the lack of connection between what academics think about and anything that happens in a business. To this rule, the *Journal of Business Ethics* was the exception, publishing practical articles and articles by practitioners as well as “pure” academic articles. If not for the *Journal*, I might have thrown in the academic towel earlier.

When I left academia, I was confronted by necessity of making whatever it is that I was knowledgeable about into something for which organizations would pay. For a time, that kept me occupied and I did little reading outside of what was on my desk or on the nightstand – mysteries. But I began to miss thinking about broader issues and that brought me back to the *Journal*. I feared not finding it as I remembered it. But it was better. Well written. Well edited. Relevant.

I have gone back to many of the other publications I read as an academic and found them to be useless for me. I am sure they are useful within their own frames of reference – or at least as notches on the tenure belt. But given that I have less time to read, I demand that what I read makes me enjoy what I am doing more – or enables me to do it better. And that is why I like the *Journal* every bit as much as I did 30 years ago. Its commitment to being cross disciplinary keeps me abreast of issues across fields. Some of its articles give me new ways to think about the perplexing problems presented by the organizations with which I interact. And it is still the publication I show to people when they ask what the heck business ethics is and whether it is really about anything.

I offer my profound gratitude to the *Journal* and to Alex and Deborah for keeping it going at the highest standard.

Moses L. Pava

First Encounter

As a newly minted PhD from the Stern School of Business at New York University in accounting (1990), I remember vividly grazing through the stacks at our library one morning at Yeshiva University. I was a young assistant professor at the Syms School of Business, and I was searching for something, but I was not quite sure what it was that I was searching for.

One thing I did know was that I was extremely uncomfortable with the efficient market hypothesis and the research paradigm based upon this ubiquitous hypothesis. There was no question my NYU education had provided me with an intellectually satisfying experience. I was truly dazzled by the beauty and possibilities of the newly emerging worldview that seemed to be corroborated by every new study published in the *Journal of Accounting Research* and the *Accounting Review*. With every new statistical refinement, the pervasive faith at NYU and other top business schools was strengthened to the point of what seemed to my teachers and colleagues as certainty. To this day, I see some of the potential benefits of judiciously applying such an elegant hypothesis to both theory and to practice. But, even then I knew something was not quite right with EMH. The efficient market hypothesis was one perspective among many others. It seemed to leave out too many important questions about finance, accounting, and business in general. The theory, my instincts told me, was too good to be true.

As I casually walked through the library, I picked up a copy of a strange looking journal. It seemed to be taller and wider than almost all of the other journals on the shelf. It included articles from a wide array of disciplines. As I began to read the articles, I thought to myself, this is interesting stuff! Perhaps the articles were written with somewhat less rigor than what I had been used to, but the subject of business ethics was just too compelling for me to forget easily.

That morning was a *defining moment* in my career. Although I had not yet read Joseph Badaracco's brilliant book by that name, nor did I immediately realize the importance of my chance encounter with the *Journal of Business Ethics*. I began to think more and more about business ethics, corporate social responsibility, integrity, and so many other related issues.

My first foray into business ethics research was an empirical study co-authored with Joshua Krausz on the association between perceived social responsibility and traditional financial performance. Josh and I chose the *Journal of Business Ethics* as our first choice, and we were gratified when the Editor, Alex Michalos, informed us that the paper had been accepted.

Over the years, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has expanded its scope, raised the level of scholarship, and has jumpstarted a high-level dialogue on the central importance of business ethics to our economy, society, and world.

Since my first publication, I have published numerous articles from empirical, theoretical, philosophical, and religious perspectives. I have read the published work of my teachers, peers, and students in its pages. My early hunch about the thinness of my formal education was truer than I could have ever known. Thanks to Alex and the entire field he has helped to deliver, the world of business research is richer, more colorful, and more significant than it was in 1990 when I first graduated with an impoverished view of the role business in society and a limited understanding of the real significance of business research. While this is my personal story, I am confident that I am not unique.

Dinah Payne and Brenda E. Joyner

Reflections

Career Impact of Citation Class Articles

The impact of having a distinguished article on our professional careers has been great and very positive. In part, it has allowed the authors to gain professional respect among academics and professionals, including recognition by the authors' own academic institutions for our scholarly efforts. It has aided in the maintenance or attainment of superior employment positions in eminent programs at excellent universities, as well. On a more personal career level, the use of the *Journal of Business Ethics* as a publication outlet has been most gratifying: to be allowed to publish in such a quality-oriented journal has given tremendous confidence to the authors and has incited us to continue to find and think about ethical dilemmas that confront and dismay business professionals. If our thought processes as presented in *Journal of Business Ethics* articles have helped a single business professional in the resolution of a moral dilemma, we are well satisfied and we take professional pride in our achievements.

***Journal of Business Ethics'* Impact on the Field of Business Ethics**

The field of business ethics is full of serious and important issues for the business professional and for all of his stakeholders. In light of the importance of business in our society and the ethical conduct of such business, a resource like the *Journal of Business Ethics* is invaluable for business professionals and those who study business ethics as professors or students. We have used articles in the *Journal of Business Ethics* many, many times in a wide variety of research: *JBE* articles have been tremendously helpful in shaping the ethical dilemma targeted for study and in shaping the discussion and resolution of such ethical dilemmas. *JBE's* impact on the field of business ethics is profound and profoundly good: it is an outlet for creative discussion on sensitive issues critically important to sound business practice. It is a venue to explore new thoughts on

timely issues; it is a well-respected organ of suggested, measured change. It allows for the healthy exercise of intellectual curiosity with a final end to be a society positively impacted by critical thought, creativity and sensitivity.

Donna H. Randall and Ann Gibson

Journal of Business Ethics: A Celebration of Three Decades

If one were to anthropomorphize a publication, the *Journal of Business Ethics* would be a young adult. In 2012 the journal celebrates a 30-year publication history. In comparison to many other academic journals dating back to an earlier century, the journal indeed may still be regarded as the “new kid on the block.” However, a 30-year publication history for any journal indicates that the journal is making significant contributions to the scholarly community and has staying power.

As researchers, we became acquainted with the journal during its formative early years. At the time, the late 1980s and early 1990s, it was not clear what direction the journal would take. There were other venues for publication of works on business ethics. However, there was something about the journal that made us want to stick around, to watch it grow, and to become part of its growth. The published articles were creative, inspiring and thought provoking.

In those early years, we felt an excitement about being associated with the journal. We were young management scholars sharing an interest in business ethics. We wanted to make a worthwhile contribution to a field that we viewed as having great importance to society. At the time, business ethics was an emerging sub discipline within the field of management and the journal to publish in was clearly the *Journal of Business Ethics*. In a 1990 article we described the *Journal of Business Ethics* as the “flagship” journal for business ethics; it remains so today.

By publishing in the journal, we joined an interdisciplinary community of scholars united by a singular interest. The authors and articles reflected a wide breath of disciplines and perspectives. Of particular note, we became part of an international community as the journal had a clearly stated interest in publishing research beyond domestic borders.

The articles that we published in the *Journal of Business Ethics* reflect, in a limited way, the diversity of issues and approaches that are characteristic of the field of business ethics. We explored issues such as why students take business ethics courses, ethical decision-making in the medical profession, and the application of the theory of reasoned action to explain unethical conduct.

However, as we approached the study of business ethics, we believed that we could make more significant and timely contributions to the field by encouraging methodological rigor in empirical business ethics research, specifically for those scholars seeking to study self-reported ethical conduct. Time shows that our hope has become a reality. According to the *Science Citation Index*, our article on methodology in business ethics research has been cited 108 times by social science

scholars from around the world who have published in a wide variety of ethics and management journals. As we might expect, the largest percentage of these publications have been in the *Journal of Business Ethics*. It is gratifying to see that our work, in some fashion, may have guided and inspired others to introduce more methodological rigor, even into present publications (2010). We are thankful, as the work we have done is clearly built upon the generation of scholars who preceded us, especially those who published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

For 30 years Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff have carefully and thoughtfully guided *the Journal of Business Ethics*. They should be proud of the independent young adult journal that is celebrating a thirtieth birthday and is well positioned for many more decades of significant achievement.

Mohammed Y. A. Rawwas

Reflections

What Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

The Citation classic [Consumer ethics – an investigation of the ethical beliefs of elderly consumers] helped me be promoted to Full Professor. It was one of the most important factors to determine my promotion. I had to include in my promotion file all articles that had cited my citation classic. Another benefit, the citation classic gave credibility and respect to my work.

What Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has introduced many theories, models and applications of business ethics that professors used in their classes and manuscripts. The journal has improved our business ethics knowledge and has given us a source to resort to it to understand the complexity of the topic.

Diana C. Robertson

Reflections

Publication of this article [Empiricism in business ethics – suggested research directions] the *Journal of Business Ethics* came at a time when empirical studies were in short supply. In the article I espoused the directions in which I believed the

field should be moving and argued for the value of a greater empirical focus. In a sense the article outlined my own future research agenda. The paper called for further emphasis on the study of ethical behavior, in addition to the study of attitudes, and empirical work that would build theory as well as test it. The paper also delineated additional methodologies used in the social sciences that could be applied to the study of unethical behavior.

I wrote the article with the firm belief that normative and empirical research in business ethics are not in competition, but that each has much to contribute to the other. Perhaps more importantly, this mindset permeates my approach to both normative and empirical work. In advising doctoral students, I continuously reinforce the point that normative and empirical scholars can learn a great deal from each other. For example, in working with a student conducting experimental work on unethical behavior in negotiations, I underscored the importance of establishing the normative basis of such behavior.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has been foundational to creating the field as we know it today. It was one of the first journals to focus explicitly on business ethics and, as such, helped legitimize the scholarly nature of business ethics research. In fact, it is difficult to imagine the field without the *Journal*. The *Journal* has allowed scholars to connect to one another around the topics about which we are most passionate. It has welcomed normative and empirical research, multiple and innovative methodologies, and has provided an outlet for international perspectives and research. In its nearly 30 years of publication, the journal has maintained its viability and importance to the field. We can only hope that it will continue to shape and define the field for at least the next 30 years.

Gedeon J. (Deon) Rossouw

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Multi-disciplinary and Global Nature of the Field of Business Ethics

The *Journal of Business Ethics* made an important contribution in establishing the field of business ethics as a multi-disciplinary and a global field of study.

Business ethics has since its inception as an academic field been characterised as a multi-disciplinary field of study. This multi-disciplinary nature of the field of business ethics is at the same time one of the biggest attractors and one of the biggest detractors of the field of business ethics. As an attractor the multi-disciplinary nature of the field offers scholars from various academic disciplines the opportunity to move beyond the narrow confines of one specific field, and the possibility of multi- and inter-disciplinary collaboration. The multi-disciplinary nature of the field, however, is also a cause of frustration and alienation amongst scholars from various disciplines, each with their own disciplinary methodologies and epistemologies. This tension between various disciplines is

visible in various collisions that have emerged in the field of business ethics, such as those between normative and descriptive approaches, between qualitative and quantitative approaches, and between reflective and managerial approaches. An achievement, but also a contribution that the *Journal of Business Ethics* has made to the field of business ethics over the past 30 years, is to provide a common dwelling for these diverse and often dissenting voices. The list of section editors of the *Journal of Business Ethics* underlines the extent to which this journal has been successful in not only accommodating a rich diversity of disciplinary perspectives, but also to enhance and entrench the multi-disciplinary nature of the field of business ethics.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* also played an important role in internationalising and globalising the field of business ethics. It succeeded in becoming a journal for the entire world, rather than a journal for, or of, a specific geographical region. On a global scale the *Journal of Business Ethics* has become the preferred journal of publication for business ethicists from all regions of the world (cf. Chan et al. 2010: 41). This was also demonstrated in the recent study by Albrecht et al. (2010). Although the *Journal of Business Ethics* is the preferred publication outlet of business ethicists around the world, the fact remains that the *Journal* has nevertheless been dominated by contributions from Western Europe and Northern America (and more specifically the USA and Canada). However, despite this domination, there was a gradual growth in contributions from other parts of the world, but especially from the Asia-Pacific region. The fact that the publishers of the *Journal of Business Ethics* recently launched the *Asian Journal of Business Ethics* is a clear recognition of the growth in contributions from that part of the globe. I have no doubt that the *Journal of Business Ethics* should once more be given at least some of the credit for internationalising and globalising the field of business ethics.

Despite the fact that the *Journal* became the world's preferred outlet for business ethics research, its readership still remains very much concentrated in the Global North and in the northern hemisphere. The cost of subscription to the journal remains prohibitively high for many countries in the Global South. Consequently despite the advances that have been made by the journal in attracting authors from around the world, the same can unfortunately not be said of readers around the world. It is my hope that ways will be found to also globalise the readership of the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

References

Albrecht, C., J.A. Thompson, J.L. Hoopes, and P. Rodrigo. 2010 Business ethics journal rankings as perceived by business ethics scholars. *Journal of Business Ethics* 95: 227–237.

Kam C., K.C. Cha, H-G. Fung, and J. Yau. 2010 Business ethics research: A global perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics* 95: 39–53.

Mark S. Schwartz

Reflections

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

My article “The Nature of the Relationship Between Corporate Codes of Ethics and Behaviour” (2001), which has somehow ended up as a *JBE* “Citation Classic”, was based on my PhD dissertation. The study, which involved in-depth interviews of 57 employees, managers, and ethics officers at four large Canadian companies, examines several questions related to codes of ethics, including whether they in fact make any difference in affecting employee’s behaviour. The primary finding of the study was that while under certain circumstances codes might affect one’s behaviour, the nature of the impact was typically indirect rather than direct in nature. To help explain how codes impact behaviour, a series of eight metaphors were developed that include: (1) Rule-book (clarify); (2) Sign-post (consult); (3) Mirror (confirm); (4) Magnifying Glass (caution); (5) Shield (challenge); (6) Club (compliance); (7) Smoke Detector (convince); and (8) Fire Alarm (contact).

This initial study led me to publishing several other articles in *JBE* including: “A Code of Ethics for Corporate Codes of Ethics” (Schwartz 2002); “Effectiveness of Codes of Ethics: Perceptions of Code Users” (Schwartz 2004); “Universal Moral Values for Corporate Codes of Ethics” (Schwartz 2005), as well as “Tone at the Top: An Ethics Code for Directors?” (Schwartz et al. 2005).

Over time however, my research focus has shifted away from codes of ethics to other potentially more important factors that might influence employee ethical decision-making. I now believe that the key elements of developing and sustaining an ethical corporate culture include: (i) ethics programs (with codes of ethics as the key component); (ii) core ethical values that are infused throughout an organization’s policies (i.e., not just within the code) as well as its processes and practices; along with (iii) ethical leadership.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

When I first began my PhD at York University in Toronto, Canada in 1993, there was no formal PhD program that specialized in the business ethics field that I was aware of. I was fortunate however to have Professor Wesley Cragg as my PhD supervisor. One of my first undertakings was to try to read all of the articles published in *JBE* (or at least the abstracts) since its inception (and there were already quite a few by the mid-1990s). Along with a review of the key textbooks published in the business ethics field, this initial review of *JBE* formed the backbone of all of my future research, and I suspect for many others in the field as well.

There is no question in my mind that without *JBE*, the field of business ethics would not have become accepted and appreciated as a legitimate academic field, now suffused with quality research. When *JBE* was added to the list of top journals by the *Financial Times* as part of its criteria for its business school rankings, this led to an even greater acceptance of the legitimacy and importance of the field's academic contribution.

In terms of my academic career, I am greatly appreciative that *JBE* exists, and that it welcomes all types of academic study from around the world, whether theoretical or empirical (including both quantitative and qualitative). *JBE* provides a critical publication outlet not just for those in the business ethics field, but for those entering or intersecting with the field from other disciplines. While there is much more business ethics research to be conducted and disseminated, I am certain that *JBE* will continue to play a dominant role in this endeavour.

References

Schwartz, M. 2001. The nature of the relationship between corporate codes of ethics and behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics* 32(3): 247–262.

Schwartz, M.S. 2002. A code of ethics for corporate codes of ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 41(1): 27–43.

Schwartz, M. S. 2004. Effective corporate codes of ethics: Perceptions of code users. *Journal of Business Ethics* 55(4): 321–341.

Schwartz, M.S. 2005. Universal moral values for corporate codes of ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 59(1): 27–44.

Schwartz, M.S., T. Dunfee, and M. Kline. 2005. Tone at the top: An ethics code for directors? *Journal of Business Ethics* 58(1): 79–100.

S. Prakash Sethi

A New Milestone for the Journal of Business Ethics

It would be a monumental understatement to state that *Journal of Business Ethics* (*JBE*) has played a critical role in the development of academic inquiry into the general area of business ethics and corporate social responsibility. This definition of business ethics – or more accurately, the ethical context of business – continues to expand and now includes notions of sustainable business practices which emanate from a corporation's core business operations as opposed to voluntary non-business related responses to community needs. To wit, society's expectations regarding corporate performance have moved from corporate social responsibility to corporate social accountability.

This journey has not been easy or planned. We cannot be sure how it will evolve in the foreseeable future because of the difficulties in defining the “common good” and the legitimacy – ethical, social or political – of those individuals and groups who advocate an enlarged and multi-dimensional notion of responsibility and accountability on the part of business institutions.

From its inception, *JBE* has been an incubator nurturing the seeds of this new arena of academic inquiry. The primary credit and burden for this endeavor must rest with its two founding editors, Prof. Alex C. Michalos and Prof. Deborah C. Poff. They shepherded the journal from its infancy through a challenging youth to its mature state of vigorous and highly influential creation and dissemination of information on all issues pertaining to business conduct, including its moral underpinnings, and its real-time impact on both direct and indirect stakeholders.

I have been privileged to be a part of this process from its beginning, as a member of the editorial board and a frequent contributor and as an avid reader. From its very beginning, the two editors recognized that: (a) business ethics must be analyzed in the context of business practices in their various manifestations and competitive market condition, and (b) diverse social norms and cultural values influence the interpretation of the nature of ethics under different socio-cultural value frameworks. Therefore, the adequacy of business responses needs to be evaluated within their socio-political context, which may differ from the traditional notions of Judeo-Christian values that are taken for granted in the industrialized societies of the West.

The editors of *JBE* were cognizant of these questions and successfully bridged the gap between the East and the West by (a) continuously changing and enlarging the composition of the editorial board to incorporate diverse perspectives and practical experiences, and (b) by broadening the scope of *JBE*'s coverage in terms of issues addressed, new analytical frameworks, empirical data and findings, and widely divergent arguments as to ethically desirable outcomes.

This open-mindedness, in my opinion, was one of the most important reasons that allowed *JBE* to anticipate enormous changes in the world of business that would fundamentally alter and evolve with the advent of globalization and would de-link business (as owners of capital) from its two other important factors, i.e., labor and physical resources. This process has led to a dramatic shift in the locus of bargaining power and control of physical and human resources between political (mostly national) and economic (mostly global) economic institutions. As a consequence, there has been a relative diminution of the power of national governments to safeguard the wellbeing of their people as custodians of common good. Conversely, it has led to a tremendous increase in the power of large MNCs and their top executives to shape the economic structures of societies and in the distribution (in their favor) of added value, i.e., income, created through economic activity and efficient utilization of factors of production, i.e., capital, labor, and physical resources around the world.

JBE's success in envisioning these changes and capturing their impact is evident in the broad scope of the topics covered in its 100+ volumes and almost of 5,000 articles published in the 30 years of its existence. By any measure, *JBE* is the highest ranked journal in its field. Its roster of authors includes many of the most prominent

and highly regarded authors from diverse academic fields who address common issues and challenge traditional orthodoxies in search of practical answers that cannot be viewed from the single lens of traditional academic disciplines.

In one sense, *JBE* and other journals dealing with ethical issues in business have become mainstream and their legitimacy and relevance are not in question, although this was not the case 30 years ago when the founders of *JBE* ventured to develop the new journal. In its early stages, the prevailing dogma of corporate social responsibility was best defined by the Noble laureate Milton Friedman, who declared that the “social responsibility of business is to increase profits.” Business organizations were naturally quick to embrace this mission to the exclusion of everything else because it provided them with an iron-clad justification for their conduct. A review of corporate pronouncements around that period provides ample evidence that companies would vociferously argue against any notion of corporate social responsibility that could be construed as undermining their primary role of maximizing profits and enhancing shareholder value. They were also quite astute in not emphasizing the fundamental assumption made by Friedman that the competitive nature of markets, which were seldom as competitive as corporate leaders would want others to believe, and also the fact that business leaders continuously and invariably successfully strove to make markets less competitive so as to give them additional “pricing power” and profitability. Moreover, they were presenting Friedman’s analysis as if it were akin to the definitive and incontrovertible statements of an expert in natural sciences. Also ignored was the fact that other Noble laureates in economics, such as Kenneth Arrow and Amartya Sen, had expressed starkly different views while still arguing within the boundaries of traditional economic theory.

In the subsequent three decades, there has been a remarkable and profound change in corporate expressions – if not actual conduct – on corporate social responsibility. The current state of corporate pronouncements could not be more different and yet equally self-serving. There is scarcely a corporation that does not profess its commitment to being socially responsible and adhering to the principles of ethical conduct and sustainable business practices; talking about social franchise; and, honoring a commitment to various types of codes of conduct as demonstration of voluntary self-regulation. Companies now publish voluminous annual social responsibility-sustainability reports publicizing their commitments to society’s well-being and describing their activities as evidence of those commitments.

The Future Role of JBE

In my view, the future role of *JBE* is even more daunting than the challenges it faced at the time of its start-up 30 years ago. Globalization has brought about fundamental changes in how economic activities are conducted around the world, how the rules of the game are determined, and how major players influence the final economic and social outcomes, and their impact on various stakeholders.

JBE and other similarly oriented journals have had a profound influence on changing the nature of discourse between corporations and society-at-large. Corporate rhetoric now echoes the narrative advocated by stakeholders who profess to speak for the groups and issues that have suffered from negative externalities, i.e., adverse side-effects, of corporate actions.

Unfortunately, there is little evidence to show that corporate decision-making has changed in any significant manner to reflect integration of ethical norms – including the notions of common good – in corporate decision-making. One has only to look at the recent economic melt-down and resultant human suffering around the world and recognize the footprint of large corporations through questionable business practices of the leading financial institutions, insider trading, financial manipulation, widespread instances of bribery and corruption, price fixing, collusion and other instances of non-competitive behavior, fraud in marketing practices, environmental degradation and abuse of indigenous people on the part of extractive industries, and unfair and exploitative labor practices in poorer countries.

Instances of such unethical and illegal practices are not isolated. They are also not confined to certain industries, companies or countries. Instead, they seem to manifest corporate conduct that is hard-wired into the DNA of corporate persona and where voluntary adherence to higher legal and ethical norms would appear to be aberrant behavior.

I believe the future role for *JBE* is even more challenging and demanding *JBE* must find a way to induce changes in corporate behavior in a manner that combines economic efficiency with social justice, restraint in the use of economic power that voluntarily yields to the supremacy of political consensus for what is common good. In the final analysis, economic institutions can flourish only in the midst of social wellbeing. To think otherwise, would lead to the demise of free societies – including capitalism – as we know it and cherish it.

Roger A. Shiner

Reflections

I would like to congratulate the *Journal of Business Ethics* on 30 years of publication and over 100 volumes. Anyone working in the field has reason to thank deeply Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff for their foresight in the establishment of the *Journal* and their energy and dedication towards its continued existence. Even though an achievement like 100 volumes cannot occur without countless hours of time put in by other editors, reviewers and referees, and of course contributors, still the *Journal* will forever be linked to Alex and Deborah, and rightly so. When the *Journal* began publication, business ethics as a field for serious academic research, especially in my field of philosophy, barely existed. The foundation of a specialized, high-quality outlet for serious research served as an encouragement, an

empowerment, and a reward for those of us working in the field as teachers to turn also to serious scholarship.

“Begin as you mean to continue” is a familiar saying. A brief look at the essays in the early volumes of the *Journal* reveals many that have become classics of the field, not matched since as to their insights and interest. Many of today’s hot topics in the field of business ethics were seen as key issues even then by the editors and contributors to the *Journal* – corporate social responsibility, the ethics of advertising and business bluffing, anonymity and whistle-blowing, the ethical challenges of multinational corporations, computer ethics (now partitioned off as a separate field of endeavour). One could adopt glass-half-empty mode and see this as an indication of how little the *Journal* has affected anything. Or one could adopt glass-half-full mode and see this as an indication of the *Journal*’s willingness to take on the perennial issues with which the world of business struggles, and with which society struggles in trying to bring some measure of ethical accountability to the world of business.

The *Journal* was positioned from the beginning as a place for multidisciplinary approaches and studies. Nonetheless, from my own particular perspective as an academic philosopher, the content of the *Journal* has evolved over the last 30 years. It began with a considerable emphasis on more abstract and conceptual studies, but in recent times the emphasis has shifted to more empirical studies – field-work studies of attitudes and responses to ethical issues and challenges, rather than analysis of what would be good ethical reasons for action in some context or other. It is easily arguable that the empirical turn is justified: how can we begin to have a practical effect on the conduct of business unless we know what is out there in terms of existing attitudes and patterns of response? However, it is also fair to ask: how can we begin to have a practical effect on the conduct of business unless we know what goals and principles are ethically valid for business. Perhaps over the next stage of the *Journal*’s life, the pendulum will begin to swing back.

Well, there it is – my assumption that in the *Journal*’s future lie another 30 years of publication and another 100 volumes. May it be so. May the *Journal* continue as it has begun – a place to publish the leading-edge research in one of the most important fields of study in the humanities and social sciences that we academics presently occupy.

Shannon Shipp

Thinking About the Future of the Journal of Business Ethics

As an author in and a reviewer for *Journal of Business Ethics* for 11 years and an avid reader and follower for many more, I have had the privilege to observe how *JBE* has developed and shaped and been shaped by the rapidly developing field of business ethics. Another journal editor once told me that to have a successful journal, the editor must select a balance of timely and timeless articles. Elsewhere in this

issue, the citation analysis of the articles published in *JBE*, the sheer number of articles published compared to other journals in the field of business ethics, and the inclusion in the *Financial Times* list of journals used to assess the quality of the publications of a given school or college of business shows that *JBE* has been able to reach that standard.

It has been interesting to observe how many of the articles published in *JBE* have addressed a few basic questions in business ethics:

1. What does it mean for businesses or individuals in business to be ethical in a business context?
2. Why do individuals or businesses act ethically (or unethically)?
3. How can we train individuals to act more ethically?
4. If training, selection, and development of ethical corporate culture fail, how do we effectively deter or punish unethical action?

Of these questions, the last has probably received the least attention. After all, this is the *Journal of Business Ethics*, not the *Journal of Corporate Punishment* or the *Journal of Deterrence*. However, according to the regulatory cycle proposed by Marianne Jennings, regulation is the end result of the companies' failure to meet the new ethical challenges they face when they develop new products, enter new markets, or develop new technologies. As a result, deterrence or punishment is a natural result of failing to meet new ethical challenges and deserving of more attention from business ethics scholars.

Punishment scholars such as Posner would argue that increasing the penalties for unscrupulous behavior would make individuals and companies less likely to engage in those activities. Yet increasing the level of regulatory oversight and associated penalties have not been the panacea one might expect. Sarbanes-Oxley in the U.S. was intended to be the law that would put an end to accounting shenanigans and manipulation of stock prices. To further strengthen the law, changes in the federal sentencing guidelines promoted even stiffer penalties for firms and individuals that violated securities laws. In the U.K., the Public Interest Disclosure Act and other regulations were enacted with the same end in mind. Unfortunately, the results were disappointing in controlling illegal or unethical behavior.

Since the passage of Sarbanes and other measures, accounting scandals such as abusive tax shelters promoted by some of the largest accounting firms in the world, ubiquitous use of backdating stock options, and the global financial crisis driven by widespread abuses in the mortgage industry and credit default swaps showed that simply writing new laws or increasing the amount of regulation will not result in the desired changes in behavior. In the wake of the mortgage meltdown, in 2010 the Dodd Frank bill was enacted to curb primarily banking institutions and I fear that the results will be the same.

But the types of ethical restraints often discussed in the pages of *JBE* and the new types of ethical oversight offered by new technologies might be part of the solution. I spoke at an all-day event where I discussed ethical awareness and ethical decision-making in the first half of the event and a partner at a Big 4 accounting firm spoke on curbing fraud and stiffening control and compliance measures in the second half.

When he stood up to speak, his first comment was, “If you listened to my colleague this morning and follow his advice to train your employees on ethics and to enact an ethical culture at your firm, you will probably not be calling my firm for assistance. If you did not, keep my number handy.”

Employees and customers can help enact, monitor, and reinforce an ethical culture through new technological methods. Consumers can use such services as Angie’s List, the Better Business Bureau business certification program, and web sites that target specific corporations such as Wal-Mart, Nike, and others to voice their concerns and be heard directly by high level managers in the affected firms. Employees can use confidential hotlines or other mechanisms to communicate with the audit committee of the firm. It may be that the future of dealing with unethical behavior is not to enact new laws and tighten the penalties but to focus on the informal means of affecting ethical behavior.

I look forward to many more years of timely and timeless articles from *JBE*

Randi L. Sims

Reflections

The research entitled “The influence of ethical fit on employee satisfaction, commitment, and turnover” was the starting point of my interest in employee ethical decision making. This particular study of hospital employees was among the first to demonstrate that ethical fit is significantly related to employee attitudes and behavioral intentions. The preliminary study laid the groundwork for my dissertation and became the foundation for much of my later work on employee ethical decision making. Before the establishment of the *Journal of Business Ethics*, research in business ethics appeared as a small sub-field within journals whose focus was primarily on other areas of business. With the launch of *JBE*, business ethics was more clearly established as an independent field of study, demonstrating the increasing importance of the study of business ethics.

Ronald R. Sims

The Institutionalization of Ethics, 1991

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

This citation classic has helped provide a platform during my career to not only dialogue with other academics who have an interest in business ethics, but also network and do increased interdisciplinary teaching, research and consulting work

with practitioners, students and others, and overlap with others in the fields of organizational change and development who have a mutual interest in changing organizational culture. Further, the citation has been instrumental in being viewed as a resource by colleagues, students, and others on who want to publish relevant, current, innovative and accessible practical or applied writing on topics such as business ethics.

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

Anyone who is familiar with the *Journal of Business Ethics* knows that it publishes original articles from a wide variety of methodological and disciplinary perspectives concerning ethical issues related to business that bring something new or unique to the discourse in their field. Articles published by contributors like myself examine moral or business ethics aspects of systems of production, consumption, marketing, advertising, social and economic accounting, labor relations, public relations and organizational behavior. Probably the most important impact that the *JBE* has had on the field of business ethics is the creation of a vehicle which has indeed promoted a dialogue between individual academics or researchers and a variety of interested professional and non-professional groups, be they from the business community, universities, government agencies, consumer groups or the society at large. More specifically, over the years the *JBE* has fulfilled its mission of improving the human condition by providing a forum for business ethics to be at the forefront in our understanding and analysis of the behavior of business organizations.

The *JBE* has been instrumental in shaping the identity of business ethics as an academic field through its published articles on a variety of research directions, inquiry methods and diversity of scholars who represent many leading academic (and non-academic institutions) from around the world. In addition, as a publication outlet the *JBE* continues to have a dramatic impact on the evolution, identity and future directions of the discourse or dialogue on business ethics. In my view, the *JBE* is a discipline-specific journal that has led the way in informing the overall academic community about the existence of business ethics as a scholarly domain. For example, when articles like the “Institutionalization of business ethics” was published in the *JBE* in 1991 the field of business ethics or research on the topic did not offer many options to publish my work on business ethics. However, over time several other specific journals emerged and as the business ethics discipline has progressed over the past few decades, more journals have opened up as outlets for a dialogue on the topic. For me, this is a sign of how business ethics has become a recognized academic domain since following the lead of the *JBE* many other business-oriented or general management journals now offer a space where scholars read new works, exchange ideas, share theories and accumulate references on the topic of business ethics. By staying true to its mission of publishing articles that examine moral or business ethics topics the *JBE* impact on the field of business ethics is quite

obvious when one considers the number of non-business ethics or discipline researchers, practitioners, university administrators and members of business, not-for-profit and government organizations are able to form their understanding of business ethics as an academic field.

Ronald R. Sims

The Challenge to Unethical Behavior in Organizations, 1992

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

This citation classic has impacted my career as it has been utilized by fellow academics and practitioners who have an interest in the implications of ethical or unethical or ethical behavior on organizations. Whether as part of tenure and promotion decisions over the past 20 years, when colleagues, doctoral or undergraduate students are engaged in their own research or articles are published in journals which cite the article, or when I have submitted proposals to editors at book publishers, the article has served as a link between myself and others.

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

Since the birth of the *Journal of Business Ethics* in 1982, the *JBE* has helped move the field of business ethics from what was once considered a relatively new niche discipline to a field or discipline viewed by scholars and others as the source for dialogue and research on the topic of business ethics. In 1992 when the *JBE* published my article "The challenge to unethical behavior in organizations", academics like myself, who were interested in business ethics topics were lucky if we could publish our research or work in more general outlets. Academic conferences, like the Academy of Management, also served as an outlet for those of us who were doing research on business ethics. The *JBE* helped the business ethics discipline mature over the past three decades. The *JBE* has allowed business ethics scholars like myself to have a research outlet that is indeed different from that of our colleagues in other academic domains and the *JBE* serves as a discipline-specific journal where business ethics researchers are able to directly communicate with like-minded audiences. Partially as a result of the *JBE*, a number of outlets include more traditional business-oriented journals now devoting substantial or more exclusive (i.e., special issues) on the topic of business ethics.

As corporate misconduct increased (e.g., Enron, WorldCom, Tyco), I believe the *JBE* has helped make the study of business ethics become more mainstream. The increased respectability of the *JBE* (i.e., the *JBE* is one of the 45 journals used by

the *Financial Times* in compiling the prestigious Business School research rank) has helped those who do research on business ethics, which is still considered a niche discipline or field by some, to overcome or better address challenges like the recognition of their scholarly contribution by their peers, administrators and various committees. Fortunately, in my experience, more and more senior scholars and administrators serving on university tenure and promotion, merit pay and hiring committees are familiar with the research domain of academics or faculty, who work in what some view as the very narrow area of business ethics. As a result, as I can attest to when considering my experiences over my academic career during their deliberations, we no longer had to rely on personal subjective judgment, opinion of others or formal journal ranking lists. One need only pay attention to how many researchers who are not viewed as “those who focus on the niche field or discipline of business ethics” are now fighting to get their articles published in the *JBE*.

Ronald R. Sims, Hsing Cheng and Hildy Teegen 1996

Toward a Profile of Software Pirates, 1996

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

Perhaps the best way to answer the first question is by sharing the comments of one of my colleagues and co-authors at the time, Dr. Hsing Kenny Cheng, who when asked to respond to the question stated the following “Software piracy was a very serious problem (and still is) when I started my academic career at the College of William and Mary in 1992. I was intrigued by the software piracy problem; however, there was little research on software piracy at the time. My then-colleagues, Professors Ronald Sims and Hildy Teegen, and I decided to answer two key questions of software piracy – who pirates software and why? Our research into the first question resulted in the 1996 *Journal of Business Ethics* article entitled “Toward a Profile of Student Software Pirates”. Building on the publication of this article in the *JBE* a follow-up study on why people pirate software appeared in *Journal of Management Information Systems* entitled “To Purchase or to Pirate Software: An Empirical Study” in 1997. Even though all of us have moved on to other research problems, we continue to experience the enormous impact of our software piracy studies on our career. None more evident than the comment of an outside reviewer quoted in the chair’s letter in support of my promotion to full professor last year: “I know first-hand that Dr. Cheng’s work laid the foundations that detailed the key triggers of software theft. His work has had a profound impact on research in software piracy which later evolved into addressing intellectual property issues surrounding other cultural products such as music, movies, and books.” I must echo the comments of both Dr. Cheng and the outside reviewer as the article was but one thread

of my more than 20 years of research, teaching and service in the business ethics arena. Research, teaching and service that has increasingly played an important role in my scholarly, teaching and service efforts here at the College of William and Mary Mason School of Business.

What Has Been the Impact, If Any, of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

The *JBE* has helped inform a large number of academics, practitioners, and others of the important issues that make up the field of business ethics and are of importance to teachers who teach business ethics, and in turn has influenced a large number of students who have gone on to be practitioners. Moreover, many of those in business have also turned to the writings in the *JBE* by those who one would consider in the fields of business ethics, or have looked to the *JBE* for guidance on issues or for help in writing corporate codes or designing training programs, all of which one finds as part of the discourse that make up the field of business ethics. In our experience, the media as well frequently turns to those who publish in research on business ethics in the *JBE* for guidance, help, or sound bites. Many of the academics one finds in the field of business ethics have been able to make an effort to open a dialogue with those in business, and have frequently been successful in doing so because of the *JBE*. The *JBE* has expanded the audience, not only for colleagues and students, but also corporate managers and the general public. We have also noticed that non-academic consultants have turned to the *JBE* for research and information which helps them better mediate between the academic arena and the corporate executive, many of whom use the business ethics scholarly material from the *JBE* to become informed about the state of the art and the arguments for or against various positions. Some of these act not only as intermediaries but, in a sense, as translators, translating information from the business ethics field found in the *JBE* into business-speak.

Ronald R. Sims and Johannes Brinkman 2003

Enron Ethics: (Or Culture Matters More Than Codes), 2003

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of Your Citation Classic on Your Career?

This citation class has had an impact on our careers as it has provided important opportunities for us to network with other colleagues, present applied research papers at national and international conferences, and be sought out by organizations and those in the media who have an interest in how to develop and/or change cultures in organizations.

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

First, business ethics which in our own view and (many other researchers) was once a niche-discipline or field has been elevated to a much higher status because of the *Journal of Business Ethics*. Since first publishing our article “Enron ethics: (or culture matters more than codes)” in the *Journal of Business Ethics* in 2003, we have found that we are no longer dramatically disadvantaged as compared to our colleagues because our research is published in a “niche” or lower quality journal as the *Journal of Business Ethics* as it is now included in the general journal ranking lists. Such a ranking has elevated the field of business ethics as very few of our colleagues (to include those who do research on business ethics and those who do not) now refer to the *Journal of Business Ethics* as a non-premier discipline outlet or label it as ‘C’ in a ranking of journals in management and related areas. This also applies to the field of business ethics. Clearly, times have changed over the years. And the change and impact on the business ethics field can partly be attributed to the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Second, tying into the first two points above the *Journal of Business Ethics* has an impact on energizing the business ethics movement, or more specifically the field of business ethics itself, which has become firmly entrenched in the academic, business and broader communities. The concern for ethics in business is partially a result of the *Journal of Business Ethics*. The *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped business ethics as an academic field to contribute to discussion forums, research and teaching that inform both ethics in business and the business ethics movement. That is, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped the business ethics field be more responsive to the other two and in turn better interface or interact with them.

Finally, from an academic perspective, looking back over the past 30 years the *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped create a history of how the field of business ethics has evolved and just how far the field has come. The *Journal of Business Ethics* has helped us understand the past of the business ethics field. But it also continues to encourage us to look at the future of the field of business ethics. And especially the reality that there is still a lot for the business ethics field to do. For example, both globalization and the continued evolution of business organizations will change the way business is done and the ethical issues businesses face. As scholars from the United States and Norway we continue to see that the *Journal of Business Ethics* will remain relevant and have an impact on the field of business ethics, as business organizations change in the years to come. In closing, if there is anything that really stands out about the impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the business ethics field, it is that the *Journal of Business Ethics* demonstrates that business ethics is neither a fad as some still claim, nor an oxymoron, as still others joke. The *Journal of Business Ethics* will continue to keep business ethics as a vibrant, complex field. We expect the *Journal of Business Ethics* will discuss ethical issues related to business ethics, from a wide variety of methodological and disciplinary perspectives, examine

moral aspects of business organizations (i.e., their systems), serve as a vehicle for discourse and dialogue, and continue to portray the field of business ethics in dynamic and fascinating ways.

Anusorn Singhapakdi

An Essay on the Paper “The Perceived Role of Ethics and Social Responsibility: A Scale Development”

My primary research area has always been in the area of business ethics. Therefore, it is an honor to have a research paper recognized by the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)*, the leading academic journal in business ethics. It is also an honor to be asked to write an essay about the impact of my *citation distinguished* paper (Singhapakdi et al. 1996) on my career and the impact of *JBE* on the field of business ethics. I believe *JBE* impacts the field of business ethics. Although my research program has always been in business ethics, as a marketing professor I also have my scholarly papers in business ethics published in traditional journals in the marketing discipline. Based on a recent citation analysis of my publication, it is interesting to find out that I generally have more citations for my *JBE* papers than for many of my business ethics papers published in marketing journals. It is also interesting that I seem to have more inquiries for my *JBE* papers, especially from scholars from developing and/or non-Western countries, than inquiries for my other business ethics papers published in traditional marketing journals. I would conclude *JBE* is more well-known among international scholars and, obviously, because *JBE* has a higher profile among *business ethics scholars*!

I believe my *citation distinguished* paper has been quite important for my career. The thrust of the paper is the development of a scale to measure a manager's perceived role of ethics and social responsibility (PRESOR). Since the scale has been widely adopted and successfully used by many scholars, the paper certainly has helped in establishing my reputation as a business ethics scholar. In fact, the paper has not only served as a good foundation for other scholars' work but has also served as a good foundation for my own subsequent work (e.g., Singhapakdi 1999; Singhapakdi et al. 2001, 2008).

For instance, the *citation distinguished* paper served as a strong foundation for the key assertion of my 1999 research (Singhapakdi 1999) that managers must first perceive ethics and social responsibility to be important to organizational effectiveness before their behaviors will become more ethical and socially responsible (the PRESOR scale was also used). The results, based on a mail survey of marketing managers in the U.S., generally supported this assertion and thus further validated the PRESOR scale. The results reveal a clear positive relationship between PRESOR and ethical decisions. In a sense, according to the results, managers believe that “Good ethics is good business” – a utilitarian motive can also result in ethical

BEHAVIOR (perhaps as easily as altruistic motives) and it's the behavior that ultimately matters.

As further examples of how this *distinguished* paper impacted my career, the PRESOR scale which was developed in the U.S. has also been adopted and translated for my research in different parts of the world. In Singhapakdi et al. (2001), my colleagues and I, among other things, investigated the variation in perceptions regarding the importance of ethics and social responsibility among marketing professionals from Australia, Malaysia, South Africa, and the U.S. The variation in those perceptions was explained by country differences (e.g., cultural differences and differences in the economic environment), organizational ethical climate, and selected demographic characteristics. In Singhapakdi et al. (2008), my colleagues and I further validated and extended the *distinguished* paper by investigating the relationship between selected antecedents and consequences of perceived importance of ethics within an economically growing non-Western culture (Thailand). I believe that my *citation distinguished* paper has been quite important for my career. I also believe that the *Journal of Business Ethics* significantly impacts the field of business ethics.

References

Singhapakdi, A. 1999. Perceived importance of ethics and ethical decisions in marketing. *Journal of Business Research* 45(1): 89–99.

Singhapakdi, A., M. Gopinath, J.K.M. Marta, and L.L. Carter. 2008. Antecedents and consequences of perceived importance of ethics in marketing situations: A study of Thai business people. *Journal of Business Ethics* 81: 887–904.

Singhapakdi, A., K. Karande, C.P. Rao, and S.J. Vitell. 2001. How important are ethics and social responsibility? A multinational study of marketing professionals. *European Journal of Marketing* 35(1/2): 133–152.

Singhapakdi, A., S.J. Vitell, K.C. Rallapalli, and K.L. Kraft. 1996. The perceived role of ethics and social responsibility: A scale development. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15(11): 1131–1140.

M. Joseph Sirgy

JBE's Impact on the Dissemination of Knowledge of Marketing Ethics in Books

What is the impact of *JBE* on the dissemination of knowledge of marketing ethics? One way to gauge *JBE's* impact is to browse through marketing ethics books and look for *JBE* citations. During the last three decades, several major books were

published on marketing ethics as well as marketing and society books and business ethics that incorporate a major component of marketing ethics. These are:

- Bloom, P.N., and G.T. Gundlach eds. 2001. *Handbook of marketing and society*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Chonko, L.B. 1995. *Ethical decision making in marketing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Gundlach, G.T., Block, L.G., and W.L. Wilkie eds. 2007. *Explorations of marketing in society*. Mason: Thomson Higher Education.
- Laczniaik, G.R., and P. Murphy. 1993. *Ethical marketing decisions: The higher road*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Michalos, A.C. 1995. *A pragmatic approach to business ethics*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Murphy, P.E., G.R. Laczniaik, N.E. Bowie, and T.A. Klein .2005. *Ethical marketing: Basic ethics in action*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice-Hall.
- Peterson, R.A., and O.C. Ferrell eds. 2005. *Business ethics: New challenges for business schools and corporate leaders*. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.
- Smith, N.C., and J.A. Quelch. eds. 1993. *Ethics in marketing*. Boston: Irwin.

Let's examine the evidence. *JBE* is cited in the book by Bloom and Gundlach (2001) in chapters dealing with changes on corporate practices in response to public interest advocacy and actions, corporate societal marketing, and macromarketing perspectives. The book by Chonko (1995) deals with ethical decision making in marketing. *JBE*'s imprint is felt throughout in discussions related to ethics and conflict, ethical decision making, ethics in the marketing work environment, marketing code of ethics, ethical issues in marketing information systems, ethics and product decisions, ethics and pricing decisions, ethics and advertising decisions, ethics and selling decisions, and ethics and distribution decisions. The book by Gundlach et al. (2007) has a major section dealing with marketing ethics. In that section, O. C. Ferrell addresses the nature and scope of marketing ethics. In this seminal article he cites research from *JBE*. *JBE* is also highly cited in the book by Laczniaik and Murphy (1993) dealing with a variety of topics in marketing ethics, such as ethics in marketing research, product management ethics, ethical issues in distribution, ethical issues in advertising, personal selling ethics, and international marketing ethics. Alex Michalos, in his 1995 book, addresses several important marketing ethics topics based on research published in *JBE*. These include the impact of trust on business, international security, quality of life, and ethical considerations regarding public opinion polling during election campaigns. Murphy et al.'s (2005) book also covered topics such as ethical reasoning and marketing decisions, ethics in researching and segmenting markets, product management ethics, ethical issues in distribution channels and pricing, ethics in advertising and the internet, personal selling ethics, and implementing and auditing ethical marketing. Again, the book is replete with *JBE* citations. The edited book by Peterson and Ferrell (2005) [both editors are marketing professors] has countless *JBE* references. The book covers a large spectrum of topics related to marketing ethics such as ethics theory, personal moral codes, ethical leadership, and the conflict inherent between

ethics and making a profit. Finally, with respect to the Smith and Quelch (1993) book, *JBE*'s imprint is evident through discussions of ethical issues in researching and targeting consumers, corporate policy and the ethics of competitor intelligence gathering, ethical issues in personal selling and sales force management, and ethical issues in advertising and sales promotion.

In sum, in its 30-years history *JBE* has made a significant impact on the dissemination of knowledge in marketing ethics through pedagogical books used in the classroom to teach marketing students, MBA students, and marketing professionals. I personally have used these books in teaching the subject matter, and I do strongly feel that *JBE* played an integral and indispensable role in the creation, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge directly related to marketing ethics. Thank you *JBE*, thank you Scott Vitell (editor of the Marketing Ethics section in *JBE*), and thank you Alex Michalos and Deborah Poff for leading this journal and making a fine and worthy contribution to the growing field of marketing ethics.

Alejo J. G. Sison

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics on the Field of Business Ethics?

I shall take a small detour in answering this question because sometimes, the shortest route isn't necessarily the best. First, I will try to respond to a query regarding the impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* to those of us who work in the field by citing a personal experience. After earning my PhD I returned to the country of my birth, the Philippines, with a desire to lend a hand in a fledgling liberal arts college that had grown out of an institution that conducted graduate programs in business. This being the early 1990s, internet connection was at best spotty, if at all available. There was no alternative, therefore, to traditional libraries for sources of scholarly information. But resources at my college were unimaginably scarce, so I practically had to make do with the materials I had brought along with me from my graduate studies. Considering the 20 kilo airline baggage allowance and the limited funds I had for shipping, all told these books and journals occupied very little shelf-space.

However, there was one piece of advice from my mentor that stuck in my mind and to which I had tried to stay true even then: "Never resign yourself to simply repeating what other people have thought of and said." This, of course, implied that I should never give up furthering my own research interests, which was precisely the point in getting a PhD in the first place. But how?

Here is where the *Journal of Business Ethics* comes in. Early on I discovered that I could write the *Journal* managers and volunteer to come up with reviews of the new books they had received. That way, not only would I be able to keep abreast somewhat of recent developments, but I would also have a chance to publish short works. Best of all, my institution would be able to keep the books originally sent for

review, for the use not only of myself and colleagues in the faculty, but of our students as well. To this day, I shall never forget this debt of gratitude that I owe to the *Journal*.

Since then I have moved on several times in my academic career, but the *Journal* has always accompanied me. I imagine it as an ever-dependable platform, both in print and electronically, from which to obtain, test and exchange knowledge. Given that knowledge doesn't come with its own voice or pair of legs, contact with it actually means contact with people of flesh and blood who are its purveyors and enablers. As a result, many of the people whom I have met through the *Journal*, in my multiple roles as reader, contributor, referee and editor, have in time turned out to be close acquaintances and friends. These include not only my fellow academics, but also managers, entrepreneurs, consultants, legislators, public administrators and publishing professionals, all of whom are usually covered by the catch-all term, "practitioners".

To some extent, my experience with the *Journal* mimics the one I have with the European Business Ethics Network (EBEN), the premier business ethics organization on the Continent and a major reference globally, in whose Executive Committee I serve. It is but logical and fitting that the *Journal* and EBEN regularly partner in the publication of special issues dedicated to the outstanding scholarship produced in EBEN conferences. In fact, we at EBEN do not consider the *Journal of Business Ethics* as just another journal, but as our journal, albeit extra-officially. Both perform the indispensable dual function of platform and gatekeeper or guardian of the best in business ethics scholarship and practice.

Laura J. Spence

Beyond the Usual Suspects: Leading the Field in Small Business Ethics

I still remember, back in 1997, receiving the proofs of my first article in the *Journal of Business Ethics* and feeling a real sense of pride to see my work in the familiar format. Then and now, the journal is highly visible as *the Journal of Business Ethics*, readily recognizable both within our field and by scholars outside it. Indeed, it is the journal's presence on the FT45 list which raises the profile and credibility of business ethics most obviously outside of our discipline, certainly within Europe. This is not at all to denigrate the other excellent publications in our field, which each make important contributions. Indeed, it is a regret of mine that the field does not have a wider range of high quality journals, which must be acknowledged to be in part a result of the extremely high number of issues of the *Journal of Business Ethics* absorbing much of the good work.

From my perspective the major contribution of the *Journal of Business Ethics* is the leadership the journal has shown in championing new and innovative approaches

and aspects of business ethics. My personal favourite is unsurprisingly my own field, ethics in small firms. Like most others in mainstream management studies, not to mention the media and our own business school curricula, we business ethicists suffer from a blinkered obsession with large multinational corporations. Paradoxically these constitute a tiny minority of private sector businesses, literally, fewer than 5% in most countries, developed and developing alike. While there is no denying the individual impact that the 'usual suspects' can have (i.e. Nike, Philip Morris, Shell, Unilever, dare I say it, Enron), overlooking the majority business form of small and medium sized enterprises has in the past left our field bereft. This despite the enormous emphasis put on entrepreneurship and small business success by policy makers as the engines of the economy (around a third of turnover) and primary creators of employment (usually around 50% of private sector employment) and community cohesion. Indeed, with the global economic crisis engulfing us at the time of writing, still more emphasis is put on small firms as our saviours. Just in case there are any sceptics left out there, small firms cannot be treated as little big firms, they are different in nature as well as size from their larger counterparts, as all the published research testifies.

In 2004 a new section was established in the *Journal of Business Ethics* on Small Business, later developing to include Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise, of which I am delighted to be the editor. This, I believe, was a major breakthrough in our field. Since that time, contributions have been published from all around the world on small business, embracing the critical developing country context (something else which we are not great at as business ethicists), and exploring the business ethics perspectives on entrepreneurship and social enterprise. I don't mean to imply that the *Journal of Business Ethics* was the first or is the only journal to publish in this area, but it has made a sustained commitment which has enhanced this research stream substantially. It is institutionalization as a stated section of the *Journal of Business Ethics* which I find so valuable, and which encourages me that our field is broadening in its focus and improving its contribution to knowledge by looking outside of – relatively speaking – a handful of well-known businesses. I look forward to still more innovative developments in the years to come.

Sebastian A. Sora

Journal of Business Ethics and Its Real Effect on Business Activities

In a world where it has become increasingly difficult to gather to exchange ideas, journals have become our *agora*. The *Journal of Business Ethics* is a particularly strong place where thoughtful businessmen and women grapple with dense, ambiguous, oft neglected ethical problems that abound in their professional and personal lives. The *Journal* provides businessmen and women with a source that helps them

to enhance their own professional skills by skillfully publishing current, original thought that helps him or her to make more ethical, wiser decisions.

I have been a reviewer of the journal and two simple truths come to mind when reflecting on *The Journal's* importance: (1) it is a compendium of the finest thoughts in one place in the field of business ethics and (2) it has had an effect on the actions of many businesses. *The Journal* provides a platform in which original thinkers can share the ethical business problems that they face daily. This was evident in Jason Brennon's article on the evilness of profit: "For-Profit Business As a Civic Virtue" which argues that Google can be an example of a Civic Virtue. Brennon crafted the language so that we can better understand what it means to have virtue in a business world.

The Journal of Business Ethics also gives space to offer new perspectives to help people understand more subtle aspects of communication that often go overlooked. Thomas Li-Ping Tang "Detecting Honest People's Lies in Handwriting. The Power of the Ten Commandments and Internalized Ethical Values" encourages employers to better understand how people truthfully communicate. *The Journal* can also be a place where business executives can find the most current thought on issues that they face in strategic and tactical planning and give them a tool to navigate and reflect on the rocky terrain.

The Journal's uniqueness in publishing only original articles that are vetted by scholars in appropriate fields creates a brain trust of thinkers in the area that can give businessmen and women guidance when confronted by ethical issues. An executive's key skill and power rests in his/her ability to decide on a daily basis and often make those decisions in isolation. *The Journal* gives the executive a community in which some of those decisions may be made more easily and ethically. For example in a recent article by Martin and Parmar, "The Assumptions in Decision making Scholarship: Implications for Business Ethics Research," explore the rational model in the context of how core assumptions create decision paths. This awareness can make executive management more aware of how they are making decisions that effect the tactical and strategic future.

The writers of the *Journal* also engage in lively thought around increasingly sensitive and timely issues that face our multicultural world. Articles such as "Do Muslims Believe more in the Protestant Work Ethic than Christians? Comparison of People with Different Religious Backgrounds Living in the US" by Yavuz Fahir Zulfikar, allow business executives to change or modify or refresh their perceptions of what it means to lead a business in a multicultural environment. The journal also provides a space to examine the gender differences in the workplace. For example, "Examining Female Entrepreneurs' Management Style: An Application of a Relational Frame" by Holly Butner provides rich research to better understand how women entrepreneurs develop and manage their businesses.

It has become increasingly important to provide a place where meaningful ideas about ethics and business can be exchanged. For a business, timing and profit take precedence over the more intangible world of ethics and reflection. However, it is the examination of the vague, fuzzy world of ethics that will allow a business to prosper in the long run. As Ayn Rand writes, "Every aspect of Western culture needs a new code of ethics – a rational ethics – as a precondition of rebirth". *The Journal of Business Ethics* is helping to write that new code through insightful and timely

research that helps business executives to understand the connection among their actions, the relationship with people they work with and for, and the growth of the businesses they work within.

Mark J. Somers

Reflections

Question 1. This study has helped me rethink organizational socialization and it shaped my thinking about outcome variables in organizational behavior especially job performance. As a result, I have studied aspects of job performance that are harmful to organizations in relation to work attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. I don't think that I would have been as aware of the broader role that ethics plays in most aspects of organizational behavior had I not done this study. It also led me to pursue research on whistle-blowing in organizations with more vigor.

Question 2. The *Journal of Business Ethics* operates as a nexus for conceptual and empirical research in the broad area of ethics in business. As a result, it gave the field an identity and a voice that allowed it to grow and to expand its scope. Many papers focused on business ethics either shared space with unrelated articles in more general management journals or became confused with the related field of corporate social responsibility. *JBE* helped focus this field, define its domain, and establish its legitimacy.

Peter A. Stanwick

Reflections

Our article "The Relationship Between Corporate Social Performance, and Organizational Size, Financial Performance, and Environmental Performance: An Empirical Examination" has had a profound impact on my academic career. When this article was published in 1998, my research interests were broadly focused on strategy and other traditional management research streams. After this article was published in *The Journal of Business Ethics*, I realized that I could have a long and successful academic career examining issues related to business ethics, social responsibility and the natural environment. It allowed me the opportunity to broaden my perspective on how business ethics impact an organization. In addition, this article validated the belief that articles pertaining to business ethics can be published in journals classified in the 'top tier' of all academic business journals. We are very proud and pleased that so many people have used our article as a reference point for their research. *The Journal of Business Ethics* has had a phenomenal impact on academic research in business ethics. It has allowed many researchers

to develop and extend existing research streams that are related to business ethics. In addition, The *Journal of Business Ethics* has converted business ethics research from a narrow niche focus to a broad and mainstream focus of academic research. The *Journal of Business Ethics* has pioneered the opportunity of business ethics researchers to develop and have published conceptual and empirical papers that cover a spectrum of topic areas and interests.

Sarah D. Stanwick

Reflections

In 1993, I completed my PhD at the Florida State University with an emphasis in accounting. My dissertation focused on environmental accounting, an area which was relatively unexplored by accounting researchers at the time. This research sparked my life-long interest in ethics, social issues and environmental accounting. As I began my teaching and research career at Auburn University, environmental and ethical issues continued to dominate my research agenda. In addition, I found myself integrating these issues into the accounting courses I taught. The publication of my article written with Peter Stanwick has had a tremendous impact on my career. The *Journal of Business Ethics* is considered one of the premier journals for publishing ethical, social and environmental research in our profession. Having our article accepted in 1998 was not only an honor, but a career milestone. Our colleagues recognize the rigor of journal and the value of our research has now been rewarded with the *JBE* Award. Over my 20 year career at Auburn University, I have watched the accounting profession go through unprecedented changes. These events have changed the face of the accounting profession. The *Journal of Business Ethics* has continued to explore these important ethical issues and present research findings that challenge researchers with new research questions. In the environmental accounting area, we now see a re-emergence of the importance of triple-bottom line reporting, an issue that I remember exploring when I was writing my dissertation. The future of business ethics research will continue to be conveyed through the *Journal of Business Ethics* for academics, business leaders and students.

Jean Garner Stead, W. Edward Stead and Dan L. Worrell

Reflections

Research is a deliberate process in which emerging themes and streams are built on the shoulders of work that has come before. From this perspective, the ultimate value of an academic article is determined by how much it contributes to this deliberate

scientific process. Thus it is that the citations an article receives provide a valid record of the article's contributions to a given field. Thus, for all three authors the recognition of our 1990 *Journal of Business Ethics* article [An integrative model for understanding and managing ethical behavior in business organizations] as a Citation Classic is validation that our research has had a positive influence on the scientific development of the field of business ethics.

Since the publication of this article, the careers of the three authors have diverged a bit. Ed and Jean Stead have followed a traditional professorial path, and both are currently professors of management. Throughout their careers, Ed and Jean have underpinned their research on the belief that quality is ultimately the key to research value. The large readership and positive responses they have gotten to the *JBE* article have validated that belief. Besides its direct impact on the field of business ethics, the article also set the stage for their later work on the search for sustainability in the business arena. Dan Worrell has followed an administrative route since the publication of this article. He held his first administrative position when the article was published, and he has since gone on to hold many subsequent administrative positions in business higher education, including three deanships. For Dan the exploration of the ethical decision metrics and the development of the associated model in the article were very helpful in an application sense throughout his administrative career. Also, the article has had visibility in the field that has been helpful for his career growth and recognition.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has long been recognized as a primary vehicle for the dissemination of important research in the field. It has played a key role over many years in creating important research space where dialogue can take place through both theoretical and empirical examination of significant ethical issues in business. Because of its reputation for publishing the best of the best business ethics research, articles that appear in the *JBE* are legitimized for both quality and relevance.

Betsy Stevens

Reflections

The impact of my research and publication of the article "An analysis of corporate ethical code studies: Where do we go from here?" has been significant for my career. It launched my interest and exploration into the field of corporate ethical codes and the role they play in articulating the ethics of an organization. Scholars were just beginning to explore this subject when the article was published in 1994. My article had only 17 footnotes as not many code studies had been published. Since then I have continued to study the impact of ethical codes in organizations with a focus on how ethics are communicated. I, and others, have published a number of articles since then exploring the role of corporate codes and the ways they can be successfully

used to influence behavior in organizations. The literature is also much richer today and we know much more about how codes function in organizations today than we did in 1994.

Question 1. This article was an extension of my doctoral dissertation research where I analyzed 40 corporate ethical codes. I completed the research in 1993 at a time when little research about codes had been published. Corporate America began embracing ethical codes in the 1980s; some operating from a desire to embrace higher ethical values and others simply wanting to manage their images and appear more ethical to stakeholders. Because so many firms adopted codes in the 1980s, some companies were concerned that the absence of a code might reflect badly on them; a few adopted them simply as window dressing.

My article analyzed the codes studies that existed at the time and asked the question: Where do we go from here? Looking back, Mission statements and ethical codes were being discussed in the literature in ways that were confusing. The terms were sometimes interchanged and it became clear that good definition of corporate ethical codes was needed. My article devoted considerable space to defining a code and articulating the difference between a code and a mission statement. I pointed out the need for additional research in this emerging area of study and suggested new avenues of study, especially along the lines of how they were communicated to employees. I also noted the need to explore the degree to which codes may or may not impact employee behavior. Since 1994, a significant stream of important research in these areas has been developed by other scholars and published in the *Journal of Business Ethics* and other highly respected academic journals.

Thomas Li-Ping Tang

Making Contributions to the Literature

It is my great honor and privilege that I have been invited to write a short essay to celebrate the achievement of the *Journal of Business Ethics* for the past three decades. As an author and member of the Editorial Board, I am proud to present the following Chinese heritage. Confucius (551–479 BC) said, “Since the age of 15, I have devoted myself to learning; since 30, I have been well established; since 40, I have understood many things and have no longer been confused; since 50, I have known my heaven-sent duty; since 60, I have been able to distinguish right and wrong in other people’s words; and since 70, I have been able to do what I intend freely without breaking the rules” (子曰:“吾十有五而志于學,三十而立,四十而不惑,五十而知天命,六十而耳順,七十而从心所欲,不逾矩.”). This reflects Confucius’ personal biography of life-long learning and the development of personal ethics.

Age 30 is not only an important milestone for an individual, but also for our *Journal of Business Ethics* because it takes the time to accumulate the knowledge, establish a well-respected field of study, and become the selected corner stone of the

business field. This important journal has been *chosen* to represent the field of business ethics in the top 45 business journals used by *Financial Times* and also in the top 20 journals used by *Business Week* to evaluate business professors' intellectual capital due to its important role of creating knowledge in ethics literature.

Let us turn to the word "knowledge" in Chinese: 學問. From the lowest to the highest, the word 學 shows a young child (子) sitting at a desk (几) holding the literature (文) with both hands (手), depicting the act of "studying". The word – literature, 文, is a string connecting two pieces of bamboo, forming two crosses, X – one on top of the other, going through four holes on each piece, symbolizing a link between two pages of a book, or the knowledge that can be passed on from one generation to the next. The word, 問, has two components: a door, 門, and a mouth, 口. In order to gain entrance to a room or a field of knowledge, one must knock on the door, 門, open one's mouth, 口, and *ask* questions. It reflects the Western wisdom: "Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you" (Bible, Matthew 7: 7). Both studying (學) and asking questions (問) must exist in order to create new knowledge. Confucius also said: "Learning without thought is labor lost; thought without learning is perilous" (學而不思, 則罔; 思而不學, 則殆.).

Our *Journal of Business Ethics* provides an open space and publishes only original articles from a wide variety of methodological and disciplinary perspectives concerning ethical issues related to business that bring something new or unique to the discourse in their field. Since 1982, it has published 103 volumes and almost 5,000 articles under the unique visionary leadership of Editor-in-Chief Alex C. Michalos and Editor Deborah C. Poff. Therefore, following Confucius' personal biography, scholars and practitioners may answer God's calling; accept an invitation for a banquet of studying (學) business ethics; fill our hearts with hope, joy, love, purpose, and meaning in our lives; take up a grand challenge with courage, faith, and passion; think deeply; cast the widest net; and ask (問) the most original, innovative, and counterintuitive questions in order to advance knowledge and serve the humanity because many are invited, but few are chosen.

Happy Birthday to the *Journal of Business Ethics*! It is your 30th Birthday! Congratulations!

Ann E. Tenbrunsel

Reflections

What, If Any, Has Been the Impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the Field of Business Ethics?

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has been extremely instrumental in expanding the field of business ethics. The impact is driven in part by the encompassing view that the journal holds of business ethics, a view which has increased not only the journal's

visibility but the visibility of business ethics itself. The journal has consistently opened its pages to a variety of approaches to the study of business ethics. In addition to normative approaches to ethics, the journal has embraced behavioral and empirical approaches and, in doing so, has expanded insight into the how and why of unethical behavior. We see this openness not only in the regular issues but also in special issues, which has allowed for in-depth coverage of a particular topic or conference devoted to business ethics. This embracing approach displayed by the editors and reviewers made “business ethics” accessible to a large group of researchers from a variety of disciplines, thus preventing the field from becoming an “ethics silo” in which only a small group of researchers talked among themselves.

The encompassing view of ethics exhibited by the journal has increased the attention paid to the journal and the research questions it addresses. This has helped make business ethics a topic deserving of attention by academics, their institutions and society at large. The *Financial Times* inclusion of the journal in their ranking of business school research is evidence of the recognition of the field and of the role that the *Journal* played in that recognition.

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has increased the accessibility of business ethics across domains, and in so doing, has enriched our understanding of business ethics by providing new perspectives that both challenged and enhanced more traditional views. For their substantial impact, the editors and reviewers of the *Journal* over the years are much appreciated by those of us who study business ethics and those that we hope benefit from the resulting research.

John Tsalikis

A Response to My Award for the “Classic” and “Distinguished” Articles

The *Journal of Business Ethics* is internationally recognized as the preeminent academic publication in the area of business ethics. At Florida International University it is classified as a “premier” journal (the highest ranking) in the College of Business Administration list. The main reason for the “premier” ranking is that the *Journal of Business Ethics* is used by both *Business Week* and *Financial Times* to rank U.S. schools.

The importance of *JBE* can be best described in the following statement: “Ethics remains crucial to business; without trust, the whole economic system could collapse.”

All of my publications in *JBE* have helped my career immensely. However, having two articles in the top 50 makes me one of the leading experts in the world on the field of ethics. Hopefully this will help me be promoted to the rank of full professor, in addition to increasing the prestige and rankings of the department of Marketing, the college and FIU.

Sean Valentine

The Journal of Business Ethics: The Torchbearer for Positive Organizational Practices for 30 Years

For the past 30 years, the *Journal of Business Ethics* (*JBE*) has been recognized as one of the premiere academic outlets for high-quality research related to organizational ethics, corporate social responsibility, ethical reasoning, and other similar topics. *JBE* is often recognized as having a strong impact in the organizational sciences (i.e., the *Financial Times* list of top academic business journals), and the journal scores high on citation indexes that track how often published articles are referenced in other works. Such rankings and citation counts are particularly important because, when assessed together, they provide a more complete picture of the normative impact that a journal has on an academic discipline. Clearly, *JBE* has been instrumental not only in building interest in business ethics throughout universities and board rooms, but also in creating a critical mass of information that has shaped the direction of business ethics as a discipline. Additionally, many institutions of higher education recognize *JBE* as a high-quality publication on internal journal lists and rankings, with some schools even specifying it as an “A-level” outlet for the purposes of tenure and promotion, raise allocation and rewards distribution, and faculty awards and recognition.

JBE possesses a number of strengths that have positioned the *Journal* as a publication leader in business ethics. For instance, the *Journal* has historically published many different types of research, including issue-based articles, theoretical pieces, practitioner-based essays, and empirical studies. This strategy has enabled *JBE* to effectively differentiate itself from other outlets, which often focus on the dissemination of work representing a particular type or approach. The empirical nature of many of the studies published in *JBE* is what makes the journal exceptionally attractive. While philosophical and/or conceptual explorations of ethics are critical for theory development and expand the boundaries of the field, it is equally important to recognize that business ethics is a fundamentally applied discipline, requiring more objective (and often more quantitative) investigations of the real-world issues that affect managers and their employees. Consequently, researchers must ultimately interact with businesses and collect primary data for the purposes of identifying and describing important ethical issues that impact the workplace. Such efforts facilitate the development of prescriptive guidance that assists practitioners and ultimately disseminates research that shapes both theory and practice. It is this particular niche that *JBE* has been able to successfully fill, thereby garnering widespread recognition and respect.

The field of business ethics has evolved greatly over the years, and *JBE* has been instrumental in focusing attention on many of the most salient ethical challenges that scholars and business professionals face. From the early origins of the field that focused on model development to the latter empirical investigations of important focal variables, the *Journal* has provided a useful forum for the exchange of cutting-edge research with important academic and practical/managerial implications.

Its scope has grown to include the publication of unique international investigations of business ethics, new comprehensive assessments of multi-level relationships that exist within the organizational context, and more discipline-specific research related to such professions as human resource management, sales/marketing, and accounting. Given these qualities, *JBE* will continue to be the torchbearer for positive organizational practices well into the future.

Scott Vitell

Commentary on a Collection of Classic Articles: Journal of Business Ethics

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has played a major role in the field of business ethics and also in my own career. I was fortunate enough to serendipitously begin a research career in the field of marketing and consumer ethics at about the same time that the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* was a nascent journal. Specifically, I completed my Ph.D. in 1986 while the *Journal* published its first issue four years earlier, in 1982. Given the *Journal's* interest in empirical research as well as conceptual pieces, it has provided a logical outlet for much of my ethics research over the years. My career has most clearly benefitted from the *Journal* in that it is both international and cross-disciplinary. Most of my other published articles in the business ethics field have primarily appeared in marketing journals, and many of these journals, until recently anyway, have tended to appeal mainly to a national readership, composed mostly of U.S. marketing scholars. Contrarily, my articles in the *Journal of Business Ethics* have been read by scholars from multiple disciplines and from all parts of the world leading to requests for reprints and/or assistance from researchers from other disciplines and other countries. This has even sometimes led to my finding new co-authors who would not have contacted me had my articles not appeared in *JBE*.

Since its inception, the *Journal of Business Ethics* quickly evolved into the premier journal in the business ethics field as exemplified by its high ranking in the *Financial Times'* list of 45 top business journals. It also ranks first among 20 scholarly business ethics journals according to a recent citation-based study by Serenko and Bontis (2009). The *Journal of Business Ethics* has served the field well by publishing articles from numerous subfields of business ethics research including teaching, religion, corporate governance, cross-cultural business ethics and consumer ethics, to name but a few. I mention the latter two areas specifically because my three co-authored papers that are being republished in this volume, as well as one of my "distinguished" articles that is also being recognized, all fall into one or the other of these two categories.

The 1993 "Effects of culture on ethical decision making: an application of Hofstede's typology" article, co-authored with Nwachukwu and Barnes, continues

to be one of the most cited *JBE* articles (and the most cited cross-cultural *JBE* article) although I certainly never would have expected that at the time it was being written. Based upon Hofstede's typology, my co-authors and I were simply trying to conceptualize the potential impact of cross-cultural differences on various constructs/relationships from the Hunt-Vitell General Theory of Marketing Ethics (Hunt and Vitell 1986). Apparently numerous readers have found those conceptualizations useful, and I am grateful for that and thank my co-authors for their insightful comments in framing the original paper.

My other articles mentioned above are consumer-related ethics articles. The *Journal of Business Ethics* has been at the forefront in terms of publishing research in the consumer ethics field, and this field would not have advanced nearly as much as it has were it not for *JBE*. The two consumer ethics articles re-published here are among the first in this field. Besides presenting the four original dimensions and individual items of the Muncy-Vitell scale, the 1992, "Consumer ethics: an empirical investigation of factors influencing ethical judgments of the final consumer" article co-authored with Jim Muncy examined the recently created (at the time) scale by analyzing the correlations between individual items of the scale and various consumer attitudes such as attitudes toward business, government and mankind in general, among others. Perhaps not surprisingly, one's attitude toward business seemed to generate the strongest correlations with the Muncy-Vitell items, with individuals having the strongest negative opinions of business being the one's most likely to condone unethical consumer behavior. While the results were not quite "cutting edge," since the scale had originally appeared in another journal (Muncy and Vitell 1992), the significance of the article was the exposure of the scale to the diverse readership of *JBE*. The 1991 "Consumer ethics: an investigation of the ethical beliefs of elderly consumers" article co-authored with Lumpkin and Rawwas essentially achieved the same results while specifically examining the ethical beliefs of an elderly population of consumers. I believe that these two articles, along with the initial presentation of the Muncy-Vitell scale, helped to generate much of the initial interest in this field. I give my thanks to *JBE* for publishing these articles at the time and, of course, my thanks and gratitude also to my co-authors for their immeasurable assistance, most especially Jim Muncy who first had the idea to develop a consumer ethics scale.

The more recent consumer ethics article, "Consumer ethics research: review, synthesis and suggestions for the future" (2003) was essentially a review piece. At the time that I wrote this article, I had "gotten away" from consumer ethics research for a few years, and was surprised to find that so much had been published in the interim. The writing of this paper helped to renew my interest in consumer ethics research once again and resulted in my co-authoring several subsequent consumer ethics pieces involving religiosity, many of which appeared in *JBE*. I am grateful to *JBE* for publishing consumer ethics articles over the years, not just mine but those of many other authors as well, and, of course, for publishing my aforementioned review of many of those articles.

Two articles that have been honored remain to be mentioned. One, a "citation classic," was actually my very first manuscript submitted to and accepted by *JBE*.

This was the 1987 article co-authored with Troy Festervand, “Business ethics: conflicts, practices and beliefs of industrial executives,” that examined the views of executives regarding business ethics. It was patterned after Baumhart’s original, ground breaking *Harvard Business Review* (1961) article and Brenner and Molander’s (1977) follow-up article a decade later. I thank these early business ethics researchers and also my co-author for the parts they all played indirectly and directly in forming my career during those beginning years. Given that this was my first article published in *JBE*, one could perhaps state that it helped to launch my *JBE* publishing career.

My remaining honored *JBE* article was “The perceived role of ethics and social responsibility: a scale development” (1996) with Anusorn Singhapakdi as the lead author, and Rallapalli and Kraft as co-authors. In this manuscript we established a scale for measuring the extent to which an individual perceives that ethics and social responsibility play important roles in the success of an organization. Anusorn was my first doctoral student, graduating in 1988, and has been a valued colleague ever since. He was definitely the lead researcher on this article that continues to be cited as much, or more, today than when it was first published. My thanks to Anusorn for his contributions to this and to many more papers that we have worked on together over the years.

In conclusion, let me relate an incident that occurred while I was defending my doctoral dissertation in 1986. My dissertation defense involved presenting the theoretical model of the Hunt-Vitell theory of ethics as well as an initial empirical investigation of it. The “outside” member of the dissertation committee was a philosopher, and I remember his insisting that mine was not really an “ethics” dissertation. This essentially resulted in a debate between my dissertation chair, Shelby D. Hunt, who was joined by other marketers on the committee, and this particular philosopher. After a rather lengthy discussion on this issue, in which I was essentially a spectator, the philosopher admitted that positive/descriptive models and empirical research were indeed worthy of academic effort, but that they should never be called “ethics” because ethics is, by its very nature, inherently normative, never descriptive. Thankfully, the *Journal of Business Ethics* has never taken this restrictive position, so I conclude my comments with kudos to the *Journal of Business Ethics*, and its longstanding editor-in-chief, Alex Michalos, for recognizing the worthiness of positive theory and empirical research in the “ethics” field, and also for not being afraid to use the term, “ethics,” to describe these worthy endeavors.

References

- Baumhart, Raymond C. 1961. How ethical are businessmen? *Harvard Business Review* 39: 6–9.
- Brenner, Steven N., and Earl A. Molander. 1977. Is the ethics of business changing? *Harvard Business Review* 55, 57–71.
- Hunt, Shelby D., and Scott J. Vitell. 1986. A general theory of marketing ethics. *Journal of Macromarketing* 8 (Spring): 5–16.

Muncy, J.A., and S.J. Vitell. 1992. Consumer ethics: An investigation of the ethical beliefs of the final consumer. *Journal of Business Research* 24 (June): 297–311.

Serenko, Alexander., and Nick Bontis. 2009. A citation-based ranking of the business ethics scholarly journals. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics* 4(4): 390–399.

Gary R. Weaver

Authors' reflections on Weaver, G.R, Treviño, L. K. & Cochran, P.L., "Corporate ethics practices in the mid 1990s: An empirical study of the Fortune 1000", Journal of Business Ethics 1999

Our 1999 *JBE* article queried corporations about their ethics and legal compliance activity. It provided useful descriptive data about formal ethics programs at a key time in the development of these programs in corporate America – the mid-1990s. Although codes of ethics had existed in a few firms for some time, and the Defense Industry Initiative had seen the development of formal ethics programs in defense industry companies, the 1990s saw a spike in formal organizational activity related to ethics and legal compliance across a wide range of corporations. Decade after decade of corporate malfeasance had trained attention toward ways to reform corporate America, and the U.S. federal sentencing guidelines for organizations were passed in late 1991. The guidelines incorporated a “carrot and stick” approach. The idea was to encourage companies to proactively manage employees in a way that would support legal compliance by offering to treat companies more generously – to assess lower penalties for those in legal difficulty – if they could demonstrate that they had actively managed employee behavior in a way likely to discourage illegal action. This turned out to be a crucial time in the development of formal ethics and compliance activity in firms, and therefore a good time to take a “snapshot” of what was happening. Since that time, we have seen the development of an entire ethics and compliance profession represented by organizations such as the Ethics and Compliance Officers Association and the Society for Corporate Compliance and Ethics. We have also seen the development of consulting businesses that support organizational efforts in training, hotlines, investigations, and other signs of activity and attention to corporate ethics. The National Business Ethics Survey, conducted regularly by the Ethics Resource Center, asks some of the same questions we asked almost 20 years ago.

From the perspective of our research, this study provided a strictly descriptive backdrop for other, more in-depth explanatory studies (published elsewhere) that attempted to understand multiple influences on corporate ethics practices and employee ethical behavior. Perhaps one of the most important insights noted in our *JBE* article was our highlighting of the symbolic side of ethics and compliance management; many firms appeared to be implementing formal programs in a

“check the box” fashion. Our other more in-depth analysis found that many firms were decoupling these programs from other important day-to-day activities of the firm, especially if their senior leaders were not highly committed to ethics as an end in itself (Weaver et al. 1999). Over the years, we (individually or together) also have examined multiple contextual influences on employee conduct (including the influence of corporate ethics programs). This research has generally supported our early sense that the formal side of ethics management is not the most important. For example, codes of ethics have only a small impact on employee behavior, especially if employees perceive that the codes are not enforced (Kish-Gephart et al. 2010). What matters much more are the climate and culture that are created in an organization. For example, employees’ perceptions that leaders care about ethics and reinforce it by holding everyone accountable, and that ethics programs are not just “window dressing” but are part of the daily organizational conversation, are key contextual influences (Treviño and Weaver 2001).

The *Journal of Business Ethics* appears to have been at the right place at the right time to provide an outlet for the burgeoning of interest in the academic study of business ethics. Beyond academe, the rest of the world seems to have gotten the message too that business ethics is neither an oxymoron nor a fad but rather a legitimate focus of study.

References

Kish-Gephart, J.J., D.A. Harrison, and L.K. Treviño. 2010. Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about the sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(1): 1–31.

Treviño, L.K., and G.R. Weaver. 2001. Organizational justice and ethics program ‘follow-through’: Influences on employees’ harmful and helpful behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 11(4): 651–671.

Weaver, G.R., L.K. Treviño, and P.L. Cochran. 1999. Integrated and decoupled corporate social performance: Management values, external pressures, and corporate ethics practices. *Academy of Management Journal* 42(5): 539–552.

Heidi von Weltzien-Høivik

Reflections

The *Journal of Business Ethics* has been instrumental in helping to internationalize research done in European countries. The *Journal* became the primary outlet for members of the *European Business Ethics Network (EBEN)*, established in 1986, who wanted to publish in English.

No other journal set the standards so clearly from the start, yet allowed authors to remain true to the historical academic traditions of their own respective countries. Research approaches differ, in particular in the humanities and social sciences. The articles in the *Journal of Business Ethics* give evidence of the great variety of innovative approaches used in the constant search for knowledge in the different parts of the world.

As president of the *European Business Ethics Network* until 2005, I have had the pleasure of promoting the journal to all our members in most of the European countries. Ever since 1997, after each annual EBEN conference, the best papers are submitted for publication based on a double blind review process. This has been a huge encouragement and valuable help for all academics whose mother-tongue is not English.

Knowledge sharing is key to advancing learning and understanding in academia worldwide. The editors of the *Journal of Business Ethics*, Alex C. Michalos and Deborah C. Poff deserve to be recognized for their outstanding achievement in making this journal what it is.

William A. Wines

Response to JBE, September 18, 2011

1. When my citation classic came out in 1992 [Toward an understanding of cross-cultural ethics – a tentative model], I was a tenured full Professor at Boise State University in the College of Business & Economics. Prior to publication of the classic, I had published 21 other articles, not counting newspaper columns, published book reviews, and edited anthologies. I was a visitor at the University of Iowa before moving to Boise State in 1984. That move was forced by the farm crisis. I stayed at Boise State 18 years before leaving for greener pastures. My selection to be the John J. Aram Professor at Gonzaga University in 1999 probably was helped by the 1992 citation classic. I received some informal communication to that effect from a member of the selection committee. Other than that, I am not aware of any effect the article had on my career.
2. The impact of the *Journal of Business Ethics* on the field of business ethics is difficult to gauge. By providing an outlet for scholarly work, the *Journal of Business Ethics* provided a very positive service. In the United States, (the rest of my comment is limited to the U.S.A.) the significance of that service has been, I think, overshadowed by the “one true religion of the market” and by the college, university, and regulatory (accreditation) politics devolving from it. The business school deans I knew, with few exceptions, worshipped at the altar of the free market. The major donors did too. The result was that business ethics did not prosper in the U.S.A.; and some recent research tends to show ethics courses disappearing from business curriculae. A non-scientific and very small sample of six of the business schools with which I am familiar shows that: (a) four of the

six had business ethics courses 25 years ago; (b) only one of the six currently has a free-standing business ethics course now; and (c) three faculty positions (tenure track) that existed 25 years ago to teach the business ethics courses have dwindled to less than one position on tenure track (It was moved to the philosophy department which is not in the business school).

John A. Wood

Reflections

Since business ethics was only one area of the discipline of ethics that demanded my effort and attention, the article had little impact on my career. “Publish or perish” was not a part of the Baylor scene at that time (it is now). Publishing was encouraged but not required. The greater emphasis was on classroom performance. Except for reading an occasional paper on the subject at a regional professional meeting, I rarely addressed the subject outside of my classes. This article was the only one I authored in the field that was published in an academic journal. I did speak on the subject at various non-academic venues, but this article did not generate the invitation.

Regarding the *Journal*, it was clear from the very beginning that *JBE* would be a first-class publication. Each semester I used several articles either as a basis for class discussion or as required background reading. I began teaching business ethics in 1981 and quickly discovered that the *Journal* would be a major source in my teaching of the subject. The quality and scope of its articles pushed the *Journal* to the forefront of the burgeoning field of business ethics. It was the most reliable source to explore the major issues emerging in the discipline. Although my course was a religion course and I used biblical and theological concepts extensively, the more philosophical and utilitarian approach of the *Journal* was a natural companion to what I sought to accomplish in the course.

Congratulations to the *Journal* for 30 years of excellence.

Qin Qin Zheng

The Impact of the Journal of Business Ethics

Being a pioneer in business ethics, the *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* has witnessed the change and development of research in this field. For 30 years, *JBE* has been devoted to improving human welfare by publishing high-quality articles that bring new or unique perspectives in business ethics. Currently, *JBE* is one of the top 45 journals used by the *Financial Times* in business school research rank. The great impact of *JBE* has made it a world-wide leading journal in business ethics.

JBE is recognized as the premier journal with a high reputation because of its great and consistent contribution to the advancement of business ethics. Standing on the frontier of business ethics, *JBE* is dedicated to disseminating advanced knowledge about business ethics and publishing research that keeps pace with the latest development in social sciences. The broad scope of *JBE* provides a platform for diversified insight and advanced vision. The rigorous style of *JBE* sets the benchmark for peer journals. Therefore, *JBE* articles are cited with high frequency in relevant research. Meanwhile, *JBE* encourages scholars to use simple language to explain complex theories. *JBE*'s efforts benefit a wider range of readers without losing its depth and specialty. As a result, *JBE* gains high acknowledgment of business ethics scholars. Distinguished professors in business ethics constantly have articles published in *JBE*. *JBE* also cultivates many emerging stars. Some best papers at Academy Management (AOM) Meetings are published here. Increasing manuscript submissions and journal subscriptions indicate the popularity of *JBE*. Actually *JBE* has become an integral part of business ethics research.

In China, *JBE* establishes the unique and critical position for its profound influence. It is well known that the Chinese remarkable economy development is accompanied with great moral degradation. Such demoralization is exemplified in widespread fake products, massive unsafe goods sold, immodest power abuse, inundated crimes, and rampant corruption. Business ethics are therefore desperately needed and have become a subject of intense discussion. Enjoying high reputation worldwide, *JBE* undoubtedly becomes a flagship journal for business ethics research in China. *JBE* is a bridge that connects western and eastern ethical perspectives through high-level academic discussion. As a top business school in China [Fudan University], we regard *JBE* as an A level journal. Publishing in *JBE* represents the great achievement in the field of business ethics. We also use *JBE* articles in reading references for MBA teaching. The perspectives from *JBE* articles not only are highly cited by Chinese scholars in theoretical development but also enlighten Chinese business elites in actual practice.

The impact of *JBE* is universal, rather than country-specific. The leading position of *JBE* is derived from its long-established international reputation and is further strengthened by the strong support of scholars all over the world. *JBE*'s achievement in the past 30 years is impressive and remarkable. Cherishing the mission of human welfare improvement, *JBE* is paving the way to a sustainable and prosperous future.