

Developing a Legal, Ethical, and Socially Responsible Mindset for Business Leadership

Dr. Frank J. Cavico

Professor of Business Law and Ethics
The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship
Nova Southeastern University
Email: cavico@nova.edu; Phone: 954 262-5096

Dr. Bahaudin G. Mujtaba (Contact Person)

Professor of Management
The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship
Nova Southeastern University
Email: mujtaba@nova.edu; Phone: 954 262-5045

Dr. Guenola Nonet

Scholar-in-Residence and Professor
The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship
Nova Southeastern University
Email: gnet@nova.edu; Phone: 954 670-7810

Dr. Isabel Rimanoczy

Scholar-in-Residence and Professor
The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship
Nova Southeastern University
Email: irimanoczy@nova.edu; Phone: 754 444-0092

Dr. Marissa Samuel

Part-time Professor of Business Law and Ethics
The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship
Nova Southeastern University
Email: marisamu@nova.edu; Phone: 954 262-5162

Submitted on *May 8, 2015* for review and publication consideration to:

Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal (ASSRJ)

Website: <http://scholarpublishing.org/index.php/ASSRJ/index>
Online Submission: <http://scholarpublishing.org/index.php/ASSRJ/about/submissions#onlineSubmissions>
Email: Thomas Harvey (Editorial Asst.) <assrj@scholarpublishing.org>; assrj@scholarpublishing.org

Developing a Legal, Ethical, and Socially Responsible Mindset for Business Leadership

**Frank J. Cavico, Bahaudin G. Mujtaba, Guenola Nonet,
Isabel Rimanoczy, and Marissa Samuel**
Nova Southeastern University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL. 33314-7796. USA.

Abstract

One of the main responsibilities of educators is to prepare the future leaders for our communities and society so they can think of the legal, ethical, social, and environmental consequences of their decisions as managers and professionals. In other words, these future leaders must become great forecasters of the impact of their decisions, strategic choices and actions before they execute them.

In order to instill ethical values in the minds of future business leaders, it is best to regularly and continuously socialize them with ethical and sustainability expectations from the outset. As such, this article proposes that educators should begin inculcating students through a mandatory “ethics” orientation at the beginning of their studies. Therefore, in this paper, the authors present an overview of an actual ethics orientation program for graduate students along with the overall benefits of it. Relevant recommendations and suggestions are provided for administrators, educators, and curriculum coordinators.

Key words: Ethics orientation, social responsibility, sustainability, business leaders, MBA Program, graduate students.

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental responsibility of a graduate school of business is to prepare the students for leadership roles in business as managers, entrepreneurs, and executives (Amman, Kerrets Makau, Fenton, Zackariasson, Tripathi, 2012). A fundamental responsibility of a business leader today is to be cognizant of, and be able to handle, not only the legal, but also the ethical, social, and environmental responsibility ramifications of business decision-making. As such, “we can define the responsible manager as a manager who is not anymore irresponsible... (but) open to his/her surroundings, a sense of citizenship, close to his/her co-workers but able to handle economic measures: in short, s/he has a polymorphous profile, hence a complex one” (Fray and Soparnot, 2010, p. 127). Accordingly, one efficacious method to help prepare business students to fulfill these leadership responsibilities is to require the students to attend a mandatory “ethics” orientation at the beginning of their graduate studies. Although ethics would be the heart of the orientation, legal, social, and environmental responsibility aspects to business leadership would be presented and explicated too. The relationship between law, ethics, as well as social and environmental responsibility to “sustainability,” would also be addressed. The authors would suggest that such the ethics component of the orientation be called, as per the title to this article,

“Developing a Legal, Ethical, and Socially Responsible Mindset for Business Leadership.” Such an “ethics” orientation would examine the values of law, ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability in a modern global business context. The focus, of course, would be on ethics. The presenters would emphasize that these values will not only be discussed in a discrete orientation, but also will arise and be addressed in several of their other courses; that is, legal, ethical, and social responsibility issues should be covered and analyzed in certain other courses too. Most importantly, the presenters should underscore that these values – law, ethics, and social responsibility – are not merely “academic” issues, but “real-world” concerns for the business leader.

Henry Mintzberg explains in his book (2004, p.10), *Managers not MBAs*, that “management is not a science. Management is more art, based on insight, vision and intuition.” The graduate students must be told that their very presence in the business school, and their status as graduate students, are very strong indicators that they will be the future business leaders. And that being a leader means that one has rights, but also responsibilities, including those obligations based on societal expectations as to the proper conduct of business. As such, ‘a responsible manager is not limited to the ‘ecologist’ connotation perceived sometimes when sustainable development is evoked, but includes ethical notions of social responsibility and corporate social and environmental responsibility, sustainable development (in its entirety), long-term performance, social responsible investments, equity, diversity, management in complexity’ (Kedge Business School, 2010, on-line edition).

The orientation outlined and explicated in this article is based on an orientation for new graduate students conducted at the authors’ school – The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship (Huizenga School) of Nova Southeastern University in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, United States of America. Although the orientation was not mandatory, the new students were strongly advised to attend. The orientation was so successful that the Huizenga School had made it mandatory for graduate business students to attend either physically or “virtually” by video-conference. The orientation would be video-taped too for those students who were unable to participate in either format. The orientation originally was called SWIM, which stands for Semi-annual, Workshop, Insights from Faculty, and Mingling with Peers (and to further explain the title: the University’s “nick-name” is the “Sharks”; and thus the presence of the (ever-present, and seemingly omnipresent) “fish” and “water” theme. The readers of this article naturally can create their own titles for the orientation and the ethics component thereof.

The general orientation would commence with a welcome and inspirational message from a high level administrator at the school of business, typically the dean or associate or assistant dean of graduate business studies. At the authors’ school, our dean officiated the orientation as the initial welcoming speaker. The dean or his or her representative would then turn the orientation over to the ethics presenter, who typically would be a faculty member with interest, experience, knowledge, and skills in the fields of ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability, especially applied ethics. The presenter need not be an attorney as the essence of the orientation would be ethics and applied ethics; accordingly, any professor in any discipline with the requisite ethics, social responsibility, and sustainability background could be, and should be, a presenter. After the basic introductions and another brief welcome to the university and school of business, the ethics component to general orientation would commence in a substantive manner with an

overview of presentation, the purposes of presentation, and introduction of case study for ethical analysis and discussion during the orientation.

Pertaining to the case study, the authors would suggest that due to the limitations of time, the case study be a “case study light” (for example, a 3-4 page compendium, summary, and synthesis of newspaper articles on a recent merger, such as Staples and Office Depot or the Kraft and Heinz merger, with a brief explication of the applicable law included for legal analysis, which would be the merger test in the Clayton Anti-trust Act of 1914 for the preceding mergers). The case study, moreover, should be one where several stakeholders are affected directly or indirectly (like the aforementioned mergers). The case study should have Discussion Question too. The Discussion Questions should encapsulate, reinforce, and effectuate analysis of the core values of the presentation. Accordingly, using the example of one of the aforementioned mergers, the Discussion Questions should be: 1) Is the merger legal based on the law? 2) Is the merger moral based on ethics (and, as will be seen, four major ethical theories should be utilized in making the moral determinations)? 3) What should a “socially responsible” merged company be doing for its stakeholders, including the local communities where it does business and society as a whole? 4) How does this merger contribute to the sustainability of the merged companies and their stakeholders and society as a whole? The case study should be one that involves a current, controversial, narrowly focused topic, involving business, of course, as well as one that has legal, ethical, and social responsibility ramifications. Moreover, as emphasized, the case study should be based on a subject matter that has consequences for many stakeholder groups, including the environment and society as a whole. A large merger, like the aforementioned examples, would be excellent for stakeholder analysis. The case study could be given to the students at the beginning of the orientation so they could refer to it during the ethics presentation. The case study could be used as the basis for a group or team work exercise, which would bring in those important areas for business leaders too. Or the case study could be used as part of a “working lunch” for discussion purposes by groups of students sitting at their lunch tables. Furthermore, at each table, after the analysis of the case, the students could select a group leader who would report to the assembled students, faculty, and administration the conclusions made by that particular group of students, thereby engendering some comparative analysis and even more discussion. Of course, it must be pointed out to the students that in their formal classes they will confront more academically traditional case studies, which would be much more factual, complex, involved, and sophisticated; yet the students must be informed that the analytical approach will be the same, that is, reasoning to conclusions from principles, theories, models, and formulas. That is, the students will reason from legal principles to legal conclusions, from ethical principles to moral conclusions, and from definitions of social responsibility and sustainability to those conclusions. The case study work will thus enhance the students’ critical thinking and problem-solving capabilities.

The authors, moreover, would suggest that the ethics component of the orientation would be for a morning session, right after the welcome by the dean, next followed by a faculty panel, and then followed by lunch; and then the rest of the day would be concerned with the more “nuts and bolts” aspects of being a graduate business student, such as citation styles, library resources and how to find and use them, technology resources, and registration and financial aid issues. The faculty panel, composed of three or four faculty members and a moderator, would consist of at least an hour long session, called “Expectations for Graduate Business Students,” wherein the

faculty panel members could set forth their own and the overall faculty's expectations of the students as graduate students at the school. One topic that particularly should be raised is how graduate school work differs from undergraduate work. This "expectations" element should be conducted in the morning session right after the ethics component to the orientation; and the ethics presenter, though not necessarily sitting in with the panel, should sit close by and be prepared to provide his or her thoughts and advice to the students. In this "expectations" component, the students would learn the faculty expectations of the students as graduate students compared to undergraduates. For example, time-management issues and the nature (and at times challenges) of group work should be discussed and illustrated by the faculty. Most importantly, the faculty members on the panel must emphasize that the faculty, as well as administration and staff, want the students to succeed at the school and then in their business careers; and as such the faculty members at the school are all there to help the students. So, the faculty panel must encourage the students to seek out the faculty, talk to the faculty, ask questions of the faculty; in essence, to "dig deep" and fully utilize the resources the university and school of business have to offer. Such a faculty panel will naturally be a big help to the students, but also will help the school improve its retention of the students in the program and thus maintain its enrollment.

The goal of the entire orientation, therefore, should continue to be to prepare the students for the "real-world" and to try to ensure the students' success as graduate business students and then as future business leaders. The orientation also will afford the students the opportunity to get to know better some of the faculty and administrators as well as other students for future "study buddy," teamwork, and networking purposes. The goal, therefore, is to have an interesting, challenging, valuable, useful, and fun day!

ETHICS AT THE UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Most likely, the first experience of the graduate student at the university and school will be the orientation. Accordingly, the orientation should commence by highlighting the university's Vision, Mission, and Values, so as to "set the stage" for the orientation and the student's academic career at the university (Cavico, Mujtaba, and McFarlane, 2010). For example, at the authors' university, the key values are: Academic Excellence, Student-Centered, Integrity, Innovation, Opportunity, Scholarship and Research, and Community and Diversity (Nova Southeastern University, Vision, Mission, and Core Values, 2015). For the purposes of the orientation, since it is an ethics focused one, the Values of Integrity, Community, and Diversity should be underscored (Nonet, 2013). Similarly, the Vision, Mission, Philosophy, and Principles of the school of business should be mentioned. For the authors' school, the Huizenga School, the emphasis is placed on ethics and integrity, diversity and respect, leadership, and learning "real-world" practical knowledge and skills in order to create value for oneself, family, business, organization, community, and society as a whole (Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Vision, Mission, and Principles, 2015). These values are obviously important, interrelated, and mutually reinforcing; and thus they should be referred to during the course of the orientation. Finally since the focal point to the orientation is ethics, mention should be made of the school's Academic Honesty Policy or Ethics Code and a brief review of the policy should be conducted. However, the discussion of the ethics code should be done in a positive manner by saying that the goal is to create a culture of honesty and integrity at the school (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2009). Yet it also must be pointed out that the school's ethics code is not mere "window-dressing" (Ryan, *et al.*, 2011), but a true policy, "policed" and enforced, and one with

sanctions for violations, which policy is taken very seriously by the school. The students also should be told that their professors will review the policy with them in more detail during their first class; and, most importantly, it must be stressed to the students that if they have any doubts as to what is required regarding proper school work, the need and nature of attribution, the extent of permissible collaboration, or any matter arguably coming under the code's precepts and purview, the students always should check with their professors. Of course, it should be emphasized to the students that they must be sure that they "give credit where credit is due"; yet since they are graduate students, they also should be counseled not to over-rely on references, citations, and footnotes. Undergraduate students merely report; whereas graduate students also analyze, comment, criticize, agree or disagree (without being disagreeable) and reason logically from principles to conclusions.

The orientation thus will accentuate, illustrate, and inculcate certain fundamental elements of the core values of the university and school, particularly ethics. Yet another very practical value for the university and school stemming from such an orientation pertains to accreditation (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2009-1). Today, the accrediting bodies, such as the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and regional accreditors, such as the Southern Association of Colleges (SACS), explicitly and specifically require that certain key standards – legal, regulatory, moral/ethical, social responsibility, and sustainability – be covered (and demonstrably so) in the graduate student's education (Cavico, Mujtaba, and McFarlane, 2010). The orientation contemplated herein certainly would help to demonstrate to the accrediting bodies that these standards are being met. Ideally, in certain other traditional core courses, the professors will build on the ethics presented in the orientation; and as such would incorporate a discrete applied ethics component to their courses, thereby "weaving" ethics (as well as social and environmental responsibility and sustainability) throughout the curriculum. That is, the ethics will not merely be solely for the orientation but will be applied in other courses too, typically in the form of case study analysis of recent controversies involving business. Consequently, experts like Peter Senge of MIT argue that "a shift of mind-a-metanoia is needed that moves management thinking away from the flawed or at least too narrowly construed models currently taught in most business school almost as gospel-towards more holistic, integrated ways of viewing the world-so that those who will lead the world will create a world worth living in" (Waddock, 2007, p. 543). Such a holistic and "weaving" approach would continue the ethical theme introduced in the orientation, which will further benefit the students, of course, but also will materially help the school demonstrate to the accrediting bodies that their accreditation standards are being fully complied with in a theoretical as well as practical manner; and that also ethics is not mere "window dressing" or only a topic for the ethics presentation to be soon forgotten or ignored; rather, ethics is truly one major theme to the school.

Sustainability

Another important value for graduate business students and future leaders and entrepreneurs to be cognizant of is "sustainability," a concept tied to the values of law, ethics, and social and environmental responsibility (Mujtaba, 2014). The most frequently cited definition of sustainable development was published by the United Nations (Our Common Future, Chapter 2, *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, 1987, p. 24): "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" Sustainability, therefore, is a broad and all-

encompassing concept since it can be interpreted as a MEANS (typically in the form of beneficial environmental actions, such as “green” buildings and offices, reducing green-house gasses, and otherwise reducing the firm’s “environmental footprint”) and also as an END (that is, having a sustainable organization, society, as well as a sustainable planet for future generations) (Cavico, 2014).

In fact, sustainability is so important to the authors’ school and university and to the students’ education that the Huizenga School dean hired two global expert “Scholars in Residence” on Sustainability: Drs. Isabel Rimanoczy and Guenola Nonet, who are co-authors on this article. Their goal is to help embed sustainability in the whole university experience, for example: connecting current sustainability champions and initiatives within the school of business and across campus; engaging students (i.e. supporting the creation of a Student Sustainability Group); partnering with the local community (i.e., with Broward County, Florida) on sustainability initiatives as well as the business community (i.e., Chambers of Commerce); faculty development and support as well as collaborative research. To illustrate the links of sustainability and current businesses’ strategies, several programs and courses on sustainability were developed, such as a “Sustainability Lunch Series,” where one of the presentations is the eminently practical “*Position Yourself for a Job in the Green Economy*” (which surely would command the attention of the job-seeking graduate business student). Sustainability, therefore, needs to be incorporated into the orientation. In the case of the Huizenga School, Dr. Nonet conducted a “Sustainability Scavenger Hunt” with the students after the morning presentations and after the lunch. The exercise also involved library resources and thus afforded the students to get familiar with the library and its resources and personnel. The goal was to incorporate sustainability as part of the ethics presentation and as an additional element of the overall presentation to reinforce sustainability, its relationship to law, ethics, and social and environmental responsibility, and for the students to have some fun “scavenging” academically in groups (as well as encouraging more “mingling” and networking).

Leadership

Leadership is an important theme at Nova Southeastern University and the Huizenga School of Business as it should be, of course, at any university, college, or school. At the graduate level, the students’ previous academic success and their present graduate level status indicate that there is a strong likelihood that they will assume leadership roles in business (as well as the public sector and professions (though the ethics presentation discussed herein, and thus this article, focuses on business context).

In order to explicate the business leader’s mindset, it is first necessary to briefly discuss who exactly a leader and what leadership is. Leadership is “the process of influencing an individual or a group of individuals while providing an environment where personal, professional, or organizational objectives can successfully be achieved” (Mujtaba, 2014, p. 92). Leadership in the modern workplace is the process by which one person exerts influence over one or more individuals in order to motivate and direct their behaviors toward the achievement of pre-determined goals and objectives. The individual or person who exerts any form of influence that guides behavior toward a predetermined objective is considered to be a “leader” (Mujtaba, 2014). Of course, some of these leaders go “above and beyond” the exertion of influence and guidance of behavior; these few individuals are also able to achieve the final outcome by

working with, and through, others in an efficient manner. As such, these few leaders are also good managers as they do the “right” things in the “right” manner.

Leadership and sustainability are interdependent concepts for long-term success and both can happen simultaneously as they are not mutually exclusive. Leaders who do not remain leaders for the long-term can be seen as merely “transactional leaders” who would just use punishment and rewards to get what they want. However, such short-term leadership is not sustainable over time since once the penalty and rewards are gone, the expected behavior will also disappear. Furthermore, people perform as the leader expects, not because they believe in the destination, objective, or outcome, but rather they comply to obtain the reward or to avoid a penalty. Consequently, people are likely to be compliant with such transactional leaders, but they will not necessarily have any commitment to the cause or goals, especially longer-term goals such as sustainability.

Transformational or sustainable leadership is thus about effectiveness or doing the “right thing”; whereas management is about efficiency or doing the right thing the right way and with the least amount of resources and in a speedy manner too. As such, these sustainable or transformational leaders would also think like managers to make sure the process of how things get done is efficient in order to be successful but also to reduce the organization’s “footprint on earth.” Accordingly, effective leaders provide a long-term vision and guide others to the right direction for the right reasons, and not necessarily to earn any rewards and benefits. These sustainable and transformational leaders focus on people in the broad sense as well as task-oriented behaviors. First, *people-oriented* behaviors include showing mutual concern as well as trust and respect for subordinates as well as other stakeholders. Second, *task-oriented* behaviors include defining and structuring work roles to ensure that everyone follows the stated rules in order to reach his or her performance capacity and meet the established standards. The sustainable and transformational leaders must adapt their behaviors to fit a broad range of individuals, stakeholders, and variables impacting their situations (Mujtaba, 2014). Effective leadership, therefore, is having the right mindset and then adapting one’s behavior to the performance needs of the person or persons as well as other stakeholders of the organization (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 2001).

Effective leaders, moreover, diagnose, adapt, and communicate based on the readiness of their followers in the workforce and other situational variables (Hersey and Campbell, 2004). Dr. Hersey defined a person’s *readiness* level as one’s ability and willingness to perform the task at hand and this definition considers two types of readiness: job and psychological (Mujtaba, 2014). Knowing a person’s (follower’s) readiness level and effectively adapting one’s leadership behaviors to match the readiness level are important elements in making sure the job gets done successfully. Leaders can and do change their styles depending on with whom they are working. The situational leadership concept is based on the interactive interplay among direction (task behavior) provided by the leader, the socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) provided by the leader and the readiness of the follower to do the specific task that needs performing. These sustainable or transformational leaders must learn the art of influencing others toward the right future vision. *Influencing* is defined as “the art of moving people to action toward a predetermined course or vision that is of value to everyone involved” (Mujtaba, 2014, p. 81). Influencing requires the development of a long-term relationship or trust with the other party. Therefore, sustainable or transformational leadership requires *influencing* and persuading others

over whom one has no position power or any direct authority (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 2001).

In today's management climate, organizations are flatter, technology-driven, and made up of more self-directed teams (Mujtaba, 2014). In order to be effective and successful, there is the need to learn techniques that will permit goal achievement with the assistance of others through skillfully applied methods of influence. Effective influencing is about developing and maintaining positive relationships or rapport with one's colleagues and employees. Influencing is the ability to achieve goals through the willing and committed work of others. However, in order to be an effective sustainable or transformational leader, one does not need any position power *per se*. For example, we know that managers often influence their employees to be great performers and model associates. Employees, on the other hand, influence one another, as well as their superiors and customers through their professionalism and rational explanations. Simply stated, influence is the ability to move others to action. Influencing allows individuals to get certain results from others without destroying their relationships. Effective influencing skills allow people to get work done faster, as well as reduce conflict and stress, while demonstrating that one is a team-player and a flexible professional. All of these objectives lead to a more effective and sustainable performance by the organization.

The sustainable and transformational leader empowers others to take ethical and responsible actions when he or she feels it is necessary (Mujtaba, 2015). Through empowerment and collaboration the leader is able to tap into the employee's motivation. Effective sustainable and transformational leaders do not rely so much on position power as they depend on personal force which comes through their relationships; and as such they align the individual's goals with those of the organization. Effective, sustainable, transformational leaders and managers become influential through training; as a result, their leadership effectiveness is raised to new levels through the appropriate use of their skills. The business leader is expected to make sound business, personnel, and financial decisions. Those functions are elemental. The business leader also must be a sustainable and transformational one. As such, the business leader must think beyond the narrow confines of the short-term interest of the shareholder stakeholder group. "What on earth is happening to management? Formerly self-evident truths are being cast aside. The sacred goal of maximizing shareholder value is now the 'dumbest idea in the world.' The search for the holy grail of 'sustainable competitive advantage' is now recognized as futile. The 'essence of strategy' seen as 'coping with competitors' is obsolete. The uni-directional value chain-the very core of 20th Century management thinking-is now a problem, not a solutionA veritable revolution in management is under way" (*Forbes*, May 30, 2013: On-line Edition). The business leader, therefore, must be proactive; that is, he or she must be a "shaper" not a mere "reactor"; and as such anticipate problems and challenges; and then show the way to solve them; and finally solve or overcome them in an efficient, effective, and efficacious manner. Such a business leader will be truly transformational and sustainable.

Accordingly, the transformational and sustainable business leader today must have "broad shoulders," as there are many challenges for business leaders, including the expectations that society has as to the proper conduct of business. The societal expectation, simply stated, is that business will act not only legally, but also morally, and next that business will be a socially and environmentally responsible one too; and finally that business be sustainable and that the

business contribute to the overall sustainability of society and the planet. As a result, the business leader must be concerned with not only the economic and legal performance of the company, but also its moral and socially and environmentally responsible performance, and ultimately its sustainability and societal sustainability. A fundamental goal of the ethics component to the orientation, therefore, must be to make the business student keenly aware of societal expectations for business and business leaders and the concomitant responsibility of business leaders to ensure that business acts legally, morally based on ethics, socially and environmentally responsible, and contributes to overall societal sustainability. The “mindset” for the business leader, therefore, is essentially a “three value drill,” that is, asking and answering: Is it legal, is it moral, and what would a socially responsible company or organization do? The first value to address is the law.

Legality

Legality is based on the law, of course. Today, obviously, there are many laws that regulate business which the business leader must be aware. To illustrate, in the United States there exists constitutions, statutes, administrative rules and regulations, case law, and executive orders. Moreover, the U.S., like many other countries has a federal system of government, so there are national laws (called “federal law” in the U.S.) and state and local law. Furthermore, in the United States, certain statutory laws, for example Civil Rights laws and Anti-trust laws have extraterritorial effect, that is, they can apply to the U.S. employees of U.S. companies doing business overseas. There are also the “domestic” laws in the host countries where one does business; and there are international laws, treaties, and conventions (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2014). So, clearly, there is a lot of law!

Nevertheless, despite the prevalence of the law, the business leader must be aware of “moral gaps” in the law; that is, the countries, localities, and jurisdictions where there is no law, weak law, or unenforced law (perhaps due to bribery) (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2014). One example of a potential moral gap in the law can be seen in the legal doctrine of adverse possession. Pursuant to this doctrine, someone who illegally trespasses on another’s property can obtain legal record title to the property, as long as the occupation is open, notorious, visible, continuous and of adverse manner, and occurs for a specified period of time (the specific period of time depends on the jurisdiction). Rooted in English law, adverse possession has historically been justified on a number of grounds. In England, it began as a method to protect land purchasers from ancient claims on the land. During the nineteenth century, U.S. courts utilized adverse possession to encourage development of the American wilderness. And as the United States industrialized, adverse possession was thought to encourage the efficient use of land for the production for factories, infrastructure, and urban areas. In essence, adverse possession was held out as a mechanism to promote efficiency and productivity (Cherek, 2012; Lester, 2003; Sprankling, 1994; Colo. Rev. Stat. 38-41-101). To be sure, the encouragement of productivity is still the cornerstone of much of the rationale for adverse possession. It is contended that society as a whole benefits when a party makes productive use of the land. As such, if a land owner allows his or her property to remain undeveloped, society loses out on the potential benefits. Thus, adverse possession benefits the public as a whole because it moves title from the idle owner to the active operator (Cherek, 2012; Lester, 2003).

Even so, furthering the productive use of land may not be as important a goal as it used to be. In fact, many believe that contemporary society struggles with issues that arise from the very

opposite underlying issue – the over-development of land and resources – and the concomitant adverse impact on sustainability. Likewise, many of the justifications concerning ambiguous property records (or dealing with long past land claims) no longer apply, as we have developed robust legal schemes replete with Statutes of Limitations (requiring lawsuits to be filed within certain periods) and systems for recording title (Cherek, 2012; Sprankling, 1994). Moreover, even if these justifications continue to apply today, a related question remains – is the harm that results ethically justified? For not only are we taking property from an owner (who by most accounts, would be considered quite innocent), and not only are we failing to provide such owner any compensation (in contrast to eminent domain, where the government at least compensates for its “taking”), but in many cases, the trespass is not a mistake; in quite a number of jurisdictions, even a trespasser who purposefully occupies someone else’s property can be granted ownership rights through adverse possession (Baude, 2013). Thus, we are, in effect, taking property from an innocent party to give to a guilty party. Accordingly, even if this doctrine is deemed to have an economic justification, the ethical justification is questionable.

Another point of law in which we may find a gap between what is legal and what is moral is the doctrine concerning Mistake of Law, which typically holds that ignorance of the law is no excuse. This legal principle, it is believed, incentivizes people to learn the law, and thus promotes law abiding behavior (Kahan, 1997; Travers, 1995). While the doctrine concerning mistake of law is probably moral in cases of obviously unethical behavior, such as murder, rape or battery, one may question the morality in more benign cases, such as a mistake as to the legally permissible business uses under a zoning ordinance, or those cases where the law is unclear, such as whether the hiring of the son or daughter of a foreign government official with the expectation of getting a contract with the foreign government is an illegal “bribe” pursuant to the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Another example is New York case where a federal prison guard was arrested for carrying a handgun without the appropriate license. The guard believed that he did not need a license because of a statute that exempted peace officers from this requirement. Peace officers were defined to include correction officers of state correctional facilities or penal correctional institutions. The guard mistakenly believed that “penal correctional institution” included the federal prison where he worked. Indeed, that is what he had been taught at a local criminal justice course, and that was the understanding shared by the local gun dealers who sold guns to the guards. Even the judges disagreed over the appropriate interpretation of the statute. Nevertheless, at trial, the guard was denied the defense of mistake of law, and was not allowed to provide any evidence of the reasonable basis for his mistake (*People*, 1987; Kahan, 1997). In the early days, prohibiting the defense of mistake of law was justified under the presumption that the law was definite and knowable. Whether it was ever truly definite and knowable is debatable; and in the current legal system, this presumption is almost certainly untrue. (Travers, 1995) Thus, in the case of the prison guard, as in the case of adverse possession, we encounter a scenario where one might argue that morality and justice for the individual are being sacrificed in favor of other societal interests.

Furthermore, there are “vague” lines the law draws, for example, the “line” between a “good will gift” to a foreign government official and an illegal bribe pursuant to the aforementioned Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Another example of a vague line is the distinction the law makes between insider trading which clearly is illegal, and trading on inside information which *may* be legal. Another example would be having a monopoly, which is legal if lawfully obtained, and

monopolization of trade or commerce, which is a legal wrong (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2014). The law also affords options for acting, for example, closing facilities, moving overseas or to another state and doing the concomitant “down-sizing” (such as in the case of a big merger). Yet it is not a principal purpose of the ethics presentation, let alone the overall orientation, to conduct a government regulation of business course. Nevertheless, in the ethics presentation, the law must be defined and juxtaposed with, and differentiated from, morality and ethics as well as social responsibility. However, most importantly, the graduate business students must be made cognizant of the fact that there are many moral gaps in the law, meaning that an action might be legal but nonetheless immoral based on ethics. Attorneys, of course, will be ready, willing, and able to advise business people (for their concomitant fees, naturally) on the legality of their actions. Yet, who will advise the business leader as to the morality of his or her firm’s actions?

Ethics and Morality

Moral questions perforce bring one into the realm of ethics. There is, and this point must be underscored in the ethics presentation to the orientation that there is a societal expectation today that business will act not “merely” legally but also morally. The authors have used the term “value” when referring to morality and ethics (as well as legality and social responsibility). So now it is time to define that key term. “Value” from a philosophical standpoint simply means something possesses worth. However, to complicate things philosophically as well as practically, values can be deemed “intrinsic” (sometimes called “terminal”) and “instrumental” (sometimes called “extrinsic”). A value is intrinsic if it is good and possesses worth in and of itself, like happiness or aesthetics (the appreciation of beauty). No further explanation or justification need be given for such an intrinsic value. Whereas a value is deemed instrumental if possesses worth not in and of itself but because it is a tool, instrument, or means to produce something else of value (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). An example would be being nice and polite to people, even though one is a miserable and angry person. Why is one “forcing” oneself to be nice? Because being nice will lead to the making of friends, colleagues, allies, and teammates, and contented employees – all of which will benefit the “nice” (instrumentally so) person in the long-run. However, the best example of an instrumental value is money. What can you do with money in and of itself? “It’s good for nothing,” as the lyrics to the old song goes. But money is the means to buy lots of other “neat stuff,” which then can bring happiness. So, who says that money can’t buy happiness! Accordingly, since the audience for the orientation will be business students and not philosophy students, the authors would recommend that the presenters, after making the distinction between values, concentrate on the instrumental value for the students and eventually their companies by being regarded, and legitimately so, as legal, moral, and socially responsible individuals and businesses.

The authors to this point have been using the terms morals and morality and ethics as being basically the same. However, from a philosophic standpoint they are distinct. Morality is based on ethics which is a branch of philosophy, like metaphysics (the study of ultimate reality) and logic. Morals and morality are technically the conclusion as to what is right or wrong or good or bad or moral or immoral. And how does one arrive at these moral conclusions? One reaches morality by reasoning from ethics. As such, ethics are the intellectual framework, the theories, and the principles that one uses to reason to moral decisions, morality, morals. In the ethics presentation the business students as graduate students must be told and trained to make that critical distinction between morality and ethics; and thereby the presenter will underscore that

ethics at this level is not a didactic or “preachy” sermonizing but rather an exercise in reasoning from theories and principles (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). So, the next ethics question emerges: What ethical theories and principles?

The authors would recommend that the graduate business students in the orientation be made awareness of four the main ethical theories in Western Civilization; and then be shown how to apply them to determine if business, even if acting legally, is acting morally. Now, of course, Western Civilization is not the only one, but it is the one that the authors and the vast majority of students at their school are familiar. Moreover, the four ethical theories chosen for presentation to the students are secular-based one. As such, there is no religious component to the ethics presentation. The reasons are several: first, not everyone “has religion,” and certainly not everyone has the same religion. However, everyone (presumably) has reason and thus can reason from secular ethical theories and principles to morality. Moreover, the presenters typically will have been exposed to and familiar with secular ethics. Finally, even if knowledgeable religious-based ethics presenters could be found, where would the time be to turn the ethics presentation into a comparative religion one? Once again, the graduate business students at the orientation must be told exactly what they are getting, and not getting. They are getting secular-based Western ethics from which they will reason to morality. The ethics presentation, therefore, will not be a didactic one; the preaching and sermonizing will be saved for other spheres of the students and perhaps the presenters’ lives.

Specifically, the four secular-based Western ethical theories that will be presented to the students are: Ethical Egoism, Ethical Relativism, Utilitarianism, and Kantian ethics (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013; Mujtaba, 2010). Ethical Egoism should be a very acceptable and accommodating ethical theory for the business student. Pursuant to that theory, it is moral to advance one’s self-interest, to prosper, and to make money. Yet the students also must be told that the “enlightened” ethical egoists, such as Adam Smith (of Invisible Hand fame), would counsel to take a long-term perspective as to maximizing self-interest; and thus one should be willing to undergo some short-term expense and effort in order to advance oneself in the long-term. Also, even if one has a big ego and a lot of power, the ethical egoists would advise that it is best to treat people well; but not necessarily because one loves them, or for that matter even likes them, but it will usually inure to one’s own benefit to treat people well and make them colleagues, allies, and part of the “team.” Recall the instrumental value of being nice!

The second ethical theory is Ethical Relativism (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). “When in Rome, do as the Romans,” as the old saying goes. Pursuant to this ethical theory, an action is moral if a society believes it to be moral. Consequently, societal norms become the standard for morality. All one has to do is to ascertain the moral norms of a particular society and adopt them and conform; and consequently one will be acting morally. Of course, one will need a definition of “society” but the authors will save that question for another day and ideally for the sociologists. Also, just because a practice is deemed to be moral in a society, the business person must be aware that there may be a superseding law that makes it illegal (for example, a societal-sanctioned moral “good will gift” to a foreign government official but one the U.S government deems to be an illegal bribe under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act).

The third ethical theory is Utilitarianism, which is a relatively modern ethical theory created by the English philosophers and social reformers, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). The core principle to this ethical theory is: “An action is moral if it produces the greatest amount of good for the greatest number of people.” Accordingly, this ethical theory is a consequentialist ethical theory; one must predict consequences; one must ascertain whether the consequences are good or bad, cause pleasure or pain, happiness or dissatisfaction; and then one must measure and weigh the consequences. If there are predominant good consequences, the action is a moral action; and if there are predominant negative consequences the action is immoral (Mujtaba, 2010). But it must be emphasized that even if an action is moral there still may be some pain, which means that the “ends can justify means”; yet everyone got “counted,” everyone’s pleasure and pain was registered based on this egalitarian ethical theory. Of course, the Utilitarians would say to try to find actions that minimize any pain, and hopefully eliminate all of it in a “win-win” type of scenario. As a practical bit of advice, the authors would suggest that when predicting consequences the business students make those determinations within discrete stakeholder groups as that approach would “channel,” and thus make more manageable, the predictive aspect of this ethical theory; and, moreover, the students should presumably be familiar with typical business stakeholders and stakeholder analysis. For example, in the aforementioned merger examples, the consequences of the merger could be examined in the context of the following key stakeholder groups: shareholders, employees, unions, consumers/customers, suppliers and distributors, competition (as everyone gets “counted”), local communities, government, and society as a whole, including the environment and future generations.

Finally, the fourth ethical theory is Kantian ethics, which is also a relatively modern ethical theory (Cavico and Mujtaba, 2013). Kant definitely had problems with Utilitarianism. Kant condemned that ethical theory as being immoral because it could morally justify pain, suffering, and exploitation so long as a greater good was produced. That is the problem of the “ends justifying the means.” So, Kant declared that one should disregard consequences in making moral determinations. Thus, a major problem emerges in Western ethics due to the conflict between the two modern ethical theories. The Utilitarians base morality on consequences and Kant says to disregard consequences. So, how does Kant determine morality? Morality is based on a formal test that Kant called Categorical Imperative. “Categorical” because, according to Kant, this is the supreme, absolute, and only test for morality; and “Imperative” because at times one must compel oneself to be moral, that is, to do what one’s reason tells one is the “right” thing to do, even though there may be some negative consequences to one personally (for example, “blowing the whistle” on one’s polluting company). Within the Categorical Imperative there are certain tests for morality that one must apply to the action itself: the first is the Kingdom of Ends test. This core Kantian principle holds that an action is immoral, regardless of consequences, if it is disrespectful and demeaning to anyone or if it treats anyone like an instrument or thing or mere means (even to achieve a greater good). Since a person knows that he or she is a human being and thus a worthwhile person deserving of dignity and respect, one logically should reason that other people feel the same too. In essence, for Kant, the core principle is for all people to treat all others with dignity and respect; and thus all will live in this Kingdom of Ends wherein all are treated as worthwhile ends and not as mere means. Another major part to the Categorical Imperative is the Agent-Receiver test. This principle is actually is the Golden Rule of Bible made secular by Kant. Pursuant to this ethical principle, Kant would

say for one to consider the contemplated action; but then contemplate that one did not know if one would be the agent, that is, the giver of the action, or the receiver of the action; and then ask (and be honest about answering) if one would one be willing to have that action done (perhaps to oneself). So, using the Categorical Imperative and the example of the merger, if the merger produces greater good overall it would be moral under Utilitarianism, but if any stakeholder group is disrespected or demeaned by the merger, it is immoral. And, one more example, what does one do about the legal, exploitative “sweatshop” in Asia making those nice and reasonably priced garments? The “sweatshop” certainly produces a lot of good which may be “good” enough for Utilitarianism, but what would Kant say? That, in a “nutshell,” is Kantian ethics, and the corresponding moral conflict in Western ethics between the two “modern” ethical theories..

Despite the ethical challenges in determining morality, in order to determine right from wrong, at least at the graduate level, one needs ethics, and philosophic ethics of the sort that is delineated herein. In the ethics presentation to the orientation, therefore, the graduate business students must be taught a little philosophy (and “a little goes a long ways”) in the form of ethics (which ethics, of course, can be supplemented by readings and videos). The ethical challenge for the business leader today, it should be emphasized to the students, is to seek to engage in actions that advance the self-interest of the firm (Ethical Egoism), that are culturally competent (Ethical Relativism), and that achieve the greater good (Utilitarianism), especially by striving for “win-win” scenarios for all stakeholders, *but* actions that do *not* demean or disrespect any stakeholders (Kantian Ethics). Again, meeting this challenge typically will take foresight, time, effort, and money. So, why bother, particularly if one is already acting legally? That is, why be moral? The rationale for acting morally, which again must be inculcated in the students in the ethics presentation, is the first ethical theory - Ethical Egoism. That is, it will inure to one’s own long-term advancement and self-interest as well as that of one’s company or organization to be regarded, and rightfully so, as not only a legal, but also a moral firm. And the role of a leader includes educating others as to their own long-term self-interest; that is, the business leader must show the way (perhaps to top management, the board of directors, and the shareholders) that acting morally will benefit the business in the long-run. However, the business leader must have those aforementioned “broad shoulders,” as there is yet more responsibility, even above and beyond morality and ethics, to be thrust on the graduate business student and future business leader.

Social Responsibility

Another challenge for business leaders today that must be presented to the students during the ethics component to the orientation is that business is expected to act not only legally and morally but also in a socially and environmentally responsible manner (Nonet, 2013). The societal expectation of this responsibility is thus above and beyond the law as well as morality/ethics. Business, therefore, is expected to be a “good corporate citizen” (even though there may be no legal obligation to do so) (Cavico, 2014). One immediate problem with “social responsibility” is the definition of the term. There are a variety of definitions (Garriga and Mele, 2004; Windsor, 2006), to wit: the term can refer to business being involved in charitable organizations and philanthropic activities as well as civic and community activities; to the way the corporation treats their employees and suppliers; the impact of the business on the local or global environment; the benefit or potential harm of the corporation’s products and services, the responsibility towards the sourcing of the materials, to name a few. Social and environmental responsibility is related to sustainability as a goal; that is, if we restore or preserve our natural

resources and communities, we will also increase our chances of sustaining as a business. The old concept of seeing the purpose of business as only short-term profit is being increasingly replaced by a broader accounting framework, developed by John Elkington (1994), which includes three dimensions of measurement: People, Planet, Profits,” also called the “Triple Bottom Line” (Economic Prosperity, Environmental Stewardship, and Social Responsibility).

Business schools have a responsibility to develop leaders with a sustainability mindset, who think and act in social and environmentally responsible ways (Mujtaba, 2015; Nonet *et al.*, 2015). The authors suggest three main responsibility challenges for the business leader. The first one starts with the following question: How much social responsibility should one engage in? The authors would counsel that social responsibility be in the “right” contextual level, that is, considering the size, stature, and finances on the firm. One does not want to do too much so as to risk the financial sustainability of the firm; yet one does not want to do too little because in this Age of Transparency doing too little may cause harm to the corporation’s reputation as well as a loss of market share. Some interesting examples of successful responsible businesses are Whole Foods, Starbucks, and Patagonia as demonstrated by the views of their happy and satisfied employees (Pelletier & Mujtaba, 2015).

The second challenge for the business leader corresponds to the following question: What type of social/environmental responsibility is recommended? The authors point to three levels of initiatives:

- Initiatives that generate savings while representing a reduction of the ecological “footprint” or improving the social/community impact. Examples are: energy assessment and identifying energy savings opportunities, reducing waste, and reusing and recycling.
- Initiatives that create new value for customers and environment/community. An example is: Starbucks sourcing coffee from fair-trade organic growers. The products are healthier for customers, the lands benefit from healthier soils, and labor is fairly rewarded, thereby alleviating poverty. Another example is Royal Caribbean which is building health clinics and schools and engaging in beach and soil preservation in Haiti (where it has a major port facility).
- Initiatives that embed the principles of social responsibility and sustainability into the corporate strategy, therefore influencing competitors and new regulations that raise the standards for all. An example is Wal-Mart creating the Sustainability Index, which helps the retailer and its suppliers to do the following: to improve the sustainability of the products the customers love; to integrate sustainability into the business of buying and selling merchandise; reduce cost, improve product quality and create a more resilient supply chain, and to strengthen customers’ trust in retailers and the brands they carry.

The authors thus would recommend actions and activities that are tied to the image, brand, products, and services of the business (which, in essence, is a marketing approach to social responsibility, and thus one that surely will appeal to graduate business students). Some actual examples might be: Home Depot contributing to Habitat for Humanity, where the tie-in is obvious; Publix Super Markets in Lakeland of Florida, as they work with local farmers in growing organic products; Royal Caribbean building schools and health clinics in Haiti, where it has a major port facility; and Starbucks doing the same in Guatemala, where it buys a great deal of its coffee. To further illustrate, Whole Foods Market, similar to their Floridian retail

competitor, Publix Super Markets, has a Green Mission encompassing the following efforts: “green” building standards, a “Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle” program, a pollution awareness campaign, using reusable bags and not plastic bags, rewarding customers who bring their own bags to shop, a charitable donation program of both sales income and food to local charities and environmental groups, sponsoring summer camps, and a program where it makes loans and provides training to local farmers and suppliers (Cheretis and Mujtaba, 2014). The objective is for people, the community, and the planet to “flourish” (Salcedo, 2015). The global professional services firm Ernst & Young, engages in social responsibility and sustainability efforts in the areas of energy conservation and environmental protection, as well as “green” training programs for employees, companies, and home owners, not “merely” to “Build a Better Working World” (which is the title of the firm’s Sustainability Report), but also because their employees, job applicants, recruits, clients, and customers “care” (John, 2015). The Hilton Ft. Lauderdale Beach Resort has spearheaded the hotel’s chain use of wind energy by means of several (very artistic) roof wind turbines to power in part the hotel. The project cost almost \$1 million dollars; and the hotel does not expect to get its “return-on-investment” for several years (Vago, 2015). Nevertheless, the hotel has acquired a deserved reputation in the community and with tourists from around the world as a socially responsible and sustainable business and thus has obtained some very favorable publicity for its “green efforts.” Moreover, in the long-term, the hotel also expects to save money by its “green” efforts (and the authors submit that it is the business leader’s responsibility to point out these long-term positive consequences for “going green”). These are all obviously beneficial actions to society and ones that demonstrate that a company is a “socially responsible” and “sustainable” one; and the actions will benefit these companies too; and a company should not be shy, the authors believe, in getting some “good PR” to show off their social responsibility and sustainability *bona fides*. And it is not merely the community that will be impressed by a company’s “green” efforts. The fact that a company monitors risks, measures its energy and water use, and does not waste energy and water, but rather conserves both, indicates not just to the public but also to business and financial analysts that a company is an efficient and effective one (John, 2015).

The aforementioned examples are all beneficial actions to society and the environment; and they demonstrate that a company is, or is committed to become, socially and environmentally responsible, while the actions also benefit the brand and profitability of the firm. Corporations are learning to communicate corporate social responsibility and sustainability initiatives to attract clients, employees, and investors, and accordingly to include such efforts in their Annual Reports.

The third challenge is who should be in charge of social responsibility. The authors would recommend a high-level, visible, and empowered (“politically” and financially) position, such as a Vice President of Social Responsibility and/or Sustainability or a Director or Team Leader. Wal-Mart has the position designated as the “Vice-President of Global Corporate Social Responsibility.” Yet some companies (in order to ensure good publicity and/or good community relations have the Director of Marketing or Community Relations in charge of social responsibility and/or sustainability efforts. So long as the position is a “real” one and not mere “window dressing,” that is, there is true “substance,” then the “form” of the exact title should not be controlling.

Particularly when addressing the millennials, business schools have an opportunity to tap into their sense of responsibility and forward-looking perspectives. The graduate business students, therefore, can, and should, be early on introduced to the challenges and opportunities of business today, thereby preparing them for a competitive environment where social responsibility and sustainability are the result of smart and strategic decisions with a “360 degree” perspective of all the firm’s stakeholders. The interest of the students can be awakened, and their acceptance gained, by using the rationale of Ethical Egoism; that is, underscoring the benefits for the individual, the organization, the community, society, and the planet in which we all live and want to do business in; and through inspiring the students by means of real and current examples of ways to be profitable while “making a difference” in society. The business students, through innovative socialization and orientation pedagogies, must be inculcated to engage in smart, shrewd, and strategic social and environmental responsibility (Khan, Ostheimer and Mujtaba, 2015). And the rationale for being socially and environmentally responsible, and one that must be underscored to the graduate business students during the presentation, is Ethical Egoism. That is, the instrumental worth of being a “socially responsible” person and organization will be the advancement of one’s own self-interest, the company’s self-interest, the corresponding benefit to community and society as a whole, and the sustainability of the planet for future generations.

SUMMARY

The societal expectations today are that business leaders and businesses must act legally, morally, and in a socially and environmentally responsible manner. That is the mindset – the “three value drill” - for business leaders. This mindset is the way to achieve sustainability; and business students as future business leaders must show the way. Consequently, the challenge for the business leader is to fulfill these expectations and to meet these challenges. The principal objective of the ethics presentation at the general orientation is to help the student act in conformity with these values and to achieve personal and organizational success. The rationale for adherence to these values (though admittedly not without some cost, effort, and time in the short-run) will be sustainability in the long-term. That is, business students will be able to achieve success and will be able to *sustain* that success for themselves, their families, their companies and organizations, their communities, for society as a whole, all while making their contribution to build a better planet for future generations. The basic “formula,” therefore, is: the value of legality + the value of morality/ethics + the value of social responsibility + sustainability (as a means in the form of environmental responsibility) = sustainability (as an end). As Socrates said a long time ago (but which the authors believe is still quite true): “Money comes from virtue.” Or as the Venetians (the very successful international business people) said in the motto of the old Venetian Republic, one must act “For the honor *and* profit of Venice” (emphasis added). Be successful, become prosperous, but be proud of yourself, make your parents proud, make your employers proud, make your community proud, and make the school proud – and that declaration should be the heart-felt closing counsel and exhortation to the students, in the humble opinion of the authors.

Bibliography

- Amman, W., Kerrets Makau, M., Fenton, P., Zackariasson, P., Tripathi, S. (2012). *New Perspectives on Management Education*. New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Baude, William (2013). Rethinking the Federal Eminent Domain Power. *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 122, pp. 1738f.

- Cavico, Frank J. (2014). *Corporate Social Responsibility and Leadership*. Davie, Florida: ILEAD Academy, LLC.
- Cavico, Frank J. and Mujtaba, Bahaudin G. (2013). *Business Ethics: The Moral Foundation of Effective Leadership, Management and Entrepreneurship* (Third Edition). Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Custom Publishers.
- Cavico, Frank J. and Mujtaba, Bahaudin G. (2009). Making the Case for the Creation of an Academy Honesty Culture in Higher Education: Reflections and Suggestions for Reducing the Rise in Student Cheating. *American Journal of Business Education*, 2(5), pp. 75-87.
- Cavico, Frank J. and Mujtaba, Bahaudin G. (2009-1). The State of Business Schools, Business Education, and Business Ethics. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 2, pp. 1-18.
- Cavico, Frank J. and Mujtaba, Bahaudin, G., and McFarlane, Donovan A. (2010). *The State of Business Schools: Educational and Moral Imperatives for Market Leaders*. Davie, Florida: ILEAD Academy, LLC.
- Cavico, Frank J. and Mujtaba, Bahaudin G. (2014). *Legal Challenges for the Global Manager and Entrepreneur* (Second Edition). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
- Cherek, Kristine S. (2012). From Trespasser to Homeowner: The Case against Adverse Possession in the Post-Crash World. *Virginia Journal of Society, Policy, and Law*, 20, pp. 271f.
- Cherētis, D. and Mujtaba, B. G. (2014). Maximizing Long-Term Value and Conscious Capitalism at Whole Foods. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 79(3), 4-16.
- Colorado Revised Statutes, Section 38-41-101 (2014).
- Denning, S. (2013). The management revolution that's already happening, *Forbes*, May 30 2013. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2013/05/30/the-management-revolution-thats-already-happening/> (Accessed 28 September 2013).
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: the Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. Oxford: Capstone.
- Fray, A-M, Soparnot, R. (2010). Chapitre 15, Le manager responsable. In: Perreti, J-M, De Bry, F., Igalens, J. *Ethique et responsabilité sociale, 78 experts témoignent*. Paris, EMS.
- Garriga, E. and Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics* 53(1-2), pp.51-71.
- Hersey, P. & Campbell, R. (2004). *Leadership: A Behavioral Science Approach*. California: Leadership Studies Publishing.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., and Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. 8th ed. Prentice Hall.
- John, Leisha (2015), Director of Environmental Sustainability for Ernst & Young, Speaker at *Sustainability 101 Lunch Series*. The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business, Nova Southeastern University, April 21, 2015.
- Kahan, Dan M. (1997) Ignorance of the Law is an Excuse – But Only for the Virtuous. *Michigan Law Review*, 96, pp. 127f.
- Kedge Business School (2009-2010). *Responsible Managers, valuing diversity*. Available at: <http://www.euromed-management.com/en/RESEARCH%20%2526%20VISION/Responsible%20Managers> (Accessed 28 September 2013).

- Khan, I., Ostheimer, S., and Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Managing Innovation and Marketing in a Globally Dynamic Firm: Best Practices in Management at Diageo. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(5) 47-61.
- Lester, Brian (2003). An Attempt to Quiet the Controversy: The Case for Automatically Equipping an Adverse Possessor with a Slander of Title Action. *New England Law Review*, Vol. 37, pp. 249f.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBA*. San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.
- Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Management Ethics and Social Responsibility amid Diversity across Nations. *Open Ethics and Law Journal*, 1, pp. 6-7.
- Mujtaba, B. G. (2014). *Managerial Skills and Practices for Global Leadership*. ILEAD Academy: Florida.
- Mujtaba, B. G. (2010). *Business ethics of retail employees: How ethical are modern workers?* ILEAD Academy Publications; Davie, Florida, United States.
- Nonet, G. (2013). Responsible Management and Business Schools: Analysis of the Schools Strategy and the Education / Management Responsable et Business Schools: Une analyse par les strategies d'établissement et par les projets pedagogiques, Ph.D defended on November 27th 2013, Montpellier University, France.
- Nonet, G., Meijs, L., Kassel, K. (December 2014). Business School and Responsible Management: A long Road to Freedom, *NITTE Management Review Special ISSUE on Management Education*, 8(2), pp.1-10.
- Nova Southeastern University, *Vision, Mission, and Core Values* (2015). Retrieved April 15, 2015 from: www.nova.edu/about/mission.html.
- Pelletier, R. A., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). Maximizing Employee Happiness and Well-being: An Examination of Value Creation and Competitive Advantage at Zappos. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 2(4), 220-232.
- People v. Marrero*, 507 N.E.2d 1068 (N.Y. 1987).
- Ryan, A., Tilbury, D., Parkes, C., Blewitt, J. (2011). Ignorance was bliss, now I'm not ignorant and that is far more difficult - Transdisciplinary learning and reflexivity in responsible management education. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 2(2), pp. 206-221.
- Salcedo, Diandra (2015). Director of Marketing and Community Relations for Whole Foods Market. Speaker at *Sustainability 101 Lunch Series*. The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business, Nova Southeastern University, April 21, 2015.
- Sprankling, John. G. (1994). An Environmental Critique of Adverse Possession. *Cornell Law Review*, 79, pp. 816f.
- The H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship, *Vision, Mission, and Principles* (2015). Retrieved April, 15, 2015 from: www.huizenga.nova.edu/about/visionmission.
- Travers, Michael L. (1995). Mistake of Law in Mala Prohibita Crimes. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 62, pp. 1301f.
- Vago, Thomas (2015). Director of Operations at Hilton Ft. Lauderdale Beach Resort, Speaker at *Sustainability 101 Lunch Series*. H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business, Nova Southeastern University, April 21, 2015.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Published as Annex to General Assembly Document A/42/427, *Development and International Co-operation: Environment*, August 2, 1987.

- Waddock, S. (2007). Leadership integrity in a fractured knowledge world. *Management learning & education* 6(4), pp.543-557.
- Windsor, D. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Three key approaches. *Journal of Management Studies* 43(1), pp.93-114.

Author Biographies

Frank J. Cavico is a Professor of Business Law and Ethics at the H. Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship of Nova Southeastern University in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. He has served as a faculty member at the school for 30 years. He is a member of the Management Department. He teaches business law and business ethics classes primarily at the graduate level in the MBA program; and Professor Cavico also teaches in the MPA program where he teaches the required Administrative Law and Ethics course. He also teaches the undergraduate business law course. He is the professor who brought ethics into the graduate business school by means of a course called "Management Ethics." He is the creator of current law and ethics course "The Legal, Ethical, and Social Values of Business," which is a required core course; and he presently serves as course leader for that course as well as an undergraduate business law course. He has also taught Constitutional and Administrative Law at the doctoral level in the Huizenga School. He has been the recipient of the Professor of the Year and Faculty of the Year Awards at the Huizenga School; and he was a nominee for the Professor of the Year Award for the university. He is the author of several books and numerous law review and management journal articles. Professor Cavico holds an LL.M degree from the University of San Diego, a J.D. from St. Mary's University, a Master's degree in Political Science from Drew University, and a B.A. in Political Science from Gettysburg College.

Bahaudin G. Mujtaba is Professor of Management, International Management and Human Resources at the Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship of Nova Southeastern University in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, United States. Bahaudin is the author and coauthor of several professional and academic books dealing with diversity, ethics, and management, as well as over three hundred journal articles. During the past thirty years he has had the pleasure of working with human resource professionals in the United States, Brazil, Bahamas, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Malaysia, Japan, Vietnam, China, Thailand, St. Lucia, Grenada, and Jamaica. He can be reached at: mujtaba@nova.edu

Guenola Nonet is a scholar in residence at Nova Southeastern University to help embed responsible and sustainable management at the business school and on campus. Guenola has a very multicultural profile with experience in Private and Public Management, International Affairs, and trainings (undergrad, grad. and exec. managers). She graduated in Business Society & Management at Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University with an 8m. exchange at Singapore Management University. In November 2013 she defended her PhD "Responsible Management and Business Schools' Education and Strategy" and received Summa cum Laude and the 2014 award for research on CSR from ADERSE-ORSE (France). Guénola Nonet is an active member of the United Nations PRME, contributing to the working group *Fighting Poverty, a challenge for Business Schools*. Guénola Nonet has been invited to several business schools and International conferences to present her pioneering research on *business schools' education and Strategy for responsible management* (Spain, France, India, United States, South Africa). Guénola enjoys conducting research and she has contributed to United Nations PRME 2nd Guideline and she wrote a Guideline book on sustainable development for the French Ministry of Ecology. Guenola is course academic leader for Leading creativity and Innovation for Sustainability (MSc of Leadership, H.Wayne Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship), she is an academic advisor for the Students organization *Green Sharks* on NSU campus.

Isabel Rimanoczy is a Scholar in Residence at Huizenga School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Nova Southeastern University, where she works on bringing sustainability into the institution and teaches a program to develop the sustainability mindset. She is the convener of LEAP!, a global network of business schools professors for the purpose of leveraging teaching, learning and researching in the area of sustainability mindset. A member of the Advisory Team of the UN PRME sponsored Flourish Prizes, she has made her life purpose to develop change accelerators and does this by writing, public speaking, workshops and teaching. Author of over 140 articles, book chapters and papers published in the USA, Latin America and Europe, she recently published *Big Bang Being: Developing the Sustainability Mindset* (Greenleaf Publishing, 2013). Other books include *Circles of Dialogue* (2011) and *Action Reflection Learning: Solving Real Business Problems by Connecting Learning with Earning* (Davies-Black Publishing, 2008), based on her research on adult learning. Isabel is a frequent speaker and presenter at international conferences, and a blogger for the Huff Post. Isabel grew up in Argentina, where she earned her degree as a Licensed Psychologist at the University of Buenos Aires, as well as an MBA at the University of Palermo. She obtained her doctorate at Teachers College, Columbia University, where she researched business leaders championing sustainability initiatives. She is the Founder and Director of *MINERVAS, Women Changing the World*, a nonprofit 501(c)3 organization that supports women making a difference. Irimanoczy@nova.edu.