


palgrave
macmillan

Humanistic Management in Practice

Ernst von Kimakowitz Michael Pirson
Heiko Spitzeck Claus Dierksmeier
Wolfgang Amann



Humanistic Management in Practice

Humanism in Business Series

The Humanistic Management Network is an international, interdisciplinary, and independent network that promotes the development of an economic system with respect for human dignity and well-being.

The Humanistic Management Network defends human dignity in face of its vulnerability. The dignity of the human being lies in its capacity to define autonomously the purpose of its existence. Since human autonomy realizes itself through social cooperation, economic relations and business activities can either foster or obstruct human life and well-being. Against the widespread objectification of human subjects into human resources, against the common instrumentalization of human beings into human capital and a mere means for profit, we uphold humanity as the ultimate end and principle of all economic activity.

In business as well as in society, respect for human dignity demands respect for human freedom. Collective decision-making, in corporations just as in governments, should hence be based on free and equal deliberation, participation or representation of all affected parties. Concerns of legitimacy must, in economics like in politics, precede questions of expediency.

We believe that market economies hold substantial potential for human development in general. To promote life-conducive market activities, we want to complement the quantitative metrics which hitherto define managerial and economic success with qualitative evaluation criteria that focus on the human dignity of every woman and every man.

As researchers, we work towards a humanistic paradigm for business and economics, trying to identify and facilitate corporate and governmental efforts for the common good.

As a think-tank, we set out to spread intellectual tools for culturally and ecologically sustainable business practices that have the human being as their focal point.

As teachers, we strive to educate, emancipate, and enable students to contribute actively to a life-conducive economy in which human dignity is universally respected.

As practitioners, we act toward the implementation of a humanistic economy on an individual, corporate, and governmental level.

As citizens, we engage our communities in discourse about the benefits of a human-centered economy.

Titles include:

Ernst von Kimakowitz, Michael Pirson, Heiko Spitzbeck, Claus Dierksmeier, and Wolfgang Amann (*editors*)

HUMANISTIC MANAGEMENT IN PRACTICE

Humanism In Business Series

Series Standing Order ISBN 978-0-230-24633-1

You can receive future title in this series as they are published by placing a standing order. Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with your name and address, the title of the series and the ISBN quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, England.

Humanistic Management in Practice

Edited by

Ernst von Kimakowitz

Michael Pirson


Heiko Spitzeck

Claus Dierksmeier

and

Wolfgang Amann

palgrave
macmillan



Selection and editorial content © Ernst von Kimakowitz, Michael Pirson,
Heiko Spitzack, Claus Dierksmeier and Wolfgang Amann 2011
Individual chapters © the contributors 2011
Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2011 978-0-230-24632-4

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6-10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2011 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-31951-0 ISBN 978-0-230-30658-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9780230306585

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	vii
<i>List of Figures</i>	viii
<i>List of Exhibits</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>Notes on Editors and Contributors</i>	xi
1 Introducing This Book and Humanistic Management <i>Ernst von Kimakowitz, Michael Pirson, Claus Dierksmeier, Heiko Spitzeck, and Wolfgang Amann</i>	1
2 ABN AMRO REAL – A New Bank for a New Society <i>Patricia Palacios and Michael Pirson</i>	13
3 AES Corporation – Serving People and Society <i>Burcu Rodopman</i>	28
4 Humanistic Business via the Integral Enterprise: The Case of Broad Air Conditioning, China <i>Alexander Schieffer and Ronnie Lessem</i>	42
5 bracNet: Bridging the Digital Divide – Covering Bangladesh with Wireless Broadband Access <i>Michael Pirson</i>	62
6 Cascades Inc. (1959–2009): Some Lessons from a Resilient Organization <i>Emmanuel Raufflet and Pierre Batellier</i>	76
7 Dialogue-Based Leadership Style As Part of Humanistic Organizational Cultures: The Case of dm in Germany <i>Wolfgang Amann and Shiban Khan</i>	92
8 Grameen Danone Foods – A Case of a Social Business Enterprise <i>Doris John</i>	103
9 Entrepreneurship, Humanistic Management and Business Turnaround: The Case of a Small Chinese Private Firm <i>Fang Lee Cooke</i>	119

10	Level Ground Trading Ltd – Fair Trade Coffee As a Front for Social Justice <i>Will Low and Eileen Davenport</i>	131
11	The Best Inputs for Maximizing Your Output: Humanistic Practices at Micromatic Grinding <i>Rakesh Kumar Agrawal</i>	147
12	Mondragon: Could Something Like This Be in Our Future? <i>Terry Mollner</i>	170
13	Novo Nordisk – Making a Difference in Diabetes Treatment <i>Patricia Palacios, Michael Pirson, and Bradley H. Bader</i>	185
14	SEKEM – Humanistic Management in the Egyptian Desert <i>Clemens Mader, Gerald Steiner, Friedrich M. Zimmermann, and Heiko Spitzeck</i>	204
15	What Is Your Calling? SEMCO's Invitation to Participatory Management <i>Carlos Largacha-Martínez</i>	215
16	Triple Bottom Line Management at Sonae Sierra <i>Pedro Teixeira Santos, Miguel Pina e Cunha, Arménio Rego, and Miguel Pereira Lopes</i>	231
17	Can Business and Humanism Go Together? The Case of the Tata Group with a Focus on Nano Plant <i>Radha R. Sharma and Shoma Mukherji</i>	247
18	TerraCycle – A Business Founded for Societal Benefit Generation <i>Heiko Spitzeck</i>	266
19	Wainwright Bank and Trust Case Study – Humanistic Management in Practice <i>Christine Arena</i>	277
20	Zipcar Incorporated: Do We Really Need to Own Our Automobiles? <i>Janet L. Rovenpor</i>	290
21	Concluding Remarks <i>Michael Pirson, Ernst von Kimakowitz, Claus Dierksmeier, Heiko Spitzeck, and Wolfgang Amann</i>	307
	<i>Index</i>	325

Tables

2.1	AMRO REAL's new business model	24
7.1	Leadership principles over time	101
13.1	Revenue and income increases	198
14.1	Year, company, main business activity	209
16.1	Areas of impact	234
16.2	2007 and 2008 awards	240
16.3	Evolution of the key performance indicators from 2005 to 2007	242
18.1	The crisis ... and the consequences	271
19.1	Humanistic management in the banking industry	288
20.1	Zipcar incorporated's growth from 2000 to 2008	291

Figures

2.1	Bank of value concept	15
4.1	An archetypal view on the four worlds and their dominant expressions	44
4.2	Fourfold structure of the integral organization	46
4.3	Local identity & Global integrity	47
4.4	Broad's knowledge cycle	53
4.5	The fourfold of broad	58
4.6	Broad – Integrally linking of the internal and societal perspective	59
6.1	Production, expansion, and consolidation processes	77
11.1	Management philosophy at Micromatic Grinding	154
13.1	Paradigm shift	187
13.2	The Novo Nordisk way of management	188
13.3	The learning curve	192
13.4	Focusing on the patient behind the disease	194
14.1	Principles of decision making by Dr. Ibrahim Abouleish (Mader, 2009)	205
14.2	Structure of SEKEM network (Mader, C., 2009)	208
15.1	SEMCO's renunciation	220
16.1	Corporate responsibility governance structure	239
18.1	Business-as-usual scenario (1961–2100)	272

Exhibits

8.1	Objectives of the Grameen Bank	104
8.2	Tenets of an SBE	107
8.3	Mission and objectives of Grameen Danone	108
11.1	Vision of MGT	148
11.2	MGT's mission	149
11.3	Highlights in the growth of MGT	151
11.4	Organizational structure of MGT	152
11.5	Organizational values of Micromatic Grinding	155
11.6	Statements recorded on a panaboard during a "No Agenda" meeting	158

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, we wish to thank the contributors to *Humanistic Management in Practice*, who graciously submitted to a competitive case selection as well as a lengthy review process. While the final evaluation of this book can only come from its readers, we believe that they have written some very inspiring, deeply telling and thoroughly researched case examples. In having done so, they allow us to complement theoretical arguments on humanistic management approaches with proof of concept, demonstrating managerial choices that put people first while laying a solid foundation for sustaining success in a competitive market environment.

Second, we wish to thank those entrepreneurs, managers and business leaders who dare to depart from the beaten track and allow for values-based decisions to supersede opportunistic, short-sighted profit seeking; it is these men and women who demonstrate true business leadership and we hope that they will be an example for many more.

With this book being the first in the newly established *Humanism in Business Series* at Palgrave Macmillan we want to thank everyone involved in the editing and production process. We greatly appreciate their expertise and experience in helping us turn academic insight into published books.

We also wish to send a warm-hearted thank you to the many supporters of the Humanistic Management Network. Through their intellectual and logistical support they not only facilitate our work and leverage our impact but also inspire us to further our efforts to promote a more humane economic and social order for all. Last but certainly not least, we would like to thank our readers for accompanying us on our intellectual journey towards a humanistic business paradigm for the world we collectively inhabit.

The Humanistic Management Network

Editors and Contributors

Editors

Wolfgang Amann heads, as director of executive education, the open enrollment and custom programs at Goethe Business School in Frankfurt, and teaches on a variety of strategy and governance topics. He was previously the principal leader of the project to turn the European Business School into a fully integrated university with multiple disciplines and faculties. He has also been vice-director of the executive school of the University of St Gallen.

Claus Dierksmeier is Professor of Philosophy at Stonehill College, Easton, USA with a special interest in the theory of freedom and the history of liberal thought in Europe and in North and South America. He has published several books on legal, political, and religious philosophy, and is currently working on topics of globalization ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Michael Pirson is Assistant Professor at Fordham Graduate School of Business in New York, as well as a research fellow and lecturer at Harvard University. Before receiving his PhD, Michael worked in international management consulting for several years. He also gained experience in the political arena while working on Hillary Clinton's Senate campaign. Michael currently serves on the board of three social enterprises.

Heiko Spitzeck is Professor at Fundação Dom Cabral, Brazil. Previously he was a lecturer at Cranfield University's Doughty Centre for Corporate Responsibility in the UK. He obtained his PhD in Business Ethics at the University of St Gallen in Switzerland, and has held visiting scholar positions at the University of California at Berkeley and Fordham University in New York.

Ernst von Kimakowitz holds an MSc from the London School of Economics, UK, and an award-winning PhD from the University of St Gallen, Switzerland, where he is also teaching as a guest lecturer. Following several years in the strategy practice of a large management consulting firm, he is now working as an independent professional, providing consulting, advisory, and executive coaching services in the Corporate Responsibility arena to both private and public sector clients.

Contributors

Rakesh Kumar Agrawal is an Associate professor at the Institute of Management Technology (IMT), Ghaziabad, India. He takes keen interest in exploring and comprehending human behavior, especially in relation to spirituality and higher principles of life, and seeks to relate these to management and management education. He holds an engineering degree from IIT Bombay, an MTech in Behavioral and Social Sciences from IIT Delhi, and a PhD in Humanities and Social Sciences from IIT Roorkee.

Christine Arena is an award-winning author, syndicated blogger and corporate strategist. Her books, *The High-Purpose Company* (Collins, 2007) and *Cause for Success* (New World Library, 2004), as well as her “Case in Point” blog, separate the strategies and companies that make a positive difference from those that don’t. Her website is: <http://christinearena.com>

Bradley H. Bader is Teaching Fellow in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University. He assists in designing and teaching general education courses for undergraduates on global health, with attention to the impact of genomics on healthcare delivery in the developing world. He received his undergraduate degree from Harvard in Psychology.

Pierre Batellier is Sustainability Coordinator, responsible for the Specialized Graduate Diploma (DESS) in Management and Sustainability, and teaches corporate social responsibility (CSR) at HEC Montréal. He has worked as a sustainability consultant for various organizations. He has written numerous business cases on CSR and has coedited *Responsabilité sociale de l'entreprise: enjeux de gestion et cas pédagogiques* (Presses Universitaires Internationales Polytechnique Montréal, 2008).

Fang Lee Cooke is Professor of HRM and Chinese Studies and Deputy Head (Research and Innovation) of the School of Management, RMIT University, Australia. Previously, she was a chair professor at Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK. Her research interests are in the area of employment relations, gender studies, strategic HRM, knowledge management and innovation, outsourcing, and Chinese MNCs. Fang is the author of *HRM, Work and Employment in China* (2005), and *Competition, Strategy and Management in China* (2008).

Eileen Davenport completed her BA at Exeter, and MA and MPhil degrees at Nottingham Trent. She has been an independent consultant for 15 years, specializing in community development. Recent clients include Oxfam International, Catholic Relief Services, and WFTO. She has published in *Strategic Marketing*, *Sustainable Development* and *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Doris John is a Faculty at Chennai Business School in India. She has specialized in developing case studies as pedagogical tools for management education and has more than 200 publications on the European Case Clearing House (ECCH). She was the first runner-up in the case-writing competition on CSR conducted by the British Council and was also one of the finalists in the Annual Case Study Development Initiative 2009 conducted by London Business School's Aditya Birla India Centre. She was involved in academic publishing with Icfai, and has also handled client servicing and PR assignments.

Shiban Khan's expertise is in theories and cultural implications of CSR. She is a visiting tutor at the Henley Business School, UK, and has been visiting scholar at the Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore and Hosei University, Tokyo. Shiban holds a Master's in Environmental Studies from the University of Pennsylvania and a Doctorate from the University of St Gallen, Switzerland.

Carlos Largacha-Martínez (PhD) is Provost for Research at Universidad EAN in Bogotá, Colombia. He received his doctorate from the University of Miami (Coral Gables, FL) in international studies and quantum sociology. His main research interests are quantum humanism and humanistic management. His most recent book participation is a chapter on "Quantum mechanics and the humanities" in *Globalization and the Prospects for Critical Reflection* (Aakar Books). He is also the editor of "Aproximaciones a la Gerencia Humanista" (EAN, 2010).

Ronnie Lessem is the Co-founder of TRANS4M Four World Center for Social Innovation (Geneva). He is a graduate from Harvard Business School and London School of Economics. Zimbabwean by birth, and UK Citizen by choice, he spent the past 25 years of his life in developing educational and research curricula and programs, which led to social and economic transformation, for London's City University, the University of Buckingham and others. He is the author of over 20 books on the development of self, business and society, among them, together with Alexander Schieffer, *Transformation Management: Towards the Integral Enterprise*, *Integral Research and Innovation* as well as *Integral*

Economics. He is together with Alexander Schieffer, the series editor of *Transformation and Innovation Series* of Gower Ashgate.

Will Low joined Royal Roads University in 2006 as leader for courses in sustainable business practice. Trained as an economist at UBC and LSE, he has taught in Canada, the UK, New Zealand, and Australia. The main focus of his research is sustainable consumption and the fair trade movement.

Clemens Mader graduated in Environmental System Sciences and finished his PhD with an emphasis on Innovation and Sustainability Management as well as Regional Sciences at the University of Graz, Austria. His research focuses on sustainability leadership and processes. He is Center Chair and Senior Researcher at the University of Graz and Guest Lecturer at Hiroshima University and University of Novi Sad.

Terry Mollner is Chair of Stakeholders Capital, Inc., a socially responsible wealth management firm in Amherst, MA; since 1972, Founder, Chair, and Executive Director of Trusteeship Institute, Inc., which promotes Mahatma Gandhi's theory of economics; and a founder and member of the board of trustees of the Calvert Social Investment Funds and Calvert Foundation. He is also on the board of Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc., and author of a forthcoming book on personal and social maturation entitled *The Love Skill: Welcome to the Relationship Age!*

Shoma Mukherji is currently pursuing an Executive Fellowship Program in Management at the Management Development Institute, Gurgaon, India. She has completed a Master's in International Management from the American Graduate School of International Management, USA, and has been a HR practitioner for 15 years. She currently works as a consultant in HR, Brand Development, Sales Administration, and Training. Her research interests are Leadership Communication, Gender Issues, Emotional Intelligence, and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Patricia Palacios obtained her MBA degree at the University of St. Gallen. She has a master's degree from Harvard University, where she also worked as a research assistant in the areas of sustainability, employee engagement and stakeholder trust. She has held several positions at UBS AG in wealth management and is currently working at the Consumer Goods Business Department of Daniel Swarovski Corporation.

Miguel Pereira Lopes is Visiting Assistant Professor and postdoctoral researcher at FEUNL. He holds a PhD in Applied Psychology from Universidade Nova de Lisboa. He has published papers in journals such

as *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, *International Public Management Review*, *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *Organization*, and *Public Management Review*.

Miguel Pina e Cunha is Professor at the Faculdade de Economia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa. He has a PhD from Tilburg University. His research focuses mainly on emergent organizational processes and positive and negative organizing.

Emmanuel Raufflet (PhD McGill) is Associate Professor in Management at HEC Montréal. He has co-edited *Responsabilité sociale de l'entreprise: enjeux de gestion et cas pédagogiques* (Presses Universitaires Internationales Polytechnique Montréal, 2008), *The Dark Side: Cases in the Down Side of Business* (Grenleaf, 2009) as well as two other books. His work has been published in the *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, *Management International*, and in *International Studies in Management and Organization*. He has won several case awards including the Emerson Award for best case in Business Ethics (2005 and 2007) and the Best Workshop Case Award (2008) at NACRA (North American Case Research Association).

Arménio Rego is Assistant Professor at the Universidade de Aveiro. He has a PhD from ISCTE and has published in journals such as *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *Creativity Research Journal*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Journal of Business Research*, and *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. His research deals with positive organizational behavior.

Burcu Rodopman is Assistant Professor in the Management Department at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey. She completed her doctorate in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at the University of South Florida and her Master's in Management at Harvard University. She has published work on mentoring, citizenship, and counterproductive work behaviors.

Janet L. Rovenpor is Louis F. Capalbo Professor of Business at Manhattan College. She teaches courses in Introduction to Management, Human Behavior in Organizations, and Strategic Management, and is the author of numerous articles in academic journals. Dr Rovenpor's research has focused on business ethics, managerial values, women in management, e-commerce, and organizational crises.

Alexander Schieffer is Co-founder of TRANS4M Four World Center for Social Innovation (Geneva). A graduate of the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, where he still lectures, he wrote his PhD on leadership and

personality development. After working in various industries in Europe and Asia, where he ran his own publishing company in Singapore, Alexander found his passion in turning education and research into vehicles for social and economic transformation and innovation. He has published a large variety of articles and books, among them, together with Ronnie Lessem, *Integral Research and Innovation*, *Transformation Management: Towards the Integral Enterprise and Integral Economics*. He is also, together with Ronnie Lessem, series editor of the *Transformation and Innovation Series* of Gower Ashgate.

Radha R. Sharma is a Professor of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Development at the Management Development Institute (MDI), Gurgaon, India. She has completed research projects supported by the World Health Organization (WHO); UNESCO; McClelland Centre for Research and Innovation; IDRC, Canada; and Government of India.

Gerald Steiner is Associate Professor of Systemic and Sustainability Management at the Institute of Systems Science, Innovation and Sustainability Research (ISIS) at the University of Graz. His research fields include systems sciences, innovation and sustainability research, entrepreneurship, and industrial design, with special consideration of transdisciplinary creative problem-solving processes.

Pedro Teixeira Santos is Teaching Assistant at Faculdade de Economia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa. He is currently pursuing his PhD in Management and his interests are organizational rhythm, organizational design, change and sustainability.

Friedrich M. Zimmermann is Professor and Chair, Institute of Geography and Regional Science, University of Graz. Former Vice-President for Research and Knowledge Transfer, currently on the Supervisory Board of the University of Klagenfurt, Austria. Research focuses on regional development and tourism planning, using sustainable approaches to study rural and urban areas. International affiliations as professor at the University of Munich, Germany, and in the US (Pennsylvania and Oregon).

1

Introducing This Book and Humanistic Management

Ernst von Kimakowitz, Michael Pirson, Claus Dierksmeier, Heiko Spitzeck, and Wolfgang Amann

It seems virtually impossible today to open a newspaper without finding articles about corporate predators stalking the planet with unethical and sometimes bluntly illegal acts. Companies are involved in human rights violations, environmental degradation, bribery, excessive executive compensation, misleading corporate communication, and spying on employees or competitors; the examples are too numerous to list. Have corporations become more ruthless in the means they use to seek ever-greater profits, or have society and the media become more sensitive to corporate misconduct? While the truth may well lie in between, the number of publicized cases that undermine what we believe to be ethically sound corporate conduct has reached unprecedented levels.

Making corporate misdemeanor public should be welcomed, as it allows consumers, business partners, employees, and other stakeholders to make better informed decisions on where to spend their money, who to do business with, where to work, or how to appraise a corporate citizen.

There is one risk from the vast publicity corporate misdemeanor currently receives, though: some people may be led to believe that such are the ways of business, that is, that companies and executives have no alternative but to compete on questionable grounds, since it's a competitive, dog-eat-dog world out there. Companies that are exposed for unethical behavior are really only doing what everybody else does; they were just unlucky enough to get caught, but they're no different from the rest, one might think.

However, such a view is not only rather cynical, it is also wrong – on two counts. First, it would mean that executives have little responsibility for misconduct under their reign, for one cannot be held responsible for actions to which there is no alternative. Managers do have choices, though; our economic activities follow man-made rules, not laws of

nature, which is why managers should be perceived and act as *decision-makers*. For the most part, managers do have occasion to evaluate the ethical content of their decisions – even if, at times, they seem to lack an inner compass to guide them in evaluating the ethical dimensions of their business decisions.

Second, this view fails to recognize that the vast majority of the world's business activities are conducted in line with what is ethically justifiable; some companies even excel at ensuring that their business is aligned with societal aims. From telegraphy to mobile telephony, from the automobile to every step towards emission-free individual mobility, from book printing to personal computing, and from coal-fired power plants to renewable energy generation, in many cases great business leaders and inspired entrepreneurs have stood at the helm of developments that have greatly benefited humanity. Some of the companies providing us with innovative products and services go even further: they also focus on *how* they produce what they offer, paying close attention to how they interact with and impact on all of their stakeholders.

This book aims to unearth accounts of businesses that excel at doing well and doing good. They make products and services that address genuine human needs and they do so in ways that equally respect all stakeholder concerns. This book also follows the *Humanistic Management Network's* previous book, *Humanism in Business*,¹ in which we laid the theoretical foundations for a more life-conducive role of business in society. The book you are now holding in your hands provides concrete examples – proof of concept, as it were, that business success and societal benefit can very well go hand in hand.

What you can expect from this book

We set out to collect evidence of businesses that stand out by demonstrating that managerial freedom includes the option to align societal purpose and business success. We wanted to demonstrate that it is not only possible for companies to earn healthy profits when putting people first, but that those who do, deliver outstanding results to their owners *and* to society.

The *Humanistic Management Network* has selected 19 case examples of companies from around the globe, in a variety of industries, and with different ownership structures and sizes. These cases explore the principles of humanistic management and examine its theoretical merits by assessing its practical feasibility. They show how businesses can unite social value generation with financial success. One general prerequisite for managing

a business along humanistic principles is the emancipation from a sole focus on maximizing profits. What these companies share is that they are managed as an integrated and responsive part of society by:

- Seeing that their organizational *raison d'être* includes the promotion of social benefit, for which business methods and market mechanisms are a means to support a specific end, rather than an end in itself.
- Submitting to the necessity of earning at least a sufficient income to be a self-sustaining organization but without succumbing to profit maximization as a normative criterion.
- Maintaining the liberty to opt out of the application of market rationality where this would conflict with or decrease the social benefits the organization seeks to create.

All these cases, which we present alphabetically, are independent accounts. You may choose the order in which you want to read them, and the following table provides a handy overview of the cases.

Company	Location	Size	Industry
1 ABN Amro Banco Real	Latin America (Brazil)	Big / National	Services
2 AES Corporation	North America (USA)	Big / Global	Industrial goods
3 Broad Air Conditioning	Asia (China)	Big / Global	Industrial goods
4 Brummer and bracNet	Asia (Bangladesh)	Small / National	Services
5 Cascades Pulp and Paper	North America (Canada)	Big / Global	Industrial goods
6 dm	Europe (Germany)	Big / National	Services
7 Grameen Danone	Asia (Bangladesh)	Small / National	Consumer goods
8 Hongfei Metal Limited	Asia (China)	Small / National	Industrial goods
9 Level Trading	North America (Canada)	Small / National	Consumer goods
10 Micromatic Grinding Technologies	Asia (Based in India)	Big / National	Industrial goods
11 Mondragon	Europe (Spain)	Big / National	Conglomerate
12 Novo Nordisk	Europe (Denmark)	Big / Global	Consumer goods

13 Sekem	Afrika (Egypt)	Small / Regional	Consumer goods
14 Semco	Latin America (Brazil)	Big / National	Conglomerate
15 Sonae Sierra	Europe (Portugal)	Big / Global	Industrial goods
16 Tata Group	Asia (India)	Big / Global	Conglomerate
17 TerraCycle	North America (USA)	Small / National	Consumer goods
18 Wainwright Bank and Trust	North America (USA)	Small / National	Services
19 Zipcar	North America (USA)	Small / National	Services

In the concluding observations we then revisit the cases and provide a brief reminder of their central messages followed by an examination of what can be learned from these examples. The lessons we suggest are, on the one hand, of a general nature and relate closely to the guiding principles of humanistic management as outlined on the following pages. On the other hand, we deduct more concrete lessons by looking at how the examples in this book demonstrate that humanistic practices can generate managerial success. In doing so, we trust that we can assist other companies that are seeking to adopt more humanistic practices.

We hope that these cases will stimulate alternative perceptions of managerial and organizational success, of what makes a company a corporate citizen that one would want as a neighbor. Enjoy the read! We trust that you will find these accounts thought-provoking and inspirational.

What is humanistic management?

We understand humanistic management on the basis of three inter-related dimensions. First, that unconditional respect for the dignity of every person is the foundation for interpersonal interaction, including any interactions taking place in business contexts. Second, that ethical reflection must form an integrated part of all business decisions. Third, that seeking normative legitimacy for corporate activities is crucial for assuming corporate responsibilities. This third dimension, which is to be understood as the dialogical extension of ethical reflection on corporate conduct, allows for the aligning of good intentions with activities that have the potential to produce good outcomes. Taken together, these three dimensions promote human flourishing through

economic activities that are life-conducive and add value to society at large. Submitting business decisions to these three guiding principles is what we call humanistic management.

Unconditional respect towards human dignity

Part of what makes us human is our shared vulnerability. Investigating humanistic management is therefore based on the fundamental acceptance that the *conditio humana* entails our shared need for protection of our human dignity. Respecting every human being, in all its depth and complexity, as individually unique and collectively worthy of unconditional protection against exploitation is a shared endeavor of societies and all their institutions. As Immanuel Kant noted, every human must always be seen as an end in itself, and never as a mere means:

Everything has either a price or a dignity. Whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; on the other hand, whatever is above all price, and therefore admits of no equivalent, has a dignity. But that which constitutes the condition under which alone something can be an end in itself does not have mere relative worth, i.e., price, but an intrinsic worth, i.e., a dignity. (Kant, 1785)

This presents a challenge to how we generally define managerial tasks. Managing is traditionally viewed as the task of achieving predefined objectives effectively and efficiently. Effectiveness is attained when the objective is achieved (i.e., output-oriented), and efficiency is attained when the objective has been achieved without wasting resources (i.e., input-oriented). This input–output orientation entails a tendency to objectify human beings (as human resources); managers influence the managed in favor of predefined objectives, thus turning them into a means to achieve an end, reducing people to little more than the equivalent of a piece of machinery.

If humanism demands seeing every individual as an end in itself, while managing people implies turning people into means, instrumental to achieving predefined objectives, is *humanistic management* even possible? Is it not an oxymoron?

The problem is that, for as long as we continue to base the manager's role on utilizing *human resources*, as which people are merely a means of production rather than embraced as ends in themselves, humanistic management is not possible, as it remains fraught with contradictions. Humanistic management is, therefore, much more than just a checklist

for treating employees or other stakeholders *nicely*; it demands a fundamental paradigm shift away from the objectification of human beings within economic activities.

Yet, surely, people need to be instrumental in production processes in order for a business to thrive; they need a place in the organization and to fulfill specific tasks. This is undisputed. Within humanistic management, though, people need to autonomously assume their roles as a result of a self-determined process. Only then are they not *instrumentalized* in their human capacity; instead, they are themselves *assuming an instrumental role* within their job. They are then offering their working hours, creativity, and commitment to achieve certain goals, to produce certain goods and services.

The utilization of people in humanistic management must therefore always be limited to the role a person assumes, never to the person himself or herself. It must result from the autonomous will of an individual to be instrumental, to turn himself or herself into a means. Within this understanding, people will only become instruments within businesses which they consider aligned with their personal values and congruent with what they perceive to be worthy of being instrumental to. A person will not autonomously choose to become a means to an end that is profoundly inconsistent with his or her values and aims.

The distinction between turning oneself into an instrument by assuming a certain role and being seen and defined as instrumental through the objectification of the whole persona is therefore more than mere semantics: it lays the foundation that allows the alignment of business goals and societal aims by respecting each person as an end.

Integrating ethical concerns into managerial decisions

The need for respecting people as ends in humanistic management leads us to the impact it has on the economy and society as a whole. In its broader context, humanistic management is based on the insight that claims of assuming corporate responsibility remain mere rhetoric without the integration of ethical evaluation into business decisions. If one follows through on unconditional respect for the dignity of all persons, one must accept that decisions that impact others must be examined in terms of their consequences for all those affected.

Humanistic management criticizes one-dimensional managerial objectives such as profit maximization. Economic rationality becomes incompatible with protecting human dignity whenever it leaves no room for the balancing of interests of stakeholders based on the quality

of the arguments articulated. When factual power overrides argumentative power – as any paradigm that proclaims the maximization of particular interests demands – those interests that cannot enforce their consideration are excluded and suppressed. This leads to situations where the interests of weaker stakeholders are disregarded and their vulnerability exploited. Therefore, we must formulate economic success criteria that no longer exclude respect for human values but are inclusive of them.

When one considers the role the private sector has been assigned in society, one finds such descriptions as: to supply goods and services that people want and/or need; or to generate employment opportunities and thereby sustainable livelihoods within an economy; or to be a source of innovation and creative solutions to existing problems.

It is, however, hard to find convincing arguments that define the role of business in society as an instrument to maximize monetary returns on investments for financiers or owners of businesses. Even the most hard-nosed proponents of shareholder value maximization ultimately argue that defining the *raison d'être* of a business organization through the maximization of monetary returns to its investors is right *because* it provides the greatest welfare gains for society overall. This argument presupposes that growing national incomes equal public welfare gains, which is not supported by either empirical findings or normative arguments. In addition, proponents of shareholder value generally remain silent on what findings support the view that maximization of financial returns to one stakeholder group automatically generates the highest welfare gains for *all*, as such views on public welfare are, by and large, blind to distributional questions.

Unsurprisingly, attempts to assign normative character to shareholder value maximization resonate strongly from many businesses and Wall Street agents that seek to *make money* rather than *make goods and services*. Unfortunately, this turns the underlying rationality about the role of business in society on its head. One-dimensional profit maximization is indifferent to the idea of businesses serving the interest of society and rewarding those people who chip in their money with a decent return for the risks they have taken. Instead businesses must strive to maximize the return for their financiers, and therefore need to offer goods and services for which they can generate demand. The difficulty with this reversed rationality is that different ends lead to different means.

A company driven by the maximization of financial returns is not overly concerned as to whether the needs it serves are genuine, as long as it can find a way to generate profitable demand. Such a company is

unlikely to have the capability for self-restraint when pursuing a growth opportunity means turning a blind eye to ethical or environmental concerns, for example. Nor can a purely profit-maximizing company afford to accept and act upon legitimate claims from weaker stakeholders if the result might be reduced earnings. It is therefore not difficult to find examples where market forces and societal gains are at odds, leaving little room to claim that shareholder value maximization is the best way to promote societal gains.

In short, a company that maximizes profit will not be able to integrate ethical considerations into all business decisions, as the maximization of the interests of one stakeholder group, superseding all others, excludes equal respect for other stakeholders. However, equally respecting all stakeholders is a necessary precondition of the unconditional respect for the dignity of all persons affected by a company's activities.

Therefore, it clearly *does* make a difference whether the role of a business is to maximize return on investment or to create value for society. While the latter includes responsibilities towards financiers, it also includes responsibilities towards other stakeholders. Without an inclusive relationship between ethical reflection and business decisions, humanistic management is simply unachievable, as managers would be precluded from equal respect for all stakeholders.

The dialogical extension of managerial ethical reflection

The integration of ethical reflection into business decisions alone can be seen as a monological process in which the decision-maker might, in all sincerity, fail to see the concerns of others, leading to what we may call honest mistakes. Therefore, the third guiding principle – seeking normative legitimacy – is necessary to ensure that the outcomes of (monological) ethical reflection are tested by entering into a dialogue with those who may challenge any aspect of a business's conduct. The solitary managerial decision about whether a certain action is ethically sound is thereby transferred to the "moral site" of stakeholder dialogue, where the manager shares the responsibility with the stakeholder to embark on a course of action that is acceptable to both parties. This is how businesses gain normative legitimacy.

Legitimacy can be considered the general recognition of an entity's conduct as desirable or apposite within a system of norms and values. This definition leaves much room for interpretation.

In management studies, legitimacy is most widely seen as bestowed by self-interested, calculating stakeholders who legitimize an organization

on the basis of their perception of receiving some kind of utility gains. For the company, this instrumental or pragmatic understanding translates into a desire to be regarded as legitimate (only) by key stakeholders, since transactional processes depend on trust, and trust will only arise when an organization is perceived as legitimate. Consequently, pragmatic legitimacy is all about the “business case” for legitimacy, encouraging organizations to manage legitimacy by providing certain stakeholders with tangible rewards as a lubricant for building trust.

Such a view is incompatible with unconditional respect for human dignity, as it turns legitimacy into a profit-enhancing resource to be obtained from society based on a cost–benefit analysis. Such a view seeks to substitute the need to gain legitimacy from all stakeholders with a reductionist concept of wanting to be perceived as legitimate only by those stakeholders powerful enough to cause harm to a business. In this view, even those stakeholders that are the putative beneficiaries, those upon whose trust a company depends, are effectively instrumentalized as a means for that company’s profit-oriented aims. The moment the cost of obtaining legitimization from certain stakeholders exceeds the benefits the company derives from it, these stakeholders will cease to be seen as worthy of the company’s efforts to gain their legitimization.

In contrast, humanistic management bestows legitimacy if the normative evaluation of an organization and its activities results in the perception that it is “doing the right thing.” This clearly differentiates *normative legitimacy* from *pragmatic legitimacy*, as the former is based on values and reason rather than mere self-interest and strategic business calculus. Arguments that create legitimacy must be normative; they must be able to ethically justify why a certain course of conduct is considered desirable or apposite.

Legitimacy that equally respects all stakeholders thus cannot be gained if ethical reasons for justifying corporate conduct cannot be established. As Max Weber pointed out, seeking legitimacy helps determine the choice of means for an exercise (Weber, 1978, p. 214).

The sincere seeking of legitimacy therefore forces a company to continuously assess its conduct, to rationally justify its behavior and compare it to expectations and the desirability of its impact on society, which is best achieved in a dialogue between all those affected.

In short, humanistic management is the pursuit of strategies and practices that seek to create sustainable human welfare. Humanistic management derives its legitimacy from preserving human dignity in business through submitting its practices to societal critique. By engaging in an open dialogue about the values that should serve business as criteria

to assess managerial success, corporate decision-makers realize that the value proposition of business is ultimately to serve people rather than to make money. The shift from one-dimensional profit maximization towards a multidimensional and value-integrative understanding of corporate success is as necessary today as it is imminent.

Why humanistic management is the way forward

The fundamental reason why humanistic management is beneficial to all stakeholders is that it has a profoundly liberating effect on a company and, consequently, on all – internal as well as external – stakeholders.

The debate about corporate responsibilities is primarily framed as a sacrifice that companies should make in order to be good corporate citizens. This proceeds along the lines that a company would be better off without all those less desirable stakeholders who demand proper conduct but do not generate revenue. These stakeholders have gained sufficient power, though, to seriously harm a company, so it must pay attention to how it is perceived by the public; it must invest in gaining and maintaining an image of moral integrity.

While this view confirms that a negative image can cost a company dearly, its reasoning is flawed. In this view, ethical corporate conduct is an investment in reputational risk avoidance in order to steer clear of the costs that may result from a negative image; it is not motivated by normative, ethical evaluation or the outcome of stakeholder dialogue; it is not rooted in wanting to do what is right.

Humanistic management means getting the priorities right from the outset and emancipating the company, first, from the restraints of a one-dimensional goal set – profit maximization – and, second, from the permanent apprehension of being exposed to the harsh public response that may follow losses of legitimacy.

Freedom from a one-dimensional goal set

The strict application of economic rationality as foundation for the shareholder value – the profit-maximizing objective function – undermines sustained business success. Shareholder value is a resultant benefit of providing products and services that address genuine needs, and producing them in ways worthy of normative legitimization. In other words, *shareholder value is not a strategy*. Companies that fail to see this will find their employees disengaged, their customers disloyal, and their public reputation at risk. Most stakeholders regard shareholder value maximization

as inherently opportunistic, and with good reason, for it is normatively wrong. While those stakeholders that could pose a threat to a company's financial success receive great attention, all others are neglected, regardless of the ethical weight of their concerns. The translation of economic rationality into the profit-maximizing company creates a situation in which rational arguments can be stonewalled by company power.

The profit-maximizing objective function inevitably leads to situations in which asymmetric power relations between a company and its weaker stakeholders result in disrespect for weaker stakeholders' moral right to have their human dignity protected.

Humanistic management acknowledges these shortcomings and enables managers to remove the blinkers that make their vision one-dimensional; it lets *human rationality* prevail over *market rationality*. Humanistic management thus enables managers to maintain their personal integrity, employees are free from working in companies whose primary aims they do not share, and all stakeholders are liberated from corporate citizens that, ultimately, follow the logic of "might is right."

Freedom from losses of legitimacy

Humanistic management substitutes *maximized profits* with *legitimized profits*. Moral or normative legitimacy thus becomes a *precondition* for profit-oriented goals. A company is enabled to share responsibility with its stakeholders, as the balancing of conflicts is transferred from the (monological) executive decision to the (dialogical) "moral site" of stakeholder dialogue.

The commercial risks of losing legitimacy are clear from the possible repercussions of a negative public image on a business. The real reason for seeking moral legitimacy is not commercial risk avoidance, though, but its normative foundation. A company must seek legitimacy to ensure that it does not act against the moral rights of others, that it does not exploit human vulnerability or instrumentalize people following profit-enhancing aims. Thus, gaining legitimacy is a *precondition* for all company activities, an end in itself rather than a means. The commercial benefits that may result from bestowed legitimacy are a bonus for having done what is right, rather than the reason for seeking legitimacy in the first place.

Kant's principle of *publicity* (1795), according to which an action that affects the rights of others is wrong if its maxim cannot be declared publicly, provides the ground rule for principled openness for engagement with all stakeholders. This is how a company obtains its "public

license to operate,” and, if it understands stakeholder dialogue as an ongoing form of legitimizing corporate conduct firmly embedded in the organizational culture, it renews this “license” continuously – free from the constant pressure to manage reputational risks and strategically influence public perceptions.

In return, internal as well as external stakeholders can derive meaning from and find purpose in a company’s activities that create value for society, making them loyal customers, engaged employees, long-term-oriented investors. Stakeholders are then also more forgiving if things do occasionally go wrong. In humanistic management, normative legitimacy becomes the decisive source of societal acceptance while simultaneously enabling managers to maintain their personal integrity as well as the organization’s.

Humanistic management thus frees the company from the constant pressure of losing legitimacy and the need to manage reputational risks, as it has made moral legitimacy the unconditional platform of activities within the market environment. Humanistic management makes moral legitimacy the yardstick for measuring the right or wrong of its conduct.

Kant’s definition of enlightenment as “man’s leaving his self-caused immaturity” (Kant, 1784) serves to describe the emancipation from a profit-maximization focus and an instrumental view of legitimacy. In Kant’s definition, immaturity is the incapacity to use one’s intelligence without the guidance of another. For managers, enlightenment is being freed from a restrictive economic rationality as the source of indisputable guidance that prevents them from exercising their intelligence. Therefore, managerial enlightenment is the emancipation of managers from self-imposed restraints that curtail the intuitive scope and the moral depth of their rationality.

Note

1. Spitzeck, H., Pirson, M., Amann, W., Khan, S. and von Kimakowitz, E. (eds) (2009). *Humanism in Business*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- Kant, I. (1784). Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, Vol. 4, 481–494.
- Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Königsberg.
- Kant, I. (1795). *Zum Ewigen Frieden*. Königsberg.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

2

ABN AMRO REAL – A New Bank for a New Society

Patricia Palacios and Michael Pirson

Succeed by doing the right things, the right way.

Value Proposition ABN AMRO REAL

“Two roads diverged in a wood, and I – I took the one less traveled by and that has made all the difference,” said Robert Frost in his poem “The road not taken” in 1918 (Frost, 2002, p. 270). The road not taken leads to the unexplored; a pathway that usually involves taking higher risks. At the same time, these risks can present opportunities; competitive advantages that can reposition an organization and place it in an entirely new spectrum. ABN AMRO REAL, one of Brazil’s top five largest privately owned banks, is among those leading financial institutions to have chosen a distinct pathway by placing corporate social responsibility at the center of all their business activities. Their business model has revolutionized the South American banking industry, demonstrating to others how an organization can be profitable while maintaining an ethical attitude. In 2008 the bank was declared “the most sustainable bank of the year” by the Financial Times and the International Finance Corporation (IFC) (IFC Press Release, 2008). This case study will illustrate how ABN AMRO REAL became successful by placing corporate social responsibility at the center of their business activities and the lessons that can be learned from their management practices.

Envisioning a new bank for a new society

ABN AMRO REAL traces its roots to Banco da Lavoura de Minas Gerais, a financial group in Belo Horizonte Brazil founded with the aim of providing farmers with financing opportunities. In 1925 Banco da Lavoura de Minas Gerais moved its head office to São Paulo, where it assumed