

A conceptual framework for understanding the learning processes integral to the development of responsible management practice.

Abstract-*

Purpose

This paper examines responsible management practice and the learning processes that underpin its development. It presents a conceptual framework to highlight the relationship between the learning experience of the individual and their capacity to develop responsible practice.

Design/methodology/approach

This conceptual paper synthesises knowledge from studies of how managers learn for ethical and responsible practice. A scoping review of peer-reviewed academic papers was conducted using key search terms that included “responsible management learning” (RML), “ethics”, “Human Resource Development (HRD)”, “responsible management (RM)”, “responsible leadership (RL)” and “work-based learning”. Analysis resulted in development of a conceptual framework of responsible management learning processes.

Findings

The review of studies concerned with how individuals learn to manage ‘responsibly’ identified a range of learning processes that are necessary for the development of responsible practice. These learning processes are presented in a conceptual model that offers insights for the design of HRD interventions. Learning for responsible practice is presented as occurring in learning spaces where the learner/ manager experiences a combination of learning processes. These are found to include situated, social and experiential learning that is ‘transformative’, potentially ‘troublesome’, and ‘reflexive’ such that learners develop responsible values and practices.

Originality/value

The paper contributes to the field of management development by focusing on the intersection between what is known about how individuals learn for ethical and responsible practice and the implications for work-based learning pedagogies.

The paper will be of interest to HRD professionals tasked with fostering a responsible and ethical culture within organisations.

Keywords: responsible management practice, responsible management learning, human resource development, workplace learning

1. Introduction.

As organisations increasingly seek to operate responsibly there has been progressively more interest in the development of responsible management practice. 'Responsible management practice' focuses primarily on the individual manager's work practices that lead them to manage responsibly.

One stream of research interest has been in how to develop responsible practice at the level of the individual manager.

This has given rise to a body of studies focusing on responsible management learning (RML). Given the maturity of this literature, it is timely to synthesise the insights to advance understanding about how individuals learn for responsible practice. Much of the RML research has focused on management education's contribution to the development of responsible management practice, with few studies focusing on workplace learning for responsible practice, with the notable exception of Hauser (2020).

The motivation for this article comes from recognition that how managers as individuals learn to be responsible within the workplace is a 'hugely under-researched and under-theorized field' (Cullen, 2020 p. 766). This conceptual paper advances the application of learning theory to responsible management development in work settings. It has significance for the design of learning and development provisions within the workplace, drawing attention to how the learning opportunity afforded by HRD interventions affects the individual's development of responsible management (RM). This is important because it suggests that not all learning opportunities and methods offered by organisations support the learning processes underpinning RML.

This paper's aim is to identify, by a systematic examination of the literature, the nature of the learning processes that enable managers to develop their responsible practice. This enables development of a conceptual model providing insights into how individuals learn for responsible practice, and the implications for the design of learning approaches.

Given that HRD is the area of practice within organisations that fosters long term opportunities for learning and development at the level of the individual, group and organisation, the insights provided in this paper orientate HRD professionals to the design of interventions which can stimulate the learning processes identified. This is timely given that HRD's contribution to developing responsible practice is widely recognised (Preuss *et al.*, 2009; Garavan and McGuire, 2010; Blakeley and Higgs, 2014; Jang and Ardichvili, 2020; Kreismann and Talaulicar, 2021). There is agreement that HRD can develop responsible practice through, amongst other things, providing opportunities for learning that supports ethical organisational cultures and communities of responsible practitioners (Ardichvili, 2013; Mackenzie, Garavan and Carbery, 2012; Blakeley and Higgs, 2014).

The importance of organisationally sponsored HRD interventions and the importance of workplace learning have also been recognised in respect of developing

'responsible management' (Hatcher, 2002; Foote and Ruona, 2008; Preuss *et al.*, 2009; Garavan and McGuire, 2010; Anderson *et al.*, 2014; Blakeley and Higgs, 2014; Hauser, 2020; Jang and Ardichvili, 2020). However, the insights from such studies have not yet been synthesised into a framework. This article contributes to theoretical and practical knowledge of the learning processes required for developing of RM.

The central question addressed is: *What are the learning processes that enable individuals to develop responsible management practice?*

To address this question, the paper is organised into the following sections. Section 2 outlines the methods employed. Section 3 offers the theoretical background to the paper. It reviews the literature on responsible management that appertains to how individuals learn and develop responsible management. Subsection 3.1 examines what constitutes being a 'responsible manager'. 3.2 focuses attention on the role of HRD in providing individual learners with learning occasions that develop responsible practice. Section 3.3 reviews studies that examine the learning processes required for individual responsible management learning. This conceptual analysis leads to a conceptual framework that assimilates the findings on RML and directs attention to the type of learning that supports the development of responsible practice, and as such provides guidance to HRD practitioners tasked with developing RM. Section 4 discusses the implications for HRD research and practice.

Methodology

This section communicates the key methodological considerations that led to this conceptual paper. Following Jaakola (2020) consideration was given to the theoretical framing where theories and concepts relating to the 'focal phenomena', responsible management learning' were selected and analysed. These were identified through a careful review of relevant literature. This was identified via a search of peer-reviewed, English language journals within institutional databases subscribed to by a large UK university. These included Business Source Ultimate, Complementary Index, APA PsycInfo, Science Direct, ERIC, Academic Search Ultimate, Emerald Insight. Most sources were from journals in the fields of general management, CSR and ethics, organisational behaviour, training and development and management education. The article search focused on the years 2000-2022 and included primary research and review papers. Papers were excluded if they were not accessible and did not focus on the 'focal phenomenon' (Jaakola, 2020) of RML. 58 publications were of direct relevance, with 18 papers being deemed particularly insightful.

A scoping of the literature appertaining to RML was conducted using terms including, but not limited to, 'responsible management learning', 'responsible management practice', 'responsible leadership development', 'learning for responsible practice' and 'learning for ethical practice.' Papers were rejected if they did not focus on individual learning processes. An iterative and incremental review of the resulting literature pool revealed an important conceptual underpinning and theme, namely a focus on the learning processes that resulted in RML.

18 papers focused on the significance of the learning experience to individuals developing responsible practice with a particular focus on the process by which the learning occurred (Table 1). These papers were analysed for their role as 'lenses' into how managers learn about responsible practice. Papers were deemed 'relevant', and then subjected to detailed analysis, when they focused on identifiable learning processes. In addition, papers were included where the learning process was deemed to be effective, or had the potential, to support the RML.

Jaakola (2020) talks of the importance of conceptual papers making the 'chain of evidence' clear, that is the association between concepts. An inductive analysis of the key papers, with a focus on identifying the salient learning processes provided a particular set of knowledge about how learning for RM occurs (section 3.3). These enabled development of a set of propositions (1- 8) that offer purchase on the learning processes underpinning the core concept, RML. These give rise to the conceptual model (fig 1) identified in section 3 delineating what is known about the salient features of individual learning that support the development of RM practice. It also revealed limited studies of RML in work-based learning, the majority examining RML in educational settings.

To verify the extent of workplace learning for responsible practice, a second search was conducted of the HRD literature using combinations of the search terms 'HRD', 'management development', 'training', 'learning' with 'CSR', 'ethics', 'sustainable' and 'responsible practice'. This revealed few studies (5 papers) that examine empirically or conceptually the potential of HRD interventions for developing responsible practice and all paid limited attention to the learning processes underpinning the intervention, and the individual process.

3.0 Theoretical background.

It is now accepted that organisations and those that work within them must act in morally responsible ways, but understanding just what this entails is problematic, both for academics, organisations, and practitioners. The concept of responsible management (RM) has emerged as a unifying concept.

3.1 Responsible management practice: what does it entail?

'Responsible management' and 'responsible leadership', although broad in their conceptual description have emerged to offer explanatory insight into those management practices that encompass ethical, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability practices at the micro, meso and mega levels (Voegtlin et al., 2012; Laasch *et al.*, 2020).

Recent studies use a practice-based conception of responsible management placing the manager at the centre of moves towards organisational responsibility and recognising the situated, social nature of responsible management (Chapple *et al.*, 2020; Gheradi and Laasch, 2021). At the level of the individual manager the focus has been on values, behaviours, and competences, even emotions that predispose them to behave responsibly (Laasch *et al.*, 2022; Laasch and Moosmayer, 2015; Carmeli *et al.*, 2017; Osagie *et al.*, 2018). This has included the possession of certain virtues, and traits (Crossan *et al.*, 2013) where personal qualities, such as

moral integrity led individuals to manage responsibly (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999) and develop through a progressive understanding of 'who to be' and 'how to be' (Erikson and Cooper, 2019).

Being 'responsible' entails demonstrating accountability for one's actions: being moral and trustworthy (Cunliffe, 2009) and exhibiting care-driven values (Carmeli *et al.*, 2017). It requires being able to identify 'right-wrong' decisions and not being irresponsible (Nonet *et al.*, 2016), being an 'activist' not 'abdicator', (Carrington *et al.*, 2019), and challenging morally suspect practice (Hibbert and Cunliffe, 2015). It thus entails 'doing good' (Waldman and Galvin, 2008) and 'what is right' rather than just avoiding 'doing harm'.

Responsible management is associated with managing positive relationships with key individuals and groups (Maak, 2007; Doh and Quigley, 2014), often portrayed as sustainable and honourable relationships with stakeholders. This can entail collaborative relations and social partnerships, sometimes across industry sectors and with NGOs (Rondinelli and London, 2003). Responsible management is thus found to be relational where expert knowledge is shared, embedded in daily practices and within communities (Figueiredo *et al.*, 2021). It is increasingly conceived as a situated and social practice (Laasch and Gherardi, 2019) that depends on relationships which can cross professional, organisational and industry boundaries. Whilst a particular focus has been on managers and leaders in senior positions (Maak and Pless, 2006; Waldman and Balven, 2015) it is expected of all managers per se (Hiekkataipale and Lämsä, 2017).

A conceptual, but also practical problem for managers seeking to act responsibly is the differences amongst organisational members in their understanding of what 'being responsible' may entail. Senior executives may exhibit responsibility to shareholders and institutional investors (Waldman and Galvin, 2008) and may even view responsible management as abiding by efficient market rules and behaviours, whereas middle and lower-level managers may identify with the interests of employees, peers, and customer groups. Therefore, responsible management requires the capacity to make sense of, and reconcile, divergent interests and perspectives (Maak and Pless, 2006; Doh and Quigley, 2014; Pirson, 2020).

The above section has examined what constitutes a responsible manager.

Proposition 1: Responsible managers demonstrate identifiable personal qualities such as a moral and responsible mindset, the capacity to recognise and engage in principled behaviours and practices.

3.2. Developing responsible managers within organisations

Within organisations it is Human Resource Development (HRD) practices that determine the organisational interventions supporting workplace learning.

Whilst HRD's role in enabling individuals to make responsible choices across all the organisations operations is acknowledged (Ardichvili, 2013; Jang and Ardichvili, 2020) there appears to be limited attention to how HRD programs within workplace

settings develop responsible practice, the exception being Hauser's (2020) focus on ethics and compliance programmes.

Proposition 2: HRD professionals seeking to enable RML require a holistic understanding of the learning processes through which individuals develop responsible practice.

Proposition 2 is attended to in the following section where a review of the literature on RML processes provides insights into how individual managers 'learn' to be responsible.

3.3 Theoretical framework: the importance of learning processes for the development of responsible managers.

In this section the dominant contributions, themes, and commonalities within-the literature on RML provide the landscape for discussion of the key learning processes for which responsible management development (RMD) interventions need to be designed for. This review is timely, given that studies of how organisations and managers learn responsible practice within workplace settings are of increasing interest (Hauser, 2020; Cullen 2020).

Studies interested in RML at the level of the individual are examined to understand the nature of learning that develops the capability of the individual to be responsible. This leads to the derivation of a conceptual model (Fig 1) that conveys the learning processes underpinning RML.

Table 1 is offered as illustrative of the literature that informed the development of the paper. Table 1 identifies studies that focused on the learning experiences of individual learners within educational settings are included as they focus on the processes by which individuals learn responsibility.

It should be noted that, although the paper's focus is primarily on individual learning, this is understood as "the kernel for the growth of collective learning" (Swart and Harcup, 2013, p. 339).

[Insert table 1]

Proposition 3: A review of research literature on RML identifies the learning processes by which individuals develop responsible practice. Existing studies suggest the development of responsible management capabilities is mediated by the learning processes an individual experiences.

The following sub-sections synthesise and organise the learning processes that analysis of the literature (table 1) identifies as important to how individual learners develop responsible practice. Based on this review propositions 4-7 are drawn in respect of the nature learning for responsible management. The propositions emerge through the research process that identified distinctive characteristics to the learning

process for RML and offer a framework for understanding how RML occurs. Fig 1 seeks to outline these key processes within one framework.

3.3.1- 'Knowing' what is 'responsible'

Learning is traditionally recognised as a process of knowledge acquisition, sharing and construction (Kraiger *et al.*, 1993; Antonacopoulou, 2006).

Whilst Doh and Quigley (2014) suggest responsible leaders “serve as an internal advocate and carrier for knowledge flow and distribution” (p.265), they find the link between responsible leadership and knowledge sharing is under-researched. So too is the nature of knowledge required by a ‘responsible’ manager. Laasch *et al.* (2022) identify ‘knowledge’ as one of six competence domains for responsible management.

Montiel *et al.* (2020) builds on Hibbert and Cunliffe’s (2015) work on facilitating learning about responsible practice through ‘threshold concepts’, suggesting that responsible practice requires managers to acquire new realms of knowledge and patterns of knowledge. These change managers’ ways of thinking, orientating them towards previously unknown ways of understanding responsible practice. Montiel *et al.* (2020) finds 33 threshold concepts that group into six important knowledge areas for responsible practice: stakeholder dynamics, emotional agency, value creation, ecological connection, altruism pitfalls and management reinventions.

Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) identify a knowledge-practice gap recognising that knowledge of responsible management does not necessarily result in managers engaging in responsible conduct. Dzhengiz and Niesten’s (2019) study of competences for environmental sustainability offers insight into the learning processes through the concept of ‘absorptive capacity’ where learners must be motivated to assimilate and use new knowledge.

Proposition 4: HRD interventions need to facilitate the absorption, sharing and embedding of relevant workplace knowledge for responsible practice.

3.3.2 Learning to discern the ‘moral rules-in-use’, ‘troublesome knowledge’ and transformative learning

‘Transformative learning’ is learning that entails “a deep structural shift in the basic premises of thought, feelings, and actions. It is a shift of consciousness that dramatically and permanently alters our way of being in the world” (O’Sullivan and Morrell, 2002, p.18). ‘Transformative learning’ has been the subject of research interest with respect to sustainable business practice & development (Balsiger *et al.*, 2017) and responsible management learning (Hibbert and Cunliffe, 2015).

‘Transformative learning’, is seen as important if values and beliefs, work practices and priorities are required to change, or divergent stakeholder and wider societal expectations are to be responded to.

One of the reasons for interest in Mezirow’s (2003) notion of ‘transformative learning’ is his suggestion that ‘principles of judgement’ develop. This moral position is “achieved through reasoning which focuses on the particularity of differences in points of view” (Mezirow, 2003, p.623). This suggests that opportunities for

transformative learning will provide managers with the means, when working with key organisational members and stakeholders, to work out what the responsible action entails and to change their practices.

As Rion (1990) asserts, the difficulty for the responsible manager is discerning what is morally right whilst facing a constant and rapid flow of interrelated decision processes that require action. Responsible management therefore requires managers to be capable of recognising the moral and ethical implications of their practice. Responsible managers need to continually “ascertain which moral rules-in-use apply in given situations. Such assessments are always complex and often intuitive” (Jackall, 1988, p.600). They require learning to differentiate between irresponsible and responsible actions (Hibbert and Cunliffe, 2015) which can be difficult (Parkes and Blewitt, 2011).

Mezirow (1991, p.15) suggests that individuals would not usually “examine the pre-suppositions upon which habits of expectation are predicated” unless they face ‘disorienting dilemmas’. These are occasions where an individual’s understanding of the world does not fit with their situation or experience, such that they must question their conventional practice. ‘Managing responsibly’ will create situations where the conventional ways in which managers operate will be challenged. For example, the conventional economic premise of the primacy of shareholder value may need to change to acknowledge multiple stakeholder interests. As Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) suggest, such ‘troublesome’ situations provide opportunities for learning, particularly about occasions of management irresponsibility. Their paper reveals the importance of establishing “space for emotion and confusion” in order that “responsible managers can identify what is troublesome in their own practice” (p.179). Although Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) suggest this within an educational setting, it is a valuable point that has relevance for learning in the workplace, implying the need for organisations to offer opportunities for learning that is transformative, and to support learners as they face potentially disorientating transformations.

Proposition 5: HRD interventions for developing RP should recognise the transformative nature of RML within a liminal space that may be disorientating for the learner.

3.3.3 Learning by reflection and reflexive practice

Central to ‘transformative’ learning is the capacity for learners to engage in both reflective & reflexive practice. Recent work has identified its importance in guiding moral practice and responsible management (Hibbert and Cunliffe, 2015; Hedberg, 2017). Sunley and Coleman (2016) and Hedberg (2017), examining management development for responsible management within educational settings, argue for the development of managers as ‘reflective practitioners’ because reflection increases moral attentiveness, awareness of moral issues and ethical expertise.

As Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) suggest, “morally reflexive individuals question existing practices (their own and others) and understand the responsibility this brings in terms of acting to change situations” (p.185). This might lead to a rejection of current organisational practices and, as Reynolds and Vince (2016) suggest, may

entail asking questions that are unpopular, unwelcome, and painful. However, this questioning of one's own and organisational practices can lead to generative learning through 'radical-reflexivity' (Allen *et al.*, 2019).

Hedberg (2017, p.520) points to collective reflection as important to the development of moral expertise, behaviour, and moral courage. Collective reflection enables parties to "explicitly discuss and understand social cues and moral constraints, and ultimately change moral intuition through deliberative reason". This is to find reflection is not just an individual process, but a collective learning process.

Proposition 6: HRD interventions for developing RP should support morally reflexive and reflective learning.

3.3.4 Social learning.

It is increasingly recognised that responsible leaders and managers work with and through a network of others, including stakeholders (Pless *et al.*, 2012; Doh and Quigley, 2014; Voegtlin, 2016; Osagie *et al.*, 2018). Indeed, responsible management is unlikely to be achievable unilaterally or without consultation, as it relies on interactions with other organisational members who also have moral agency. It is achieved "in social processes of interaction," that create the conditions for employees to behave in responsible ways (Maak and Pless, 2006). Whilst the social nature of responsible practice is recognised, developmental perspectives fostering occasions for collective learning appear rarely in the literature on responsible management learning. However, Garavan *et al.* (2010) identify HRD's role in facilitating social learning processes that support stakeholder framing and analysis of complex CSR and CS issues.

Implicit in an acknowledgement that learning is social and occurs through interactions with others is recognition that reciprocal or mutual learning can occur (Gheradi *et al.*, 1998). This acknowledges the joint achievement of shared understanding and knowledge, perhaps suggesting a convergence of learning, a co-construction. Benn *et al.* (2013) supports this notion of co-evolution of learning within communities of practice for sustainability. This points to the importance of shared sensemaking as a means for parties to learn what constitutes responsible practice. Fougère *et al.* (2020), examining RML in service level agreements, illustrates the importance of reciprocal learning that occurs across professional and organisational boundaries.

Young (2006), in a paper on global justice, presents 'responsibility' through a 'social connectedness model'. Her focus is on the notion of 'shared responsibility' which she explains as 'personal responsibility for outcomes, or the risks of harmful outcomes, produced by a group of persons and shared between them'. She proffers that "sharing responsibility means, in part, that agents challenge one another and call one another to account for what they are doing or not doing" (Young, 2006, p.130). This allows managers to understand the values and moral position of others, exposing them to different ways of thinking and acting. This 'collective reflection' provides a means to 'change moral intuition' which in turn can lead to 'mindful ethical behaviour' (Hedberg, 2017, p. 520).

Proposition 7: HRD interventions for developing responsible practice should enable situated and social learning where the focus is on shared responsibility.

This section, through examining the nature of learning for responsible practice, leads to a conceptual model (Fig 1.) that portrays the learning conditions suited to the development of responsible practice.

The study finds learning for responsible practice entails knowledge acquisition and application, which is sometimes troublesome. It occurs through reflexive practice, is transformative and often social. For HRD professionals seeking to enable RML this orientates them to the importance of HRD interventions providing these learning processes.

Proposition 8: It is possible to identify specific learning processes that enable development of RML and are relevant to the choice & design of HRD intervention. Absence of these reduce the potential of an HRD intervention to support RML

3.4 Development of a conceptual framework

In this section a conceptual model of learning processes that enable RML is introduced (fig 1). The framework synthesises the key learning processes that underpin successful development of responsible management practice revealed by analysis of the literature. These are the learning processes that management development programs should facilitate if they are to have the best chance to develop responsible behaviours. As such the conceptual model integrates insights into how managers learn for responsible practice into one holistic framework.

The theoretical anchor to the model is adult learning theory (Yang, 2004). This accepts the utilisation of different learning theories, individually or together, and supports an integrative approach.

[Insert fig 1]

4. Discussion and Implications

This paper responds to an absence of attention, within the HRD and management development literature, to how managers develop responsible practice. The paper brings together intersections in the literature on RML to identify the individual learning processes that enable the development of responsible management.

Its contribution to knowledge is to highlight the pivotal role of learning processes in developing responsible management practice. The conceptual model provides comprehensive insights into the nature of the learning experience by which RML occurs. The model has implications for the design of HRD interventions used to develop responsible management practice. Delineating the processes by which learning occurs suggests the importance to HRD practitioners of creating appropriate learning climates. The insights into the nature of learning are important for both direct and indirect HRD interventions.

4.1 Implications for RML research

This paper, by examining what is known about learning for responsible management offers a step toward the development of a unified and stronger understanding of what learning for responsible management practice entails. It achieved this by demonstrating commonalities in the existing research on RML and developing these into conceptual streams enabling better comprehension of the range of learning processes that underpin RML.

There has been limited attention to the learning processes of individual managers, so this paper contributes to studies of RML by directing attention to their learning experience.

4.2 Implications for HRD research

HRD scholars can make a valuable contribution to the responsible management development agenda given their knowledge of learning theory. Research that examines learning for 'responsible practice' within ordinary work practices is lacking, despite the importance of workplaces as sites of RML.

This paper begins to develop a pedagogy for learning that directs attention to the capacity of HRD initiatives to facilitate learning for responsible practice. Given that studies exploring how HRD interventions provide the appropriate learning conditions and processes are noticeably absent, this is an area for future research.

As a conceptual paper the model has not been empirically tested. Future research might empirically test the conceptual framework by investigating the learning opportunities provided by different types of HRD interventions, and their effectiveness in enabling managers to develop their responsible work-based practices. Exploratory research would be an appropriate research design given that the learning processes for RML are underexplored. The research should examine HRD interventions within organisational, as opposed to educational settings and focus attention on relationships between the learning processes and learning outcomes such as moral mindsets and behaviours. The focus would be on the individual and how they learn RM, with attention to participants' own insights into the learning environment and processes. The research should be longitudinal to examine the transformational impact of the learning experience and if, when and how managers applied the responsible practice lens in workplace situations.

At times the concepts of 'responsible management' and 'responsible management learning', given their breadth and nebulous nature, were difficult to handle conceptually. Further research could usefully explore the implication of this for both researchers and managers.

Finally, very few empirical studies were found in management settings, which suggests that grey literature and professional practice sources, which were not used in the review, could be insightful in respect of HRD's role in enabling RML.

4.3 Implications for HRD practice

HRD practitioners have an important role in developing responsible management practice in organisations by their choice of HRD interventions. Not all HRD interventions are likely to provide the learning conditions required for the development of 'responsible practice'.

This paper draws HRD professionals' attention to the experience of how individuals learn for RM, highlighting the important influence of the learning processes afforded by work-based learning intervention design.

The conceptual framework (fig 1) suggests an integrative and holistic approach to learning, and, as a such, a new model for HRD practice. This contributes to HRD's body of knowledge in respect of the type of learning that HRD interventions can engender. It suggests an important role for HRD in facilitating and supporting the process of learning. It provides insight into the type of learning that HRD interventions would need to offer. It suggests those interventions that facilitate deep, personal, situated, and transformative learning experiences have the potential to be more effective in developing responsible practice. Enabling RML will not occur through the surface-level learning of methods such as instruction.

The conceptual framework of learning processes that underpin RML provides an organising structure for carrying out development interventions for RM highlighting the significance of the individual's developmental experience and the need for their engagement with, identifiable learning processes.

There are organisational implications that arise from the type of learning found to develop responsible practice, for example, facilitating managers' skills and awareness of how they learn by developing reflective practice and supporting developmental/collaborative networks that examine existing workplace practices.

HRD professionals will need to recognise the importance of supporting an individual's learning for responsible practice, given that it may entail questioning existing practice and confronting troublesome knowledge, such as recognising where areas of irresponsibility exist. This support may take the form of reflective logs, mentoring and communities of learnings, but it may also have implications for wider HR practices such as line management support, reward, and performance management.

Currie and Knights (2003) suggest that stimulating managers to reflect critically may be challenging because these are not skills normally required of their role. They also suggest that many managers may be more interested in building their careers than examining their social and environmental responsibility. Reflection may result in 'transformative learning', which Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) suggest can result in feelings of vulnerability and insecurity as managers are required to shift their world view. This can encourage defensive routines and, at worst, withdrawal from the programme. Hibbert and Cunliffe (2015) talk of "the pain associated with questioning habitual ways of thinking and acting" (p.179). These are ongoing work relationships; they are not classroom simulations or reflections within an education setting, and as such they cannot be allowed to fail. Therefore, organisations will need to find ways to recognise and reward engagement with the responsible agenda.

A limitation of the study is that the learning processes offered by the different HRD interventions are not examined, this provides opportunities for further research. Further studies might examine how particular HRD interventions can be used to facilitate learning processes that support and develop RM. Given different development options expose learners to different learning processes, it may be that coaching and mentoring programmes are more suitable, as opposed to approaches centred on imparting knowledge, such as classroom-based interventions.

5.0 Conclusion

This paper finds that the literature on learning for responsible management reveals identifiable learning processes that have the potential to transform both managers' mindsets and practice. This suggests the importance of designing HRD interventions within organisations that support and facilitate moral development, through opportunities for critical reflexivity and transformative learning.

Bibliography

- Abdelgaffar, H. A. (2021), "A review of responsible management education: practices, outcomes and challenges. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol.40 No. 9/10, pp.613-638. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-03-2020-0087>
- Allen, S., Cunliffe, A.L. & Easterby-Smith, M. (2019), "Understanding Sustainability Through the Lens of Ecocentric Radical-Reflexivity: Implications for Management Education", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.154, pp.781–795. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3420-3>
- Anderson, V., Garavan, T., Sadler-Smith, E. (2014), "Corporate social responsibility, sustainability, ethics and international human resource development", *Human Resource Development International*, Vol.17 No. 5, pp.497-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2014.954187>
- Ardichvili, A., Jondle, D. (2009), "Integrative Literature Review: Ethical Business Cultures: A Literature Review and Implications for HRD", *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.8 No.2, pp. 223 - 244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153448430933409>
- Ardichvili, A. (2013), "The Role of HRD in CSR, Sustainability, and Ethics: A Relational Model". *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.12 No.4, pp. 456–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484313478421>
- Balsiger, J., Förster, R., Mader, C., Nagel, C., Sironi, H., Wilhelm, S., Zimmermann, A.B. (2017), "*Transformative Learning and Education for Sustainable Development*". *GAIA* Vol. 26 No.4, pp.357-359. <https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.26.4.1>

Bass, B. M., Steidlmeier, P. (1999), "Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.10 no.2, pp.181–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8)

Benn, S., Edwards, M., Angus-Leppan, T. (2013), "Organizational Learning and the Sustainability Community of Practice: The Role of Boundary Objects". *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 26 No.2, pp.184-202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026613489559>

Blakeley, K., Higgs, M. (2014), "Responsible leadership development – crucible experiences and power relationships in a global professional services firm". *Human Resource Development International*. Vol.17 No.5, pp.560–576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2014.954192>

Carmeli, A., Brammer, S., Gomes, E., Tabar, S.Y. (2017), "An organizational ethic of care and employee involvement in sustainability-related behaviours: A social identity perspective". *Journal of Organizational behaviour*. Vol.38 No.9, pp.1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2185>

Carrington, M., Detlev, Z., Benjamin, N. (2019). "Activism and Abdication on the Inside: The Effect of Everyday Practice on Corporate Responsibility". *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.160 No.4, pp.973-999. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3814-5>.

Chapple, W., Molthan-Hill, P., Welton, R. (2020), "Lights Off, Spot On: Carbon Literacy Training Crossing Boundaries in the Television Industry". *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.162 No.4, pp.813-834. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04363-w>

Crossan, M., Mazutis, D., Seijts, G., Ganz, J. (2013), "Developing leadership character in business programs". *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol.12 No.2, pp.285-305. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2011.0024a>

Cullen, J. (2020), "Varieties of Responsible Management Learning: A Review, Typology and Research Agenda", *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.162 no.4, pp.759-773. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04362-x>

Cunliffe, A. L. (2009), "The Philosopher Leader: On Relationalism, Ethics and Reflexivity—A Critical Perspective to Teaching Leadership", *Management Learning*, Vol.40 No.1, pp.87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507608099315>

Currie, G., Knights, D. (2003), "Reflecting on a Critical Pedagogy in MBA Education. *Management Learning*, Vol.34 No.1, pp.27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507603034001129>

Doh, J.P., Quigley, N. (2014), Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: influence pathways and organizational outcomes", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol.28 No.3, pp.255–274. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0013>

Doh, J. P., Stumpf, S. (2005), "*Handbook on responsible leadership and governance in global business*". Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Dzhengiz, T., Niesten, E. (2020), "Competences for Environmental Sustainability: A Systematic Review on the Impact of Absorptive Capacity and Capabilities", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol.162, pp. 881–906. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04360->

Eraut, M. (1985), "Knowledge creation and knowledge use in professional contexts", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol.10 No.2, pp.117-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075078512331378549>

Figueiredo, M.D., Castro N.M. and Silva, M.E. (2021), "A practice-based learning approach toward sustainable consumption in the workplace", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 197-211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-05-2020-0086>

Foote, M. F., Ruona, W. E. A. (2008), "Institutionalizing Ethics: A Synthesis of Frameworks and the Implications for HRD", *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.7 no.3, pp.292–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484308321844>

Garavan, T. N., McGuire, D. (2010), "Human Resource Development and Society: Human Resource Development's Role in Embedding Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability, and Ethics in Organizations", *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol.12 No.5, pp.487-507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422310394757>

Gherardi, S., Laasch, O. (2021), "Responsible Management-as-Practice: Mobilizing a Posthumanist Approach", *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04945-7>

Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D., Odella, F. (1998), "Toward a Social Understanding of How People Learn in Organizations: The Notion of Situated Curriculum", *Management Learning*, Vol.29 No.3, pp.273–297. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507698293002>

Hatcher, T. (2002), "*Ethics and HRD: A New Approach to Leading Responsible Organizations*". Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Hauser, C. (2020), "From Preaching to Behavioral Change: Fostering Ethics and Compliance Learning in the Workplace", *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.162, pp.835–855 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04364-9>

Hedberg, P. R. (2017), "Guiding Moral Behavior Through a Reflective Learning Practice", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol.41 No.4, pp.514–538. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562917695199>

Hibbert, P., Cunliffe, A. (2015), "Responsible management: engaging moral reflexive practice through threshold concepts", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.127 No.1, pp.177-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1993-7>

Hiekkataipale, M., Lämsä, A. M. (2017), "What Should a Manager Like Me Do in a Situation Like This? Strategies for Handling Ethical Problems from the Viewpoint of

the Logic of Appropriateness”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.145 No.3, pp.457-479.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2911-y>

Jaakkola, E. (2020), Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. *AMS Rev* **10**, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>

Jackall, R. (1988),” Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers”, *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol.1 No.4, pp.598-614.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20006876>

Jang, S., Ardichvili, A. (2020), “Examining the Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Resources: Implications for HRD Research and Practice”, *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.19 No.2, pp.183–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320912044>

Kraiger, K., Ford, J. K., Salas, E. (1993), “Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.78, pp.311–328.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.311>

Kreismann, D., Talaulicar, T. (2021), “Business Ethics Training in Human Resource Development: A Literature Review”, *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.20 No.1, pp.68–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320983533>

Laasch, O. (2018). Just old wine in new bottles? Conceptual shifts in the emerging field of responsible management. *CRME Working Papers*, Vol.4 No.1, pp.1–13.

Laasch, O., Moosmayer, D., Antonacopoulou, E., Schaltegger, S. (2020), “Constellations of Transdisciplinary Practices: A Map and Research Agenda for the Responsible Management Learning Field”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.162 No.4, pp.735-757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04440-5>

Laasch, O., Moosmayer, D.C. & Antonacopoulou, E.P. (2022), The Interdisciplinary Responsible Management Competence Framework: An Integrative Review of Ethics, Responsibility, and Sustainability Competences. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05261-4>

Maak, T. (2007), “Responsible Leadership, Stakeholder Engagement, and the Emergence of Social Capital”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.74 No.4, pp.329–343.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9510-5>

Maak, T., Pless, N. (2006), “Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society- a relational perspective”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.66 No.1, pp.99–115.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9047-z>

MacKenzie, C., Garavan, T., Carbery, R. (2012), “Through the looking glass: Challenges for human resource development (HRD) post the global financial crisis—business as usual?” *Human Resource Development International*, Vol.15, pp.353-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2012.669236>

Mezirow, J. (2003), "Transformative Learning as Discourse", *Journal of Transformative Education*, Vol.1no.1, pp.58–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344603252172>

Montiel, I., Gallo, P.J. & Antolin-Lopez, R. (2020), "What on Earth Should Managers Learn About Corporate Sustainability? A Threshold Concept Approach", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.162, pp.857–880. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04361-y>

Nonet, G., Kassel, K., Meijs, L. (2016), "Understanding responsible management: emerging themes and variations from European Business School programs", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.139 No.4, pp.717-736. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44164253>

O'Sullivan, E., Morrell, A. (Eds). (2002), "*Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning: Essays on theory and praxis*", New York: Palgrave.

Osagie, E. R., Wesselink, R., Runhaar, P., Mulder, M. (2018), "Unravelling the Competence Development of Corporate Social Responsibility Leaders: The Importance of Peer Learning, Learning Goal Orientation and Learning Climate", *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol.151 No.4 pp.891-906. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3638-8>

Parkes, C., Blewitt, J. (2011), "Ignorance was bliss, now I'm ignorant and that is far more difficult, transdisciplinary learning and reflexivity in responsible management education", *Journal of Global Responsibility*, Vol.2 No.2, pp.206-221. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20412561111166058>

Pirson, M. (2020), "A Humanistic Narrative for Responsible Management Learning: An Ontological Perspective", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol.162, pp.775–793 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04426-3>

Pless, N. M., Maak, T., Waldman, D. A. (2012), "Different approaches toward doing the right thing: Mapping the responsibility orientations of leaders", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol.26 No.4, pp.51–65. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0028>

Preuss, L., A. Haunschild, A., Matten, D. (2009), "The Rise of CSR: Implications for HRM and Employee Representation", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.20 No.4, pp.954–972. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190902770893>

Rion, M. (1990), "*The Responsible Manager: Practical Strategies for Ethical Decision Making*", Harper & Row.

Rondinelli, D., London, T. (2003), "How corporations and environmental groups collaborate: assessing cross-sector collaborations and alliances. Assessing cross-sector collaborations and alliances," *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol.17 No.1, pp.61-76. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2003.9474812>

Sunley, R., Coleman, M. (2016), "Establishing a foundational responsible mind set", In Sunley, R., Leigh, J. (Eds.), 2016. *Educating for Responsible Management: Putting Theory into Practice*. (pp.28-51). Sheffield: Greenleaf publishing.

Swart, J., Harcup, J. (2013), "'If I learn do we learn?': The link between executive coaching and organizational learning. *Management Learning*, Vol.44 No.4, pp.337–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507612447916>

Voegtlin, C. (2016), "What does it mean to be responsible? Addressing the missing responsibility dimension in ethical leadership research", *Leadership*, Vol.12 No.5, pp.581–608. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1742715015578936>

Waldman, D. A., Gavin, B. M. (2008), "Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol.37 No.4, pp.327-341. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230299061_1

Waldman, D., Balven, R. (2015), "Responsible Leadership: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions", *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol 28. No.3, pp.19–29. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0016>

Yang, B. (2004), Can adult learning theory provide a foundation for human resource development? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6 (2): 129-45

Young, I, M. (2006), "Responsibility and global justice: A social connection model", *Social Philosophy & Policy*, Vol. 23, pp. 102-130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2534-8>