CALL FOR PROPOSALS

REVIEW ARTICLES

Business Ethics Quarterly invites scholars to submit proposals for manuscripts that provide comprehensive and insightful scholarly surveys of topics relevant to business ethics research. Articles developed out of these proposals should summarize recent important research on a topic relevant to business ethics (broadly defined), develop linkages between that topic and other important topics and issues, and provide valuable directions for future research on the topic. Work from both the social sciences and humanities is welcome; authors should consult *BEQ*'s "information for contributors" page to see the range of topics *BEQ* considers for publication (www.businessethicsquarterly.org).

Proposals should be five to ten pages long (double-spaced), not including references. Please limit references to two pages, single-spaced, highlighting the most significant works in the topic area you propose to survey. Any necessary tables or charts should be in an appendix, and should be limited in number.

Submit proposals to editor Denis Arnold at BEQeditor@uncc.edu. Proposals will be reviewed by the editor and associate editors or editorial board members. Proposals will be evaluated on the following criteria:

1) **Importance**: The proposed review manuscript must address an important and substantial area of research, integrating a wide range of research on that topic in a way that makes a clear contribution to the advancement of theory and research relevant to business ethics. The contribution to advancing theory and research is essential; proposals that merely summarize existing research will not be accepted, and manuscripts that fail to advance theory and research will be rejected despite earlier approval of a proposal. Please note that in recent years *BEQ* has published reviews on moral identity, whistleblowing, neuroscientific approaches to ethics, organizational justice research, evolutionary approaches to ethics, the ethics of emotional influence in organizations, personal legacies in organizations, and sweatshop labor issues. Thus we are not likely to accept a proposal on one of these topics unless it takes a radically different approach to the issue. Other topics also are under consideration for publication; authors might wish to check with the journal to determine if their topic of interest already is under consideration.
2) **Organization**: The proposal should be clearly organized, well-argued, and engage the relevant existing research well.
3) **Feasibility**: The proposal should be defined precisely enough that the editors will be able to judge its feasibility.

Authors who are invited to submit a full review article will submit their article to our online manuscript review system. An invitation to submit a full article does not guarantee publication. Review articles will be reviewed by the editor and associate editors or editorial board members.

©2012 **Business Ethics Quarterly** 22:2 (April 2012); ISSN 1052-150X pp. 469–472
DOI: 10.5840/beq201222229

https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

BUSINESS ETHICS QUARTERLY SPECIAL ISSUE: REINTEGRATING INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS FOLLOWING ETHICAL OR LEGAL TRANSGRESSIONS

DUE NOVEMBER 1, 2012

Guest Editors:

Jerry Goodstein, College of Business, Washington State University, Vancouver
Ken Butterfield, College of Business, Washington State University
Mike Pfarrer, Terry College of Business, University of Georgia
Andy Wicks, Darden Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Virginia

With this call for manuscripts, we hope to encourage greater attention to a topic that has gained greater visibility in the business ethics and management literatures within the past few years: the challenge of individual and organizational reintegration following ethical and legal transgressions. We define "reintegration" broadly as a process that involves the repair of relationships damaged by wrongdoing in ways that enable individuals and organizations to regain support (e.g., trust, respect, credibility, legitimacy, reputation) from relevant internal and external stakeholders. We define "transgression" broadly as any individual or organizational act or behavior that violates legal, ethical, or social boundaries.

A few recent efforts have been made to present different models of reintegration at the individual and organization/industry levels. Goodstein and Butterfield (2010) draw on a restorative justice framework to present a process of reintegration related to individual wrongdoing in organizations. They emphasize the importance of (a) offenders taking steps in the aftermath of wrongdoing to make amends with those harmed, (b) victims responding to these efforts by forgiving offenders, and (c) members of the workplace community most directly affected by the transgression in turn extending support to offenders. At the organizational level, Pfarrer, DeCelles, Smith, and Taylor (2008) integrate diverse literatures, ranging from stakeholder theory to crisis management, to present a model of reintegration consisting of four major stages for organizational offenders in interaction with key stakeholders: (a) discovering the transgression, (b) explaining wrongdoing to stakeholders, (c) serving penance, and (d) internally and externally rebuilding organizational processes and legitimacy. There has been growth as well in complementary work focused on repairing damaged interpersonal trust (e.g., Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009) and reputation (e.g., Rhee & Valdez, 2009), on forgiveness and reconciliation in the aftermath of interpersonal offenses (e.g., Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006), and on the normative foundations of moral repair (Walker, 2006) and making amends (Radzik, 2009).

An important goal of this special issue is to extend this existing work by raising and directing attention to important descriptive, explanatory, and normative questions and issues associated with the process of individual or organizational reintegration, thereby encouraging scholars from a variety of disciplines to advance this work in a variety of meaningful directions. Potential topics include, but are not limited to the following:

https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. What actions can an entity (person, group, or organization) take to restore its moral standing and regain support from stakeholders after a legal or ethical transgression? What actions can an entity take to reinforce and encourage the efforts of offenders to be reintegrated?
2. What are the moral obligations of offenders to repair relationships following transgressions? What are the moral obligations of victims and other stakeholders with respect to the offenders' efforts to repair relationships?
3. Does the process of reintegration differ for different types of entities (e.g., for-profit vs. non-profit organizations, companies with high CSR rankings vs. those ranked lower, managers vs. non-managerial employees, senior executives)?
4. Does the process of reintegration differ for legal or ethical transgressions, or is it the same? What restorative actions are more or less effective for each type of transgression?
5. Are actions related to reintegration perceived similarly for all salient stakeholder groups, or are they different? What normative principles (e.g., degree of direct harm) should guide the magnitude of efforts to make amends and, in turn, the magnitude of reciprocal support (e.g., authenticity of offender's actions) by stakeholders within and external to organizations?
6. What conflicts may arise when trying to restore relationships with different stakeholder groups?
7. Do the actions taken by entities following a transgression differ over time? What factors influence the expectations of offenders and relevant stakeholders at different points in time?
8. What are the potential trade-offs in the short and long term with regard to specific repair actions?
9. What individual, group, organizational, and broad social or environmental factors impact the likelihood of an entity becoming reintegrated following a transgression? For example, is reintegration more likely in team contexts with a high level of interdependence? Do particular internal formal structures, processes, and practices facilitate or impede reintegration within organizations, and within industry and institutional contexts? Does regulation play a role?
10. What role do the virtues play in fostering restoration and reintegration—whether on the part of the individual, stakeholders, the organization, or all of the above? How does virtue theory—or other theories of ethics—provide insights and guidance that can facilitate healing in relationships in the wake of transgressions and the process of reintegration?
11. What role do the media and other third party "infomediaries" play in the reintegration process? What influences their actions? How do infomediaries influence stakeholders' perceptions?
12. What are the consequences of successful or unsuccessful reintegration? Does successful reintegration with others contribute to restoring personal or organizational integrity following an interpersonal transgression? Do breakdowns

https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in reintegration increase the likelihood of future incidences of wrongdoing, individual turnover, declines in organizational performance, or other important consequences?

To address these questions, we seek a broad and relevant range of submissions, including both normative, philosophical research and theoretical or empirical (quantitative or qualitative) social-scientific research. We encourage contributions that make use of, and contribute to, one or more theoretical perspectives that find their place within business ethics and other relevant fields of inquiry (such as philosophy, organization studies, religion, psychology, sociology, political science/theory, legal theory, economics, etc.). We discourage manuscripts that fail to reflect the depth and complexity of the full process of reintegration. Papers that are more narrow in focus (e.g., focusing solely on victim forgiveness, emphasizing highly technical legal issues, or restoring reputation only with shareholders) may be desk rejected. We also discourage manuscripts directed to topics related to the broad domain of transgressions, such as corruption, conflict management, and influences on deviant behavior, unless they are directed specifically to the process of reintegration and the kinds of questions and issues outlined above.

Authors must submit manuscripts by November 1, 2012, using *BEQ*'s online submission website (http://editorialexpress.com/beq). Manuscripts must conform to *BEQ*'s normal submission requirements, which are explained in detail on the "Information for Contributors" page at http://www.businessethicsquarterly.org). Manuscripts should not exceed 12,000 words and will be blind-reviewed following the journal's standard process. The Guest Editors will make final acceptance decisions. Be sure to include a reference to "Special Issue: Reintegrating Individuals and Organizations" in the "Comments" box of the submissions website. For further information, contact Guest Editor Jerry Goodstein (jgoodstein@vancouver.wsu.edu).

REFERENCES

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. 2006. Getting even or moving on: Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organizations. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 91: 653–68.

Dirks, K. T., Lewicki, R. J., & Zaheer, A. 2009. Repairing relationships within and between organizations: Building a conceptual foundation. ***Academy of Management Review***, 34: 68–84.

Goodstein, J. D., & Butterfield, K. D. 2010. Extending the horizon of business ethics: Restorative justice and the aftermath of unethical behavior. ***Business Ethics Quarterly***, 20: 453–80.

Pfarrer, M. D., DeCelles, K. A., Smith, K. G., & Taylor, M. S. 2008. After the fall: Reintegrating the corrupt organization. ***Academy of Management Review***, 33: 730–49.

Radzik, L. 2009. ***Making amends: Atonement in morality, law, and politics***. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rhee, M., & Valdez, M. E. 2009. Contextual factors surrounding reputation damage with potential implications for reputation repair. ***Academy of Management Review***, 34: 146–68.

Walker, M. U. 2006. ***Moral repair: Reconstructing moral relations after wrongdoing***. New York: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222229 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222229 Published online by Cambridge University Press