

## **EDITORIAL: Rethinking socially responsible behaviour of organisations in the new normal**

*Dear readers!*

During the last couple of years, chaotic, turbulent, and rapidly changing environments in which we live and work have become the new normal (Ahlstrom et al., 2020). Exploding technological developments, the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused people to suffer from loneliness and other health and social issues, ecological disasters and climate change, and geopolitical conflicts and wars disrupt our lives at an ever-increasing pace and breadth.

To be sure, recently, organisations have been facing purely simple or complex problems less frequently; wicked problems, which are ill-formulated, where the information is confusing, where there are many decision-makers and clients with conflicting values (McCall & Burge, 2016; Churchman, 1967; Turner & Baker, 2019) prevail. Under such circumstances, businesses should be less concerned about higher profits, and should rather start addressing viability, reliability, and business continuity aspects more. Thus, how to deal with stakeholders including employees, clients, business partners, and the society in general with the intention and aim of ensuring business continuity in the long term?

Although the answer to the question might be to some businesses inconvenient and/or unacceptable, nonetheless, it implies being socially responsible seeing that corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers to “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (European Commission, 2011). Being socially responsible means dealing with “context-specific organizational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance” (Aguinis, 2011, p. 855).

As regards employees, organisations are already implementing numerous initiatives, but they are further encouraged to address employee well-being more and to respect diversity. Employee diversity and inclusion can serve as perfect tools for solving labour shortages or lack of competencies issues. Moreover, as the role of leaders (especially middle level) while ensuring employees positive attitudes (for instance organisational commitment) and behaviour (for instance, organisational citizenship behaviour) is increasing, leadership programmes are welcome.

Turning to customers and business partners, organisations are encouraged to take care of clients and their satisfaction with goods and services proactively. Although using technologies can offer a lot of advantages, businesses should nonetheless rearrange the processes in such a way that technologies did not cause inequality and stress, and were user-friendly.

Finally, turning to society in general, sustainable business models (Broccardo et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2023) could serve as the means for successfully running a business in the long run. The argumentation for this statement is multifold. First, sustainable business models combine economic profit with benefits for all stakeholders. Second, compared to the theory of traditional business models that calls organisations to define the value proposition by considering companies, processes,

customers, products, resources, and suppliers, sustainable business models additionally require ecological and social value as mandatory pillars of the value creation process (Calandra et al., 2023).

Živilė Stankevičiūtė,  
Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania,  
Editorial Board Member, Corporate and Business Strategy Review

---

## REFERENCES

1. Aguinis, H. (2011). Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 855-879). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-024>
2. Ahlstrom, D., Arregle, J.-L., Hitt, M. A., Qian, G., Ma, X., & Faems, D. (2020). Managing technological, sociopolitical, and institutional change in the new normal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(3), 411-437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12569>
3. Broccardo, L., Zicari, A., Jabeen, F., & Bhatti, Z. A. (2023). How digitalization supports a sustainable business model: A literature review. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 187, Article 122146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122146>
4. Calandra, D., Secinaro, S., Massaro, M., Dal Mas, F., & Bagnoli, C. (2023). The link between sustainable business models and Blockchain: A multiple case study approach. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(4), 1403-1417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3195>
5. Churchman, C. W. (1967). Guest editorial: Wicked problems. *Management Science*, 14(4), B141-B142. <https://punkrockor.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/wicked-problems-churchman-1967.pdf>
6. European Commission. (2011). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for corporate social responsibility*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52011DC0681>
7. McCall, R., & Burge, J. (2016). Untangling wicked problems. *AI EDAM*, 30(2), 200-210. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S089006041600007X>
8. Pan, L., Xu, Z., & Skare, M. (2023). Sustainable business model innovation literature: A bibliometrics analysis. *Review of Managerial Science*, 17(3), 757-785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00548-2>
9. Turner, J. R., & Baker, R. M. (2019). Complexity theory: An overview with potential applications for the social sciences. *Systems*, 7(1), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems7010004>