IJSRIS journal

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE STUDIES

ISSN: 2820-7157
www.ijsrisjournal.com

June 2026 Volume 5 Number 3 289-301

Received Date: 21 April 2026 Accepted Date: 12 May 2026 Published Date: 1 June 2026

Values-based management and social responsibility in humanist and responsible companies become explicit for modern companies of the 4th type

BAFOSAMBI BATAELYANGA Franck, BOONE IMBOLO Jean Michel, MAYIFILUA N'DONGO Innocent, MOULIONGO Dany, BULAYI MUZUBA Desire

1. Researcher at the Centre for Research in Human Sciences (CRESH), Department of Economic Sciences and Finance, BP 3474 KINSHASA-GOMBE, Democratic Republic of Congo, (+243) 814528177, ORCID No.: 0009-0000-9417-5888, gaipid2020@gmail.com

Abstract

Corporate Social Responsibility: Values-Based Management, or a Managerial Revolution? The answer remains to be defined, and they provide some key insights here. Companies are major players in society, and their management depends on values acceptable to their social environment. The concept of a responsible company, developed by the United Nations, recognizes that "Businesses have a sustainable role and can manage their operations in a way that stimulates economic growth and enhances competitiveness while ensuring environmental protection and promoting social responsibility." A simple exercise is to list your values and compare them with the corresponding management practices, which aspire to a new economy and a new generation of companies of the fourth type.

Introduction

The concept of human capital: managing it effectively to leverage it intelligently. A company's human capital is an intangible investment comprised of all its skills, creating value and driving performance. Human capital management aims to invest in the skills, knowledge, and experience of the women and men who make up companies. "We have not yet fully grasped the brutality of the change, much less the necessary adaptations required to respond harmoniously to the new economic reality. We must move from the domination of power to the domination of knowledge. Management's command will give way to the inspiration of people on the ground because they will better understand market conditions and how to respond to them (Léon Courville 1994).

We are currently experiencing a management crisis that is leading us to question the methods and structures, the mission and purpose of our largest companies. The rapid pace of change that characterizes our era in all political, social, cultural, and economic spheres forces the industries it is disrupting to confront the insurmountable. This is the conclusion drawn from the analysis and recommendations contained in the report, long "forgotten" by the leaders of major corporations, including those of Bell Systems, who had commissioned Alvin Toffler to find a dynamic approach. Years have passed, and the advent of the new technological revolution assailing our industrialized societies only confirms the pressures of the shock of the future and the third and fourth waves, and justifies the paths and means he advocated for meeting the great historical challenge posed by our forefathers, such as Adam Smith and Ronald Coase, which they are or were facing.

This article updates the discussion and is one of those that address the issue context by context, placing conclusions within the perspective of the present and our lived experience: adapt or perish. More than a prophetic vision coming true, it serves as a compass to guide us through the turbulence of our changing society, or a new economy taking hold. What is true is that we are experiencing a "Management" crisis that compels us to question even our largest companies: their methods and structures, their mission and purpose. As Alvin Toffler said, the constant concern in business today is to adapt in order to avoid perishing (Alvin Toffler, 1985, p. 7, 14-15).

This concept is indeed interesting both internally and externally to the company. It allows us to move beyond the usual divisions between departments, providing a perspective and a direction for living and working together, sharing the merit and the profits generated. It offers a holistic approach focused on what is essential to the functioning of businesses, along humanistic lines. Externally, the orientation of social responsibility, or a managerial revolution of values, is crucial to performance, as it recognizes the efforts made at work and contributes to the company's success. In practice, drawing on numerous concrete examples, the authors present the constraints and advantages, the strengths and dilemmas of the company in relation to its environmental and social responsibility, and thoroughly analyze the challenges and limitations of the relevant mechanisms.

This journey shows that the benefits of corporate social responsibility are far from straightforward. In particular, it highlights the temporal dimension of the change processes at work. This is evident in the theories that drive responsible and humanistic business. This article is notable for the clarity of its analyses and the richness of its arguments. These are currently being pursued through a managerial revolution: acceptable values and a concept of sustainable development and globalization. This theme, which we describe as: designing an excellent marketing plan, is based on the idea that "the power that resides in [man] is new in nature, and no one knows what he can do, and he does not know until he tries." Marketing is the art and science of customer engagement. It's about determining what your current and future customers perceive as what they want, need, can use, and can truly afford, and then helping them achieve it by creating and structuring your products and services in a way that delights customers and motivates them to embrace your mission as their own." Raph Waldo Emerson in the book Now. A Great Company! by (Mark Brian Tracy) Annon: what is currently being added is management by values as social responsibility, in the responsible and humanistic company intended for managers, researchers, and students in industrial economics. "The pressures exerted by shareholders, employees, consumers, certain NGOs, and the regulatory framework are increasingly influencing leaders. Between real progress, strategies of apparent compliance, and inaction, the challenges are framed in terms of transparency, risk, and reputation.

By integrating sustainable development goals, corporate management becomes more complex. New management and evaluation methods emerge, combining different dimensions of responsibility and involving stakeholders. The thicket of new management tools—codes of conduct, social and environmental standards and certifications, social reports, ratings—must be deciphered akin to market analysis, drawing on numerous concrete examples. In this discussion, we present the constraints, strengths, and dilemmas of companies facing their environmental and social responsibility and analyze in depth: the challenges and limitations of the mechanisms involved. (Michel Capron et al. Paris 2004, p. 2).

This article offers a reflection on its positioning, along with empirical elements drawn from the field of companies undergoing transformation and embracing social, sustainable, and humanistic responsibility. Concrete situations are examined within the context of the myth and reality of the responsible company, and humanistic management provides elements for understanding the implementation of a composition within the environment and offers clarification for a better understanding of this form of management for atypical companies, new practices, and new collective values, their activities under the understanding of humanistic companies through management. We assure you that with so many questions:

To accelerate this process, we have some relevant questions to guide current and future research:

- What should you do if you have let yourself get angry with a colleague in front of an entire department or company?

- Can the manager's knowledge and skills alone solve problems and move the company forward?

- How to manage and motivate your company through values and pay your staff with recognition?

- What factors influenced interprofessional relations in your company?

This section provides advice and personnel management tools to help you transition from traditional personnel management to high-level values-based management. It outlines the qualities and attitudes that should be shared by all employees and managers, including the manager.

- Is a humanistic company more successful than a traditional company?
- Is the world moving towards a more humane form of capitalism?
- Is this responsible company liberated?
- Is the responsible company laying eggs in the eyes of the eye, or is it a managerial revolution?

All these questions will be answered throughout the work. We had compiled the following key points:

1) State of the question
2) Corporate Social Responsibility
3) Why talk about the human cost in companies today? Is the world moving towards humanist capitalism?
4) Strong measures and a humanistic approach in a liberated company.
5) Is a humanist company more efficient than a liberated company?
6) Strong measures for a humanistic approach in a liberated company.

1. State of the question

The concept of the humanistic company has encountered too many managerial currents, managing human capital within the company, how to take advantage of this precious intangible asset, theorized in the 1960s by two American economists, Theodore SHULTZ, then Gary BECKER, the concept of human capital considers the individual as the sum of three elements which are skills, experiences and diverse and varied knowledge" (Manager en mission www.managersen.mission.com) in their book Managing Human Capital within the Company) (2018).

Alvin Toffler remains constantly preoccupied with adapting or perishing! in his work "Adapt or Perish and the Enterprise Facing the Shock of the Future" (1986, p. 7). The ongoing school of thought to understand the enterprise, which Jean-Marc Vittor, in an article published on September 30, 2013, still discusses, was inspired by Ronald Coase, who died in 2014, and who invented the concept of "transaction cost," a valuable insight for understanding the existence of businesses and institutions, long ignored by economic science.

Ronald Coase, Nobel laureate, was decidedly not a man like any other. He was passionate about a subject of study neglected by his peers: why does the corporation exist? The answer he gave at the age of sixty-three remains illuminating, leading today to fascinating questions about the future of the corporation, central to the strategic thinking of Vivendi, Microsoft, and Samsung. To avoid further escalating the situation, as seen in an article in the prestigious "Harvard Business Review" about his peers' inability to shed light on these debates, and to offer any useful guidance to managers and entrepreneurs, the responsible and humanistic corporation can play a role in clarifying what Adam Smith said: "the nature of the corporation, its reason for being." Today, Michel Capron et al., in their work "Enterprise and Society: Myths and Realities," explore the collective and socially responsible corporation. It also includes the sharing of knowledge, which stems from training.

Professor Albert Bope Lobo, in his book "Management of Organizations 2018," discusses the impact of human resource management: "Innovative organizations actively encourage the training and development of their members, whose knowledge remains within the group, and act according to the social climate. Apologizing in front of the entire team clearly exposes the manager. If an employee has influence, they will not hesitate to use it to destabilize the manager by making a joke, a remark, or a sneer, which will put the manager in a position of justification. Therefore, use this approach with moderation. The development of effective and sustainable leadership that you will acquire, as well as the implementation of collective and human organizational strategies, will allow us to contribute to the sustainable growth and productivity of your company, based on the participation of each individual and the collective, through shared values."

All the answers have taken shape, according to the authors. Jacques Horovitz's book on the "humanist enterprise" (2013) adds that "its management depends on the values acceptable to its social environment. Pressures exerted by shareholders, employees, consumers, certain NGOs, and the regulatory framework increasingly influence managers. Between genuine corruption, apparent compliance strategies, and a wait-and-see approach, the issues are framed in terms of transparency, risk, and reputation." "By integrating sustainable development objectives, corporate management becomes more complex. New modes of steering and evaluation emerge, combining the different dimensions of responsibility and the involvement of stakeholders: the lack of new management tools—codes of conduct, social and environmental standards and certifications" (Michel Capron, 2004, p. 58)—has altered management by "values."

Its epistemological approach is often hypothetico-deductive; we will formulate hypotheses while empathizing with the subject. This approach would still be inductive, even "compressive," recursive, and iterative (Pailli and Mucchulli, 2010, p. 73). "In this paper, we hope the ideas, examples, and concepts you will discover in this article will be useful in your own search for greater collective intelligence, involvement, humanism, and responsibility in your company" (Researcher BAFOSAMBI Franck et al., 2025). An examination of the different theoretical and practical conceptions of social research in companies reveals great diversity and ultimately considerable uncertainty regarding what is meant by corporate responsibility. Nevertheless, we can distinguish some characteristic types of practices, allowing us to better understand the possible room for maneuver. These maneuvers were, however, the work of the State, which wanted to humanize companies and organizations.

Why this article?

The importance placed on human capital has grown stronger since organizations realized that their success or failure largely depends on how they leverage their teams. This observation is almost entirely absent in Congolese companies and in parts of Africa, even where successful businesses exist. "Managers must focus on the complementarity of skills and personalities within their teams, rather than solely on a dazzling array of abilities. Indeed, it is by capitalizing on this diversity of skills within the group that they can foster a strong team spirit and generate genuine synergy."

In concrete terms, it touches on all the major problems facing the planet in this 20th and 21st century debate: effects of climate change, water scarcity, depletion of natural resources, extinction of species, energy consumption, epidemics, poverty, uncontrolled mass migration, respect for human rights, valuation of human resources… the issues are therefore immediately at a global level, even if they must be broken down at local and regional levels, which are little known in our country.

This trend toward socially responsible business cannot be complete without incorporating the concept of the humanist enterprise. This type of business is still a surprise to some economists, managers, and industrial economics researchers, who are largely unfamiliar with these kinds of questions and research. We must understand that these businesses are evolving, and so are the concerns of their leaders. The role of the humanist enterprise, which aligns more readily with that of sustainable development, shares the same focus: people, society, the environment, and a different approach to management.

2. Managing human capital within the company

As a creator of value and a driver of performance, human capital management aims to invest in the skills, knowledge, and experience of the women and men who make up companies—a valuable intangible asset. "The human-centered company places people at the heart of its strategy by combining economic performance, employee well-being, and social responsibility. It is based on transformational leadership, trust, a sense of purpose, and the development of individual skills within a collective framework" (Management en mission https://www.manager.managersenmission.com).

2.1. Key principles of the human enterprise

- "People first": success is linked to well-being, kindness and quality of work life (QWL);
- Trust and autonomy: management encourages initiative and self-reliance, rather than strict control;
- Meaning and purpose: employees understand the impact of their work beyond simply producing a profile;
- Skills development: investing in capital through continuing education and apprenticeships;
- Corporate social responsibility: acting for the common good while respecting the environment and stakeholders.

Implementation of the humanist enterprise

To become a humanistic company, it is necessary to transform the management culture, shifting from control to management based on sharing, understanding individual differences, and cooperation. This requires involving employees in decisions and valuing dialogue. Managing human capital, as a precious asset, is essential (Manager on assignment, 04/04/2018, www/https/hecexecutive school.be, accessed 12/04/2026).

2.2. Responsible Management, a three-level structure

To become a reality, responsible management requires a shift in mindset regarding the design, production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. It must also be supported by the transformation of individuals within companies and society as a whole. In other words, responsible management is not a method that can be applied by following a set recipe; it requires rethinking our habits and biases and reflecting on the values that guide our actions.

This training program is structured around seven key values, designed to help participants better understand responsible management. Each value is presented from three analytical perspectives.

- The individual (or micro) perspective examines the behaviors and attitudes of people within and around businesses. It is often through individual actions that collective movements emerge and inspire profound changes in our societies.

- The organizational (or meso) perspective focuses on the actions of the company, as well as its structure, processes, and stakeholders. Companies are also powerful agents of change that can significantly influence the future of humankind on planet Earth.

- The societal (or macro) perspective focuses on changes that involve society as a whole. It integrates governments, international institutions and civil society organizations into the equation of responsible management" (Council Cabinet consulted on 07/04/2026 at 14:54).

2.3. How to manage human capital

Managing human capital is a real challenge for companies, and more specifically for managers who have to collaborate with individuals possessing sometimes very different skills and personalities. How can this rich pool of skills be transformed into a true driver of performance, crucial for gaining a competitive edge in a difficult environment? Here are some ways to achieve this:

2.3.1. Placing employees in the right position

The concept of human capital rests on the idea that each individual possesses skills and diverse knowledge, representing valuable assets that can contribute to a company striving for performance and profitability. The first task of a manager involved in human capital management within their company is therefore to recognize these characteristics. The objective: to offer each employee a position that aligns with their abilities and core motivations.

However, it's important to remember that these specificities can evolve over time. Indeed, an employee's role should be viewed as something that can change, not as something permanently fixed. Furthermore, it's thanks to this internal flexibility that the company is able to adapt to an environment subject to sometimes very rapid changes. – Johan Sellito, Email:contact@sellito.com.

3. The direction of corporate social responsibility

One of the central questions concerns the scope of corporate responsibility, which implicitly raises the question of who is responsible for determining the general interest or the public good. The international legal order does not present standards that prioritize social, health, and environmental regulations over those of commerce, and a widely held view today asserts that it is sufficient to trust, on the one hand, the business community to regulate economic activity and, on the other hand, private charity to repair the damage caused by this activity.

Defining corporate responsibility today, therefore, raises many difficulties, as we shall see. The European Commission, for example, considers that "Being socially responsible means not only fully complying with applicable legal obligations, but also going beyond them and investing more in human capital, the environment and relations with stakeholders" (European Community Commission, 2001). The ambiguities of the concept stem from the fact that responsibility can result from both a commitment and an obligation. Thus, depending on the country and culture, the emphasis is placed on one rather than the other; the Anglo-Saxon world tends to place more trust in voluntary approaches, even at the risk of creating significant inequalities; while the Latin world prefers binding measures that provide a minimum set of rights and obligations for all.

Faced with this concept of responsibility, several questions arise: Is the company responsible? To whom is it accountable? What is it responsible for? What is the extent of this responsibility? These are all fundamental questions that do not have single answers and depend on the conceptions of the company and its role in society. "Being responsible" simply means taking ownership of one's actions and their consequences and accepting to answer for them. "Responsible" does not, however, mean "guilty": the concept does not necessarily imply that a fault or offense has been committed. Many great authors, mostly philosophers, have written on this concept, which was initially a legal one. Two of them in particular, Max Weber (1959) and Hans Jonas (H.

Jonas, 1990), have influenced or implicitly inspired all discourse concerning corporate responsibility; the former because he developed the idea of an ethics of responsibility that takes into account the foreseeable consequences of all human action; and the second because he emphasized the responsibility of the living generation towards future generations.

The contemporary theme of corporate responsibility has found, at least in Europe so far, an ideological reference point capable of establishing a body of "best practices," or even standard behaviors: sustainable development. In practice, there is now an assimilation between the "socially responsible" company and the one that contributes to sustainable development, as evidenced by these two quotes from public authorities: "Corporate social responsibility can play an important role in advancing sustainable development" (Anna Diamantopoulou, European Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs, July 2002); "Within the context of a global awareness of the challenges of sustainable development, Congolese companies are being led to fully exercise their social and environmental responsibility in their activities," as has been the case for French companies (Interministerial Committee on Sustainable Development Strategy, June 3, 2003).

The concept of sustainable development is not without its ambiguities: definitions abound; the principles invoked vary from one actor to another, and one of the basic principles, the precautionary principle, is widely controversial. The number of dimensions tends to increase when, for example, the cultural dimension is included, and so on. The "triple P" slogan, which popularized the notion, even has two different interpretations: People, Planet, Profit for the business community; and People, Planet, Prosperity for international organizations within the UN system. But Alain Etchegoyen points out that the term "sustainable development" is convenient because "it resolves ambiguities and contradictions inherited from the very words 'responsibility' and 'value,' which are plagued by cynicism or misunderstanding" (A. Etchegoyen, March 18, 2003).

3.1. Why talk about the "human cost"? Is the world moving towards a humanist capitalism?

Refusing to discuss the human cost reduces the world to a field of economic confrontations aimed solely at gaining market share, and to achieve this, at lower costs and increased competitiveness for firms. This new business model, the neoliberal enterprise (Armand Zacharie et al., 1999, p. 186), enriches all areas of society. "Social interests vanish."

“Businesses coexist within the same society with other organizations and economic agents: government agencies, the state, consumers, banks, etc. They forge complex and numerous relationships with their environment, within which clarification is useful for a better understanding of their activities. Businesses take on many forms. The effects of globalization. The emergence of citizen movements. This is accompanied by deregulation that is beginning to unsettle the capitalist system itself, which is searching for new regulations.” (O. Postré et al., 2003, p. 17).

These often originate from Anglo-Saxon proposals and initiatives that tend to spread worldwide, forcing European firms to react and adapt. Frequently referred to as "market regulation" or "self-regulation," they concern not only financial and commercial systems, but also two of the "pillars" of sustainable development: the social and environmental dimensions. We are therefore faced with the following paradox: the weakening of states and supranational organizations leads to companies playing an increased role in conducting world affairs, even as they suffer a crisis of legitimacy and trust and must make significant efforts to regain this trust from society.

This need for companies to seek legitimacy is recurrent, but it is felt particularly acutely today. The formalization of rules in the area of corporate responsibility, which is "the guarantor of access to legitimacy" (L. Gauthier, 2001, pp. 70-76), is an important indicator. In 2002, the Johannesburg World Summit was a striking illustration of this paradox; the issue of corporate responsibility made a notable entry into the arena of international debate, but at the end of the negotiations, no binding provisions were adopted, and the problems were left to the self-regulation of economic actors.

3.2. The company facing its environment

Creating a fulfilling work environment is a fact: truly fulfilled employees are more productive and creative than others. But how do you make your employees happy and motivate them to invest themselves sustainably in their tasks, even when those tasks are particularly complex? By encouraging them in their actions and trusting them. In short, by allowing them to work in ideal conditions.

Investing in a selection of Human Capital Management (HCM) funds

It is sometimes difficult to accurately assess the actions taken in a field as vast and complex as human capital management within a company. Fortunately, HR managers can support their approach with an HCM solution to achieve their goals.

Whether completely standalone or integrated into an HRIS (Human Resources Information System), HCM software allows for the management of numerous aspects related to this mission, including recruitment, training, time management, identification of at-risk profiles, and skills development (Johan Sellico, accessed 12/04/2026).

The concept of "corporate responsibility" itself gives rise to various formulations that can be a source of confusion. Translated directly from the Anglo-American "corporate social responsibility," the most common, universally accepted term (responsabilité sociale d'entreprise) can suggest a conception limited to what pertains to relationships between people within a community, or what promotes individual well-being, or what relates to common interests (for example, "social accounts" to refer to companies' financial statements). This explains why French often uses the term "sociétal" (Robert Historical Dictionary, 1970s) to express a broader dimension and thus avoid any confusion.

However, due to the increasing use of English, the French term "social" tends to encompass the societal dimension as well... This complicates matters. For these reasons, the phrase "global corporate responsibility" is becoming more widespread, and it is in this sense that we will speak of corporate social responsibility (CSR), as we have chosen to adhere to current usage. The acronym CSR will therefore refer, in this article, unless otherwise stated, to the social (in the narrow sense), environmental, and societal aspects of corporate responsibility, as has just been clarified. The concept of the humanist company also deserves consideration.

Like Véronique Cherki, who addressed the theme "How do we recognize a values-driven company?" In her article "Fragments of a Humanist Company," she notes that: "After having sacralized the pursuit of profit and chosen the expansion of wealth as the ultimate goal, the question of the humanist company arises at a time when economic and social indicators are flashing red." She suggests that the principles of the humanist company respond to the ever-growing needs of a population yearning for meaning. A corporate culture rooted in the values of humanist philosophy.

Humanism places humankind at the center of the world and considers the good of humanity as the ultimate goal of all human activity. It stems from an anthropological reflection: all humans are of the same species. From this flow a morality and a political system, embodied in the humanist project described at the beginning of this work, where Jacques Horitz was most eloquent. These human organizations are built upon the converging bridges of various humanist currents, from the progressive Catholicism of Marc Saignier, through the Christian humanism of Charles Péguy, the self-management socialism of Mancudor Dia, the ethics of Abbé Pierre, and the Chinese humanism of Confucius.

This new ethic considers the individual as the absolute reference point and their pursuit of self-determination as the primary principle of humanity. In his plea for business, Bernard Collomb, former CEO of Lafarge, writes: “The humanist company is the one that reconciles its commitment to its employees, its social and environmental responsibility, and its duty to its shareholders. The world to come will be so complex that it will favor companies that know how to put their efficiency at the service of respect for humankind and its environment. It is in the social and solidarity economy sector that we find the first organizational models based on the values of this philosophy (El Isaac Getz, Bundok of the group that manages: 2000 companies across France, Switzerland and Quebec (New Economy, http://www.humanisme and lumière.com, accessed 2012).

The concept of a business also warrants some commentary. A "business" can be simply defined as any organized entity whose purpose is to produce economic goods and services. However, a more precise definition is not straightforward given the increasing difficulty of delineating the boundaries of such an entity: the deliberately broad approach we favor allows us to exclude no activity or organizational structure as long as it makes use of human, social, or natural resources. The concept of responsibility is now extended to other human organizations that integrate this theme into their thinking and practices: government agencies, social organizations, and platform associations. What we regret is the evolution of these business models, which are less well-known in the DRC and among our economists as well. We remembered the discussions within the industrial economics research group where some of our elders did not want to differentiate between economic transformation and the new economy, as a kind of rupture, but the deployment of liberated, humanist, responsible business models is currently coming to us like aliens, where does it come from, where is it going? It is precisely the new economy that is taking root in new businesses.

4. Strong measures or a humanistic approach in a liberated company

“This is the period for developing strong measures, not just for the bosses,” says Isaac Getz, Professor at ESP Europe and author of the book on organizational transformation. “All employees are finally contributing to control, but also to guide teams and allow everyone to participate in the company’s project. Success requires internal communication. It’s about enabling each employee to share the company’s strategy and be more effective in their role. Like a mission-driven organization, this management model is unique, yet multifaceted, since there are as many examples as there are companies, each creating its own tailor-made methods. It differs from all other forms of organization; even giving employees more freedom still requires them to speak on behalf of an employee about what they need to live and accomplish their tasks” (Steve Bussières, accessed 2022).

“One example is that of the director of the Bussières family-owned metal products factory in Saint-Henri. His boss, Stive Bussières, eliminated the traditional organizational structure that had been in place in his company since 1991, replacing it with a new one based on trust and everyone's involvement in the company. He stated, ‘I was struggling with the pressure of my responsibilities. When I saw that other Quebec companies like Cascades and Regitex had freed themselves from all responsibility and were waiting for new rules to emerge naturally from collective intelligence, I decided to take a single step: eliminating the timesheet system. The first decision: they now report their hours based on trust. The acquisition of a new machine, the start of a new project, the renovation of a space, and all their day-to-day operations are decided by everyone. The boss or manager attends the meetings, but their voice no longer carries the same weight as the problematic one, which rests in the hands of the employees involved, and that's for the best.’” Surprisingly, these types of companies have seen consistently increasing revenues, as CEO Bussière noted in the example above. This trend toward employee-level responsibility does not signal the end of managers, but rather a complete transformation of their roles. They are gradually shifting from controllers to facilitators, focusing on meeting employee needs and supporting their initiatives. This approach requires putting aside personal responsibilities and accepting a flattening of hierarchical relationships. In many liberated, humanistic, and responsible companies, this translates into the elimination of privileges such as offices and parking spaces, leading to compromises between superiors and authoritarian attitudes” (Christophe Deschamps et al. 2011, p. 7).

Simplifying structures and placing trust in employees are becoming increasingly important for modern businesses. Another example comes from the group led by Bundock, CEO of the business leaders' association, a network that now boasts over 2,000 members across Quebec, France, and Switzerland, and which inspires people to get involved and implement things that work. "Today's managers are revolutionizing the businesses of tomorrow and ensuring the success of the current ones," he says. "These innovative organizations are unique and agile; they could become the norm for certain types of businesses, and everything suggests that there will soon be thousands of them worldwide," concludes Isaac Getz.

The pressure and control exerted on employees lead to demotivation; workers want more than just a (decent) salary. They seek meaningful work that allows them to express their skills and creativity. Other observers, such as Ebrahim Meharan, Professor of Management and Technology Development at the University of Quebec at Montreal, note that in the face of this upheaval of traditional practices toward a more human-centered approach, we should seize the opportunity. In other words, we must always be ready to change our ways of doing things, to modify our practices and resources.

4.1. Practical and durable results

“What we need is no longer thinkers, but people who act and solve problems. It's not about regimenting employees, but about giving them the information and the means to act so they can find their own ways to implement solutions. Does this mean managers should no longer think or decide? No, on the contrary, they must have sufficient experience in their field to know in advance how to act and react. Reflection no longer happens only when an action is planned, but continuously.”

Like a captain in a storm, it is during the environment in which they must operate that this, of course, has significant repercussions on how a company is conceived. Formerly, decision-makers—all employees—become decision-makers, no longer having to wait for orders from headquarters as before. At most, company management must give its employees a vision of its development and a framework within which they must operate: the type of clientele, budgets, collective responsibilities. But within this framework, they must make their own decisions and act, emphasizes Isaac Getz, Bundock. (Bundock et al., accessed 2022). This primacy of action leads to the disappearance of hierarchy in the sense of collective work. The goal of this speed, a sense of urgency, and the collective well-being of responding quickly to customer needs, is to avoid the pitfalls of a hierarchy. Today, it is no longer possible to consider the known in separate terms.

“In a world where everything is done differently, a company that develops dissonant messages internally and externally, from top to bottom, is a ‘schizophrenic’ organization that keeps its employees in a dangerous state of disorientation,” emphasizes Ebrahim Meharan, quoted above. Why, moreover, is ethics devoted to the distinction between good and evil, while the approach to corporate social responsibility (CSR) focuses on issues of efficiency, operational effectiveness, sustainability, and, of course, accountability? Finally, ethical behavior is equated with behavior that respects regulations and contractual commitments; however, most approaches aim to go beyond mere compliance with obligations, particularly through voluntary commitments.

The ethical approach to corporate responsibility thus appears limited and is, moreover, absent from most European initiatives. Giving rise to varying discourses and practices, the notion of corporate responsibility also raises many questions about its social significance. Is it a passing fad or a fundamental shift? Smoke and mirrors or sincere commitments? For some, it is a response from the business world to protests, resulting in non-binding regulation of capitalism that is insufficient and even dangerous; for others, there is a "major historical opportunity" to seize, because the corporate social responsibility movement can be a sufficiently powerful lever to transform the reality of businesses and financial markets, and therefore play a crucial role in influencing the course of globalization. (Steve Bussière et al., accessed 2022, p. 3). Both of these perspectives are within the realm of possibility, but in our view, there is still a long way to go. The future will largely depend both on the capacity to structure professional and political mobilization on these issues and on the ability of stakeholders to implement the approach. As for the humanist enterprise, it is led by a servant leader.

Shouldn't we be talking about the majority of today's businesses and their materialistic and short-termist characteristics? Traditional businesses have remained organizations where the important thing is to control all human resources (people are now just resources like oil, electricity, or machines). Domination and authority have become so paramount that they are as important as the company's core business: professional managers can move from a perfume and soap company to one that assembles cars, because they aren't asked to know how to pack cereal boxes or assemble scooters; they are asked to organize, to ensure that no one turns right when someone else tries to turn left, to borrow Yoshikazu Hawawa's image. It is indeed the traditional company that must adapt and diversify its management styles.

The perception gap is widening... Because employees themselves are expressing a distress and fatigue that can be perplexing. How many times have we heard, "I wonder when things will calm down..."? But, over the years, "it" doesn't seem to calm down... Employees feel like they're subjected to decisions as if they were mass treatments, whereas we all know that everyone wants to be treated as a unique individual!

“In a knowledge economy where obsolescence is accelerating, the plurality of knowledge, reasoning, skills, and people is definitively fracturing the established order. The fundamental way of functioning is no longer sustainable in its current state. The shift from vertical to lateral organizations is becoming inevitable. Faced with the vagaries of the environment, the future lies with organic organizations and their capacity for rapid reconfiguration. The challenge for new managers will therefore be to mobilize the skills of each employee, foster their potential, and cultivate collective drive while minimizing the negative environmental impact of the company. However, leaders do not always have the latitude they would like.” Harmand Hatchud and Blanche Segrestin from the Mines ParisTech school emphasize that it allows shareholders to pursue objectives other than shareholder value as long as these objectives are approved and evaluated” (Blanche Segrestin, Armand Hatchud 2012 p.290)

How can we make the 4th type company a community of energy investments and more explicit dreams?

Once the initial surprise has passed, shouldn't leaders and managers question what leads these employees to adopt these behaviors? What are the conditions that create these behaviors? And, among these conditions, what role do they play, through their behaviors and the messages they convey, since they carry the company's credo (or at least a discourse through which their employees envision their company)? What will they discover? That their employees very often engage in pure reciprocity of treatment, which translates into what could be called mirror behaviors. Let's keep in mind that a perceived lack of meaning is one of the major factors of stress... All things considered, we note that the confrontation of the hypotheses of this study: "values-based management as the first hypothesis. A company that is becoming more human. 'Our company is one big family,' they have bosses saying, is concerned about the meaninglessness of the proposition." Employees and workers are thus drawn into an organization about which they know practically nothing, and for which they cannot demonstrate any initiative, placed in total ignorance, simply carrying out orders without seeking to understand. They are therefore difficult to motivate.” (Nicole Danone et al, pp. 11-16).

In the hypothesis section, among the four contributions to this thesis, Bernard Benattar begins by challenging us on the very expression "values-based management," because "managing" often implies being calculating and prudent, while "values" seem to mean precisely the opposite: you would be better off discovering where this philosopher is going with this! In another piece, Michel Calef questions this oxymoron before discussing the behaviors, structures, and processes necessary to bring values to life in business. This first part of the article deciphers in detail, firstly, what values are and, secondly, the necessary coherence between these values and how the company is managed. The first point is approached through humanism and the second through responsibility. But an overview of the company in the 21st century was necessary before going further. These are the reasons why problems can exist in traditional businesses.

“When we alluded to this in the article co-authored by Nicole Danon, Régine Lepage & Jocelyn Rémy, we presented a wide range of factors that can lead to demotivation in today’s workplace. Our three authors have provided an initial overview that raises serious questions. The company, once a tool for production, has become a tool for profit and therefore materialistic. This situation is exacerbated by the short-term views of shareholders, whose sole reference point is the share price, and of certain managers who struggle to implement long-term policies knowing that their careers are judged on short-term results. And, for their part, employees are destabilized by these constant changes, this blurring of the lines between private and professional life, and this excessive workload in an increasingly dehumanized company” (Jacques Horovitz, 2013, p. 10). The leader of the humanist company—the servant leader—uses a leadership model based on performance at all costs; pressure and coercion are no longer effective. The current economic environment and crisis are leading us to seek another form of leadership: one that focuses on serving rather than self-serving, transforming the fear underlying many autocratic behaviors into a genuine interest in personal development.

This explanation of servant leadership rests on the hypothesis that "values-based management finds its answer in the humanistic company." According to Sandra Sala, "servant leadership is based on moral authority and influential management founded on human values such as listening, humility, authenticity, empathy, ethics, empowerment, and the development of others. It involves authentic communication and a good understanding of oneself, enabling a process of continuous improvement while fostering the development of others and oneself. It places the individual at the heart of the company and values interpersonal skills."

The responsible company, as a hypothesis of the responsible company in light of organizational theories, as seen in the introduction and on page, is progressing, but very unevenly, sometimes hesitantly, sometimes opportunistically. And while one might think that this responsibility is structuring for these strategies, one can also imagine the resistance at play. The question is therefore posed: in a capitalist market economy, can a company normally integrate corporate social responsibility? Or the humanistic context of the company? To form the fourth type of company? In other words, beyond the occasional power struggles and the personal involvement of this or that company leader, are CSR and overall performance generalizable criteria? A look at the theories can help us answer this (M. Friedman 1971, p. 92). Humanistic companies: employees benefit from their income as a form of recognition. He is not paid according to his status, nor is he rewarded with a higher rank to earn a good salary solely through recognition for "working well individually or collectively" for the entire company.

What responsibility do which leaders, companies, and businesses bear?

This concerns "social responsibility." Michel Capron poses a new question: is it smoke and mirrors or a managerial revolution? For the authors of the book "Myths and Realities of the Responsible Company," the answer remains to be defined, and they provide the keys to understanding it here. Companies are major players in society, and their management depends on the values acceptable to their social environment. Pressures exerted by shareholders, employees, consumers, certain NGOs, and the regulatory framework increasingly influence leaders. Between genuine progress, strategies of apparent compliance, and inaction, the challenges are framed in terms of transparency, risk, and reputation.

By integrating sustainable development goals, business management becomes more complex. New modes of governance and evaluation emerge, combining the different dimensions of responsibility and the involvement of stakeholders; the thicket of new management tools—codes of conduct, social and environmental standards and certifications, social reports, ratings—must be cleared and analyzed (Michel Capron et al. 2004). In the debate animating businesses, civil society, not to mention managers and researchers, advocates for an alternative approach, clarity of analysis, and robust argumentation.

5. A possible theoretical alternative based on the notion of social responsibility, responsible and humanistic companies, and true values and leadership:

This hypothesis, or similar hypotheses, are normalized by the influence of managers in civil society and the State, which represents the international community. "But the school of thought that Marx, close to humanist thought, makes a clear error in the theory of the end of classes: it believes in the linearity of social history. Because a trend was true during the post-war boom, many think it must continue thirty years later at the same pace. The history of the 19th century is such that the respective fluctuations of the objective facets (structured and subjective inequalities, collective identities) of social classes have their rise." As DL Charvel stated in *Revue de l'Office* no. 79, October 2001, pp. 353-354, in Marx, a class "in itself is a group sharing the same conditions of existence, linked to its position in the mode of production and management. The class becomes 'not-self' when its members become aware of their shared interests and the need to organize to defend them." Following the "spiral of social classes" in 1930, 1950, 1970 and 2000 of the paradox of collective action, according to OSLO (American Sociologist, author of the logic) of collective action, 1965, collective participation is more and more costly for each of the members of the group, it assumes, in fact, that individuals surround themselves with love, flee accusations that carry weight between personal matters, and that individuals devote part of their time to organizational tasks.

“This is a societal issue, as economic activities both produce and consume wealth, both human and natural. It is indeed necessary to establish behavioral standards to prevent irreversible destruction and mitigate the damage caused. When asked about environmental quality, everyone surveyed consistently says they want a clean world. But how much are these people willing to pay for it? Environmental quality comes at a cost, whether in terms of waste management, pollution prevention, or the high prices of eco-friendly products. In short, maintaining our high standard of living requires using more natural resources, some of which are non-renewable, and generating more pollution. Our environment can absorb the majority of the population and its waste, as long as it doesn't exceed a certain level. But beyond these limits, environmental damage is often irreparable.”

In public markets, the world is considered a resource, private or common, that individuals can use as they see fit to maximize their private gains in free markets. Social efficiency consists of taking extremes into account, that is, basing individual actions not only on private benefits and costs but also on social consequences (John Sloman et al., 2011, p. 320). However, it is important to include in "the world" the consequences for future generations and not just those for the individuals who make up the economy today. The Brundthand Report, since 1987, has provided a definition (which was reiterated at the Earth Summit held in Rio in 1992) of sustainable development, a reference point (E. Armand et al. 2005), and an intergovernmental vision of development. The report begins with an intergenerational perspective, defining sustainable development as "the ability to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The report identifies three dimensions that must be integrated into all sustainable development initiatives: the economic, the environmental, and the social. To be sustainable over time, the development of a society implies the reproduction and expansion of three dimensions of the capital stock:

- Classical economic capital;
- Economic capital is composed of all the natural resources inherited by a generation;
- The capital of social equity can be likened to the integrative capacity of the community, which depends in particular on access to wealth and its mode of repair.

Two schools of thought clash: one argues that, without pressure or threats to their profits, companies would not spontaneously engage in ethical or environmentally friendly actions. The other contends that it's not all about subtle marketing and communication strategies, and that companies are capable of genuine commitment. Why pit the two against each other? What if there were a third way, as proposed by Pierre Rabhi and the Colibri movement in their International Charter for the Earth and Humanism? The concept of "colibrisism" and collectivism is emerging, which could be a point of discussion—don't we know the extent to which each person contributes to the well-being of those who serve?

Epilogue

Skills and knowledge evolve with experience and assignments. To enable employees to utilize their best skills at any given time, and above all to give them the opportunity to develop their practices, it is essential to protect them and regularly immerse them in situations that push them out of their comfort zone. It is indeed when faced with a challenge that an individual is most likely to innovate and therefore progress. Of course, developing new skills also involves professional training tailored to the company's needs, the employee's profile, and the collective interest (John Sellito, Op cit).

Leaders, managers, human resources managers, business creators and students will discover here how classical management has reached its limits and how to establish new practices and new values within a company that has become "socially responsible, humanistic and responsible.

The corporate world represents a universe where the human element is disregarded. Indeed, the management of private, and often public, companies fails to consider people as a resource or a pool of talent. It generally views people only as a more or less skilled workforce, expected to perform tasks and services for the benefit of the company's clients and its shareholders or the community. Who has employees? Who cares about their level of satisfaction, their needs (not just their desires), their motivations? What shared vision do employees have of their company, their management, and their contribution to the world of today and tomorrow?

We hope that the ideas, examples, and concepts you've discovered in this article will be useful in your own quest for greater collective intelligence, engagement, and humanism within your company. To help you understand where you are on this journey, we've structured the article as follows:

- Are the values shared by everyone or are they just nicely displayed? If they are only displayed, start by discussing them with your teams to find out how they feel about them.

- Are your management practices consistent with your values? Are they consistent with each other? To find out, a simple exercise is to list your values and compare them with your corresponding management practices. This will help eliminate management practices that are completely unrelated to your values.

- Are your leaders exemplary in their behavior and do they embody your values? If the answer is no, replace them. And/or train them. And/or have their teams provide them with feedback. And/or ask them to harness everyone's energy by holding working sessions where the team puts themselves in the leader's shoes and says: "This is what I would do if I were in your position."

- Do you have rituals and symbols that reinforce your culture, rituals and symbols that align with your values? If not, get creative.

- Is your compensation and recognition system aligned with your values? If so, that is, no multiple objectives, create recognition mechanisms, stop thinking that money is the key to buying commitment from your collaborators.

- Are you basing the progress on his commitments?

We wish you a good journey towards the humanistic company, towards the responsible company; in sustainable development, provided that humanity is taken at the center of the world and that companies transform themselves and resist the shocks of the future.

Thanks

Our thanks go directly to the team at the National Scientific Council (CSN) for the training workshops for each of us and to the Center for Research in Human Sciences (CRESH) for raising awareness and providing us with supervisors (professors and research fellows) to develop the said article project.

- **Funding:** This article project was entirely funded by its authors. Due to a lack of external funding or support from any institution, we relied on contributions from each author.

- **Conflict of interest:** In preparing this article, we acted impartially and independently. We did not identify any conflicts of interest during its preparation.

- **Ethical considerations:** Responsible conduct, taking into account moral principles and standards, was followed to carry out this study.

- Authors' contribution:

    - ❖ BBF: designed and supervised the study, wrote the main manuscript and validated the final version.

    - ❖ BIJM participated in data collection, statistical analysis, and document formatting.

    - ❖ BMD provided the literature review and participated in the formatting of the document.

    - ❖ MD approved the final text

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

- Authors' ORCID number:

BAFOSAMBI B/F: https://www:orcid/0009-0000-9417-5888

BULAYI MD: https://www.orcid/0009-0004-4532-8621

BOONE IJM: +243 816404141

MOULIONGO D: +243 815196650

Bibliographical references

1. Alvin Toffler, Adapt or Perish: The Company Facing the Shock of the Future, Denoël, Paris, p. 7

2. Christophe Deschamp, part of the discussion on the new economy between the Bank of Paris and the platforms, Paris, 2012 (electronic route).

3. Curiously, "Societal" in American English has existed since the end of the 19th century (cf. Webster's Dictionary), while the use of "social" in French is much more recent (early 1970s) (cf. Robert Historical Dictionary).

4. D. Duval, Liberalism has no future, La Découverte, Paris, 2003.

5. Debate on the new economy, http://www.humanisme and lumière.com, accessed 2012.

6. D. Plihon, The New Capitalism, La Découverte, Paris 2003.

7. Ethegoyen, "The meaning of 'Sustainable Development'", Les Echos, March 18, 2003

8. Glossary of the European Union Green Paper, Commission of the European Communities, promoting a European framework for corporate social responsibility, Brussels, July 2001.

9. H. Jonas, The Imperative of Responsibility, Editions du Cerf, Paris 1990.

10. HR Bowen, Social Responsibility of the Businessman, New York, Harper & Row, 1953.

11. JOHAN SELLITO, Managers on assignment, Email: Sellito.com, accessed on 1/04/2026

12. LEON COURVILLE, Piloting in the Storm, Presses HEG, Quebec, 1994

13. L. Gautier, "Implicit Functions of Corporate Ethics Charters", French Management Review, no. 136, Nov.-Dec. 2001, pp. 70–76

14. M. Weber, Wissenschaft als Beruf – Politik als Beruf, 1919 (trans, French: Le savant et le Politique, Plan, Paris, 1959)

15. Nicole Danone et al, article co-written in the book humanist enterprise, ed. p.

16. O. Postré, M. Vigier, Capitalism, La Découverte, Paris 2003, p. 33

17. Yves Morieux (BCG), Keynote "Let IT Be" (USI 2010)

18. Miche Capron et al., Myths and realities of responsible business. Alternatives économiques, ed. La Découverte, Paris, 2004 (Cover)

19. Responsible Management Consulting Firm www.advaloris.CH Accessed on 07/04/2026 at 2:54 PM

20. Annon Mark Thompson and Brian Tracy Now… create a great company (Goto www.briantracy.com great business), printed in the United States of America.