Available on: https://gjefm.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3117-6771, P-ISSN: 3117-6763

Global Journal of Education, Finance and Management
Volume: 02 Issue: 08 August-2026

The Role of Lecturers in Business Ethics Education

Nguyen Quoc Ky
Cuu Long University, Vinh Long, Vietnam, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8211-8237

Published Date: August 11, 2026 **DOI: 10.65150/EP-gjefm/V2E8/2026-07**

ABSTRACT: Background: Business ethics education must prepare learners to exercise professional competence while confronting conflicts involving profit, power, data, labor, social responsibility, and human dignity. Yet programs that privilege technical efficiency may leave graduates insufficiently prepared for ethical judgment.

Purpose: This conceptual study clarifies the role of lecturers in transforming ethical knowledge into learners' capacity to identify conflicts of interest, assess consequences, justify decisions, and accept responsibility in business life.

Methods: The study uses a qualitative theoretical design combining conceptual analysis, critical interpretation, and theoretical synthesis. It examines educational and philosophical scholarship on ethics, money, power, norms, dialogue, professional responsibility, and business ethics education.

Key findings: Lecturers function as organizers of the relationship among moral knowledge, learners, and business practice rather than merely as transmitters of rules. Dialogue, critique, and morally complex situations support the formation of reasoned judgment. The credibility of ethics education also depends on the lecturer's professional integrity and on institutional limits that prevent grades, recognition, and academic standards from being treated as purchasable goods.

Implications: Business ethics education should integrate ethically structured classroom dialogue, transparent and fair assessment, and case-based reflection on stakeholders and consequences. Lecturer development and curriculum design should therefore treat ethical judgment, academic integrity, and responsibility as core professional competencies rather than supplementary content.

KEYWORDS: Business ethics education; lecturers; ethical judgment; social responsibility; non-trading limits in education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Business ethics education faces an urgent requirement: to train learners with professional competence without losing the ability to judge ethical issues. In the modern business environment, decisions about profitability, data, labor, advertising, finance, supply chain, and social responsibility increasingly have a direct impact on people's lives (Maire et al., 2026). A decision may be procedurally legitimate but still harm dignity, distort the facts, exploit customers' weaknesses, or shift risk onto workers and communities. When business education emphasizes only efficiency, competitive skills, and the ability to adapt to the market, learners are more likely to enter the profession as tool operators than as responsible subjects (Caro et al., 2026). This issue puts faculty at the center of business ethics education. Lecturers do not merely communicate ethical principles, much less make ethics an ornamental appendage to the training program (Biesta et al., 2026). The role of lecturers lies in organizing the relationship among moral knowledge, learners, and business life; helping learners identify conflicts of interest, analyze consequences, question the apparent rationality of decisions, and protect human dignity under the pressure of money, targets, reputation, and organizational power. The article clarifies this role as a condition for business ethics education to form judgment, social responsibility, and a humane professional culture (Hayik, 2026).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on business ethics education often focus on 3 main directions. The first step is to discuss the possibility of teaching ethics in a business training environment (Aristotle, 2014). The debate at this level centers on whether morality can be taught as a system of knowledge, a capacity for judgment, or merely as a result of life experience and personal qualities formed before the learner enters university (Plato, 1997). Recent approaches have moved beyond the "teachable or not" framing, shifting the focus to pedagogical conditions that help learners recognize conflicts of interest, assess consequences, and take responsibility for career decisions (Dewey, 2024).

The second direction is to study methods of teaching business ethics (Kant, 2012). Many works focus on situational analysis, group discussion, experiential learning, decision-making simulation, role-playing, enterprise crisis analysis, reflective journaling, and ethical integration into management, finance, marketing, accounting, or human resources modules (Freire, 2018). These methods have the advantage of moving learners out of a state of passive reception, forcing them to confront a situation for which there are no available answers (Gadamer, 2013). The

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

focus of this research direction is to make ethics a practical competency in business decision-making, rather than merely memorizing principles (MacIntyre, 2007).

The third direction analyzes the business training environment as a structure that shapes learners' moral sense (Foucault, 1995). Studies on the hidden curriculum, achievement pressures, career competition, the commercialization of education, learner-to-customer image, and school-business relationships have expanded the scope of research beyond the classroom (Sandel, 2012). Business ethics education depends not only on the content of the course but also on how the school organizes assessments, validates competencies, uses tuition fees, builds reputation, and manages relations with the labor market (Nussbaum, 2010).

Theoretical gaps appear in the position of lecturers (Rancière, 1991). Many studies have addressed learning methods, programs, situations, and effectiveness, but have not fully clarified the role of the lecturer as a subject who organizes the relationship among moral knowledge, learners, and business life (Arendt, 2018). If lecturers are only seen as implementers of learning materials or facilitators of discussions, their ethical-pedagogical role will be narrowed (Levinas, 2011). The paper goes on to develop a theoretical framework that puts the lecturer at the center of the process of transforming ethical knowledge into the capacity for judgment, criticism, and professional responsibility (Habermas, 1990). This framework also extends the analysis to the non-buying limits of education, where academic truth, fair judgment, and the dignity of learners become conditions for the convincingness of business ethics education (Rawls, 2005).

3. METHODOLOGY

The paper uses qualitative research methods oriented toward conceptual analysis, critical interpretation, and theoretical synthesis. The research examines the role of lecturers in business ethics education, focusing on the relationships among ethical knowledge, learners, the training environment, and business life (Martín, 2025). The focus of the method does not lie in measuring learners' moral attitudes with quantitative data, but in clarifying the theoretical structure that enables lecturers' pedagogical subjects to transform ethical knowledge into judgment, criticism, and professional responsibility. Analytical manipulation is implemented through pairs of relationships: knowledge and life, norms and situations, learners and markets, means and purposes, values and prices, education and commercialization (Pollak & Smith, 2026). Each relationship is examined through questions about the affected subject, protected interests, hidden vulnerabilities, and the conditions that enable learners to assume responsibilities in business activities. The research material consists of 2 groups (McDonnell, 2025). The first group comprises a set of theoretical documents on education, ethics, labor, money, power, norms, and realistic people that serve to build the conceptual foundation of the article. The second group is international studies on business ethics education, case studies, classroom dialogue, reflection, social responsibility, and the role of lecturers in business education (Alberts et al., 2025). The combination of these two groups of materials helps the article both have its own theoretical foundation and participate in dialogue with the journal's research fields (Coghlan et al., 2026).

4. RESULTS / FINDINGS

The results of the study are summarized into 3 points. First, lecturers in business ethics education serve as the subject organizing the relationship among ethical knowledge, learners, and business life (Little, 2026). This role goes beyond imparting principles, as ethics is only of educational value when it is transformed into the ability to identify conflicts of interest, analyze consequences, and defend human dignity in professional decisions. The next point, dialogue, critique, and moral situations are central modalities for the formation of judgment (Dunham, 2026). Learners need to be placed in situations that present conflicts among profit, responsibility, fairness, data, labor, and community, thereby learning to reason, self-examine, and take responsibility for their choices. Finally, business ethics education is only convincing when it itself retains the limit of non-buying (Levi & Russell, 2025). Academic truth, fairness in assessment, the dignity of learners, and the responsibility of the teaching profession are conditions that prevent moral knowledge from being reduced to slogans (Davenport & Phillips, 2026).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Lecturers as subjects organize the relationship between moral knowledge, learners, and business life

In business ethics education, the lecturer cannot be understood as someone who communicates a system of rules for learners to memorize and apply mechanically. This understanding impoverishes the essence of moral education because norms are separated from concrete life relationships, in which business decisions are always associated with benefits, risks, power, responsibilities, and consequences for people. Business ethics does not start with the learner naming principles, but with the ability to identify situations in which people can be turned into vehicles for profit, targets, brands, data, organizational power, or competitive pressure (Heltai et al., 2026). The role of the lecturer lies in organizing the process by which moral knowledge enters the capacity of judgment, helping learners understand why a seemingly procedurally valid behavior can still hurt dignity, distort the truth, or impair social life. The relationship among lecturers, moral knowledge, and learners is transformational. Moral knowledge does not, by itself, become a responsibility simply by being present in the curriculum (Fletcher et al., 2026).

Learners also cannot form their own ethical competence just by attending a module on business ethics. That transformation needs a pedagogical subject who knows how to connect concepts with situations, situations with the structure of interests, and the structure of interests with consequences for people. Lecturers organize the relationship between knowledge, learners, and life through the knowledge they study, with a disciplined, professional personality, a sense of responsibility for their words, and awareness of the consequences of education (Roberts, 2026). In business ethics education, this requirement becomes direct, as concepts such as fairness, honesty, social responsibility, transparency, integrity, or dignity can all become slogans if not examined in specific business relationships. Lecturers shape learners' capacity for moral judgment by moving them beyond the two polar extremes. One extreme is imperative ethics, where learners are taught only what is permissible, what is forbidden, what is praised, and what is sanctioned, as education needs to "extend beyond the transmission of knowledge toward processes of becoming and acting" (Sejdiu & Ramadani, 2026, p. 13). The other extreme is relativistic ethics, where interests, context, competing goals, or personal choices justify every decision.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Business ethics education must place learners in a more difficult analytical area: recognizing the legitimate limits of benefits; distinguishing between value and price; distinguishing between efficiency and harm; distinguishing between formal compliance and substantive responsibility. When a business optimizes costs by shifting risk to workers, customers, or the community, the ethical question does not stop at whether the behavior has violated the regulation (Natsir et al., 2024). The core question is directed at the beneficiaries; the consequences and the relationships are concealed, and people are reduced to just tools for business goals. Norms have educational power only when learners understand the moral causes of limitation. A student who only hears that it is not plagiarism may fear sanctions; when plagiarism is understood as the appropriation of intellectual labor, the disruption of academic truth, and the rendering of knowledge unverifiable, the norm becomes a sense of responsibility (Hertogh, 2024). In business education, reporting fraud, false advertising, data exploitation, discrimination in recruitment, or manipulation of consumer demand, even if there is a risk of being detected.

Such behaviors are wrong because they disrupt the conditions for trust in common life, usurp others' ability to make choices, and turn the market into an environment for organizing falsehoods. Lecturers must make learners see that depth, because professional ethics cannot be sustainable by relying solely on the fear of sanctions (Jansen, 2026). Business education is often under pressure to meet operational capacity requirements: better sales, more efficient management, stronger customer persuasion, faster resource optimization, and more sustainable market share expansion. These competencies have professional value, but they become dangerous when they are separated from the question of purpose and effect. A learner can be very good at market analysis, reading consumer data, designing brand strategies, managing human resources, and optimizing finances, but still lacks the moral competence to limit one's actions to one's body, time, privacy, etc truth and dignity of others; Professional competencies should be associated with "encouraging personal growth, and improving decision-making processes" (Eidenmüller et al., 2025, p. 68).

Business ethics education must protect the distinction between adaptive skills training and responsible competency education. Lecturers must bring learners back to the position of professional subjects, not allowing them to see themselves as a functional unit of the enterprise or as a tool to realize the market's goals. Faculty power in the business ethics classroom needs to be organized as transformational power, not possessive power (Patterson-Craven, 2026). Lecturers hold knowledge, methods, grades, comments, and academic opportunities. This asymmetry is the actual condition of education. The problem does not lie in the negation of pedagogical power, but in the way it helps learners become less dependent on the teacher. True teachers do not own learners and do not use knowledge, authority, experience, or titles to usurp learners' will (Istace & Van Assche, 2026). The purpose of the instructor is to help learners learn to ask themselves questions, read independently, self-verify, self-correct, and take responsibility for themselves.

In a business ethics class, the instructor does not impose an ethical conclusion as a final verdict. Learners need to analyze the benefits, evidence, arguments, criticisms, and consequences, and then take responsibility for their judgment (Figueroa, 2026). The learner's moral competence cannot be measured by the mere repetition of the lecturer's viewpoint. This capacity manifests as the ability to ask accurate questions, detect contradictions, identify affected subjects, distinguish facts from justifications, recognize hidden benefits, evaluate the consequences of choices, and defend arguments against criticism. A valuable business ethics class does not create easy consensus. However, it forces learners to face difficulties in business life, in the spirit of education based on intrinsic motivation "rather than fear-based enforcement alone" (Badreddine et al., 2026, p. 17 of 21). Profit is necessary for the survival of the business, but it does not have the right to become the sole standard for defining value.

Competition can spur innovation, but it loses legitimacy when it turns workers into expendable expenses, customers into targets to be manipulated, personal data into fuel for exploitation, or communities into recipients of the pollution portion of growth. The role of the lecturer also lies in keeping moral knowledge from being separated from life (Bartling et al., 2026). The concept is born of life, returns to the explanation of life, is tested by life's consequences, and then opens up other possibilities for life. An ethical module cannot only present normative doctrines in the history of thought. These theories need to be situated within the contexts of recruitment, payroll, firing, advertising, data governance, supply chain, consumption, finance, the work environment, and responsibility for the vulnerable (Mertz & Richland, 2025). When theory meets real-world situations, learners realize ethics is not an external decoration of business. Ethics is the internal structure of business decisions, as every business choice reorganizes human relations through product, money, contracts, data, labor, and power.

Lecturers in business ethics education serve as responsible intermediaries between knowledge and life, between norms and situations, between organizational power and human dignity, and between learners' professional goals and the social consequences of that profession (Bowers et al., 2024). Lecturers cannot live moral lives on behalf of learners, nor can they guarantee that every learner will act correctly after graduation. Pedagogical work can provide a foundation so that learners do not enter the business world with moral blindness. When learners know how to question the purpose of work, know how to see the people behind the targets, know how to distinguish professional success from the possession of others, business ethics education achieves the basic function: turning moral knowledge into judgment and responsibility in professional life, in line with "student-centered, active-learning strategies" (Maginnis, 2025, p. 55).

5.2. Dialogue, criticism, and moral situations as a mode of forming judgment capacity

The role of organizing the relationship among moral knowledge, learners, and business life is fully realized only when the classroom moves from the receptive space to the judgment space. Business ethics education cannot achieve its goal through one-sided explanation, because business life does not present people with completed moral propositions. Business decisions often emerge in the context of overlapping interests, incomplete information, time pressure, dispersed responsibilities, and consequences obscured by governance language (Basarati, 2026). Learners need to be trained in conflict situations in which they must ask questions, defend their arguments, adjust their perspectives, and take responsibility for the consequences of their choices. Dialogue, criticism, and moral situations constitute a pedagogical mode that helps moral knowledge move from an abstract conceptual state to a verifiable capacity for action. Dialogue in business ethics education is not a free exchange of ideas in the simple sense (Garcia-Dominguez & Beaumont, 2026).

Dialogue is an academic structure that requires learners to make personal judgments based on evidence, concepts, others' experiences, and the social consequences of decisions. An opinion is only valid when it can explain the situation, identify the affected subject, and answer the

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

question of responsibility. The dialogue classroom does not eliminate the lecturer's role, nor does it make all perspectives equal (Budairi, 2026). Lecturers keep conceptual discipline, check the accuracy of facts, ask learners to distinguish arguments from feelings, and distinguish benefits from ethical reasons. Thanks to this structure, learners learn to speak responsibly, listen critically, and modify judgments when the argument is no longer solid. Criticism plays a role in moving dialogue beyond permissive consensus (Elton-Chalcraft et al., 2026). In many ethics classes, learners can quickly agree to beautiful values such as honesty, fairness, integrity, respect, and social responsibility. Such consent has not proven moral capacity.

Moral competence begins to manifest itself when learners have to deal with situations where values collide: defending jobs or disclosing financial truths; keeping customers confidential or preventing harm to the community; optimizing profits or maintaining safe working conditions; using data to personalize services or protecting privacy, through "inclusive and deliberative processes" (Sanders et al., 2024, p. 259). Criticism reveals the weaknesses of the initial choice, forcing the learner to recognize the limitations of moral intuition and the fragility of familiar answers. The moral situation is the environment in which contradictions are concretized. A situation with pedagogical value is not a story that illustrates a pre-known lesson (Kovalova et al., 2026). The situation must involve a conflict between business objectives and people's living conditions, between short-term interests and long-term responsibilities, between legitimacy and legitimacy, and between the organization's right to make decisions and the right of those affected to be respected.

When the situation is structured as a contradiction, the learner cannot respond by repeating the principle. They must identify who is involved, who is absent from the decision-making process, who has a voice, who is silenced, what data is used, what data is discarded, what benefits are named, what hurts are hidden (Govind & Davies, 2025). In business ethics education, the situation should not be reduced to an exercise in choosing the right answer. Business life rarely operates as a closed panel. One decision can mitigate one form of harm but create another; a policy that may be financially sound but undermines trust; a strategy that may be legitimate in the short term but destroys the organization's ethical foundation (Hahn, 2025). The situational method needs to force learners to build arguments, compare options, identify unexpected consequences, assess the possibility of reimbursement, and determine responsibility after making a decision.

The focus is not on finding the perfect answer but on developing the capacity for grounded judgment, recognizing limits, and taking responsibility for those affected. Dialogue and critique need to be placed in relation to the truth (Pilkington, 2026). The classroom can become a space for reproducing falsehoods as learners learn to say things deemed moral to get good grades, impress lecturers, or avoid the risk of argument. Business ethics education must be against that performance ethic. Learners should be asked to substantiate their judgment with facts, analyze benefits through the lens of power structures, and evaluate consequences in terms of specific human lives in order to "counteract power asymmetries" (Buckley-Zistel et al., 2026, p. 11). An argument for social responsibility is empty if it fails to answer the questions of responsibility to whom, in what relationships, with what resources, and under what checks and balances. A statement of integrity is less convincing when not tested by pressures related to salary, promotions, contracts, competition, and organizational norms.

Criticism in the classroom must also protect learners from two opposing threats: submission to authority and relativization of responsibility (Galbraith & Flatley, 2026). Obedience to authority causes learners to accept the conclusions of lecturers, textbooks, or corporate standards without self-examination. Relativizing responsibilities makes every choice a matter of personal preference, context, or strategy. Both undermine moral education (Hirschl & Hudson, 2024). Learners need to be placed in the process of proof, where personal judgment is challenged by back-to-back questions, suffering damages, conflicting facts, and long-term consequences. The instructor may retain the right to coordinate, but that right must pave the way for the learner's capacity for self-examination. The ethical dimension of business education also needs to be incorporated into new structures of professional life, including data, algorithms, digital platforms, automation, global supply chains, and flexible labor (Majrashi, 2025).

These structures make responsibility more difficult to see. An algorithmic pricing decision can create discrimination without public disparagement. An automated recruitment system can screen candidates using seemingly neutral criteria (Rajendra & Thuraisingam, 2026). A personalized marketing campaign can exploit a customer's psychological weaknesses while still being seen as optimizing the experience. Learners must realize that modern business ethics does not stop at the direct relationship between sellers and buyers. Ethics has gone into system design, data selection, forecasting models, incentive mechanisms, and accountability, including the need to "reduce the deleterious impact of AI bias" (Jao & Chuah, 2026, p. 9). The academic assessment in this section should be consistent with the development of judgment capacity. The conceptual memory test only measures the ability to reproduce. Ethical competence should be assessed through argumentative profiles, situational analysis, cross-critique, reflection diaries, group reports, and the ability to adjust perspectives in response to new evidence (Baird et al., 2026).

A mature moral learner is not one who always gives the right answer from the start. However, one who detects flaws in his judgment, accepts responsibility for consequences that are not yet fully seen, and knows how to extend his or her concern from personal interests to those affected. This assessment approach helps the class avoid making ethics a sub-component of the program and instead places it at the core of professional competencies for business learners. Dialogue, critique, and moral situations create a form of learning in which learners are not only exposed to moral knowledge but also have to practice judgment under the pressure of contradictions (Fox et al., 2026). Through this process, business ethics education moves from teaching what should be done to training the ability to recognize what is happening, call the right vulnerable, analyze the benefits, justify, and choose responsibly. This foundation opens up the deeper problem of business education: morality cannot stand in the classroom if education itself is bought and sold, if grades, diplomas, satisfaction, and reputation replace the truth of knowledge. The limit of non-purchase in education becomes a condition for protecting the moral role of lecturers and the moral competence of learners (Bourassa, 2026).

5.3. Limitation of non-purchase and sale of education and responsibility of the teaching profession in business education

Dialogue, criticism, and moral situations can form judgment only when the educational environment retains the authenticity of knowledge. A class can talk a lot about integrity, fairness, and social responsibility. However, those values lose weight if grades are exchanged for relationships, diplomas are bought with money, output standards are presented in the language of promotion, learners are treated as absolute customers, and lecturers are turned into comedic service providers in the market heart. Business ethics education faces this contradiction from within: how can business ethics be taught in an educational environment so dominated by business logic that knowledge, judgment, reputation,

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

and academic belief are all at risk of becoming commodities (Bsheer, 2025)? The non-sale limit of education does not negate the need for tuition, salaries, facilities, technology, university administration, or financial resources. Education needs material conditions to survive; lecturers need to be paid well; learners need learning infrastructure; The school needs resources to research and operate. The problem lies in the order of purpose (2026).

Money can nurture education when it is aligned with the mission of protecting knowledge, developing learners, and maintaining academic equity. Money corrupts education when it becomes the right to buy recognition, the right to evade academic requirements, the right to put pressure on grades, the right to turn lecturers into servants of satisfaction, and the right to turn diplomas into consumer certificates. In business ethics education, this limit has special significance (Stulz, 2025). Business learners enter areas where money, profits, contracts, competition, brands, and data have a strong organizational power over behavior. If the training has implicitly taught that everything can be negotiated with money, including academic truth, then the learner will bring that implicit lesson to business. A subject of integrity cannot be convincing when learners witness cheating being tolerated to preserve the school's image (Yang et al., 2026). A lecture on social responsibility becomes hollow if learners see disadvantaged people excluded from learning opportunities because they cannot afford it. At the same time, the language of promotion remains framed in terms of liberation and service.

Business ethics education starts with the consistency between what is taught and how education is organized. The score is one of the areas most strongly challenged regarding the no-sell limit (Huikku et al., 2026). Grades are not psychological rewards, nor are they tools to retain learners. A grade is a responsible confirmation of the level of competence attained. When grades are relaxed to avoid complaints, raised to protect graduation rates, adjusted to beautify assessment data, academic equity is broken; then, education no longer "builds an educational policy on the principles of trust in the teacher and academic freedom" (Kuzmina & Avdieieva, 2025, p. 26). An honest learner is placed on a par with a false learner; the person who really tries is hurt; society receives certifications that do not reflect their competence.

In business ethics education, this bias has broader consequences beyond the classroom, as learners are empowered to participate in career decisions that affect labor, finance, data, customers, and communities. The diploma also needs to be placed within the limits of not buying and selling (Lin-Januszewski, 2026). A diploma is valuable when it recognizes a real learning process, a proven competency, and a confirmed social responsibility. When diplomas become products for sale, education loses its function of opening people up and transforms into a certification market. Learners are no longer led toward intellectual maturity but are encouraged to optimize their path to earning a degree at the lowest cognitive cost (Healey, 2026). The school no longer questions what the learners have or what abilities they have, but rather whether the training product is attractive to the market. Lecturers in that situation are dragged into professional conflicts: protecting academic standards can be considered difficult; Compromising on permissiveness betrays the responsibility of education. Professional responsibility in business ethics education is assessed by the ability to keep the boundary between supporting learners and following learners (Ren & Li, 2026).

Support is intended to help learners understand requirements, have the learning conditions, receive fair feedback, correct mistakes, and develop competencies. The following are ways to lower the requirements to maintain satisfaction, avoid conflict, and turn evaluation into emotional service. Learners need to be respected as subjects, not flattered as customers who are always right (Botha et al., 2025). True respect requires instructors to be truthful about their competence, to point out shortcomings, to defend evaluation standards, and to provide opportunities for correction. An education that is afraid of dissatisfied learners will find it difficult to create responsible subjects in a high-pressure business environment. Lecturers must also protect themselves from professional alienation (Diehl, 2026). When a school operates based on satisfaction metrics, enrollment numbers, pass rates, rankings, and market reputation, faculty are more likely to be pushed into the role of producing positive experiences than protecting knowledge. Lectures can become easily consumable content; criticism can be softened; reading, writing, and proof requirements may be reduced; Ethics can be presented as a communication skill or as a reputational risk management tool.

The responsibility of the teaching profession requires lecturers to counteract this reduction with academic competence, fairness in assessment, courage to speak the truth, and awareness of the social consequences of each training certification; Recognition of education must therefore be "an institutional and political process that redistributes authority, not just resources" (Mendes dos Santos et al., 2026, p. 19 of 23). The limit on non-purchase also relates to access to education. When business ethics education is only available to those who can afford it, ethical knowledge is locked in a privilege. When learners are burdened with excessive student debt, their career freedom after graduation is constrained by the pressure to repay (Carroll & Amideo, 2024). When lecturers are underpaid, overworked, or dependent on precarious contracts, the responsibility of the teaching profession is also undermined by the material conditions of the workers. Protecting ethical standards in business education requires considering the full spectrum of relationships: learners, lecturers, schools, the labor market, financial mechanisms, and societal expectations. A moral appeal lacks weight if it does not touch on the conditions that make morality difficult to implement (Jones et al., 2025).

Business ethics education must teach learners to understand the limits of the market by having the school set limits before the market. Not all values can be converted into prices. Academic truth, fairness in assessment, learner dignity, academic freedom, professional responsibility, and the social credibility of a diploma are values that are not to be treated as ordinary goods (Wang et al., 2026). Once these values are sold, education will no longer have a sufficient foundation to discuss business ethics. Lecturers play the role of protecting that border in each lecture, each comment, each grade, each learning request, and each time rejecting permissiveness. Business ethics education cannot be built on ethical teachings that are separate from the educational structure (Rosenkranz & Lavizzari, 2026). Lecturers organize the relationship between knowledge, learners, and life; dialogue, criticism, and judgment training situations. The limit of not buying and selling protects the conditions for the whole process to remain honest. When education retains the truth of knowledge, the learner has the basis to enter the business with the capacity to distinguish means and purposes, benefits and dignity, success and responsibility. The role of the lecturer reaches ethical depth not only by teaching learners to speak ethically correctly, but also by helping them form in an environment where truth, fairness, and responsibility are still truly valued (Dopelt, 2026).

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The article affirms the central role of lecturers in business ethics education. The value of this role lies not in communicating an existing set of rules, but in the ability to organize the process of transforming moral knowledge into the capacity to judge, criticize, and take responsibility in professional life. As business decisions become increasingly tied to data, profits, labor, consumption, the environment, and organizational power, business ethics education needs to help learners recognize the people behind norms, contracts, prices, and efficiency. The article's meaning lies in placing lecturers at the center of a theoretical framework that connects moral knowledge, pedagogy, and non-trading limits in education. Business ethics are only persuasive when classes, assessments, diplomas, and educational relations uphold academic truth, fairness, and learners' dignity.

7. LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The limitation of the article is that it is mainly presented at a theoretical level and has not been verified by empirical data from classrooms, training programs, or learners' experiences. Further studies can investigate the practice of teaching business ethics, compare pedagogical models across training institutions, and evaluate the impact of dialogue, critique, and ethical situations on learners' capacity for judgment.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No datasets were generated or analyzed in this conceptual and analytical study.

DECLARATIONS

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval

Not applicable. This conceptual and analytical study did not involve human participants, animals, or identifiable personal data.

Data Availability Statement

No datasets were generated or analyzed in this conceptual and analytical study.

REFERENCES

1) Alberts, B., Nurse, P., & Schier, A. F. (2025). Science, education, leadership, and politics: An interview with Bruce Alberts and Paul Nurse. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology, 41*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-cellbio-101323-034601
2) Arendt, H. (2018). *The human condition* (2nd ed., enlarged; M. Canovan, Intro.; D. Allen, Foreword). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1958)
3) Aristotle. (2014). *Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans. & Ed.; 2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.)
4) Badreddine, S., et al. (2026). Predicting cybersecurity behaviors in higher education institutions: A data-driven analysis of policy, culture, and motivation in the UAE context. *Information, 17*(2), Article 152. https://doi.org/10.3390/info17020152
5) Baird, J. A., Filipe Pancada Correia, C. F. D., Cowie, B., El Masri, Y., Hayward, L., Kanjee, A., … Yan, Z. (2026). Formative assessment: A global phenomenon. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 33*(2), 92–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2026.2673240
6) Bartling, B., Valero, V., & Weber, R. A. (2026). The causal effect of income on market social responsibility. *The Economic Journal, 136*(675), 869–904. https://doi.org/10.1093/ej/ueaf064
7) Basarati, A. (2026). The demise of critical agency in a post-conflict teaching environment. *ELT Journal, 80*(2), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccag001
8) Biesta, G., Takayama, K., Heimans, S., & Kettle, M. (2026). Challenging teacher education: A series of invited papers for the Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(3), 225–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2026.2676232
9) Botha, E. A., Blignaut, J. H., & du Toit-Brits, C. (2025). The significance of teachers' willingness and commitment as self-directed learning agents. *Africa Education Review, 21*(6), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2026.2641498
10) Bourassa, G. N. (2026). 'If you love teaching so much … ': Teaching against the injunctions of the capitalist state and refusing the weaponization of love. *Critical Studies in Education, 67*(2), 280–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2025.2470380
11) Bowers, P., Graydon, K., Ryan, T., Lau, J. H., & Tomlin, D. (2024). Artificial intelligence-driven virtual patients for communication skill development in healthcare students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 40*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.9307
12) Bsheer, R. (2025). Education during genocide: The university and its discontents. *Curriculum Inquiry, 55*(3–4), 281–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2026.2646152
13) Buckley-Zistel, S., Bast, J., & Holderied, L. (2026). Humanrightization of migration discourses: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Human Rights Practice, 18*(1), Article huaf044. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huaf044
14) Budairi, A. (2026). When silence speaks: Rethinking dialogue, voice, and learning. *Changing English, 33*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2025.2589870
15) Caro, S., Gillis, T., & Nelson, S. (2026). Differential validity in fair lending. *Journal of Legal Analysis, 18*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laaf013

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

16) Carroll, P., & Amideo, A. E. (2024). Gender equality: Opportunities and challenges for the OR community. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 75*(6), 1011–1029. https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2024.2343343
17) Coghlan, D., Abbott, C., Hauser, B., Pedler, M., & Wood, L. (2026). Journeys in action learning: Career reflections and lessons for the next generation. *Action Learning: Research and Practice, 23*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767333.2025.2586510
18) Davenport, H. L., & Phillips, K. E. (2026). "Panicked responsibility": Confidant perspectives of disclosure and information management in university student affairs. *Communication Education, 75*(2), 157–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2025.2559810
19) Dewey, J. (2024). *Democracy and education*. Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1916)
20) Diehl, W. C. (2026). Balancing distance education: Learner realities, system responsibilities, and humane design. *American Journal of Distance Education, 40*(2), 129. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2026.2661239
21) Dopelt, K. (2026). The impact of social media on public health and education: Mechanisms, vulnerabilities, and policy implications. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 16*(3), Article 43. https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe16030043
22) Dunham, H. (2026). Toward critical consciousness: One preservice teacher's approximations in the elementary literacy classroom. *Action in Teacher Education, 48*(2), 112–129. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2025.2591962
23) Eidenmüller, T., Plavcan, P., Weber, M., Humpert, R. P., Beernink, L., Kampmann, I., & Ajiri, D. (2025). Professional self-reflection in the digital age: Technological tools for managerial development. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research, 10*(3), 62–72. https://doi.org/10.51847/8Nc9K5Uzeb
24) Elton-Chalcraft, S., Cooling, T., Hand, M., & Hannam, P. (2026). Knowledge and religious education: A metalogue. *British Journal of Religious Education, 48*(3), 325–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2025.2548522
25) Felch, S. M. (2026). Christian higher education in a global context. *Christian Higher Education, 25*(1–2), 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15363759.2026.2647098
26) Figueroa, A. (2026). Exploring collaborative communities for active learning: Enhancing engagement and critical thinking skills. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 99*(3), 138–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2026.2655873
27) Fletcher, T., Ní Chróinín, D., Dillon, M., Beckey, A., Bowles, R., Hamblin, D., & Kitching, N. (2026). Learning about meaningful physical education in physical education teacher education: Two case studies of sustained implementation. *Curriculum Studies in Health and Physical Education, 17*(2), 116–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/25742981.2024.2442926
28) Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.; 2nd Vintage Books ed.). Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)
29) Fox, C., Parker, M., & Locker, E. (2026). The meaning of excellence in learning and teaching to students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 51*(4), 632–648. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2588681
30) Freire, P. (2018). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (50th anniversary ed.; M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1970)
31) Gadamer, H.-G. (2013). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.; 2nd rev. ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1960)
32) Galbraith, J., & Flatley, E. (2026). Addressing the linkages between nondiscrimination and substantive rights. *Human Rights Law Review, 26*(2), Article ngag004. https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngag004
33) Garcia-Dominguez, A., & Beaumont, T. (2026). Experiences with test-driven elaborated feedback for teaching introductory programming. *Computer Science Education, 36*(2), 375–424. https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2025.2554497
34) Govind, P. J., & Davies, P. J. (2025). Embracing relationality in planning law to help restructure relationships between people and land: A case from Australia. *Journal of Environmental Law, 37*(3), 537–557. https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqaf029
35) Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholsen, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1983)
36) Hahn, J. (2025). The language games of canon law: Strategic ambiguity between law and religion. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion, 14*(2), 205–221. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojlr/rwae004
37) Hayik, R. (2026). Raising awareness of minority-language representation through engaging pedagogies. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 20*(2), 184–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2024.2395518
38) Healey, M. (2026). Broadening and integrating undergraduate research. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 58*(2), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2026.2642562
39) Heltai, J. I., Jani-Demetriou, B., Schmidt, I., Szabó, G., & Tarsoly, E. (2026). Pathways to ethical subjectivity: Participant transformation in tripartite collaborative research. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 23*(2), 97–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2025.2503708
40) Hertogh, M. (2024). Empirical approaches to the rule of law: Contours and challenges of a social science that does not quite yet exist. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 20*(1), 35–51. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-041822-044308
41) Hirschl, R., & Hudson, A. (2024). A fair process matters: The relationship between public participation and constitutional legitimacy. *Law & Social Inquiry, 49*(4), 2074–2101. https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2023.82
42) Huikku, J., Ojala, H., & Mättö, M. (2026). Understanding the shift: Exploring motivational and contextual factors affecting the adoption of learning approach. *Accounting Education, 35*(4), 526–562. https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2025.2483835
43) Istace, T., & Van Assche, K. (2026). Neurotechnological cognitive enhancement and human rights: A complex dynamic between empowerment and constraint. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences, 13*(1), Article lsag004. https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsag004
44) Jansen, B. (2026). The politicization of business ethics: State, corporation, and society seen from a Schmittian perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 36*(1), 31–68.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

45) Jao, J. C., & Chuah, J. C. T. (2026). Artificial intelligence in negotiating energy production and other interests in marine spatial planning: Managing transparency and bias. *The Journal of World Energy Law & Business*, *19*(1), Article jwaf029. https://doi.org/10.1093/jwelb/jwaf029
46) Jones, E., Ruiz, I., & Undurraga, S. (2025). Repositioning care in economics: Concepts, measurement, and policy implications. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *41*(3–4), 653–675. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grag001
47) Kant, I. (2012). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (M. Gregor & J. Timmermann, Trans. & Ed.; rev. ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)
48) Kovalova, E., Durana, P., Zvarikova, K., & Trulikova, I. (2026). From theory to debt decisions: Evidence on financial literacy among university students. *Economies*, *14*(3), Article 100. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies14030100
49) Kuzmina, S., & Avdieieva, S. (2025). Professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy on educational reform: Dreams and the reality of authoritarian modernization. *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*, *12*, 16–29. https://doi.org/10.18523/2313-4895.12.2025.16-29
50) Levinas, E. (2011). *Otherwise than being, or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1974)
51) Levi, M., & Russell, E. (2025). Property righting: The politics of rights over land and labor. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *28*, 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033123-021046
52) Lin-Januszewski, L. W. (2026). Symbolic haunting: First-generation university students' limited sense of entitlement. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *47*(5), 833–852. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2026.2615957
53) Little, S. B. (2026). Overcorrection as a strategy for virtue development. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *74*(3), 331–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2025.2608793
54) MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (3rd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.
55) Maginnis, M. S. (2025). The future of virology education. *Annual Review of Virology*, *12*, 43–57. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-virology-092623-110921
56) Maire, Q., Chatelier, S., & Resnik, J. (2026). On global citizenship education in a new conjuncture. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *47*(3), 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2026.2669394
57) Majrashi, K. (2025). Employees' perceptions of the fairness of AI-based performance prediction features. *Cogent Business & Management*, *12*(1), Article 2456111. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2456111
58) Martín, A. D. (2025). Analysis of the theoretical phase of Wells and Matthews' model of emotional self-regulation: Methodological aspects. *Metatheoria – Journal of Philosophy and History of Science*, *15*(2), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.48160/18532330me15.381
59) McDonnell, E. M. (2025). Bureaucracy in action: The sociology of public administration. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *51*, 191–211. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-091324-053657
60) Mendes dos Santos, A. C., Mattalia, G., Medeiros-Leal, W., Spagnoletti, N., & Carvalho Ribeiro, S. M. (2026). Beyond commodities: Valuing the contributions of stewardship practices in sociobiodiversity-based bioeconomy. *Forests*, *17*(3), Article 380. https://doi.org/10.3390/f17030380
61) Mertz, E., & Richland, J. (2025). Law, anthropology, and their languages. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *54*, 409–425. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-041422-012037
62) Natsir, M., Ilahi, A. H. A., & Adnas, T. P. (2024). Political and legal developments in mineral and coal mining laws: A critical review. *Diponegoro Law Review*, *9*(2), 186–203. https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.9.2.2024.186-203
63) Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
64) Patterson-Craven, S. (2026). Positioning novice teachers as truth-tellers: How novice teachers can engage in fearless speech and exercise their agency. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *56*(3), 293–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2025.2536661
65) Pilkington, B. (2026). Psychiatry, pathology, and disease: Some benefits of philosophical reflection. *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy: A Forum for Bioethics and Philosophy of Medicine*, *51*(2), 79–88. https://doi.org/10.1093/jmp/jhaf045
66) Plato. (1997). *Complete works* (J. M. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson, Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.
67) Pollak, S. D., & Smith, K. E. (2026). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying early adversity and development. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *22*, 187–214. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-061724-091000
68) Rajendra, J. B., & Thuraisingam, A. S. (2026). The role of explainability and human intervention in AI decisions: Jurisdictional and regulatory aspects. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, *35*(2), 152–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2025.2537514
69) Rancière, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation* (K. Ross, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1987)
70) Rawls, J. (2005). *Political liberalism* (Expanded ed.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1993)
71) Ren, J., & Li, X. (2026). Mentor support and postgraduate research ability: The role of research self-efficacy and academic atmosphere. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *46*(3), 487–501. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2364648
72) Roberts, D. (2026). Epistemic injustice, neurodivergence, and inclusive pedagogy: Dyslexia and augmentative communication in higher education. *Disability & Society*, *41*(7), 1788–1809. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2026.2659094
73) Rosenkranz, G. B., & Lavizzari, A. (2026). Education as a field of contention: Feminist and anti-gender struggles over democracy. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, *33*(1), 26–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxaf058
74) Sandel, M. J. (2012). *What money cannot buy: The moral limits of markets*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
75) Sanders, A., Khatarina, J., Assegaf, R., Toumbourou, T., Kurniasih, H., & Suwarso, R. (2024). The Omnibus Law on job creation and its potential implications for rural youth and future farming in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, *65*(2), 248–262. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12408

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

76) Sejdiu, S., & Ramadani, R. (2026). Catalytic communication in sustainability education: Bridging the knowledge–action gap through affective engagement and strategic praxis. *Education Sciences*, *16*(3), Article 494. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16030494
77) Stulz, R. M. (2025). Risk, the limits of financial risk management, and corporate resilience. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, *17*, 411–430. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-financial-112823-022941
78) Wang, S., Prestridge, S., Forbes, D., & Wang, Y. (2026). Beyond access alone: Distance education in an AI and open knowledge era. *Distance Education*, *47*(2), 181–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2026.2681755
79) Yang, L., Lv, J., Shao, J., Wang, P., Xu, S., & Yang, R. (2026). Consequences of undisclosed conflicts of interest in academic publishing. *Accountability in Research*, *33*(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2026.2616765

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Nguyen Quoc Ky