

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

The Three Faces of Business in Society

Thithit Atchattabhan

Ph.D. Candidate, School of Management, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

Nishchapat Nittapaipapon

Ph.D. Candidate, School of Management, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

Abstract:

A significant to corporate citizenship initiatives thrived and broadly acceptance of “The Four Faces of Corporate Citizenship” by Carroll (1998). According to the global context has been changed and affected to social simultaneously reflected occur with business. Business has to manifest and force to tackle with the troubles. With respect, the recognition and acceptance of Carroll's (1998), in this paper has enhanced and re-emerged to amplify considering Carroll's corporate citizen faces. Therefore, in pursuit of a proper business role in society, the three faces of business in society have articulated the set of new 3Cs principle and augmented in extent beyond Create Value (CV), Corporate Responsibility (CR), and Corporate Philanthropy (CP). Eventually, we would propose new faces of the business role in society through social contract theoretical perspective in addition to that two aspects motivate the role of business in society following desire and requirement driven.

Keywords: *Business roles in society, create value, corporate responsibility, corporate philanthropy, social contact*

1. Introduction

In the modern era, it deems to be the decades of exploration with studying in the boundary of business responsibility and social performance. Most studies have pursued the improvement of business and society literature to consider the context of empirical research and practice. Toward conceptualizes the role of business in society is necessary for the corporations to embed and perceive to manipulate and apply into practice. The contextual literature has been prototyping the potential motivation of business toward accountability articulating the set of corporate citizen and corporate responsibility principles (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Carroll, 1998; Freeman et al., 2004; Matten & Moon, 2008; Schwartz & Carroll, 2003).

Extrapolated from Carroll (1998) foundational work, it is to intend to determine a business frame of social performance, explanations, and orientations which encompass to business connect with society as a good corporate citizen. With a decade of studying, the concept of business role in society has varied studies and been evaluated the key terms respectively. Despite his literature demonstrated the role of business: be profitable; obey the law; engage in ethical behavior; and give back through philanthropic, whereas they would emerge regarding the reason of there have been the incomplete theoretical elements of the business role. The subtext in mentioned is the mist of mindset in which keeps primarily its own sake even though contributes the others with the benevolent endeavor. Most concerning of corporate citizen context was gained to focus on responsibility, whereas the manifold value creation principle has processed of mutating ineffective. It led to entail trade-offs among the stakeholders, society, and environmental. It seemed to underline to major the economic and profit for social expectation on business within the traditional emphasis on profit making.

This paper we would propose new faces of the business role in society through social contract theoretical perspective in addition to that two aspects motivate the role of business in society; (1) desire-driven; and (2) requirement-driven. With respect, the recognition and acceptance of Carroll's “Four Faces of Corporate Citizen” (1998), his concept would deserve to reshape the paradigm and determine whether modify while it probably argues to conceptualizing the face of business in society. In pursuit of a proper business role in society, the concept will be enhanced and re-emerged to amplify the Carroll's corporate citizen faces. Therefore, this paper would be proposed the incentive augment with consisting; (1) discussion of Carroll's corporate citizen faces; (2) propose the new role of business in society, the “Three Faces of Business in Society”; and (3) implementation and future research based on new business role proposed.

2. Step toward Carroll's Corporate Citizen

With respect, the recognition and acceptance of Carroll's “Four Faces of Corporate Citizen” (1998), in this paper we have enhanced and re-emerged to amplify Carroll's corporate citizen faces. Therefore, we would propose the incentive augment consisting; (1) discussion of the incomplete theoretical element in business faces; (2) adopting in duplicate of business faces through category approach.

2.1. *The Incomplete Theoretical Element in Business Faces*

2.1.1. Social Contract Theoretical Principle

There is a long history of social contract theory associated with the concept political philosophy as a heuristic role and realism theories (Donaldson, 1990). Much of the scholars have attracted to this approach which depicted in various discipline and critical discussion. Hobbes, the philosopher initiated imply the terms of individual actions have been connected merely to personal power and conscience amplifying the theory of social contract attempt to demonstrate the divergence; the rational individual ought to voluntary concede to give up the inherent freedom to acquire the public benefit (Hobbes, 1651; Brandt, 1928). In general, this notion represents the interaction of people coexistence in civic society according to people have the needs and desires align with their self-interest. However, the society is stated to recognize an agreement, obey the law and the normative of social, and ethical. This concept refers to the reasonable of human and creates peaceful coexistence to the community. Therefore, the social contract theory is explainable in the objective and agreement even interest of the related parties which reflected “the state of nature”. Although the social contract theory is prominently categorized in the political theory, the theory can narrate the social contract theory to expand reciprocal into the responsibility of business (Deegan et al., 2000; Deegan et al., 2002; Donaldson, 1982). To further justify, there is an assumption to pinpoint of explaining the social contract, following Donaldson’s state the relations between parties of society as “Party A agrees to do X, and party B agrees to do Y” (Donaldson 1982). The concept interpreted the contract imply to the objective and agreement even interest of the related parties. As a business point of view, business normally needs to corporate beyond the own desirability and maximize target. If business solely focuses on self-interest, eventually business has not authorized to operate. In accordance with the social contract theory, business would consent to surrender either terminate or offer to any commitment with social and stakeholders for the reason that business would be rewarded by society as well. In widely view, this conceptual and business’s actions would be allowed to the social legitimacy.

2.1.2. Fulfill Carroll’s Corporate Citizen with Social legitimacy

Legitimacy theory relates to the concept of a social contract between business and society that it arranges business with (Deegan, 2002; Deegan et al., 2000; Deegan et al., 2002; Cormier & Gordon, 2001; Patten, 1991). Shocker and Sethi (1973) demonstrated an outline of the notion of a social contract. Owing to wholly social and business institution would be unexceptional and operate in society through obviously or implicitly perform a social contract, wherewith its survival and growth are originated rely on: (1) to deliver socially desirable to society; and (2) to provide of economic, social or political benefits to relevant stakeholder groups. As we are acknowledged, social contract presents about the interaction between relevant parties and performance of the organization to social expectation. Subsequently, the mentioned of Lindblom (1994), the legitimacy can explain into two aspects that what the corporation should act and does act. Additional, it is considered that an organization’s survival will be threatened if society perceives that the organization has breached its social contract (Deegan 2002). Where society is not satisfied that the organization is operating in a legitimate manner, society will revoke the organization’s contract to continue its operations. Deegan et al. (2000) provide examples of how this may be done: consumers may reduce the demand for the organization’s products; factory suppliers may eliminate the supply of labor, and financial capital to the business; or constituents may lobby government for increased taxes, fines or laws to prohibit those actions which do not conform to the expectations of the community. Thus, we can define the social legitimacy is a resource supplying for business existence that social contract must accompany it. Considering, we briefly highlight the social contract theory implications and utilized reflecting into practicing. We then propose discipline of the significant business motivation: *desire-driven* (beyond business-interest, economic, environmental, society, including monetary and nonmonetary); and *requirement-driven* (beyond social requirement and expectation for conduct business and reward by social legitimacy). In essence, the two driven aspects are the intrinsic motivation that drives the business feature while they should be simultaneously driving force and intertwined into each decision making. Toward on Carroll’s corporate citizen paradigm, creating value in the desire-driven aspect does not explicit appear.

2.2. *Duplicate of Carroll’s Business Faces*

At this point we referred to Schwartz and Carroll (2003); they have redefined and developed the three-domain of CSR based on responsibility perspective. An attempt to justify bridging between business and social anticipation, Carroll (1979) initiated and articulated CSR determination subsequently; he depicted the components of CSR into category parts as a “Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility” (Carroll, 1991) remained in the social issue manipulation. In essence, these acceptances would have completely expected to categorize as the responsibility while the three-domain of CSR by Schwartz and Carroll (2003) is also cultivated. Subsequent the three-domain model of CSR with alluding to Carroll (1998) prototype are explored and modified as they are intergraded leading into corporate responsibility. The set of principle proposed consist of Economic, Law, and Ethical wherewith Philanthropy aspect has become and subsumed within the economic and ethical domain (Schwartz & Carroll, 2003). In contrary, philanthropy has been emphasized and significant in Carroll’s four aspects (Carroll, 1998). Within this context, we agree with Carroll (1991; 1998) that philanthropy is necessary to determine separately whereas we argued with the context of Schwartz and Carroll (2003). Regarding the pyramid of corporate social responsibility by Carroll (1991), CSR has been interpreted and posit philanthropy as being a good corporate citizen. As anecdotal evidence demonstrated that it has been the majority of business donates to charitable organizations (Carroll, 1993). Moreover, Schwartz and Carroll (2003) mentioned that Carroll recognizes that “it may in fact be ‘inaccurate’ (1979, p.500) or a ‘misnomer’ (1993, p.33) to call such activities ‘responsibilities’ due to their voluntary or discretionary nature.” Likewise, we considered corporate philanthropy; separated out of the responsibility category in business face based on a

distinguish motivation that philanthropy referred to the voluntary to giving back and fulfilled to society, whereas with each other responsibilities referred to meet the requirement and/or expectation of society (Carroll, 1991).

To highlight, we reshaped Carroll's corporate citizen to determine the new face of business in social contract perspective. Economic and law responsibility are integrated into corporate responsibility (CR) and categorized of requirement-driven. Philanthropy from Carroll's corporate citizen is narrated into corporate philanthropy (CP) and categorized of voluntary-driven. Toward the desire-driven, we have previously discussed, and create value (CV) fulfilled an incomplete theoretical element of Carroll's corporate citizen. These face categories implied respect coherent the Carroll's four-parts aspects which they are expanded and assigned to the meaning and intertwined categories. In addition, the three faces are determined and proposed the significant role of business in society wherewith ethical and moral be cultivated. It deems to be a distinction of mindset started from the corporate citizen by Carroll (1998) including the discussion of Schwartz and Carroll (2003).

3. Three Faces of Business Role in Society

The three faces of business in society have articulated the set of new principle has augmented in extent beyond create value, corporate responsibility, and corporate philanthropy.

3.1. Create Value (CV)

"In recent years, business increasingly has been view as a major cause of social, environmental, and economic problems. Companies are widely perceived to be prospering at the expense of the broader community. Even worse, the more business has begun to embrace corporate responsibility, the more it has been blamed for society's failures. The legitimacy of business has fallen to level not seen in recent history. This diminished trust in business leads political leaders to set policies that undermine competitiveness and sap economic growth. Business is caught in a vicious circle" (Porter & Kramer, 2011 p.4).

Owing to Porter and Kramer (2011), these states presented the business contexts that being perceived self-orientation which led business to continue to view how the role of business should be. Therefore, business has to realize the changes and indeed rethinking about business principle; leverage mindset to out of merely economic aspect and liberate the attitude of responsibility shadow to be a creator which determine the purpose and the own puissance corporation value. By creating value has contributed bringing business gathering with society (Porter & Kramer, 2011), there have been the reasons of actually enforce business to be existing. When momentum started to change, business requires finding itself and shapes a new vision of corporate performance in the context of part of society genuinely. Hence, the corporate executives' responsibility would be described differences in the approach separating into two aspects. Firstly, they can determine and disregard the impact of the corporation's broader ability to decline the opportunity to reconsider the pleasure purpose of their organization. Perhaps, most of them would principally decide this aspect in which each development, if there are the leaders who cannot adopt with changes, they may be regularly left from business cycles. Secondly, a business can set purpose from itself desired what the value of their corporations should be, focus, and create. The corporate executives would assort to embody the opportunity for further encouraged the desired operation driven: to see their affected as the value of both monetary and nonmonetary; shaping entities of the stakeholder, social, and environmental they touch simultaneously maintaining, customizing their economic implement effectively as well. We suppose the second aspect would engender a good evolution, and then it deemed to be good exemplify efforts inspiring to the others. This shift has attributed impact the normal relationships that we think about business and what customer, supplier, employee, community member, competition, and cooperation mean and intrinsic value. Likewise, the social responsibility of business consists to create value for society as from the social aspect that "profits do not have any intrinsic value" (Pies et al., 2010 p.269). Subsequent Freeman (2010), as well as Pies et al. (2010), examined that business is not merely about economic, money whether profit whereas the purpose of any business is to maximize benefits for shareholders. Thus, it would be attempted and intrinsic motivation to figure out the key to developing a new model or new focus of business in society. The context of the new faces of business in society entails business base on creating something better off such as doing good and living. More specifically, a business may be appropriate attain its purpose that can be separated beyond money and profits. At this point, we would emphasize that it is explicitly clear to remind comprehending as money and profits are important but purpose entailed the intrinsic corporate value.

Decades of studying, the traditional business principle has extended beyond profit making which highlighted the economic responsibility and profit maximization. Friedman (1970) also mentioned business should be served with value creating in accordance with the purposes and desires particularly making money. However, this new faces of the business role in society propose a discussion and augment referred to the corporate citizen paradigm of Carroll (1998). Concerning Carroll (1998) revealed that business ought to be good corporate citizen consequently to Freeman's mentioned for the reason of being good corporate citizen, that business is part of society where business roles as contributing to making society better and connects with society together (Freeman, 2010; Freeman & Evan, 1990; Freeman & Liedtka, 1991). Toward every business necessary to be profitable that would be interpreted in the face of economic responsibility (Carroll, 1998). As aforementioned, this discussion will posit economic responsibility is gathering into one part of corporate responsibility thus, we have illustrated in further discussion. With regard to Friedman (1970), he has revealed that the purpose of business is business whereas the literature of Carroll (2015) and Pies et al. (2010) stated that business has mandated to realize to society, in consequence, there has been query what the purpose of business should be.

Owing to these above mindset toward desirability and feasibility proposed, motivational principles apply whereas thereafter volitional principles set in business (Gollwitzer, 2012), business able to create the manifold value regards to multiple aspects that business would perform the corporate identity, be appropriate and worth in addition, business has the quest to justify why this corporate should exist toward on social contract approach. Based on business explicitly does not merely manipulate within the context of economic

nevertheless it deeply interwoven with the stakeholder, environmental, and integrate business as part of society that would not be apart. Simultaneously there has been comprehended and crystallized thinking of a business strategy to tackle social mandate with the mindset of value creation which wide angle view has enlightened the significant role to rebound business.

3.2. Corporate Responsibility (CR)

Given impetus by the changes of social consciousness that entered to a crescendo, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has emerged in relevance and pinpoint as a global concept ever since. Nowadays, CSR has evolved to be interplay between the movement of thought and practice. Although many scholars have tried to articulate the definition to CSR, a precise definition is indefinable and not yet to be achieved (Dahlsrud, 2008). The most comprehensive CSR definition has referred to Carroll's notions which encompassed the pyramid that placed economic on the bottom and comprised with legal responsibility to ethical and philanthropic responsibility on the top respectively (Carroll, 1979, 1991, 1999). According to the notion by Angelidis and Ibrahim (1993), they narrated that CSR articulated the set of corporation performances enacted to fulfill the social needs. In accordance with Lerner and Fryxell (1988) revealed that the corporation's CSR performances ought to be in concord with societal values and anticipations. Subsequently, there has been developed the social, economic, and environmental responsibilities gathering into the strategic approach of corporate sustainability for social value creation (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002; Forbes & Milliken, 1999; Marrewijk, 2003; Porter & Kramer, 2006). It seems to be engaged supportive to the corporation's enthusiasm to its legal obligations by determining policies and performances that socially reinforce and benefit to society. As well as Ghillyer (2008) has congruently construed CSR as the actions of an organization in which targeted toward the achievement of a social benefit over and above maximizing profits for its shareholders and meeting all its legal obligations. In addition, Marrewijk (2003) has determined CSR gathering with economic, social, and environmental responsibilities in alliance to the ultimate goal of corporate sustainability in which converge the present needs without broken the future needs.

According to the aforementioned aspects, these seem to explain that customers, employees, and shareholders have increasingly become the core stakeholders who the business has responded. To better understand of CSR in a category of moral obligations or ethical conscience of business, CSR is able to summarize as the role and contributions of businesses in enabling involved people and the surrounding community. As Scholl (2001) have the notion that CSR is to intertwine the extent of moral obligation or normative principle. This seems to be defined in the range of practical and managerial. Therefore, abiding by the law does not directly represent being socially responsible and CSR is completely the indication of a willing effort in which the company consents with ethical standards when compared to only economic or legal responds (Jones, 1980; Carroll, 1999). Then business is assented from society to operate supposing that there will conduct the responsibility for its actions beyond legal requirements. Indeed, CSR is the idea that business is responsible to various stakeholders who can be determined and affected, either legally or morally mentioned and expected to the business activities (Frederick, 1987; Mitnick, 1995; Jones, 1999). Moreover, it also posits the business value regarding the terms of moral and ethical philosophy, conscience, or benevolence commitment and not just a query of compliance to the law which often places in the relay on the concepts of corporate social responsiveness and corporate governance. Subsequently, Moir (2001) explained that business might engage in CSR accord to the social contract point of view that aligns a firm with conscientiously not merely for the reason that it is a profitable interest, but it is the component of how society absolutely entrusts business to continue operation. These mentioned above proposes that business has thrived the authority and influence in some definite contexts formulated from social and that the non-compliance of those obligations critically faces the economic, social, and even the existence of business. Indeed, this thought is making the sense of the responsibility concept of creating value along the purpose which business pursue in long-term responsiveness and derive the social legitimacy.

3.3. Corporate Philanthropy (CP)

Extrapolating from Carroll's "The Four Faces of Corporate Citizenship" (1998), philanthropy demonstrated into the one of an essential role of business in society in which we have formerly pinpointed as the keystone of thinking that would propose in the diverse aspects, separated from economic and legal responsibilities. While ethical has remained to integrate with each above components above. This discussion we considered the philanthropy perspective as philanthropy is the voluntary to giving back and fulfilled to society.

Increasingly a comprehensive conceptualization of corporate philanthropy (CP), there is an important effecting to the organizations' altruistic practice reciprocates to communities and society. The theoretical literature on philanthropy is initiated commitment with charity and giving back to society. Prior anecdotal evidence pointed to philanthropy as a novel and potentially of business donations to social as same as being benevolent to involve employees with empathy and attitudes manipulation (Françoise, 1995). The study of Debbie and Linda (2002) revealed that philanthropy is integrated with the elements of corporate performance for approaching to support social responsibility including its stakeholders. An attempt to determine a substantial what philanthropy had to society is consequent to an organizational legitimacy activity towards a social expectation (Moir & Taffler, 2004; Windsor, 2006). The philanthropy can indeed reflected in a burgeoning importance of the individual, organizational and institutional levels (Gan, 2006; Genest, 2005; Wymer & Samu, 2003). Regarding to the fundamental of moral and ethical, there has been the self-interest driven to motivate the philanthropic behavior of benevolent to others wherewith the individual concerning has emphasized an optimistic to perceive altruism and could enhance stakeholders as the strategic approach of the corporation (Sheth & Babiak, 2010; Wang & Coffey, 1992; Windsor, 2006). Meanwhile, aforementioned as Keim (1978) explained the institutional level can be conceptualized focusing on the activities affected businesses and society relations from the standpoint of corporations have met social expectation. Subsequent, Madden et al. (2006) has defined that corporate philanthropy has aligned business and been motivated with the expressive

volunteering of giving the own resources, time including money donation to benefit society even the organizations as well as foundations wherever purpose to operate the philanthropic activities. The way in which corporate philanthropy has contributed to generating the public relationship and corporation's image through the corporate benevolent and humanitarian giving; corporations have to consider their missions are engaging in the strategies those would be articulate to their efforts for enhancing the competitive advantage (Porter & Kramer, 2002; 2006).

Aforementioned anecdotal evidence by Carroll (1979), philanthropy is pinpointed on the top of the CSR pyramid. Halme and Laurila (2009) have proposed despite corporate philanthropy is conceptualized as an old-fashioned, there has been existent combined the role of corporate philanthropy in business strategy and deemed to exemplify of corporate social performance. Bowen et al. (2010) conducted philanthropy in which it conceptualized to be an alternative initiative of a broader range of society and private commitment actions. Concerning the literature by Aguinis and Glavas (2012), they proposed that corporate philanthropy practice has also comprised the cornerstone of corporation thinking reflected in the institutional and individual levels which the results have been indeed fulfilled some part of skills and incompetence to the organization consequently, Genest (2005) examined that in the globalization, corporate philanthropy had motivated culture and entailed to the corporate values with altruistic practicing. The reasons of altruistic engendered the result of remarkable definitions on the voluntary character (Galaskiewicz & Colman 2006). Similarly Carroll (1998) revealed that business ought to give back to society, consequently to Freeman's mentioned for the reason of being good corporate citizen that business is the set in society where the concept of philanthropy connects business with society together (Freeman, 2010; Freeman & Evan, 1990; Freeman, & Liedtka, 1991). Owing to philanthropy has enlightened and contributed accountability of business for recognizing to place the corporate philanthropy into the context of responsiveness to society, therefore, the concept provides an additional role of the business that metaphorically aimed to generate mutual betterment of society and lives (Esben, 2010; Pies et al., 2009).

Within the era of globalization, corporate philanthropy has been seen as the component of corporate citizen, Genest (2005) described the corporation could comprehend the corporate philanthropy is manipulating with innovative of potential difference. Previously, it is driven by business corporations desiring to volunteer mutually and to be perceived as obliging particularly good corporate, for those reasons there has been embed to allocate resources as well as perform manipulations as for instance of donating money and take actions for the humanitarian endeavors (Genest, 2005). Presently, the perspective of ethical behavior is analyzed in more utilitarianism approach that is relevant to the review by Shaw and Post (1993). There has been an attempt to clarify complement to the initiatives of philanthropy that interdependent helped serve the same purpose and envisioned in long-term which entailed the reorient to venture philanthropy for social business (Hehenberger et al., 2014). In essence, it has defined the philanthropic investment approach such as Grantmaking, Program-Related Investing, Venture Philanthropy, Impact Investing and Sustainable Investing those are aimed to the investors or the enterprises whose the principle purpose intended to social issues while declined recompense and gave the return on invested back to society; hence, most of the venture philanthropists have desired to reinforce the donation and investment for a long vision without any profiteering (Hehenberger & Harling, 2013; John, 2007). The subtext in this probably would have interpreted corporate philanthropy as provide supporting the own existing resources and deemed to fulfill to some incompetence issues of the corporation. Meanwhile, the outsiders might make it better off; therefore, it seemed to provide and support through other organizations with the willingness resources without any profiteering or exploitation. Building this concept, it deems to interpret as the genuine philanthropic which has represented a positive effect on the goodwill of doing well on practicing philanthropy strategic and be derived back to corporation and shareholders (Godfrey, 2005). According to the outcomes of corporate philanthropy on business, as Godfrey (2005) explicated that corporate philanthropy and corporate financial performance relations relied on the moral investment. As the above mentioned moral funding would gain a bulk trust to shareholders among preventing for the intangible assets related to corporate relations simultaneously, seemed to generate the wealth for shareholder and positive consequence to corporate financial performance through indeed philanthropic performance (Bright, 2006; Choi & Wang, 2007; Godfrey, 2005; Kellie & Ana, 2015)

To highlight this insight, Wulfson (2001) revealed that manipulating philanthropy for achieving business and social is to pinpoint the reciprocal supporting society otherwise the others. At this point, the studies of corporate philanthropy conceptual have been seen as one of the most empirical researches since the previous era until currently in which corporate philanthropy has posited for the role lead society better off.

Regarding philanthropy in social contract approach, when a business has reciprocated and beyond and/or further social expectation; business would achieve the acceptance of corporate legitimacy for business operation in society. As an academic concern of Halme and Laurila (2009) as well as Porter and Kramer (2002) have considered of practicing corporate philanthropy strategically, the corporation would also acquire legitimacy.

4. Implementation and Future Research

Increasingly, the globalization has been changed thus the reorientation is required for the company to be adjusted. The rationale of adjusting reinforces to indeed comprehend of the social contract approach which reciprocates the relations between society and business. Meanwhile, the results would intimately relate to enlarge the role of business in which the core thought of managerial and practical based on the fundamental of desire and requirement driven. It deemed leading to the opportunity, contributed responsiveness, and derived the social legitimacy.

However, this article has aimed to highlight the three faces affected to business in society regarding integrate utilizing for the future research. Given the impetus, there have been some of these major characteristics of the concept that have emerged driving force of business survival in which how to integrate this three faces to business operation. In the sense, the concepts are intertwined and would

utilize into the management control system of the company as regards the three approaches have been examined and place in relation to theory and practice toward the underlying principles into a range consideration of the relationships between business and society.

5. References

- i. Anand, A.I. (2006). An analysis of enabling vs. mandatory corporate governance: Structures post-Sarbanes-Oxley. *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law*, 31, 229-252.
- ii. Andriof, J., & McIntosh, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Perspectives on corporate citizenship: Context, content, and processes*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- iii. Angelidis, J.P. & Ibrahim, N.A. (1993). Social demand and corporate strategy: A corporate social responsibility model. *Review of Business*, 15, 7-10.
- iv. Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932-968.
- v. Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2013). Embedded versus peripheral corporate social responsibility: Psychological foundations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6, 314-332.
- vi. Amit, R., Zott, C., & Pearson, A. (2012). Creating value through business model innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53, 40-49.
- vii. Bies, R. J., Bartunek, J., Fort, T. L., & Zald, M. (2007). Corporations as social change agents: Individual, interpersonal, institutional, and environmental dynamics. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 788-793.
- viii. Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper and Brothers New York.
- ix. Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A., & Herremans, I. (2010). When suits meet roots: The antecedents and consequences of community engagement strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 297-318.
- x. Brandt, F. (1928). *Thomas Hobbes' Mechanical Conception of Nature*. Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard.
- xi. Bright, D. (2006). DIALOGUE: Virtuousness is necessary for genuineness in corporate philanthropy. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31(3), 752-754.
- xii. Carroll, A.B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.
- xiii. Carroll, A.B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, July/August, 39-48.
- xiv. Carroll, A.B. (1993). (2nd Eds.), *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*. Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing.
- xv. Carroll, A.B. (1998). The four faces of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review*, 100/101(1), 1-7.
- xvi. Carroll, A.B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business and Society*, 38, 268-295.
- xvii. Carroll, B.A. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(2), 87-96.
- xviii. Choi, J., & Wang, H. (2007). The promise of a managerial values approach to corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75(4), 345-359.
- xix. Cormier, D. & Gordon, I. (2001). An Examination of Social and Environmental Reporting Strategies, Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 14(5), 587-616.
- xx. Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1-13.
- xxi. Debbie, T.Mc. & Linda, F. (2002). The role of strategic philanthropy in marketing strategy. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(5/6), 689-705.
- xxii. Deegan, C. (2002). The Legitimizing Effect of Social and Environmental Disclosures- A Theoretical Foundation. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311.
- xxiii. Deegan, C., Rankin, M. & Voght, P. (2000), Firms' Disclosure Reactions to Social Incidents: Australian Evidence, *Accounting Forum*. 24(1), 101-130.
- xxiv. Deegan, C., Rankin, M. & Tobin, J. (2002), An Examination of the Corporate Social and Environmental Disclosures of BHP from 1983-1997: A Test of Legitimacy Theory. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 312-343.
- xxv. Donaldson, T. (1982). *Corporations and Morality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- xxvi. Donaldson, T. (1990). Social Contracts and Corporations: A Reply to Hodapp. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(2), 133-37.
- xxvii. Dyllick, T & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11, 130-141. DOI: 10.1002/bse.323.
- xxviii. Esben, R.P. (2010). Modelling CSR: How managers understand the responsibilities of business towards society. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 155-166.
- xxix. Forbes, D. P., and Milliken, F. J. (1999). Cognition and corporate governance: Understanding boards of directors as strategic groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 489-505.
- xxx. Françoise, L.S. (1995). Global corporate philanthropy: a strategic framework. *International Marketing Review*, 12(4), 20-37. DOI:10.1108/02651339510097711.
- xxxi. Frederick, W.C. (1987). Theories of corporate social performance. In S.P. Sethi and M.C.

- xxxii. Freeman, R.E., (2010). Managing for stakeholders: Trade-offs or value creation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96, 7-9.
- xxxiii. Freeman, R.E. & Evan, M.W. (1990). Corporate Governance: A Stakeholder Interpretation. *The Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 19(4), 337-359.
- xxxiv. Freeman, R.E., & Liedtka, J. (1991). Corporate social responsibility: A critical approach. *Business Horizons*, July/August, 92-98.
- xxxv. Freeman, R.E., Wicks, A.C., & Parmar, B. (2004). Stakeholder theory and the corporate objective revisited. *Organization Science*, 15, 364-369.
- xxxvi. Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., Wicks, A.C., Parmar, B.L., & De Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- xxxvii. Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- xxxviii. Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits, *The New York Times Magazine*.
- xxxix. Gan, A. (2006). The impact of public scrutiny on corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69(3), 217–236.
- xl. Genest, C.M. (2005). Cultures, organizations and philanthropy. *Corporate Communications*, 10(4), 315–327.
- xli. Ghillyer, A. (2008). *Business Ethics: A Real World Approach*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- xl.ii. Godfrey, P.C. (2005). The relationship between corporate philanthropy and shareholder wealth: A risk management perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 777–798.
- xl.iii. Gollwitzer P.M. (2012). Mindset theory of action phases. In Lange, Paul A. van. (Ed.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp.526-545). Los Angeles: Sage.
- xl.ii.ii. Graves, S.B., & Waddock, S.A. (1994). Institutional owners and corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1034-1046.
- xl.ii.iii. Halme, M., & Laurila, J. (2009). Philanthropy, integration or innovation? Exploring the financial and societal outcomes of different types of corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(3), 325–339.
- xl.ii.iiii. Hart, S.L., & Sharma, S. (2004). Engaging fringe stakeholders for competitive imagination. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1), 7-18.
- xl.ii.v. Hehenberger, L. and Harling, A. (2013). *A Practical Guide to Measuring and Managing Impact*. The EVPA Survey European Venture Philanthropy Association.
- xl.ii.vi. Hehenberger, L., Boiardi, P., & Gianoncelli, A. (2014). *European Venture Philanthropy and Social Investment 2013/2014*. The EVPA Survey European Venture Philanthropy Association.
- xl.ii.vii. Hobbes, T. (1651). C. B Macpherson (Ed.), *Leviathan*. London: Penguin Books.
- xl.ii.viii. I. Humber, J.M. (2002). Beyond stockholders and stakeholders: A plea for corporate moral authority. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 36, 207-221.
- xl.ii.ix. li. John, R. (2007). *Beyond the Cheque: How venture philanthropists add value*. Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship. Oxford: Said Business School, University of Oxford.
- xl.ii.x. lii. Jones, T.M. (1980). Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. *California Management Review*, 22(2), 59–67.
- xl.ii.xi. liii. Jones, T.M. (1999). The institutional determinants of social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20(2), 163–179.
- xl.ii.xii. liv. Keim, G.D. (1978). Managerial behavior and the social responsibility debate: Goals versus constraints. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1), 57–68.
- xl.ii.xiii. lv. Kellie, L. & Ana, S. (2015). Battling the devolution in the research on corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126, 285–308.
- xl.ii.xiv. lvi. Laplume, A.O., Sonpar, K. & Litz, R.A. (2008). Stakeholder Theory: Reviewing a Theory That Moves Us. *Journal of Management*, 34(6) 1152-1189.
- xl.ii.xv. lvii. Lindblom, C.K. (1994). *The Implications of Organizational Legitimacy for Corporate Social Performance and Disclosure*. Paper presented to the Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference, New York.
- xl.ii.xvi. lviii. Lerner, D.L. & Fryxell, E.G. (1988). An empirical study of the predictors of corporate social performance: a multi-dimensional analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 7, 951–959.
- xl.ii.xvii. lix. Madden, K., Scaife, W., & Crissman, K. (2006). How and why small to medium size enterprises (SMEs) engage with their communities: An Australian study. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 49–60.
- xl.ii.xviii. lx. Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 95–105.
- xl.ii.xix. lxi. Matten, D., & Crane, A. (2005). Corporate citizenship: Toward an extended theoretical conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 166-179.
- xl.ii.xx. lxii. Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). “Implicit” and “explicit” CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 404-424.
- xl.ii.xxi. lxiii. McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 117-127.
- xl.ii.xxii. lxiv. McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, P. M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 1-18.
- xl.ii.xxiii. lxv. Mitnick, B.M. (1995). Systematics and CSR: the theory and processes of normative referencing. *Business and Society*, 34(1).
- xl.ii.xxiv. lxvi. Moir L. (2001). What do we mean by corporate social responsibility?. *Corporate Governance*, 1(2), 16–22.

- lxvii. Moir, L., & Taffler, R. (2004). Does corporate philanthropy exist?: Business giving to the arts in the U.K. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54(2), 149-161.
- lxviii. Orts, E.W., & Strudler, A. (2002). The ethical and environmental limits of stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12(2), 215-233.
- lxix. Patten, D.M. (1991). Exposure, legitimacy, and social disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 10, 297-308.
- lxx. Pies, I., Beckmann, M. & Hielscher, S. (2010). Value Creation, Management Competencies, and Global Corporate Citizenship: An ordonomic approach to business ethics in the age of globalization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 265-278.
- lxxi. Pies, I., Hielscher, S. & Beckmann, M. (2009). Moral commitments and the societal role of business: An ordonomic approach to corporate citizenship. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 19(3), 375-401.
- lxxii. Porter, M.E. & Kramer M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 57-68.
- lxxiii. Porter, M.E. & Kramer M.R. (2006). Strategy and Society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78-92.
- lxxiv. Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (2011). Creating shared value: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77.
- lxxv. Porter, M.E. & Kramer M.R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard business review*, 84(12), 78-92.
- lxxvi. Scholl, H.J. (2001) Applying Stakeholder Theory to E-Government: Benefits and Limits, Towards the E-Society: the series IFIP International Federation for Information Processing. Springer, 74, 735-747.
- lxxvii. Schwartz, S.M. & Carroll, B.A. (2003) Corporate Social Responsibility: A Three-Domain Approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(4), 503-530.
- lxxviii. Shaw, B., & Post, F.R. (1993). A moral basis for corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(10), 745-751.
- lxxix. Sheth, H., & Babiak, K.M. (2010). Beyond the game: Perceptions and practices of corporate social responsibility in the professional sport industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(3), 433-450.
- lxxx. Shocker, A.D. & Sethi, S.P. (1973). An approach to developing societal preferences in developing corporate action strategies. *California Management Review*, 97-105.
- lxxx. Wang, J., & Coffey, B.S. (1992). Board composition and corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(10), 771-778.
- lxxxii. Windsor, D. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Three key approaches. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 93-114.
- lxxxiii. Wulfson, M. (2001). The ethics of corporate social responsibility and philanthropic ventures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(1/2), 135-145.
- lxxxiv. Wymer, W. W.J., & Samu, S. (2003). Dimensions of business and nonprofit collaborative relationships. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 11(1), 3-22.