CSR and Sustainable Development: Concepts, Contexts, and Issues

SYLLABUS AND LEARNING GUIDE

This **LEARNING GUIDE** is prepared by Dr Sami Hasan (samiul.hasan@yahoo.com).

Some ideas and designs are borrowed from other learning guides that Dr Hasan had (co)prepared at the University of Technology Sydney where he worked as an associate professor (SL) from 2002-07. Dr. Hasan holds a PhD from the School of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo.

No part of this **LEARNING GUIDE** can be copied or used for commercial purposes OR outside the Trisakti University.

CSR and Sustainable Development: Concepts, Contexts, and Issues

Contents

Subject information

SALAMAT DATANG

CSR and Sustainable Development: Concepts, Contexts, and Issues is one of the core subjects for the newly introduced Master of Management in CSR. This subject builds upon core subjects in functional areas of Accounting, Finance, Marketing and Management to analyse the broad current environment of CSR and sustainable development, and to explore the ethical, legal, economic, and competency issues involved. The subject compliments the other core subjects by reflecting upon the theoretical aspects and challenges of corporate social responsibility aimed at sustainable development.

The subject reflects upon the theoretical aspects and challenges of CSR aimed at sustainable development.

Within the context of a global village, this subject critically appraises diverse aspects of corporate social responsibility made towards personal and societal global transformation for sustainable development. You will develop a broad understanding of corporate social responsibility by looking into the strategies and practices employed by different types of organisations. You will have an opportunity to explore and acquire micro-skills in specific areas, particularly through the understanding of sustainable development and its relationship to stakeholders in business firms, in class and also through the assessment tasks.

This subject critically appraises diverse aspects of corporate social responsibility aimed at sustainable development.

This Learning Guide is designed to help you maximise your benefit from the **CSR and Sustainable Development: Concepts, Contexts, and Issues** and its Intensive Workshops. The Guide is to help you comprehend theories and issues of corporate social responsibility into a broader context, and apply the acquired comprehension directly to your work experience, and in no way a substitute for the essential and optional readings, taking part in learning activities, or thoughtful assessment of the readings.

This Guide, focusing on the workshops, suggests a learning pathway and directs your learning towards the assessment tasks.

Learning Partnerships

Learning partnerships are an important educational strategy used in this subject. In this subject, you will be challenged to understand and integrate concepts that you may not have encountered before. In order to have a better understanding of the concepts and the readings you will be required to form learning teams (to be discussed on the first day). It is expected that you will engage with learning partnership beyond the classroom.

Teaching Staff

The subject will be taught by a team of academics and practitioners. Dr Sami Hasan is the main instructor of the subject. The final list of other members of the team will be available on the first day of lecture.

Specific Objectives of the Course:

On successful completion of this subject students should be able to:

Identify the dimensions of and analyse the theories developed to explain sustainable development

Explore the dimensions of and comprehend the theories developed to introduce social responsibility parameters in business entities

Analyse roles and interrelationships between major international, national, and local codes of business principles underlining social responsibility

Examine the legal and ethical issues undermining the business roles in social formation/development.

Assess the impact of broad programs of CSR, eg. the UN Global Compact

Study the major steps and tasks in CSR

Appreciate the ethical, economic, legal, and managerial issues of CSR for sustainable development, in particular in the context of Indonesia

Evaluate the effectiveness of (more than) one selected local CSR program(s)

Workshop Contents

Key questions: *How can business entities ethically, theoretically and strategically devise a compartmentalized social responsibility program without a holistic system of social obligation mechanism, and stakeholder engagement and vice versa?*

The first day focuses on the *issues of* profit maximisation *and* risk *reduction, and the power of* corporations in a globalised *world that calls for a sustainability watch.*

The second day will be devoted mainly to *comprehending the intra-generational equity* issues of sustainable development that essentially is a concern of low-income countries as well as a focus of the environmental justice debate.

The third day concentrates on *corporate social responsibility in the global perspectives.*

Students will identify, explore, analyse, study, evaluate, and appreciate the ethical, economic, legal, and managerial issues of CSR for sustainable development, with examples from Indonesia and overseas.

The Workshops are spread over two weeks, and held in block format. The first week will deal with theoretical and conceptual issues, while the second will be devoted to understanding and analysing examples and lessons from Indonesia and overseas. Attendance at all sessions is compulsory.

The Assessment Tasks

Task	Value	Length
1. A synthesis of selected topics	30%	Between 3500 and 4000 words
2. An analysis of CSR practices and issues of two corporations	30%	Between 2000 and 2500 words
3. Mid-term examination	20%	
4. Class discussion and group presentations (10 in each week)	20%	

Assessment tasks are not to impress with words but to logically express and analyze.

Details of Assessment tasks

Assessment Task 1: A synthesis of selected topics: (2500 words; 30 Marks)

The Course in the first week will deal with seven main topics (see below). The second week will be an extension of the explanations in the first week and demonstrations of practical application and lessons of business social responsibility in Indonesia and other parts of the world. The students will be required to write an essay encompassing at least a half of the topics in a different frame highlighting similarities and differences or contested issues in the selected topics. The main idea is to see the students can comprehend materials under study and intelligently compare and contrast critical issues.

Assessment task 2: Essay (2500 words; 30 Marks)

Identify two (one Indonesian and another overseas) business entities. Find out both organisations' recent social responsibility strategies and programs. Critically analyse the programs' relations to the UN Global Compact. Where have they done better? Where are they lacking? What transferable lessons are available for others?

You must use materials in the Reading Guide, and also research and cite other relevant publications. Use Trisakti library catalogue and databases, eg. ProQuest. Include the following in your essay:

- A general description of the organisation.
- Describe the international perspective.
- What type of social responsibility programs are the organisations working towards? (eg. religious, environmental, socio-economic)
- To what extent, if any, does the organisation consider human rights issues within and outside the organisation?
- Describe the organisational strategies and practices used to undertake CSR for sustainable development.
- How are these practices funded?
- How do these relate to the UN Global Comapct?
- Why is this particular course of action being undertaken?
- Whose interests are/are not being served by this course of action?
- What, if any, form of evaluation is undertaken by the organisation?

Presentation of assessment tasks

Assessment tasks should be submitted in typewritten form, using one and a half or double line spacing. Adhere to the required length of assessment tasks, and proof read before submission.

Re-submission policy

In the case where the grade for the assessment task fails to realise a satisfactory level of achievement, supplementary work, or the opportunity to resubmit written work, may be provided at the discretion of the Subject Coordinator.
Supplementary work will only be accepted in instances where failure is at the borderline.

Criteria to be used to grade the assessment tasks

Developing and demonstrating expertise in some basic research skills and analytic methods are necessary for successful completion of the subject. Students will have to demonstrate skills in:

- Selecting and consistently focusing on a topic (not being distracted to other SIGNIFICANT BUT IRRELEVANT issues);

- Appreciating the role and importance of problem analysis,

- Understanding, identifying, and using relevant and reliable sources of information and data, and Incorporate readings into assessment tasks

- Support your position with appropriate reference material

- Receiving, providing, and appreciating constructive feedback,

- Effectively presenting ideas in a logical and appropriate manner (tailoring to the audience)

- Relate elements of the subject to your personal/professional experience

- Use the materials from workshop exercises

- Recognizing a research project as an on-going conversation with an audience and,

- Developing an appreciation of academic writing (for appropriate expression, not impression).

The following specific criteria will be used to grade the students' submissions:

- Articulation and statement of the problem (10%)

- Ability to comprehend and use CSR approach, methods, and contents (10%)

- Research and analysis of the identified issue (25%)

- Validity of the critique and/or proposed solution (25%)

- Reliability, (non-web) source, and appropriateness of facts/data (15%)

- Organization, structure, and presentation (15%)

Engaging with the readings

Readings are samples from different perspectives to provoke you into thinking, finding more and to relate. You will have to consult additional external resources as you work through the assessment tasks and develop your own grassroots understanding.

You are given essential readings for each section. We suggest you read each one rapidly to get the general idea of its content. A second reading can be done with pen or highlighter in hand to add your own margin notes or to highlight information you find especially significant– and useful for completing the assessment tasks.

Section 1   CSR and Sustainable Development: Concepts, Contexts, and Issues– What, Why?

Introduction

In the post-WWII period the need for European reconstruction on the one hand, and fulfilling the high economic aspirations of people in the newly independent countries in Asia and Africa, on the other witnessed considerable efforts in economic growth and 'development'. Innovation for diversification and differentiation through technological progress to create and sustain competitive advantage turned out to be the major feature of development initiatives. The approach advocated 'personal achievement' as opposed to community benefit assuming a 'trickle-down' effect to the 'periphery' inevitable.

Corporations also have become killing machines like sharks by "moving its operating costs to external organizations and people" (Professor Joel Bakan in The Corporation*).*
Do you agree?

The human economic actions were legitimized and reinforced through an extensive use of corporations. Over the years corporations have harnessed incredible power due to their involvement in significant economic activities in fulfilling demands and creating jobs. Corporations eventually have assumed more rights, than a person, with perpetuity, and do not need to function within the designated charters (Noam Chomsky in *The Corporation*).

There are about 64,000 MNCs with economic activities equalling to about $20 trillion or about 45% of the world's total GDP.

Nonetheless, the power of the corporations in economic growth and job creation are undeniable. There are about 64,000 MNCs with economic activities equalling to about $20 trillion or about 45% of the world total gross national income (GNI). The business entities in general and corporations in particular create wealth and carbon in the air at the same time. The publication of *Our Common Future* in 1987 created a world wide awareness, and urge for searching an 'environmentally sound' development that is sustainable in the long run, instead of 'development at the cost of the environment'.

In 2000, the United Nations (UN) adopted a Global Compact as a guide for all to undertake socially and environmentally responsible business practices. The Compact underscores and reinforces the needs for implementing such UN codes like the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights to Work, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, and the UN Convention Against Corruption in the operation of businesses. The Global Compact advises businesses to embrace, support and enact, within their jurisdiction, a set of core values in relation to human rights, labor standards, the environment, and anti-corruption. A university subject like this can offer the participants an opportunity to comprehend the concepts, theories and dynamics of sustainable development as well as social responsibility of business entities.

Course description

The Course is intended to offer the students enrolled in the Masters in Management (CSR) a comprehensive understanding of BSR and its relationship to sustainable development, and focuses both on increasing the student's research capability and allowing the students opportunity to advance other relevant skills as well as knowledge gained in the Program's curriculum. The Course is designed essentially to help students become proficient in identifying, researching, and analyzing areas of BSR that may contribute to the achievement of different aspects of sustainable development. By combining theory, methods, knowledge, and skills students will be required to critique BSR policies and programs for selected business entities. Each student will prepare, present, and defend the BSR Critique independently.

Many terms are used to mean corporate social responsibility (CSR), for example, business ethics, corporate citizenship, corporate accountability, and corporate sustainability. How would you define corporate social responsibility in a very simple way?

Course Goals and Learning Outcomes of the Course

The goal of the Course is to enable the students synthesize the knowledge and skills acquired in the Program in order to develop, define, and analyze BSR programs in relation to sustainable development. The completion of the Course is expected to enhance the students':

Ability to relate theory and practice by the
- Use of knowledge (theories, principles, and tools) gained from the study at the Trisakti University in identifying and analyzing specific aspects of business social responsibility; and

- Application (adapting appropriately) of the gained skills and knowledge in researching and developing programs for business social responsibility;

Critical awareness of
- Contemporary issues of BSR in general, and in the Region; and
- The need for adjusting aspects of BSR to suit people's cultural or ethnic requirements, and of developing and maintaining useful relationships with specific internal/external stakeholders;

Skills in research and analysis with the
- Use of specific methods of collecting and analyzing information and data relevant for BSR drawing on technical, creative and organizational skills; and
- Commencement, management, and completion of a BSR program;

Communication skills in
- Communicating orally and in writing in a fluent and logical manner; and
- Presenting messages using visual, verbal, and written forms;

Interpersonal skills and professional relations in the course of
- Understanding and identifying with BSR principles, specific BSR programs, and BSR issues; and Team work

Course Method

This course uses an interactive teaching approach consisting of lectures, discussions, learning partner interaction, class room activities, debates, and student presentations. Scheduled lectures by the regular instructor or guest speakers are to be conducted in a workshop format, and incorporate hands-on class exercises with practical readings. The face to face teaching in the course is scheduled for six days in two consecutive weeks. The first week will essentially deal with general theories, principles, and issues of BSR, while the second week will focus primarily on appropriate regional and Indonesian themes.

Students are required to attend all sessions of intensive seminar/workshop presentations delivered by the regular instructor or by guest speakers tailored to help the students achieve the learning outcome of the Course and define, criticize or defend BSR programs.

The Course is designed to help students become proficient in identifying, researching, and analyzing areas of BSR that may contribute to the achievement of different aspects of sustainable development.

Subject Outline

1. Human Needs, Innovations, and Corporations

A. Human values, behaviour, and corporations

B. Corporations in the Colonial and Post Colonial Eras: 'Dutch East India' to 'Rio Tinto'

C. Corporations: Missions and Mandates

'Corporations'- A documentary

2. Sustainable Development and Intergenerational Equity

A. Ecosystems, human culture and values

B. Cultural relativism and fundamental issues in sustainable development

C. Corporate activites, economic transformation, and climate change: Issues

3. CSR: Historical Development and Conceptual Frame

A. Organisations for Human Needs

B. Stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility

C. CSR in the frames of social legitimacy and social contract theory

4. CSR: Contexts and Congruence

A. CSR and Business Ethics

B. CSR and Corporate Governance

C. CSR, and Community Development, and Social Capital

5. Global Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility

A. UN Global Compact, and other accords on CSR and Sustainable Development (SD)

B. CSR Monitoring: ISO 26000

C. Sample CSR practices from all over the world: The Common Thread

6. CSR Practices and the Three Sectors

A. The three-sector approach to sustainable development: Tools and Issues

B. Government-Business-Third Sector partnerships

C. Indonesian cases: Leadership in CSR

8. CSR, 'Legitimacy', and Change for a Sustainable World

A. CSR, the environment, and scenario planning for change management

B. Government legislations and functionaries influencing CSR: Europe, USA, etc.

C. Indonesian regulatory regime: principles and issues: UU PT No.40, 2008

9. CSR and Sustainable Development: Domestic Concerns and Issues

A. Indonesian regulatory regime: Reporting SD/Sustainability dan CSR in Indonesian selected business entities

B. Indonesian context and characters of CSR: Leadership in CSR

C. BSR practices and sustainable development in Indonesia: Field, online, and/or classroom study of recent local cases

    i. Lapindo Case

    ii. My Forest's Tears

Course Administration

Assessment system and standards

The Course will adopt the following grading scheme.

Mark	Total points
A+	90.0 – 100.0
A	80.0 – 89.9
A-	77.0 – 79.9
B+	73.0 – 76.9
B	70.0 – 72.9
B-	67.0 – 69.9
C+	63.0 – 66.9
C	60.0 – 62.9
C-	57.0 – 59.9
D+	53.0 – 56.9
D	50.0 – 52.9
E	< 50.0

Assessment Standards

FOR 'A+' GRADE: Overall the work demonstrates (in an outstanding way) the student's ORIGINALITY BASED ON EXCEPTIONAL PROFICIENCY in all the learning objectives. It also reflects consistently outstanding skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'A' GRADE: Overall the work demonstrates (in an interesting or challenging way) the student's ORIGINALITY BASED ON EXCELLENT PROFICIENCY in all the learning objectives. It also reflects consistently excellent skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'A-' GRADE: Overall the work demonstrates (in an interesting or challenging way) the student's ORIGINALITY BASED ON GOOG PROFICIENCY in all the learning objectives. It also reflects consistently admirable skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing

FOR 'B+' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates an EXCELLENT understanding of the materials used, and proficiency in all the learning objectives. It also reflects good skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'B' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates a SUPERIOR understanding of the materials used, and proficiency in all the learning objectives. It also reflects good skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'B-' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates a GOOD understanding of the materials used, and proficiency in all the learning objectives. It also reflects good skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'C+' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates GOOD ABILITY TO USE AND APPLY fundamental concepts and skills, going beyond mere replication of content

knowledge. It sometimes reflects proficient skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'C' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates SUFFICIENT ABILITY TO USE AND APPLY fundamental concepts and skills, going beyond mere replication of content knowledge. It reflects passable skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'C-' GRADE: Overall your work demonstrates AN ABILITY TO USE AND APPLY fundamental concepts and skills, going beyond mere replication of content knowledge. It reflects passable skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'D+' GRADE: Overall your work satisfies the Basic Learning Requirements of all assessment items, sometimes GOING BEYOND MERE REPLICATION of content knowledge. It also reflects passable skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

FOR 'D' GRADE: Overall your work SATISFIES THE BASIC learning requirements of assessment items. It also reflects passable skills in communication (written and visual), and referencing.

Plagiarism

'Plagiarism' is a broad term that refers to the practice of appropriating someone else's ideas or work and presenting them as one's own without acknowledgment. Plagiarism is literary or intellectual theft! It can take a number of forms, including:

- Copying the work of another student, whether that student is in the same class, from a earlier year of the same course, or from any other tertiary institution;

- Copying any section, no matter how brief, from a book, journal, article or other written source, without duly acknowledging it as a quotation;

- Copying any map, diagram or table of figures without duly acknowledging the source; or

- Paraphrasing or otherwise using the ideas of another author without duly acknowledging the source.

Whatever the form, plagiarism is unacceptable both academically and professionally. By plagiarizing you are both stealing the work of another person and cheating by representing it as your own. **Any instances of plagiarism can therefore be expected to draw severe penalties**.

Students who condone plagiarism by allowing their work to be copied will also be subject to severe disciplinary action.

TEXTBOOK and References

There is no text book for the course. A bibliography is added at the end of this Guide. More readings will be added and discussed, and important readings for each topic will be highlighted by the respective instructor(s).

Databases
EBSCO, ProQuest
Publications of International Organizations
International Labor Organization
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
World Bank
Important Journals:
Academy of Management Journal
Academy of Management Review
Accounting, Organizations, and Society
Business and Society
Corporate Governance
Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management
Development
European Management Journal
International Journal of Social Economics
Journal of Business Ethics
Journal of Consumer Marketing
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy
Journal of Management Studies
Journal of Market Research
Managerial Auditing Journal
Strategic Management Journal

Assumptions about the nature of things

Our understanding of the world is based on assumptions, not facts that can be proved right or wrong. Assumptions form the bases from which we begin our thinking. We *assume* them to be correct. But there are important disagreements between researchers about *what* we should assume to be correct. These assumptions depend on whether we would like to maintain and adjust the status quo (either appreciating it or avoiding uncertainty), or challenge the existing assumptions to affect changes in the society. The intention and motivation for either of these depends on values, experience, and social associations of individuals. We need to understand the nature of things to critically assess a BSR program. The problem, however, is human being by nature tend to dislike change because it creates uncertainty. Status quo expands the comfort zones. Do you like change? Why?

Section 2   Human Needs, Innovations, and Corporations

Values are ideas about what is good or bad, and right or wrong. These ideas are passed from generation to generation as important parts of any socio-cultural system, and become the symbol of existence for a community. Values are related to three essential human needs: intellectual (Understanding and Achievement), social (Achievement and Belonging), and personal (Security and Physical)

Based on the values in a society its members give priority to particular levels of the hierarchy. In some societies (such as western developed) there is a preoccupation with lower level values. The influence of western culture on some developing countries has often tended to focus their attention on lower level values. But more traditional societies, including many in Africa and Asia retain a focus on higher level needs and values. Values, along with beliefs, attitudes and norms are a very important part of 'culture'.

Organisations, created to satisfy human needs, are based on certain values. Government organisation's primary obligations are to regulate security of, and relations among people and organisations. Business organisations' primary purpose is to serve itself by making profit (while creating and distributing goods and services). Non-profit organisations provide goods and services without servicing itself– profits generated, if any, are reinvested to further the organisations' missions.

Corporations, about 400 year old phenomenon since the establishment of the East India Trading Company in 1601, have gradually become powerful, and with "one and only

one social responsibility"— "to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits" (Friedman). In the recent past, high profit levels drove CEO pays up (531-to-1 in 2000; as opposed to 42-to-1 average worker pay in 1980). Corporations' money also 'buy' political support through donations to political parties (in 2000, business interests donated $1.2 billion or 75% of the total to US federal candidates), and through the use of 20,000 lobbyists in Washington DC (cf. Drutman). High profit margins also have raised high concerns for environmental degradation, and calls for a reexamination of cultures that influence organizations' relationships to society and other stakeholders.

Goal based values facilitate organisational culture, including that of the corporations. Organisational culture includes an organisation's philosophy, norms, and rules, and guides its policy, attitudes, and behaviour toward employees and/or stakeholders. It influences the employees' behaviour within and outside the organisation. Culture is dynamic, though. The process of culture formation is identical to the process of group formation in that the very essence of group identity– the shared patterns of thought, belief, feelings, and values, that result from shared experience and common learning– is called the 'culture' of that group. The pace of cultural change depends on factors like political and economic systems and activities, and group and/or personal goals. Business organisations are created with a culture ingrained in profit making.

In every culture there are core assumptions about what it means to be 'human', what the basic human instincts are, and what kinds of behaviour are considered 'inhuman'. In every culture there are also core assumptions about the relationship of an individual to the group; these assumptions reflect ultimately the concept of 'self'. Western and Asian societies have different core concepts of 'self'. In western culture the self is compartmentalised (ie. work, family, and leisure involve different aspects of the self); in traditional cultures the self is more of a whole without a separation between work and family (Schein, 1985). Does the concept of business social responsibility play differently in an organisation promoting compartmentalised self than the others that do not?

Activity 1: What are your assumptions and values thereof?

activity You do it alone first, and then check answers with your learning partners.

Activity 1: What are your assumptions and values thereof?

This is an activity for making your own assumptions and values clear to yourself. Where do you agree? Which are the main areas of your differences? Try to trace back to the origins of your own assumptions and values. What made you (not) change? Are some assumptions and values prejudiced? Which ones serve you and your organisations in fulfilling social obligations?

Assumption/belief	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
Employee pay should be responsibility and need based			
Work, and family life involve different aspects of the self			
Most people are governed by self interest, so must company			
Most people are trustworthy, so are the companies			
Business of business is to expand the capital			
Lobbying cost for business is an ethical expense			
Government is only a chain in business interests			
BSR should and can go beyond the border			
People are more a product of nurture than nature			

Section 3 **Sustainable Development and Intra-Generational Equity**

Environmental conservation can be just as Eurocentric as any other set of policies unless set within the social, economic, and political contexts of the region or country concerned.

Human beings live within a complex web of relationships and interactions amongst three systems: the biosphere, technosphere, and sociosphere (Kassas 1987). Biosphere is the natural system (of all living and non-living natural things) and comprises atmosphere (gaseous envelop), lithosphere (solid surface layer of earth), and hydrosphere (liquid substrate). Biophysical elements (renewable, and non-renewable) are the sources of life and living being and of creating utility (goods) to satisfy needs. The most important aspect of biosphere is land– a major factor of productive activities.

The human-made system of structures (farming system or industry) and tools (technosphere) have influenced the ownership and use of the biosphere (by transforming it) to meet human needs. 'Technosphere' includes the physical structures or human settlements, irrigation and drainage systems, transport and communication networks, and industrial centres, and 2) techniques or settlement patterns and design, farming systems, production process, and other processes of utility creation. The important thing

is that while the physical structures are under the control of human beings, the techniques are managed by human beings but still under the influence of the biosphere, eg. climate, hydrology (Kassas, 1987).

reflect   All children under the age of 14 are supposed to be at school. But since economic necessity forces some children seek employment, the Indian Supreme Court opines that children can be employed. How would you define child labour? Does 'child labour' depend on historical and cultural factors? How a business entity can fulfil its social responsibility by employing low-wage children and then giving in charity? Can businesses, without jeopardising the profit making obligations, affect structural change in the workforce so that the children do not need to seek employment? What is your stand on the above? Discuss this with your learning partner.

'Sociosphere' (the human-made system of non-structures– economic, political and social institutions and process) is developed and adopted by human beings to manage the interrelationships among themselves, and the relationships with the other two systems. The two major divisions in the sociosphere are a) institutions and b) values and beliefs. It includes cultural, economic, and political institutions, and values. Human beings are, however, at the centre of these systems, because resources result from value focused human actions on elements of the biosphere using human-made tools and techniques.

The technosphere and sociosphere are both creations of human beings. The study of sustainable development should consider human beings more than anything else, because only the 'noosphere' (technosphere and management), and human-made structures and devices can effect the biosphere (Kassas and Polunin, 1989). Kassas (1987) defined development as the existence of indigenous capability of a society for managing the complex inter-relationships among the three systems, thus if such management is set firmly on the bases of biosphere conservation then development can be sustainable (Kassas, 1987). Caldwell thus rightly suggests that environment management is 'primarily the management of men, not of things' (Caldwell 1970, p.231). In that sense BSR has to do more with the behaviors of the individuals than the production or programs. Do you agree?

The process of integrating the three 'spheres' in the creation of utilities is more important than the structure or the form of government, market, or the civil society. How can business entities integrate the interests of the three 'spheres' in fulfilling its social obligation?	Sustainability is a means for improving the quality of life as well as an end because without sustainability economic activities cannot be viable. The World Bank and other international organizations focus on intergenerational equity (fulfilling the needs of the present without compromising the capability of the future in doing the same). Can it be achieved without addressing equity among the people and regions in the present generation? Our class discussion will revolve mainly around this theme. So prepare yourself.

Activity 2: Employment, Intra-generational Equity, and BSR

The question of social responsibility arises because of the existence of poverty or the absence for some the 'living conditions and amenities that are customary in the societies to which a person belongs' (Townsend, 1979). The problem is poverty can be seen as a responsibility of the poor themselves or a result of social, economic, or political forces (Iyengar, 1991). On such a context business entities should not and cannot contribute to public goods or in the alleviation of poverty to address issues of intra-generational equity because the businesses create jobs, offer goods and services, pay taxes, and distribute profit that is then used to create economic activities.

Section 4   Human Security, Human Rights, International Development, and the Corporations

Poverty threatens human security. Human security or 'safety for people from both violent and non-violent threats emphasizes freedom from fear, but includes freedom from want (human development), and may 'comprehensively cover all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity'[1]. Human security thus closely relates to social security. Social security, in a broader sense, includes elimination of conditions detrimental to the survival, functioning, progress, and sustainability of human beings. Deprivation of these or 'any basic capabilities' (King and Murray, 2002) causes poverty. Achieving such living conditions and amenities of life thus become rights as opposed to needs. Needs can be met out of charitable intentions, but rights create legal obligations. The fundamental aspects of survival, functioning, progress, and sustainability needs refer to enough food, health, education and skills development, and not being discriminated against (due to color, creed, gender, and social or political backgrounds). But do business entities have any obligation to these social security issues? If so, how can or do they achieve those?

The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 emphasizes negative rights (rights that need to be protected, not created– and does require only codification) eg. freedom of thought, conscience and religion, of expression and opinion, and from torture

---

1 Garry King and C.J.L.Murray, 'Rethinking Human Security', Political Science Quarterly 116: 585- 610, 2002.

or cruelty, inhumane treatment or punishment. Positive rights (rights to goods and services that are produced and distributed and have budget implications) like the rights to food, shelter, development, etc. received only passing remarks in the Declaration. In order to rectify the situation the United Nations in 1986 enshrined the UN Declaration on the Right to Development to ensure everybody's entitlement to, participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of economic, social, cultural and political development, and self-determination (Article 1). The Declaration was not supported by most rich countries[2] because the underline assumptions of the Declaration is believed to have been that the existing resources need to be shared equitably assisting the marginalized people to assert their rights to these resources, thus making the process explicitly political (Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall, 2004).

The rich countries' behavior in protecting their economic dominance was revealed further when the detailed plan of actions, related to the 'Declaration on the Right to Development', calling for world food security, resolving the debt burden, eliminating trade barriers, promoting monetary stability, enhancing scientific and technical cooperation was favored by 133 countries and opposed by 11 OECD countries (including Canada, France, Italy, UK, US with one abstention– Australia) because the plan of action was deemed as an 'imposition of one-sided obligation' (Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall, 2004).

Under the above circumstances, what social responsibility business entities can accept or be imposed upon? What moral authorities do governments have to impose any BSR guidelines on the business entitities? OR are governments more concerned about ballot risk and do not (or cannot) care about imposing any thing on the businesses any way?

---

2 146 countries (including only eight rich counties- Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Netherlands, and Norway) supported the resolution at the United Nations General Assembly. Eight OECD countries abstained (including Japan, Germany, UK), while the US voted against, see Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall, 2004.

Activity 3: Complex BSR Relationships in Business Entities

In the above discussion we have tried to give you a brief account of the complexity of the issues of social security, poverty reduction, human rights, and business responsibility. To check your grasp on these issues do the following exercise with your learning partner.

Explain the issues without judgement or opinion. Then -

- State your beliefs and opinions as persuasively as you can.

- At the end, identify a business entity and analyse its approach in dealing with the above issues.

- What may make one business entity successful and another fail, in effectively handling these issues? OR

- Do you think that the success and failure do not depend on their direct BSR actions, rather on indirect (intangible) BSR (Brand, Systems, and Relationships) actions that create profit? Try to use actual examples with lessons.

Then swap and listen while your learning partner does the same.

Section 5   CSR: International Perspectives and Critiques

There is a strong temptation to rationalize actions as an exercise of 'social responsibility'... for a corporation to generate good-will as a by-product of expenditures that are entirely justified in its own self-interest....I can express admiration for those (corporations) who disdain such tactics as approaching fraud (Friedman, 1970 in Greenwood, 2007).

Which side of this debate do you belong to? How is your organization doing things differently?

The underlying assumption of the business or corporate social responsibility concern is that the businesses have not done enough to minimize exploitation of labor or of resources. These actions perpetuate poverty. Thus business houses have a moral obligation to rectify the mistakes or even a strategic need to address the concerns of these 'exploitation'.

In the present globalised world national matters are dependent on international arena where organizations are involved in creating uncertainty for each other thereby achieving ideological as well as material maxims. *Human Development Report 2005* highlights a quotation from the Brazilian President Lula da Silva, 'Hunger is actually the worst of all weapons of mass destruction, claiming millions of victims every year. Fighting hunger and poverty and promoting development are the truly sustainable way to achieve world peace……….There will be no peace without development, and there will be neither peace nor development without social justice'.

The principles of social justice provide a way of assigning rights and duties in the basic institutions of society and define an appropriate distribution of benefits and burdens of social cooperation. Social justice refers to relational (human relationships), distributive, and retributive aspects, and in general means fairness and equity in the distribution of a wide range of attributes– not confined only to material things. In the present world, due to very unequal power relationships, the question of social justice mainly refers to relational and/or retributive issues; distributive justice is almost a taboo.

In order to address the social justice concerns, the UN took an initiative in 2000. All (189) member countries agreed to the UN Millennium Development Goals to halve extreme poverty, end hunger, reduce child and maternal mortality, and reverse the spread of diseases like malaria by 2015. To meet these goals nations and corporations have to work together.

Philosophical underpinnings of CSR

N. Conrnelius, M. Todres, S. Janjuha-Jivraj, A. Woods, and J. Wallace, 'Corporate Social Responsibility and the Social Enterprise', *Journal of Business Ethics* 81: 355-70, 2008.

"Corporate social responsibility (CSR) behaviour and values may change as a result of the adoption of actions with implicitly alternative philosophical underpinnings."

"Instrumental economic benefits predominate in the decisions made regarding how to conceptualise and pursue CSR."

"Individuals within the firm, then, should be empowered to actively evaluate and decide upon ethical issues in the workplace."

"Windsor (2006) indicates that the developmental history of CSR includes three competing approaches, namely ethical responsibility theory, economic responsibility theory and corporate citizenship conceptions. The first two viewpoints are characterised by competing moral frameworks and political philosophies. For Windsor (2006: 98) building on the thinking of Rorty (2000) there is an unresolved debate within ethics itself ''where moral philosophy is trapped between Kant (i.e. duties) and Dewey (pragmatism)''. Swanson (1995) (in Maignan and Ralston (2002) expresses a similar viewpoint. He argues that CSR initiatives stem from three philosophical outlooks, namely utilitarian, negative approach and positive duty approaches. For the first, CSR is viewed as a performance objective in terms of profitability and return on investment. The negative duty approach addresses the adoption of socially responsible practices, when firms are required to conform to stakeholder norms. Finally, the positive duty approach includes socially responsible behaviour pursued by firms as a means in its own right as opposed to it resulting from external pressures."

****

"…Waddock (2004) highlights practical applications arising from theoretical developments (e.g., how companies have increasingly incorporated codes of conduct and ethics in their operational activities, the pursuit of social and environmental reporting standards, and the increased acceptance of internationally recognised certification, such as ISO 9000 for product quality and AA 1000 stakeholder engagement). The adoption of these practices originates in efforts of firms to be more accountable to stakeholders, and to measure outcome of their activities in more standard ways. This external CSR orientation is pursued for concerns of stakeholders (government, regulatory bodies, customers, pressure groups). However, some scholars have questioned the robustness of both the operational assumptions and practices associated with CSR. Haigh and Jones (2006) identify six sets of factors which appear in the literature as promoting social responsibility; intraorganizational factors, competitive dynamics, institutional investors, end-consumers, government regulators and non-governmental organisations. They conclude that instrumental economic benefits predominate in the decisions made regarding how to conceptualise and pursue CSR. However, occupying a more pragmatic position, understandable given the voluntarist nature of private companies engaged with ethical issues, Garriga and Mele (2004) identify four clusters of ideas. These are instrumental theories (where social acts are pursued purely for economic ends), political theories (and responsible use of power), integrative theories (the corporation focuses on social demands) and ethical theories (based on ethical responsibilities of corporations to societies). Indeed, Garriga and Mele (2004) propose that there should be 'a new theory on the business and society relationship, which should integrate these four dimensions'. (2004: 53). Takala and Pallab (2000: 109) cite the importance of firms considering internal aspects of CSR where ''employees have to be socialised into the fact that along with the firm, they are equally responsible for morally right, pro-environmental actions''.

HOW MUCH RESPONSIBILTIY SHOULD INDIVIDUALS IN A BUSINESS HAS IN ENSURING AN ETHICAL STAND OF EVERY ACTION? IS IT PRACTICABLE WHY? WHY NOT?

In 2000, the United Nations (UN) adopted a Global Compact as a guide for all to undertake socially and environmentally responsible business practices. The Compact underscores and reinforces the needs for implementing such UN codes like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights to Work, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, and the UN Convention Against Corruption in the operation of businesses. The Global Compact advises businesses to embrace, support and enact, within their jurisdiction, a set of core values in relation to human rights, labor standards, the environment, and anti-corruption

The UN Global Compact, with ten principles, is an essential guide for environmentally and socially responsible business practices. The first and the second principles relate to "respecting human rights" and "non-complicity in human rights violations". How do you defend or criticize the fact that the principles of the UN Global Compact do not make any reference to the employees' positive rights like 'fair pay' for a 'decent living'?

The 'UN Convention Against Corruption (2003)' (the basis of Principle 10 of the UN Global Compact) is inclusive and targets all form of public as well as private sector corruptions with preventive measures and possible criminalisation of related acts including 'illicit enrichment' (Article 20) and 'concealment' (Article 24). But then since only about 30 countries so far have ratified the Convention (with no OECD countries except France and Hungary because the Convention is contrary to many countries' national legislations and/or interests, Hasan, 2006), the credibility of the UN Convention Against Corruption is in doubt any way. How then these countries hold business entities responsible for corrupt practices OR require the business houses to have socially responsible business practices?

Section 6   The Essential Readings: A Review

…the more an organization engages with its stakeholders, the more it "belies the true complexity of the relationship between engagement and corporate responsibility".

The first item in the Reading List (**Greenwood, 'Stakeholder Engagement'**) "transcends the assumption that stakeholder engagement is necessarily a responsible practice". 'Stakeholder engagement' in the paper is discussed "as a mechanism for consent, as a mechanism for control, as a mechanism for co-operation, as a mechanism for accountability, as a form of employee involvement and participation, as a method for enhancing trust, as a substitute for true trust, as a discourse to enhance fairness, or as a mechanism of corporate governance". The article contends that the more an organization engages with its stakeholders, the more it "belies the true complexity of the relationship between engagement and corporate responsibility".

"..corporate irresponsibility occurs when the strategic management of stakeholders …… becomes an immoral practice based on the deception and manipulation of stakeholders."

The paper thoroughly analyses aspects like "high-road human resource management" (practices that elicit the knowledge, emotions or spiritual commitment of employees through valuing them and empowering them as individuals), and suggests that "just because an organization does not engage with employees does not mean that the organization is not responsible towards them". It also deals with, for example, social reporting (a company's social performance to its internal and external stakeholders). The social reporting process is often depicted as a dialogue between the company and its stakeholders and a means by which the stakeholders can participate in the activities of the company, but cannot be the only tool. The paper depicts and deciphers different models of stakeholder engagement and suggests that "corporate irresponsibility occurs when the strategic management of stakeholders does not remain responsibility-neutral practice but becomes an immoral practice based on the deception and manipulation of stakeholders".

CHARKIEWICZ ("Corporations, the UN and Neo-liberal Bio-politics") starts the article highlighting many international efforts since the 1970s in reigning in corporations. For example, the United Nations conducted a program on multi-national corporations in their headquarters in New York. A key concern to

this office was to ensure that transnational corporations apply in home and abroad same standards in relation to accounting for profits, terms of employment or domestically prohibited toxic chemicals. Efforts to develop binding agreements or a non-binding code of conduct for corporations turned to be unsuccessful because corporations moved overseas to benefit from the other world's comparative advantage (without never violating a law). Over the years, there have been similar other UN initiatives. For example, the Secretary Generals' advisory council of CEOs (1996), and the Global Compact (1999).

But the author's biggest puzzle is why not corporations study how profits are made? May be because the corporations have a 'double persona'– "the one that is audited and verified as caring and moral in CSR, and the other one that is charged with making profits". Charkiewicz suggests since the CSR debate is about child and prison labor, unpaid minimum wages and sweatshops, or destruction of livelihoods and violations of human rights by individual corporations in the South, the systemic logic of the reproduction of financial capital is not addressed, the rich countries are off the hook, and colonial inequalities in power relations are maintained". OR really?

(**Lantos, The Ethicality of Altruistic CSR**) The main focus of the paper is the ethicality of altruistic CSR (philanthropic CSR activities that are not particularly beneficial to the firm's financial health). Evaluating the issue from many different ethical dimensions (eg. utilitarianism, rights, justice, and care), Lantos concludes that may be altruistic CSR is immoral because it tend to violate shareholder property rights diverting funds for public benefit at the expense of those for whom the firm should care only (or more). But then taking the argument further by using secular as well as Judea-Christian ethics the author suggests that altruistic activities are commendable for firms and individuals. The paper also provides some guidelines in this regard.

Welford's article analyses the results of comparative study of CSR in Asia, Europe, and North America undertaken in 2004. The

Can and should multi-national corporations apply in home and abroad same standards in relation to accounting for profits, terms of employment or domestically prohibited toxic chemicals?

Corporations have a 'double persona'– "the one that is audited and verified as caring and moral in CSR, and the other one that is charged with making profits".

Altruistic CSR may be immoral because it tends to violate shareholder property rights diverting funds for public benefit at the expense of those for whom the firm should care more.

surveys are based on electronic communications and a study of relevant codes and governmental policies in different countries. The paper concludes that there seems not to have any North-South divide in CSR approaches and success, but it is evident that there is a relationship between economic development and good CSR strategies. Welford also alludes to the influence of localized issues and cultural tradition on CSR practices. But the differences and improvement during the two surveys done in two-year apart are indication that things are moving– may be to the right direction. Or is it? We will discuss this in the workshop. Read the paper and ponder about your own and your firm's situation.

The paper by **Cornelius et al (CSR and the Social Enterprise)** deals essentially with CSR in third sector organizations named, as in some European states, social enterprise or: ''a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholder and owners''. The paper deals with the developmental history of CSR including the three "competing approaches, namely ethical responsibility theory, economic responsibility theory and corporate citizenship conceptions".

The authors contend that due to "their size and emphasis upon addressing external social concerns, the corporate relationship between social enterprises, social awareness and action is more complex than whether or not these organizations engage in CSR". This may be true for organizations emphasizing on CSR as well as those that do not. The paper shows that community based CSR activities is often well developed in the SMEs– a situation which may be replicated in social enterprises especially those that have grown from micro-enterprises embedded in local communities. The authors underline implications for employee management even in organizations in the third sector. Do the third sector organizations have a case to answer? What do you think?

Bowen in his paper **(Corporate Social Strategy)** studies the two theories– behavioral theory (with special reference to

There seems not to have any North-South divide in CSR approaches and success, but then CSR is moving. Is it in the right direction?

Social enterprise is "a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community"

Is there exploitation in the third sector organizations in the name of (forced) philanthropy?

Bowen studies behavioral

and resource based theories in relation to CSR.

organizational slack and managerial discretion and values) and the resource based theory (with particular reference to resource bundles, capabilities and competences)– in relation to CSR. While both of these approaches may be appropriate for investigating corporate social strategy, they rely on different assumptions about strategic management which hold significant implications for both theory and practice.

The author draws at least two significant implications for the practice of corporate social strategy from the juxtaposition of the two theories of the firm. First, that designing a corporate social strategy is not the same as implementing it. The more managers acknowledge the behavioral aspects of social strategies, the more they need to understand the requirement for directing from the top on social issues to be supported by appropriate resource allocation mechanisms and organizational structures. In less proactive organizational climates, however, individual managers at lower hierarchical levels may be inspired by the behavioral view to initiate and support their own social strategies. Corporate social strategy may be more complex, contradictory, political and contested than simple top-down explanations of corporate strategy might suggest. The study also suggests that different corporate social strategies require the mobilization of different types of resources. The analysis supports some previous observations that governance choice is a determinant of corporate social strategy.

Corporate social strategy may be more complex, contradictory, political and contested than simple top-down explanations of corporate strategy might suggest.

The article on '**Cultures, Organizations and Philanthropy'** by **Genest** examines the influence of corporate culture on the practice of corporate philanthropy in a global environment. The paper uses content analysis of corporate texts and media; interviews with global philanthropy practitioners. The paper concludes that corporate philanthropy is a reflector of corporate values; global corporate philanthropists have a history of commitment to corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities; global companies practice international philanthropy; program delivery differs as a reflection of corporate history, values, mission, and business drivers; global corporations utilize CSR to

Corporate philanthropy.... "differs as a reflection of corporate history, values, mission, and business drivers"..

Global corporate

gain and maintain their "license to operate"; corporate cultural learning is pursued as an explicit activity; and cross-cultural learning is generally perceived as an implicit outcome. CSR shares values, opportunity for integrated cultural learning.

The author suggests that the trend towards the organizational integration of CSR activities, including philanthropy, as a response to working in a global environment, presents a unique opportunity for the inclusion of cultural learning as part of the sharing of corporate values. Organizational adaptation across cultures can only occur when global leaders, managers, and organizational members transform themselves to meet the new global reality. Corporate citizenship relies on the integrity of global corporate citizens that generates trust. To achieve trust, people of the global corporation must behave responsibly by assuming national values and norms as well as the values of their corporate sponsors. "Finally, they must put corporate values to practice in their everyday relationships and business activities. In conclusion, values add value."

Meehan et al (Corporate Social Responsibility) developed a model that bridges the gap between CSR definitions and strategy. The paper highlights the overly theoretical nature of many previous approaches to CR. Through a review of the three main approaches to CR – CSR, CSP, and CC– the authors show that each of the previous approaches fails to provide the kind of practical tools that managers need to embed a CR orientation in their organizations. To counter these deficiencies, the authors offer the 3C-SR model with practical guidelines for managers on how to connect with the growing numbers of ethically aware consumers to simultaneously achieve economic and social objectives. The CR/CC orientation requires three simultaneous elements– commitments, connections and consistency. All three elements need equal treatment and should be equally robust for the system to be successful.

philanthropists have a history of commitment to CSR activities

To achieve trust, people of the global corporation must behave responsibly by assuming national values and norms as well as the values of their corporate sponsors.

The 3C-SR (commitments, connections, and consistency) model offers guidance on how to connect socially committed organizations with the growing numbers of ethically aware consumers to simultaneously achieve economic and social objectives.

Castka et al. (Integrating Corporate Social Responsibility into ISO Management Systems) highlights different aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR), corporate governance (CG), corporate sustainability (CS), corporate citizenship, triple bottom line (TBL) etc. because even though the theory and models surrounding stakeholders management and social responsibility are abundant, the analysis of CSR is still in an embryonic stage and critical issues regarding frameworks, measurement, and empirical methods are yet to be undertaken. The authors in this context, focus on CSR frameworks and propose a generic framework for organizations to establish, manage, improve and document a CSR management system. The proposed framework is drawn from available CSR frameworks, standards and the authors' own research conducted with UK-based businesses. They present a process-based framework analogous to ISO 9001: 2000, which is generic in nature and is applicable to organizations regardless of type and size – from public to private, from small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs) to multinational enterprises (MNEs), from manufacturing to service organizations. Castka et al argue in the paper that "CSR is a concept to run organizations profitably yet in a social and environmentally responsible way in order to achieve business sustainability and stakeholder satisfaction" and hence, the authors propose a "framework for the implementation of CSR that lies within a quality management and systems thinking approach".

Key Terms

The following words, phrases or acronyms are used in this course, or in other courses in this program. Although some are in common usage, it is advisable to have tighter, sector-specific definitions as part of your professional development. You may not agree with the definitions given here, but they will be useful starting points in coming to your own understanding. Your learning partners are ideal people to begin the process with.

Term	Meaning
Advocacy	Actively seeking widespread support for an issue, often on behalf of others.
Civil society	The public life of individuals and institutions outside the control of the state.
Community	A local, national or international social grouping of people identified by race, culture, religion, geography or interest, whose characters distinguish them from other groups of people.
Community action	A labour–intensive notion of a community collectively acting to achieve a particular goal.
Community development	'A process by which individuals identify themselves as a community and work to expand the capacity of their community to share equitably in its resources for the benefit of all its members' (Community Aid Abroad)
Conscientisation	An awareness of selfhood, espoused by Paulo Friere, who believed that comprehending one's cultural and political realities is a pre-requisite for change and social transformation.
Empowerment	The transferring of holistic and long-term power to powerless groups of people through development efforts.
Ethics	The art of determining what is right and/or good or the general pattern or "way of" life, and a set of rules of behavior or "moral" code (cited in Dwivedi, 1987). Cannot be universal because of the reliance to agreement among members of a given group. Thus in business there are essential moral and normative codes of value creation in organisations (organisation ethics), the process of decision making in organisations and market (market principles or ethics), and the process of selecting and dealing with a particular product or service (trade or professional ethics) (based on Harrison, 2005).
Foreign aid	Financial and other assistance given to low income countries by high income countries.
Globalisation	Worldwide interdependence and interconnectedness of the production and distribution of economic goods and services and the widening, intensifying, and acceleration of related impacts.

Grassroots	Emerging from the people (as opposed to governments or corporations)
Human needs	Essential goods and services required for the survival, functioning, and progress of human beings
INGO	International Non-Government Organisation
Intra-generational equity	Social and economic justice among people and regions of a generation.
Mandate	Authorisation, with regard to policy.
Network	Exchange of ideas and information with other people.
Networking	Establishing communication links with other people as a means of exchanging ideas and information.
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
Participation	People's direct action in the development process, through the process of empowerment
Periphery	The people and regions outside the core economic and political activities or regions
Poverty	"Lack of resources to obtain the types of diets, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely encouraged and accepted, in the society to which a person belongs" (Townsend, 1979).
Social action	Taking collective action on behalf of society or the common good.
Social capital	Those features of social organisation such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions.
Social justice	Fairness and equity in human relationships, in the distribution of goods and services, and in retribution (Smith, 1994:26).
Social security	The elimination of conditions detrimental to the survival, functioning, progress, and sustainability of human beings
Sustainability	Meeting present needs while taking future environmental and socio-political costs into account.
Trickle-down	The economic belief that the effects of economic development will eventually benefit the poorer end of the society.
UNDHR, 1948 (The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948)	The codification of negative rights (rights that need not be created– only to be protected– and does require only the will and codification) eg. freedom of thought, conscience and religion, of expression and opinion, and from torture or cruelty, inhumane treatment or punishment (does not include positive rights like the rights to goods and services that are produced and distributed and have budget implications).
UN Global Compact	The guide adopted by the United Nations in 2000 for all to undertake socially and environmentally responsible business practices.

References and Further Reading

A. B. Taman (2006). 'The Sociological Context of Corporate Social Responsibility Development and Implementation in Indonesia' *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 13: 300 – 305.

Albareda, L., J. M. Lozano, and T. Ysa (2007). 'Public Policies on Corporate Social Responsibility: The Role of Governments in Europe', *Journal of Business Ethics 74*: 391-407.

AnnGriesse, M. (2007). 'Developing Social Responsibility: Biotechnology and the Case of Dupont in Brazil' *Journal of Business Ethics* 73:103-118

Arora, B. and R. Puranik (2004). A Review of Corporate Social Responsibility in India, *Development* 43: 93-100.

Babbington, A. and T. Perreault 1999. 'Social Capital, Development and Access to Resources in Highland Ecuador', *Economic Geography* 75:395-29.

Bakan J., (2004). *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit Of Profit And Power*, Constable & Robinson Ltd. 2004.

Bird, F. and J. Smucker (2007). 'The Social Responsibility Responsibilities of International Business Firms in Developing Areas', *Journal of Business Ethics* 73:1-9.

Bolman, Lee G. and T.E.Deal (2003). *Reframing Organizations: Artsitry, Choice, and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Bowen, F. (2007). Corporate Social Strategy: Competing Views from Two Theories of the Firm' *Journal of Business Ethics* 75:97-113.

Castka, P, et al. (2005). 'Integrating Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) into ISO Management Systems- In Search of a Feasible CSR Management System Framework', The *TQM Magazine* 16(3): 216-4.

Charkiewicz, E. (2005). 'Corporations, the UN, and Neo-liberal Bio-politics', *Development* 48: 75-83.

Chomsky, Noam (1998). *Profit Over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order*, Seven Stories Press, New York.

Christian, D. (2004). *Maps of Time: An Introduction to Big History*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Conway, Dennis and N. Heynen, eds. (2006). *Globalization's Contradictions: Geographies of Discipline, Destruction, and Transformation*, Routledge, London.

Cornelius, N. et al. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility and the Social Enterprise', *Journal of Business Ethics* 81: 355-70.

Derman, Bill (1995). 'Environmental NGOs, Dispossession and the State: The Ideology and Praxis of African Nature and Development', *Human Ecology* 23:199-215.

Diamond, Jared (1997). *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*, W.W.Norton and Co, NY. (A Historical Geographical Analysis of World Civilization which is retold in a DVD made in 2005).

Doh, J.P., Guay, T.R., (2006). 'Corporate Social Responsibility, Public Policy, and NGO Activism in Europe and the United States: An Institutional-Stakeholder Perspective', *Journal of Management Studies* 43: 47-

Easterly, W. (2006). *The Whiteman's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*, The Penguin Press, NY, Chapter 8, From Colonisation to Postmodern Imperialism.

Fleischacker, S. (2004), *A Short History of Distributive Justice*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Genest, C.M. (2005). 'Cultures, Organizations and Philanthropy', *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 10: 315-27.

Gill, Roger (2003). 'Change Management- or Change Leadership', *Journal of Change Management* 3: 307- 18.

Gittell, R. & Vidal, A. 1998 *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Gossling, T. and Chris Vocht (2007). 'Social Role Conceptions and CSR Policy Success' *Journal of Business* 74:363-372.

Greenwood, M. (2007). 'Stakeholder Engagement: Beyond the Myth of Corporate Responsibility' *Journal of Business Ethics 74: 315–327*.

Hasan, S. (2002). Social Capital, Good Governance, and Sustainable Development: Analysing Experiences From Asia, Presented at the 5th ISTR (International Society for Third-Sector Research) Conference held in Cape Town, South Africa, 7-10 July 2002 (available online).

Hasan, S. (2005).'Social Capital and Social Entrepreneurship in Asia: Analysing the Links', *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 27: 1-18.

Ife, Jim (2002), *Community Development*, Longman, Sydney.

Imbun, B. Y. (2007). 'Cannot Manage without The "Significant Other": Mining, Corporate Social Responsibility and Local Communities in Papua New Guinea' *Journal of Business Ethics* 73:177-192.

Isbister, J (1993), *Promises not Kept: The betrayal of Social Change in the Third World.* Kumarian, Hartford, CT.

Joachim, J. (2003) 'Framing Issues and Seizing Opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and Women's Rights', *International Studies Quarterly* 47, 247-274

Jones, P., D. Comfort, and D. Hillier (2005). 'Corporate social responsibility and the UK's top ten retailers', International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management 33: 882-92.

Lacoste, Yves (1984). *Ibn Khaldun: The Birth of History and The Past of the Third World*, Verso, London.

Landes, D.S. (1998) *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor,* New York and London: WW. Norton & Company.

Lantos, G.P. (2002). 'The Ethicality of Altruistic Corporate Social Responsibility', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19: 205-30.

Lepoutre, J. and A. Heene (2006). 'Investigating the Impact of Firm Size on Small Business Social Responsibility: A Critical Review' *Journal of Business Ethics* 67:257-273.

Lindgren, M. and H. Bandhold (2003). *Scenario Planning: The Link Between Future and Strategy*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Meehan, J. and K. Meehan, and A. Richards (2006). 'Corporate social responsibility: the 3C-SR model', *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33: 386-398.

Murillo, D. and J. M. Lozano (2006). 'SME'S and CSR: an Approach to CSR in their Own Words' *Journal of Business Ethics* 67:227-40.

Offenheiser, R.C., and Holcombe, S.H., (2003) 'Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing a Rights-Based Approach to Development: An Oxfam America Perspective', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32:

Pirsch, J., S. Gupta, and S. L. Grau (2007). 'A Framework for Understanding Corporate Social Responsibility Programs as a Continuum: An Exploratory Study' *Journal of Business Ethics* 70:125-140.

Putnam, R. with R. Leonardi, and R. Nanetti 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Tradition in Modern Italy* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rose, J.M. (2007). 'Corporate Directors and Social Responsibility: Ethics versus Shareholder Value', *Journal of Business Ethics 73: 319*-331.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The end of Poverty: How can we make it happen in our lifetime?* Penguin, England.

Singer, Peter (2002). *One World: The Ethics of Globalization,* New Haven CT, Yale University Press.

Smith, S.C. (2005). *Ending Global Poverty: A Guide to What Works*, Palgrave, NY.

Snider, J., Hill, R.P., and Martin, D. (2003). Corporate social responsibility in the 21st century: A View from the world's most successful firms', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 48: 175–187.

von Weltzien Hoivik, H. (2007). 'East Meet West : Tacit Messages about Business Ethics in Stories Told by Chinese Managers' *Journal of Business Ethics* 74:457-469.

Walcott, Susan M. (2006). 'Mulit-Local Global Corporations: New Reach Same Core Locations', in Conway, Dennis and N. Heynen, eds. *Globalization's Contradictions: Geographies of Discipline, Destruction, and Transformation*, Routledge, London, pp. 49-64.

Watson, M. and Mckay, J. (2003). 'Auditing for the Environment', Managerial Auditing Journal 18: 625-30.

Welford, Richard (2005). 'Corporate Social Responsibility in Europe, North America, and Asia: 2004 Survey Report, *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 17: 33-52.

Werlin, H.H. (2003). 'Poor Nations, Rich Nations: A Theory of Governance', *Public Administration Review* 63: 329-42.