

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/aebj

Exploring corporate social responsibility's global and Glocal practices in Qatar: A practitioner and stakeholder perspective

Ilaria Gualtieri^a, Martina Topić^{b,*}

^a CSR Consultant, Qatar

^b Leeds Business School, Leeds Beckett University, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 November 2015

Received in revised form

24 December 2015

Accepted 17 January 2016

Keywords:

Corporate social responsibility

Qatar

Stakeholder perspective

Practitioner perspective

ABSTRACT

This study analysed corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the state of Qatar, aiming to determine the discipline' global and *glocal* dimensions. The study investigated the notion that CSR remains western-driven in contrast to the scholarly trend that increasingly values national variables. Given the importance of CSR, the relationship between theory and contextual influences becomes a central element to evaluate the opportunity for specific corollaries to mainstream CSR. The methodology deployed for the study included a literature review, and interviews with practitioners and stakeholders. The results showed that although CSR as a concept is valid per se, an appropriate approach would value the operating environment as a key determinant, appreciating that specific cultural contexts necessitate variations to the mainstream theory.

© 2016 The Authors. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Holy Spirit University of Kaslik. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The growth of business prompted a drastic redefinition of the role of corporations in societies, and this is what brought interest in the corporate conduct. However, together with the role of corporations, interest in corporate social responsibility (CSR) has grown in intensity and vastness, producing a body of knowledge attentive to the identification of universal frameworks. Conversely, since the early days, authors such as Carroll (1979, 1991a, 1999) and Sethi (1975) argued that CSR is inherently contingent to its operational context. The CSR discipline's dichotomy is further demonstrated by a progressive *glocalisation* of the approach within regional and national contexts (Ali & Al-Aali, 2012; Ararat, 2006; Baden & Wilkinson, 2014; Crotty, 2014a, 2014b; Gjølborg, 2010; Jamali & Mirshak, 2007; Jamali, 2014a; Katsioloudes & Brodtkorb, 2007; Kim, Amaeshi, Harris, & Suh, 2013; Momin & Parker, 2013; Welford, 2004).

Since the relationship between theory and contextual influences is central to comprehensively evaluating the practice, this study promotes a model to assess CSR global and *glocal* dimensions. Arguing that the operating environment is a key determinant, this study aims at appreciating contextual variations to CSR mainstream theory. Rather than merely following prior models, the

Peer review under responsibility of Holy Spirit University of Kaslik.

* Corresponding author at: Martina Topić, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds Business School, Rose Bowl, Portland Crescent, LS1 3HB Leeds, United Kingdom.

E-mail address: M.Topic@leedsbeckett.ac.uk (M. Topić).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aebj.2016.01.001>

2214-4625/© 2016 The Authors. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Holy Spirit University of Kaslik. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

study argues that CSR is a dynamic process, creating a framework based on the work of [Carroll \(1979, 1991a\)](#), [Dahlsrud \(2008\)](#), and [Wood \(1991a, 1991b\)](#). Although these models may appear dated, they comprehensively represent the CSR construct evolution and jointly illustrate the dimensions ascribed to the discipline. Secondly, the study proposes hypotheses about how such knowledge structure has evolved, presenting a cognition framework to assess both CSR global and glocal practices. The model is then tested on a case study, aiming to explore CSR dimensions within a specific country, Qatar.

2. The corporate social responsibility (CSR)

The meaning of CSR has a long and adverse history in the literature ([Carroll, 1999](#), p. 291), dogging the debate from the beginning ([Frederick, 2006](#)). Notwithstanding sixty years of a fertile debate, the sole agreement within academia about a CSR definition is the concurrence that the task is inherently problematic ([Crane, McWilliams, Matten, Moon, & Siegel, 2008](#), p. 7; [Grafström & Windell, 2011](#), p. 221; [Jackson & Apostolakou, 2010](#), p. 373), and there is no universal definition of CSR ([Blowfield & Murray, 2008](#); [Lockett, Moon, & Visser, 2006](#); [McWilliams, Siegel, & Wright, 2006](#)), or leading conceptual framework ([Carroll, 1999](#)).

When it comes to CSR theories, [Carroll \(1979\)](#) addressed the theoretical gap with his popular construct on CSR as an obligation of companies to do more than just abiding to laws. Although the model was re-designed in 1991 as a pyramid, and again in 2003 as a new model, the categorisation remains at the core of CSR, proving to maintain its balance in closer times ([Pinkston & Carroll, 1996](#); [Schwartz & Carroll, 2003](#)). Although business is an economic unit, Carroll identifies responsibilities “beyond profit making”, or the legal and ethical compliance advocated during the 1970s ([1979](#), p. 500). Ethical responsibilities involve behaviours expected by the society “over and beyond legal requirements” ([Carroll, 1979](#), p. 30; [Carroll, 1999](#), pp. 289-290). Discretionary responsibilities are voluntary roles that businesses perform guided by the desire to engage in social roles not mandated, legally required, or expected in an ethical sense ([Carroll, 1979](#), p. 30; [Carroll, 1999](#), pp. 289-290).

Following Carroll’s initial work, during the 1980s, [Freeman \(1984\)](#) introduced the stakeholders’ theory, which came as an open opposition to classic view of the shareholder theory. [Friedman \(1962, p. 133\)](#) as a main proponent of the classic theory asserted that “the only responsibility of business is to maximise its profits”. Essentially, basic ethical and legal considerations remain subdued to the profit orientation [Friedman \(1962, p. 133\)](#). As opposed to this view, the attention of Freeman’s stakeholder theory is on the relational aim of corporations, which are connected to the operational context, but also to stakeholders that represent and pursue different interests. Additionally, [Cochran and Wood \(1984\)](#) theorise a linkage between CSR and profitability through the corporate social performance (CSP) model ([Rahman, 2011](#)).

3. The CSP model

The CSP model introduces a managerial system for CSR: corporations should have a basic understanding of CSR, appreciate its relevance, and enforce a responsiveness system ([Jamali & Mirshak, 2007](#)). [Carroll’s \(1991b, Chapter 12\)](#) three-dimensional framework correlates the total responsibilities of businesses (CSR, responsiveness, and any other social interaction) to strategic responses ([Wartick & Cochran, 1984](#), p. 758).

The model builds on businesses and society interrelation, representing the first attempt to strategically manage external influences over corporations. Although [Wartick and Cochran \(1984\)](#) furthered it to corporate practices, Donna Wood proposed reinterpretation of the concept through a set of interrelated processes ([Carroll, 1991b](#), p. 693, Chapter 12; [Carroll, 1999](#)). [Wood \(1991\)](#) placed CSR into a broader context as the product of a corporation’s specific configuration of principles, social responsiveness processes, and observable outcomes. Wood’s Corporate Social Performance Model contains the following elements:

Principles of social responsibility

- Institutional principle: legitimacy
- Organisational principle: public responsibility
- Individual principle: managerial discretion

Process of corporate social responsiveness

- Environmental assessment
- Stakeholders’ management
- Issues management

Outcomes of corporate behaviors

- Social impacts
- Social programmes
- Social policies

Source: [Wood \(1991a, 1991b, p. 248\)](#).

The model identifies three levels of CSR’s foundation within companies: institutional, organisational, and individual. The corresponding motivations include legitimacy, public responsibility, and managerial discretion. Responsiveness complements the normative and motivational components, comprising three interlocked actions: rooted in the knowledge/acknowledgement of

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7395781>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7395781>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)