

Unlocking the social domain in sustainable development

Social domain
in sustainable
development

Monica Thiel

*Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Tilburg University,
Tilburg, The Netherlands*

183

Abstract

Purpose – Beginning with a multitude of differing definitions and theories of CSR and sustainability, an analysis of the effects and impacts of the social domain to remain an untapped resource to strengthen and merge the practice of sustainable development. The paper aims to discuss these issues.

Design/methodology/approach – Utilizing a systematic review of literature between 1977 and 2013 about CSR and sustainability definitions and theories to reveal knowledge fragmentation in the use of the social domain and its implications within sustainable development.

Findings – Identifies the gaps of the social domain in sustainable development and raises awareness to advance sustainable development beyond current sustainable development strategies, initiatives and practices. The pertinent publications from the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the systematic literature review were analyzed to determine how the social domain is used and interpreted in CSR and sustainability. Based upon the findings, four themes represent the social domain as socio-economics, stakeholders, societal well-being and social sustainability with suggestions for further research.

Research limitations/implications – The systematic literature review searched one academic search engine and focussed on journals and books written in English.

Originality/value – The contribution of the paper highlights, first, how an underdeveloped social domain can contribute toward multiple meanings of sustainable development and the social domain's untapped capacity to develop a clearer standard definition of sustainable development and second, the potential to advance competitive advantage for corporations and governments.

Keywords Sustainable development, Social responsibility, Competitive advantage, Corporate social reporting

Paper type Literature review

Introduction

Sustainable development is increasingly gaining global importance across all sectors and industries and has become standard reporting for corporations and governments. However, the current meanings and definitions of sustainable development are often used interchangeably with corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainability and are constructed broadly with no standard meaning or definition leading to a plethora of social responsibility reporting and practices.

The attention of the social domain within the environmental and economic domains is ascertained by academic scholars, resulting in an increasing growing number of academic and practitioner journal and book publications. However, there is very little research of how knowledge fragmentation in the social domain can lead to multiple definitions of sustainable development. Consequently, the social domain in sustainable development is the most underdeveloped and least discussed (Opp and Saunders, 2013). Furthermore, most academic scholars mention a limited aspect of the social domain in CSR and sustainability without further discussion of the social domain's unclear definition and underdeveloped role in sustainable development.

The aim of this paper is to address the knowledge fragmentation in the social domain of CSR and sustainability through a systematic literature review of the academic journals and books with suggestions for future research. Based on the literature review findings,



World Journal of Science,
Technology and Sustainable
Development

Vol. 12 No. 3, 2015
pp. 183-193

© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
2042-5945
DOI 10.1108/WJSTSD-02-2015-0009

this paper proposes that the social domain in sustainable development is the gateway to better understanding of how the social domain can contribute toward a standard definition of sustainable development. The systematic literature review indicates how the current definitions of the social domain contribute toward differing understandings of the social domain in sustainability and CSR. Consequently, knowledge fragmentation in sustainable development is generated by an underdeveloped social domain in which the current knowledge of the social domain is dispersed within numerous academic publications. As a result, this prevents a deeper thoughtful and critical examination of the social domain's potential to merge shared understanding in sustainable development and to advance sustainable development through competitive advantage among corporations, governments and local communities.

Methodology

The objective of the systematic literature review is to comprehensively scope and understand a subject for evidence of undertaking further research (Hidalgo Landa *et al.*, 2011) while following appropriate procedures (Hemingway and Brereton, 2009). The search terms "corporate social responsibility social domain" and "sustainability social domain" were performed in Google Scholar academic search engine in February 2012. The aim of the initial search was to identify literature about the social domain in CSR and sustainability. The search terms were conducted in English. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were implemented to highlight a specific topic within the broad literature of CSR and sustainability. The inclusion criteria focussed on titles and abstracts relevant to the social domain in CSR and sustainability. Exclusion criteria included papers focussed primarily on the economic and environmental or other domains of CSR and sustainability. Peer and non-referred journals that did not highlight the social domain in the initial search were omitted, resulting in 440 pertinent publications. The process of applying and refining the criteria resulted in 149 papers focusing on the social domain in CSR and sustainability. The next step required reviewing the full text to identify themes of the social domain in CSR and sustainability by the author and one reviewer. If a paper referred to more than one theme, then the paper was assigned to all themes. A second search was conducted in April 2013 utilizing the same search engine to ensure a comprehensive literature review, resulting in six additional papers. In addition, a review of the references in the pertinent papers dating from 1977 to 2013 was cross-checked to identify additional relevant literature. A variety of publications emerged within the criteria process. However, journals were the primary source for establishing relevant research. Most papers refer to the social domain as socio-economics (67), followed by stakeholders, (62) and societal well-being, (21) with some journals defining the social domain as social sustainability (five).

Four themes defining the social domain in CSR and sustainability

Theme 1: Socio-economics. Socio-economics play a significant construct in CSR (Garriga and Mele, 2004). However, that role has not developed the social domain of CSR and sustainability because most social domain initiatives are not intended to tackle social issues beyond socio-economics. Similarly, Mihelcic *et al.* (2003) defines the social domain within sustainability as socio-economic driven to ensure "that humankind's use of natural resources and cycles do not lead to diminished quality of life due either to losses in future economic opportunities or to adverse impacts on social conditions, human health and the environment" (p. 5315). Likewise, Turner, II *et al.* (2003) define the human conditions as

social/human capital and endowments (e.g. population, entitlements, institutions, economic structures). Moreover, neo-classical economics determines how people respond to the cost of gains and losses in environmental inquiry (Daly, 1977; Ekins, 1992; Jacobs, 1991; Norgaard, 1994; Redclift, 1999) indicating an economic role of the social domain in CSR and sustainability that leads to focusing on economic themes and impacts in sustainable development and defining the social domain as economic driven.

Theme 2: stakeholders. Stakeholders are an obvious component of a corporation's success and are a primary method of CSR (Freeman, 1984; Alkhafaji, 1989; Anderson, 1989; Brummer, 1991; Brenner and Cochran, 1991; Clarkson, 1991; Goodpaster, 1991; Hill and Jones, 1992; Hosseini and Brenner, 1992; Meznar *et al.*, 1990; Preston and Sapienza, 1990; Wood, 1991; Prahalad and Hamel, 1994) that is often driven by the stakeholders (Carroll, 1979, 1999; Wood and Jones, 1995). Generally, stakeholders can be defined as "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Consequently, how stakeholders should be considered and categorized is questionable (Lepineux, 2003). Apparently, society is described as stakeholders (De Bakker *et al.*, 2005). Noren (2004) describes stakeholders as "trade unions, owners, shareholders, investors, bankers, auditors, insurance companies, consumers, staff, financial analysts, suppliers, customers, competitors, future employees, media, NGOs, national authorities, local authorities, neighbors, surrounding environment (environment, public health and safety, sustainable development), and politicians" (p. 8). However, Clarkson (1995) classifies stakeholders as suppliers, customers, employees, shareholders and community, and suggests corporations must deal with stakeholders and not society. Some CSR scholars suggest that the stakeholder theory consists of descriptive (no moral value statements) and normative (moral value statements) aims (Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Garriga and Mele, 2004; Loranzo, 2005; Ulrich, 2008). However, "stakeholder mismatching" (Wood and Jones, 1995, p. 229) suggests limitations of relationships between corporations and society and the social domain in general leading to defining the social domain as simply people.

Theme 3: societal well-being. Societal well-being (Prescott-Allen, 2001) plays a central role in CSR and sustainability.

For example, Prieto-Carron *et al.* (2006) focus on poverty reduction in developing countries of the global South and suggest "that a critical research agenda needs to be concerned with the creation of new ways of systematically assessing the impact of CSR social issues such as poverty, wages and workers' and conditions in general" (p. 983). Noren (2004) proposes corporations improve societal well-being through protection of their workforce. Likewise, "businesses are to effectively promote societal well-being because they exist as a response to a social need, and have a privileged financial position in the society" (Iamandi, 2007, p. 7). However, varying dimensions of social life reveal progression and regression within societal plans may not result in positive advancement (Meadowcroft, 1999) because individuals are autonomous and are free to create value for themselves within mutual interests of stakeholders and without reciprocation to others. Therefore, "developing impact assessment" (Prieto-Carron *et al.*, 2006, p. 986) of the internal processes of the social domain in CSR and sustainability and not external human well-being outcomes is warranted.

Theme 4: social sustainability. The interest in sustainability is challenging traditional disciplinary thinking in the social sciences (Redclift, 1999). The societal component of sustainability is generally defined as societal structures, institutions and social capital (Spangenberg, 1997). Further to this, Bossel's (2000) system of basic orientators includes

reproduction, psychological needs and responsibility that depict the human elements within the environmental basic orientators. However, Littig and GrieBier (2005) question societal change within social processes and structures to ensure the chances for development of future generations. Blindheim (2011) suggests attaining the common good in sustainability is contingent upon the legitimate operations and design of political institutions. However, there are many differing actors within society that need to be addressed. Consequently, social sustainability may constrain collective human behavior through multiple and differing social construction and prompt inquiry into whether sustainability is a collective outcome, resulting in a limited role of social sustainability within the social domain, and generating multiple practices and definitions of sustainable development.

Discussion, implications and future research

As it has been established in the preceding sections, socio-economics, stakeholders, societal well-being and social sustainability overlap and work together to form the primary constructs in the social domain. The systematic literature review indicates that the literature in CSR and sustainability depict the social domain broadly within pre-existing societal outcomes intertwined across disciplines. As a result, a solid clear definition of the social domain is difficult to locate because a divided society is constructing sustainable development and contributes toward multiple definitions and theories of sustainable development.

The literatures of CSR and sustainability are complex social phenomenon that focus on social sustainability, socio-economics and societal well-being within corporations and governments and are driven and measured by local community, stakeholder interests and corporate management (Clarkson, 1995; Cooper and Owen, 2007; Godfrey and Hatch, 2007; Gond and Crane, 2008; Gond and Matten, 2007; Johnson and Onwuguegbuzie, 2004; Marquis *et al.*, 2007; Matten *et al.*, 2003; Newell, 2005; Owen, 2008; Pater and Van Lierop, 2006). This results in a narrow social domain that creates a multitude of definitions within sustainable development and obscures the potential of the social domain to limit and constrain a shared understanding of sustainable development. As a result, there is much literature published about the role of CSR and sustainability for corporations and governments (Clarkson, 1995; Williams and Aguilera, 2008), and very little about the role of the social domain. In addition, environmental and economic domains are addressed greater than the social domain (Opp and Saunders, 2013). Further to this, there are neglected and one-sided social domain concepts of sustainability and CSR (Littig and GrieBier, 2005; Marquis *et al.*, 2007; Wiersum, 1995) as presented in the themes from the systematic literature review.

The social domain in CSR and sustainability requires future research to critically evaluate the potential of the social domain to generate multiple definitions of sustainable development. How do socio-economics, stakeholders, societal well-being and social sustainability fuse to become the social domain? It can be argued it is due to unregulated CSR and sustainability reporting (Mersereau and Mottis, 2011). Society is socially constructing the social domain responsibility rules and frameworks for communicating the role of corporations and governments social responsibility within the International Labor Organization (ILO), UN Global Compact, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI), Socially Responsible Investing (SRI), and Integrated Reporting (IR). These frameworks seek to institutionalize CSR and sustainability on a global level through the creation of social norms, rules and standardized social

procedures, thereby decreasing convergence of sustainable development. Moreover, since social preferences are heterogeneous, it is inevitable that not all societal values will be fully reflected in policy, resulting in multiple definitions of sustainable development. Therefore, differing societal norms and values play an integral role in developing a solid definition of the social domain. Consequently, corporations and governments have heterogeneous values and preferences that may be shared and diffused. Likewise, “society’s values and current levels of knowledge are reflected in companies’ activities and companies are judged according to current standards” (Van Marrewijk and Were, 2003; Noren, 2004). In addition, “social and environmental performances are not seen as an end in themselves but as a source of competitive advantage or a condition to be competitive” (Valor, 2005, p. 199). Therefore, it can be argued, non-reciprocal societal standards require further research to decrease multiple definitions of sustainable development.

Sustainable development is often utilized as a strategic approach for competitive advantage of many companies (Collins and Porras, 1996; Gladwin *et al.*, 1995; Makower, 1994; Scott and Rothman, 1992; Dutta *et al.*, 1995; Reinhardt, 1998), and is a driver of competitive advantage (Donaldson and Preston, 1995), corporate reputation (Porter and Kramer, 2006; McWilliams *et al.* 2006; Branco and Rodrigues, 2006) and sustainable competitive advantage (King, 2002; Adams and Zutshi, 2004). As a result, governments are viewing CSR codes of conduct as a cost-effective means to enhance sustainable development strategies and as a component of their national competitiveness strategies to compete and position their exports globally (Petkoski and Twose, 2003). In contrast, Marcus and Anderson (2006) research findings indicate various factors that influence CSR and competitive advantage. For example, progressive corporations and financial institutions view CSR and sustainable investments as a competitive advantage or a minimum requirement for risk mitigation (Petkoski and Twose, 2003). Likewise, managing community relations may reduce risk thereby creating an opportunity for competitive advantage (Berman *et al.*, 1999).

Since competitive advantage is a driver in sustainable development, future research should address the role of the social domain to advance competitive advantage in sustainable development. For example, “the sustainability of human – environment systems is determined through three main characteristics: resilience to disturbances, both natural and anthropogenic; desirability to human societies and (often implicit) temporal and spatial scale boundaries” (Mayer, 2007, p. 278). Therefore, competing human systems should be reflected in the social domain of sustainable development to reveal competing and unequal social responsibility among local communities, governments and corporations. Further to this, relational motives can drive new norms that articulate social expectations for business (Scott, 2004). Moreover, relational motives within a company’s industry group may often depress a company’s instrumental motives (Aguilera *et al.*, 2007). Likewise, Bansal and Roth (2000) data findings suggest that companies may be significantly motivated by relationships followed by instrumental motives with moral motives as least significant. However, the admittance of societal responsibility and social competitiveness values in the societal progress indexes (Becic *et al.*, 2012) warrant further research of the important role of the social domain in sustainable development.

Conclusion

The literature review highlights that the social domain in sustainable development plays a strong role in decreasing multiple definitions and theories of sustainable development. Moreover, the social domain switches roles within socio-economics,

stakeholders, societal well-being and social sustainability, resulting as an untapped resource to advance sustainable development. The themes have important implications for addressing multiple definitions and theories of sustainable development. Therefore, creating a clear definition of the social domain is vital for sustainable development and for establishing competitive advantage as the role and responsibility of not only the economic domain, but also the social domain in sustainable development. Thus, it can be argued that competitive advantage in CSR and sustainability is economic and not socially driven because society does not compete at business levels, thereby leaving corporations to compete economically.

Clearly, the social domain plays a key role to reshape and develop a standard definition for sustainable development. This paper has shed light on how the social domain has played a limited role in CSR and sustainability practices and strategies in corporations and governments. Public attitudes about CSR and sustainability require awareness of society's role and responsibility to advance sustainable development beyond current CSR and sustainability industry and policy stakeholder practices. Social fragmentation among local communities, governments and corporations in CSR and sustainability will decrease because the social domain will become a driver of sustainable development instead of a support mechanism for economic and environmental development. Overall, the social domain in sustainable development requires further research and a deeper understanding of individual preferences and decision-making in defining CSR and sustainability because a competing society sustains itself by efficacy capacity.

References

- Adams, C. and Zutshi, A. (2004), "Corporate social responsibility: why business should act responsibly and be accountable", *Australian Accounting Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 31-39.
- Aguilera, R.V., Rupp, D.E., Williams, C.A. and Ganapathi, J. (2007), "Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: a multilevel theory of social change in organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 836-863.
- Alkhafaji, A.F. (1989), *A Stakeholder Approach to Corporate Governance: Managing in a Dynamic Environment*, Quorum Books, New York, NY.
- Anderson, J.W. (1989), *Corporate Social Responsibility*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Bansal, P. and Roth, K. (2000), "Why companies go green: a model of ecological responsiveness", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 717-736.
- Becic, E., Mulej, E.M. and Svarc, J. (2012), "Measuring social progress by sustainable development indicators: cases of Croatia and Slovenia", *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 37, pp. 458-465.
- Berman, S.L., Wicks, A.C., Kotha, S. and Jones, T.M. (1999), "Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 488-506.
- Blindheim, B.T. (2011), "Institutional convergent alternatives to instrumental and ethical corporate social responsibility perspectives", *Presentation given at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Sustainable Development Society (ISDRS)*, Columbia University, New York, NY, May 9.
- Bossel, H. (2000), "Policy assessment and simulation of actor orientation for sustainable development", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 337-355.
- Branco, M.C. and Rodrigues, L.L. (2006), "Corporate social responsibility and resource-based perspectives", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 111-132.

- Brenner, S. and Cochran, P.L. (1991), "The stakeholder model of the firm: implications for business and society theory and research", *Proceedings of the International Association for Business and Society*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 449-467.
- Brummer, J. (1991), *Corporate Responsibility and Legitimacy*, Greenwood Press, New York, NY.
- Carroll, A.B. (1979), "A three-domain conceptual model of corporate performance", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 497-505.
- Carroll, A.B. (1999), "Corporate social responsibility: evolution of a definitional construct", *Business and Society*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 1-28.
- Clarkson, M.B.E. (1991), "Defining, evaluating and managing corporate social performance: the stakeholder management model", in Post, J.E. (Ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 331-358.
- Clarkson, M.B.E. (1995), "A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 65-91.
- Collins, J.C. and Porras, J.I. (1996), "Building your company's vision", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 65-77.
- Cooper, S.M. and Owen, D.L. (2007), "Corporate social reporting and stakeholder accountability: the missing link", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 32 Nos 7-8, pp. 649-667.
- Daly, H. (1977), *Steady-State Economics*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, CA.
- De Bakker, G.A., Groenewegen, P. and Den Hond, F. (2005), "A bibliometric analysis of 30 years of research and theory on corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance", *Business and Society*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 283-317.
- Donaldson, T. and Preston, L.E. (1995), "The stakeholder theory of the corporation concepts, evidence, and implications", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 65-91.
- Dutta, P.K., Lach, S. and Rustichini, A. (1995), "Better late than early: vertical differentiation in the adoption of a new technology", *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, Vol. 4, pp. 563-89.
- Ekins, P. (1992), *A New World Order: Grassroots Movements for Global Change*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984), *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Perspective*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Garriga, E. and Mele, D. (2004), "Corporate social responsibility theories: mapping the territory", *Journal of Business Ethics, Building Ethical Institutions for Business: Sixteenth Annual Conference of the European Business Ethics Network (EBEN)*, Vol. 53 Nos 1/2, pp. 51-52, 58-59, 63-66.
- Gladwin, T.N., Kennelly, J.J. and Krause, T.S. (1995), "Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: implications for management theory and research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 874-907.
- Godfrey, P.C. and Hatch, N.W. (2007), "Researching corporate social responsibility: an agenda for the 21st century", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 70, pp. 88-95.
- Gond, J.-P. and Crane, A. (2008), "Corporate social performance disoriented. Saving the lost paradigm?", *Business and Society*, Vol. 20 No. 10, pp. 2-20.
- Gond, J.-P., and Matten, D. (2007), "Rethinking the business-society interface: beyond the functionalist trap", No. 47-2007 ICCSR Research Paper Series- ISSN 1479-5124, pp. 2-20, available at: www.nottingham.ac.uk/business/ICCSR (accessed September 12, 2009).
- Goodpaster, K.E. (1991), "Business ethics and stakeholder", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 53-72.

- Hemingway, P. and Brereton, N. (2009), *What is a Systematic Review?*, 2nd ed., Hayward Medical Communications, pp. 1-8.
- Hidalgo Landa, A., Szabo, I., Le Brun, L., Owen, I. and Fletcher, G. (2011), "Evidence based scoping reviews", *The Electronic Journal Information Systems Evaluation*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 46-52.
- Hill, C.W.L. and Jones, T.N. (1992), "Stakeholder-agency theory", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 131-154.
- Hosseini, J.C. and Brenner, S.N. (1992), "The stakeholder theory of the firm", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 99-119.
- Iamandi, I. (2007), "Corporate social responsibility and social responsiveness in a global business environment: a comparative theoretical approach", *Romanian Economic Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 23, pp. 1-18.
- Jacobs, M. (1991), "Sustainable development, capital substitution and economic humility: a response to Beckerman", *Environmental Values*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 57-68.
- Johnson, R.B. and Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004), "Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come", *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 33 No. 7, pp. 14-26.
- King, A. (2002), "How to get started in corporate social responsibility", *Financial Management*, October, p. 5.
- Lépineux, F. (2003), "Dans quelle mesure une entreprise peut-elle être responsable à l'égard de la cohésion sociale?", doctoral dissertation, CNAM, Paris.
- Littig, B. and Griebier, E. (2005), "Social sustainability: a catchword between political pragmatism and social theory", *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 8 Nos 1/2, pp. 65-79.
- Loranzo, J.M. (2005), "Governments and corporate social responsibility", *Publication, Politics, Regulations and Voluntariness*, Doubleday, Barcelona.
- McWilliams, A., Siegel, D.S. and Wright, P.M. (2006), "Corporate social responsibility: strategic implications", *Journal of Management Studies*, Guest Editor's Introduction, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Makower, J. (1994), *Beyond the Bottom Line*, Simon and Schuster, London.
- Matten, D., Crane, A. and Chapple, W. (2003), "Behind the mask: revealing the true face of corporate citizenship", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 45 Nos 1/2, pp. 109-114.
- Marcus, A.A. and Anderson, M.H. (2006), "A general dynamic capability: does it propagate business and social competencies in the retail food industry?", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 19-46.
- Marquis, C., Glynn, M.A. and Davis, G.F. (2007), "Community isomorphism and corporate social action", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 799-820.
- Mayer, A.L. (2007), "Strengths and weaknesses of common sustainability indices for multidimensional systems", *Environment International*, Vol. 34, pp. 277-291.
- Meadowcroft, J. (1999), "Planning for sustainable development: what can be learned from the critics?", in Kenny, M. and Meadowcroft, J. (Eds), *Planning Sustainability*, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 12-40.
- Mersereau, A. and Mottis, N. (2011), "Corporate social responsibility and management control", Working Paper No. 1114, Research Center ESSEC, pp. 1-37.
- Meznar, M.B., Chrisman, J.J. and Carroll, A.B. (1990), "Social responsibility and strategic management: toward an enterprise strategy classification", paper presented at the National Academy of Management Meetings, San Francisco, CA.

- Mihelcic, J.R., Crittenden, J.C., Small, M.J., Shonnard, D.R., Hokanson, D.R., Zhang, Q., Chen, H., Sorby, S.A., James, V.U., Sutherland, J.W. and Schnoor, J.L. (2003), "Sustainability science and engineering: the emergence of a new metadiscipline", *Environmental Science Technology*, Vol. 37 No. 23, pp. 5314-5324.
- Newell, P. (2005), "Citizenship, accountability and community: the limits of the CSR agenda", *International Affairs*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 541-557.
- Noren, G. (2004), *The Role of Business in Society*, Confederation of Swedish Enterprise, Stockholm.
- Norgaard, R.B. (1994), *Development Betrayed: The End of Progress and A Coevolutionary Revisioning of the Future*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Opp, S.M. and Saunders, K.L. (2013), "Pillar talk: local sustainability initiatives and policies in the united states-finding evidence of the 'three E's': economic development, environmental protection, and social equity", *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 1-40.
- Owen, D. (2008), "Chronicles of wasted time? A personal reflection on the current state of, and future prospects for, social and environmental accounting research", *Accounting, Auditing, and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 240-267.
- Pater, A. and van Lierop, K. (2006), "Sense and sensitivity: the roles of organization and stakeholders in managing corporate social responsibility", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 339-351.
- Petkoski, D. and Twose, N. (2003), "Public policy for corporate social responsibility", *WBI Series on Corporate Responsibility, Accountability, and Sustainable Competitiveness*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 1-61.
- Porter, M.E. and Kramer, M.R. (2006), "Strategy and society: the link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 84 No. 12, pp. 78-92.
- Prahalad, C.K. and Hamel, G. (1994), "Strategy as a field of study: why search for a new paradigm?", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. S2, pp. 5-16.
- Prescott-Allen, R. (2001), *The Wellbeing of Nations: A Country-by-Country Index of Quality of Life and the Environment*, Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Preston, L.E. and Sapienza, H.T. (1990), "Stakeholder management and corporate performance", *The Journal of Behavioral Economics*, Vol. 1 No. 9, pp. 361-375.
- Prieto-Carron, M., Lund-Thomsen, P., Chan, A. and Bhushan, C. (2006), "Critical perspectives on CSR and development: what we know, what we don't know, and what we need to know", *International Affairs*, Vol. 82 No. 5, pp. 977-987.
- Redclift, M. (1999), "Sustainability and markets: on the neo-classical model of environmental economics", in Kenny, M. and Meadowcroft, J. (Eds), *Planning Sustainability*, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 66-77.
- Reinhardt, E.L. (1998), "Environmental product differentiation: implications for corporate strategy", *California Management Review*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 43-73.
- Scott, M. (2004), "Corporate social responsibility: a burning issue for recruits", *Financial Times*, October 18, available at: www.ft.com (accessed April 1, 2013).
- Scott, M. and Rothman, H. (1992), *Companies with a Conscience: Intimate Portraits of Twelve Firms that Make a Difference*, Citadel, New York, NY.
- Spangenberg, J.H. (1997), "Environmental space-based proactive linkage indicators: a compass on the road towards sustainability", in Moldan, B. and Billharz, S. (Eds), *Sustainability Indicators, Report of the Project on Indicators of Sustainable Development*, Wiley, London, pp. 119-125.
- Turner, B.L., Kasperson, R.E., Matson, P.A., McCarthy, J.J., Corell, R.W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N., Kasperson, J.X., Luers, A., Martello, M.L., Polsky, C., Pulsipher, A. and Schiller, A. (2003), "A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science" *PNAS*, Vol. 100 No. 14, pp. 8074-8079.

- Ulrich, P. (2008), "Corporate citizenship or the political aspect of corporate governance in civil society", in Backhaus-Maul, H. (Ed.), *Corporate Citizenship in Germany: Review and Perspectives*, Social Sciences, Wiesbaden.
- Valor, C. (2005), "Corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship: towards corporate accountability", *Business and Society Review*, Vol. 110 No. 2, pp. 191-212.
- Van Marrewijk, M. and Were, M. (2003), "Multiple levels of corporate sustainability", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 44 Nos 2-3, pp. 107-119.
- Wiersum, K.F. (1995), "200 years of sustainability in forestry: lessons from history", *Environmental Management*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 321-329.
- Williams, C.A., and Aguilera, R.A. (2008), "Corporate social responsibility in a comparative perspective", in Crane, A., McWilliams, A., Matten, D., Moon, J. and Siegel, D.S. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Wood, D.J. (1991), "Corporate social performance revisited", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 691-718.
- Wood, D.J. and Jones, R.E. (1995), "Stakeholder mismatching: a theoretical problem in empirical research on corporate social performance", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 229-267.

Further reading

- Amaeshi, K.M., Ezeoha, A.E., Adi, B.C. and Nwafor, M. (2007), "Financial exclusion and strategic corporate social responsibility: a missing link in sustainable finance discourse?", No. 49-2007, ICCSR Research Paper Series, ISSN 1479-5124, pp. 1-18, available at: www.nottingham.ac.uk/business/ICCSR (accessed September 2, 2009).
- Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2002), "Assessing and improving partnership relationships and outcomes: a proposed framework", *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 215-231.
- Carroll, A.B. (1991), "The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: towards the moral management of organizational stakeholders", *Business Horizons*, July/August, pp. 39-48.
- Carroll, A.B. and Shabana, M.K. (2010), "The business case for corporate social responsibility: a review of concepts, research and practice", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 85-105.
- Donaldson, T.J. (1982), "What is business in America?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 259-266.
- Donaldson, T. and Dunfee, T.W. (1994), "Toward a unified conception of business ethics: integrative social contracts theory", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 252-284.
- Gallimore, R., Goldenberg, C.N. and Weisner, T.S. (1993), "The social construction and subjective reality of activity settings: implications for community psychology", *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 537-559.
- Gond, J.P., Kang, N. and Moon, J. (2011), "The government of self-regulation: on the comparative dynamics of corporate social responsibility", *Economy and Society*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 640-671.
- Kinderyte, L. (2008), "Analysis and comparison of methodologies for corporate sustainability assessment", *Environmental Research Engineering and Management*, Vol. 4 No. 46, pp. 66-75, Z9.
- Longo, M., Mura, M. and Bonoli, A. (2005), "Corporate social responsibility and corporate performance: the case of Italian SMEs", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 28-42.
- Lopez, M.V., Garcia, A. and Rodriguez, L. (2007), "Sustainable development and corporate performance: a study based on the Dow Jones Sustainability Index", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 75 No. 3, pp. 285-300.

Luhmann, N. (1981), *Soziologische Aufklärung 3*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen.

Margolis, J. D., and J. P. Walsh (2001), *People and Profits? The Search for a link Between A Company's Social and Financial Performance*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Social domain
in sustainable
development

About the author

Dr Monica Thiel is a Member of the Academy of Management and the European Group for Organizational Studies. Her research articles and case studies have been published in the *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, *International Journal of Business and Globalization*, *Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases*, *Elsevier Ltd. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, and the *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*. Prior to her pursuit of a PhD in Social Science at the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Monica worked in multinational corporations, non-profit organizations, government, military, and small-medium enterprises in business management and social responsibility initiatives. Her current research interests include corporate social responsibility, sustainability, competitiveness, strategic management and innovation. Dr Monica Thiel can be contacted at: mt2652@gmail.com

193

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com