KÜRESELLEŞEN DÜNYA'DA OKULLAR İÇİN VE DİĞER ÖRGÜTLER İÇİN SOSYAL SORUMLULUĞUN ÖNEMİ

Önder ŞANLI (*)
Mehmet ALTUN (**)
Çetin TAN (***)

Öz

Hem ülkemizde hem de tüm Dünya'da sürekli olarak değişim ve gelişmeler yaşanmaktadır. Bu değişim ve gelişmeler örgütlerin yapılarında da olmaktadır. Günden güne değişen şartlara göre toplumun hem eğitim kurumlarından hem de diğer örgütlerden olan beklentileri de değişiklik göstermektedir. Bu durumlarında asıl nedeni yine bu gelişmeler ve değişimlerdir. Bu hızlı değişim ve gelişmelerin sonucunda hem eğitim kurumlarının hem de diğer örgütlerin nasıl etkililiği de tartışılan önemli konular arasındadır. Bu süreçte örgütler amaçlarını ve görevlerini gözden geçirmeye zorlanmaktadırlar. Örgütler kendilerini bu değişim ve gelişmelere uyumlu hale getirebilirlerse gelecek için daha da kuvvetli olabileceklerdir, ancak tam tersi bir uygulama ise örgütler için tam bir hüsran olabilir. Bu anlamdaki değişim ve gelişmelerin en başında gelen kavramlardan birisi de "sosyal sorumluluk" kavramıdır. Çağımızda bu kavram her geçen gün önem kazanmıştır. Örgütlerden beklenen şey sadece kendi menfaatlerini düşünmek olmamalı, aynı zamanda topluma karşıda sorumlu davranışlar da sergilemelidirler. Örgütlerin asıl varlık sebepleri toplum olduğuna göre toplumu daha güçlü yapabilmek adına da sorumlulukları olmalıdır. Toplumsal kurallara, toplumsal değerlere ve toplumsal beklentilere karşı saygılı ve sorumlu olmak günümüzde örgütler için oldukça önemlidir. Bu davranışların sonucu olarak toplum bu örgütlere güvenecek ve onların da daha güçlü olmaları için gayret edecektir. Bu kazan-kazan politikaları ile birlikte hem örgütler hem de toplum gelecek için daha güçlü olacaklardır.

Bu çalışmada sosyal sorumluluğun hem okullar için hem de diğer örgütler için ne denli önemli olduğu kuramsal bir çerçevede daha önceden yapılmış benzer araştırmalardan da örnekler verilerek açıklanmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgüt, Toplum, Sosyal Sorumluluk

---

*) Dr., MEM, Malatya (e-posta: ondersanli44@hotmail. Com).

**) MEM, Malatya (e-posta: altunx@hotmail.com).

***) Yrd. Doç. Dr., Çetin TAN, Siirt Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi (e-posta: cettan889@hotmail.com)

Dr. Önder ŞANLI
532 / Mehmet ALTUN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çetin TAN

Importance of Social Responsibility for Schools and Other Organizations intThe Globalizing World

Abstract

There has been an ongoing changes and development both in the world and in our country. These changes have also been seen in the structures of organizations. What the society expects from educational institutions and other organizations have been changing according to current conditions day by day. This situation is the main reason for that. As a result of these rapid changes the efficiency of educational institutions and the other organizations are being questioned. Organizations have been forced to review their aims and duties. If the organizations can orient themselves to these changes, they can be more powerful for the future but the opposite situation may be a frustration for them. One of the distinctive features of the organizations in this meaning is the concept of 'social responsibility'. This term has gained a very big popularity in these days. Whatever accepted from the organizations is not just thinking their own simple profits or duties. It has been also accepted to be socially responsible organizations. As the organizations consist for the soceity, they have to make some contributions to make their soceity more powerful in some ways. Appreciating the social norms, values and expectations have been critacally important for the organizations in our age. As a result of these behaviors soceity will also trust these organizations and try to make them more powerful. With these win-win policies both organizations and the soceity will be more strong for the future. In this study; importance of social responsibility for schools and other organizations have been analysed by comparing the studies previously done.

Keywords: *Organizations, Soceity, Social Responsible.*

Introduction

The term "social responsibility" has been challenged as early as the 1970's. Sethi (1975, 1979) distinguishes between social obligation, social responsibility, and social responsiveness. He argues that, like all other social institutions, organizations are an integral part of society and must depend on acceptance of their role and activities for their existence, continuity and growth. The crucial issues in the concept of CSR are the search for legitimacy by companies and the doubts by critics about the legitimacy of companies' actions. Corporate behaviour in response to market forces or legal constraints is defined as social obligation, and is proscriptive in nature. Social responsibility implies congruence of corporate behaviour with prevailing social norms, values and expectations of performance, and it is a concept which is prescriptive in nature. The concept of social responsiveness suggests that what is important is not how a company should respond to social pressures, but what should be their long-term role in a dynamic social system. The idea is that business orientation in any social dimension must be anticipatory and preventive (Barco & Rodrigues, 2007: p.9)

CSR is the concept used most widely to address the relationships between business and society. However, some concepts, such as corporate sustainability and corporate citizenship, have been proposed recently to conceptualize these relations. Some authors view these three concepts as synonymous (see, for example, Andriof and McIntosh, 2001) whereas others propose some distinctions between them (see, for example, Marrewijk, 2003, for distinctions between CSR and corporate sustainability, and Matten et al., 2003, Matten and Crane, 2005; and Valor, 2005, for distinctions between CSR and corporate citizenship).

The concept of social responsibility, though gaining momentum, has been criticized by Friedman as subversion against capitalism. Milton Friedman argues that the 'social responsibility of business is to increase its profits' (1970, p.1). Friedman and other proponents of shareholder value argue that focusing beyond what is of ultimate value to the owners of businesses will dilute business focus, reward inefficiency and waste, and generally not give due diligence to the expectations of shareholders (Walker & Marr, 2002: p.25).

Problem

It can easily be said that there are so many reasons for us to be socially responsible. Davis (1960), McGuire (1963), Heald (1970), Johnson (1971), Manne and Wallic (1972) in Carroll, all concur that socially responsible business practices are not only beneficial to society but are also of strategic importance in achieving the profit motive and enhancing public rating and acceptance of such corporations that incorporate CSR in their business models (Dentchev, 2005). Social responsibility is important to integrate as educational institutions stretch services and provide programs to include civic engagement and social participation on the local and national levels.

Constituents in the business environment are similar to that of education; customers (parents and students), shareholders (parents, community and educators), and leadership (superintendent, central office staff, and principals). These constituents perceive social and civic responsibility to equate with moral or ethical behavior if implemented without looking strategic and formulated (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Freeman, 1994), thus providing a connection that encourages participation and support.

While administrators need not be identical to the members of the educational community, there must be "an alignment of philosophy, priorities, power and personality that will enable the principal to lead the community and school to a higher level" (Owen, 2007, p. 46). With this shift in emphasis pressure is increasing on future and experienced administrators to become socially, politically and civically engaged and to keep in touch with the political and social climate of the community (Owen, 2007).

Aim

The aim of this study is to show the effects of social responsibility on soceity and it is also aimed to give information about the developing process of social responsibility with the resuts of the resarches previously done.

Method

This study was designed in conceptual model. Social responsibility is one of the most important concepts in our globalizing world. It can not be noted that the term 'social responsibility' is examined and discussed sufficiently in the field of education administration. Within this perspective, this article is an introduction to the concept of social responsibility. It aims to improve our understanding of social responsibility. In this context, in this article, mainly the concept of social responsibility has been described and related concepts has been introduced.

What is social responsibility?

Corporate social responsibility is an issue that has dominated many executive discussions in recent times. Indeed, there are differing perspectives on CSR. At one extreme it is argued that CSR is achieved as long as an organisation does not obey the law. At the other extreme it is argued that an organisation has a duty to ensure a "good society". (Mbare, 2007)

Mc Guire (1963) defines social responsibility as an obligation to society that extends beyond a company's economic and legal responsibilities. Socially responsible behavior also benefits companies. A 1999 study showed that the most important non-financial factors for investors were social performance towards the community, women, minorities, and employees, as well as environmental and product safety (Cox, 2004). Additionally, corporate social responsibility can lead to increases in financial measures. Better employee motivation, customer goodwill, and lower transaction costs result from corporate social responsibility (Cox, 2004); however, the benefits also extend beyond the corporation.

In his study, Goodpaster (1983) noted that analyzing the concept of social responsibility is a central part of the larger area of inquiry known as business ethics. The debate in business ethics spans topics as wide as the ethical legitimacy of capitalism and as narrow as the personal moral dilemmas of business executives in their day-to-day decision-making.

Docketed definitions of CSR are not clear over its exact nature and place in the business-society relations. The complexity of coming up with a universally agreed characterisation of CSR is partly a result of the fact that social problems differ from society to society and this tend to define the role that business has play in society as well as the expectations of society on how and to what extent business should help in solving social problems. Votaw (1973) as quoted by Carroll (1999: 280) seems to be summarising the complications of coming up with a unanimous definition of CSR when he notes that: The term 'social responsibility' is a brilliant one; it means something, but not always the same thing, to everybody. To some it conveys the idea of legal responsibility or liability; to others, it means socially responsible behavior in an ethical sense; to still others, the meaning transmitted is that of "responsible for," in a causal mode; many simply equate it with a charitable contribution; some take it to mean socially conscious; many of those who embrace it most fervently see it as a mere synonym for "legitimacy," in the context

of "belonging" or being proper or valid; a few see it as a sort of fiduciary duty imposing higher standards of behavior on businessmen than on citizens at large. Thus, a precising definition of CSR is as elusive as its exact nature and role in the business-society relations. Such absence of a specific and widely agreed definition makes CRS vulnerable to confliction interpretation by stakeholders (Windsor, 2001).

Carroll (1979) and in Carroll (1999:282) made an influential contribution to the debate on the meaning of CSR. He came up with a four-part definition of CSR when he stated that a corporation has economic, legal, ethical and discretionary responsibilities.

He argues that organisations have an economic responsibility to engage in activities that generate profits for them. For him, the economic component of CSR conforms to a capitalist economic system where commodities that business deal in must be sold at a profit (Smith, 1991; 2002).The legal responsibility ensures that a corporate organisation's operations conform to the legal requirements of the society in which it operates within. For him society expects corporate organisations to fulfil their economic responsibility within the legal parameters set forth by that society's legal system. After noting the inadequacies of previous definitions on CSR, in that they only made reference to business' primary responsibility to make profits and obey the law, Carroll went beyond these self-interested goals to include ethical and voluntary acts to help society solve its problems. The ethical responsibility says that corporate organisations' actions must conform to the moral precepts of their host society. Carroll might have included the ethical responsibility in his four-part definition of CSR over and beyond the legal responsibility because the law does not cover every aspect that makes corporate organisations act in an ethically responsible manner. The forth responsibility is the discretionary responsibility. This responsibility ensures that corporate organisations voluntarily contribute towards solving a number of ills that afflict society. For him (1999: 283), this responsibility is not as clear an expectation of society, as is the case with the ethical responsibility. For this reason, therefore, Carroll argues that corporate responsibilities that fall under this component are voluntary.

In the European Commission (the European Commission, 2002) has come forward to support CSR initiatives and seems to be actively involved in debates about its usefulness for businesses. The commission believes it is in the companies' long-term interests to exceed their social and environmental obligations and deliver a superior ethical performance. CSR is (WBCSD, 2000) "the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of work life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large". Hick asserts that CSR centers on the relationship between business and society and how businesses behave towards their key stakeholders such as employees, customers, investors, suppliers, communities, and special interest groups (Hick, 2000). Henderson (*see, Guardian, Nov. 2001*) describes what he calls the new CSR agenda as follows: "It identifies a new and enlarged responsibility for businesses today in contributing to both the well-being of society in general and the integrity of the natural environment."

The term corporate citizenship has various definitions in the literature, the main criteria for differentiation being how deeply the company's activities are embedded in the social environment. A widely used definition comes from the research of Westebbe and Logan (1995) who define corporate citizenship as the holistic, coordinated and strategically aligned engagement of a company beyond its usual business goals to help resolve social issues. The British NPO Business in the Community defines corporate responsibility as the management of a company's positive impact on society and the environment through its operations, products or services and through its interaction with key stakeholders such as employees, customers, investors and suppliers (Business in the Community, 2008).In its core sense, CSR is understood in Germany as supporting activities with a strong focus on civil society, mainly social activities with no political background or influence on government (Schrader, 2003), like, for example, supporting universities in research and teaching. In the English speaking parts of the world one can observe a move towards a much wider understanding of those concepts (Schrader, 2003), as CSR often includes the relations to local and national governments and the acceptance of governance responsibility.

Developing Process of Social Responsibility

Concepts of the business-society relationship have evolved and expanded over the past five decades - from social obligation and stewardship, to social responsibility and social responsiveness (Brennan and Johnson, 2000) and finally, as Frederick (1994, 1998) suggests, to social consciousness. Brennan suggest that this scholarship has resulted in less business defensiveness, more emphasis on managerial techniques for responding to social issues, and more empirical research on corporate social roles, responsibilities and constraints (Frederick, 1994; Clarkson, 1995).

The relationship between business and society has, for long, been a source of intellectual interest to business ethicists (Carroll, 1999:268; Heinze, 2005). Though it appears undeniable that corporate organisations function "…as part of an interactive system of relationships with individuals and groups in society" (Mescon, Bovée and Thill, 1999:64), the ideal business-society relationship remains intractable. Concern for business to contribute towards social prosperity has always persisted since the days of Aristotle who reckoned the need for business to reflect the interests of the society in which their operations are based (Solomon, 1999:83). People live in a society and everyone is part of the social organisation.

The idea of CSR has been around for a long time, beginning with the work of writers such as Bowen (1953 – cited by many as the 'father' of CSR) and carrying on through the work of Davis (1960, 1973) Johnson (1971), Jones (1980, 1983) and more recently Carroll (1991, 1999). The idea really exploded however in the period following the Earth Summit in 1992, since which event CSR has become a veritable industry in its own right with its own 'practitioners journals conferences' etc. Serious reflection on the impacts of CSR seems loosely divided into two camps;3 on the one hand, from those most closely

connected to its praxis, there is the idea that whilst CSR might not be perfect, it has at least in some cases led to significant transformations in how individual corporations conduct their business. WBCSD (2002), for example, in reviewing the evolution of CSR argue that it has been successfully mainstreamed and that "partnerships and alliances that are firmly rooted in social responsibility ground are flourishing. Among them are a range of collaborations which promote such initiatives as good employee relations, community empowerment, educational awareness and supply chain/customer engagement. Sensible companies dare not embark on major decisions without having first undertaken well-organized dialogues with their stakeholders" (WBCSD 2002:6).

The role of companies in society has dramatically changed over the last years (Osburg, 2009). The traditional sharing of tasks between the public and the private sector has evolved and new forms of cooperation have emerged (Schrader, 2003). There are three main trends that are responsible for this shift of paradigms: Firstly, the importance of governments is diminishing in various sectors as, with reduced budgets, governments are less and less able to guarantee adequate education, health or insurance against poverty. Increasing the public income through raising taxes is usually very difficult. As a result, countries lose a significant part of their capability to shape the social agenda (Habisch, 2003; Hansen & Schrader, 2005; Schrader, 2003). In former times, voluntary donations by companies could be seen as additional funding for public tasks. Nowadays, societies across the globe expect companies to become engaged in public issues, far beyond their usual business activities within the areas of arts, social issues, health or education (Bertelsmann, 2005; Gazdar & Kirchhoff, 2003).Over the last decade, most companies have accepted these new paradigms to act as corporate citizen, and thus have developed proactive concepts to meet the expectation of communities they operate in (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2005; Habisch, 2003).

Based on Clarke (1998) and Lantos (2001) two viewpoints on the role of business in society (which lead to different views on CSR) will be distinguished. The "classical view", based on neoclassical economic theory, defines it in purely economic profit making terms, focusing on the profit of the shareholders. In contrast, the "stakeholder view", based on stakeholder theory, holds that companies have a social responsibility that requires them to consider the interests of all parties affected by their actions. The classical view is justified mainly on the basis of neoclassical economic theory arguments using notions such as the free market, economic efficiency, and profit maximisation.

Carroll (1979, p. 502) holds that social responsiveness is not an alternative to social responsibility but rather "the action phase of management responding in the social sphere." Wartick and Cochran (1985, p. 765) hold that both "are equally valid concepts and that both should be included as separate dimensions of corporate social involvement." The concepts of social responsiveness and of corporate social performance can be seen as the evolution of the concept of social responsibility.

Importance of Social Responsibility for Organizations, Schools and Soceity

Schreuder (1978) acknowledges the inseparability of business and ethics. For him, the slim wedge between business and ethics can be bridged by a concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). It is the duty of business community to promote the welfare of society. For instance, a corporate organisation is said to be socially responsible or a good citizen (see Matten and Crane, 2003) if, among other things, it makes safe products devoid of serious structural defects, carefully disposes of its industrial wastes without causing ecological disasters, provides equal employment opportunities irrespective of gender, race or class and contributes towards solving society's problems in a number of ways such as building Old Peoples' Homes and donating food to the poor. Matten and Moon (2004), the fundamental idea of CSR is that "…it reflects both the social imperatives and the social consequences of business success, and that responsibility accordingly falls upon the corporation, but the precise manifestation and direction of the responsibility lies at the discretion of the corporation."

Wood (1991) also suggests that companies use three main kinds of processes to bring these principles into practice: environmental assessment, issues management, and stakeholder management. She then presents the outcomes of bringing principles into practice within the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary domains, categorizing them in terms of social impacts (beneficial or negative), social programs (which refer to the actions companies take to manage their social impacts in a favourable manner), and social policies (which emerge to guide decision making).Wood and Jones (1995, p. 231) use a stakeholder framework to modify Wood's definition of corporate social performance as principles, processes, and outcomes. They redefine the outcomes as internal stakeholder effects, external stakeholder effects, and external institutional effects.

However, the typology of corporate social responsibilities proposed by Lantos (2001, 2002) is considered to be a useful development of Carroll's model, because it addresses the problem of distinguishing the ethical and philanthropic components that Schwartz and Carroll (2003) stressed, and because it considers the purpose with which companies engage in social responsibility activities. Based on their nature (required versus optional) and purpose (for stakeholders' good, the company's good, or both), Lantos considers three different types of responsibilities; ethical, altruistic, and strategic. it seems more worthwhile to agree on the following five key elements identified by Buchholz (1991, p. 19):

➢ Companies have responsibilities beyond the production of goods and services at a profit;

➢ These responsibilities involve helping to solve important social problems, especially those they have helped create;

➢ Companies have a broader constituency than shareholders;

➢ Companies have impacts that go beyond simple marketplace transactions;

➢ Companies serve a wider range of human values than can be captured by a sole focus on economic values.

Education has a lower power distance than corporate organizations. This low power distance indicates that constituents see power as situational and feel that decisions should be questioned, discussed and agreed upon. Societies with a low power distance have less social, economic and political stratification, which translates into a need for relational leadership skills with a focus on social and civic responsibility in reflection to the community's needs (Begley, 2001;Carl, 2004;Holfstede, 2001; House, 2004; Javidan, 2006).

Social responsibility is crucial to educational leadership. One challenge to social responsibility within education is the perception of power. According to Carl (2004) power distance is the extent to which constituents believe power should be concentrated in the hands of leadership, and the extent to which they believe that leaders should be obeyed without question. Waldman's research (2004) found that leaders within higher power distance cultures devalued all aspects of social responsibility, indicating that lower power distance cultures embrace social responsibility.

Effective educational leaders have an ethical obligation to provide a socially responsible learning environment to meet the needs within a specific school culture while fighting the cynical expectations of the community (Duignan, 2006). Duignan (2005) found that with the increasing need for students to learn civic and social responsibility within the school day, educational leaders are looked upon to exemplify the best example of social responsibility (as cited in Duignan, 2006). This social obligation extends from the campus culture into the community where an educational leader faces high expectations of civic and social responsibility.

Lynch (2000) states that many professional schools and colleges, including schools of education, have been socially active and committed to progressive social change…during most of the 20th century" (p. 241). " It is indeed the work of higher education to nurture an educated person, a hungry spirit in search of meaning, a mind equipped with knowledge and skill to do good work but first and foremost a mind equipped to go inward in the journey of self discovery, to explore both outer and inner space, to participate in the life of our community and democracy and to ask uncomfortable questions of policy and practice in our society" (p. 317).

By cultivating diversity, promoting integrity, and serving as a civilizing function, universities can support the demand for a higher social functioning through the avenue of debate and open-forum argumentation (Postman, 1996). Universities must be the forum for expanding the role of educational leadership, as untenured administrators do not always feel the freedom to create a social agenda within the contexts of their positions although they are expected to reflect the social needs of the community in which they work.

Educational preparation programs must integrate a service learning activity into required field experiences. Hart, Youniss and Atkins (2007) found that mandated

community service can increase civic engagement if the activities engage students in addressing social problems. Field experiences are the perfect arena for implementation of community service. David (2009) found that "service learning projects can influence both short-term and long-term attitudes and actions regarding civic participation when the projects are carefully designed and implemented". The design should include "explicit learning goals, committed and well-trained teachers, opportunities to debate important social issues, effective coordination with community agencies, and dedicated time in the curriculum" (David, 2009, p 84).

Baxter (2008) distinguishes several areas to be considered when developing a comprehensive educational leadership program:

➢ Program accreditation and state licensure standards for school leadership.

➢ Faculty and staff selection.

➢ Curriculum design and implementation

➢ Student recruitment and selection

➢ Program evaluation

Each area requires specific planning and is supported by educational, sociological and philosophical frameworks designed to increase social responsibility. A greater understanding of Baxter's concept of a comprehensive educational leadership program is necessary to identify areas of strength and weakness within specific educational leadership programs and to develop an understanding of how each area should reflect a higher level of social participation. Additionally, educational leadership programs need to be able to justify the addition of social learning to leadership programs through a through explanation of each element of the program. (Burkman,2010)

While much of the curriculum provided in an educational leadership program is standardized based on state and national competencies, students should still be exposed to a variety of instructional methods and authentic collaborative activities (Baxter, 2008).

Hess & Kelly (2007) also advocate for a wide variety of texts to be used within each program. Not only should texts encompass fundamental, modern, progressive and conservative educational theories, social theories, business models of leadership, and cultural and political texts should be utilized. CSR has been conceptualised in a number of different ways which are related clearly to differing views regarding the role of business in society (see, for example, Clarke, 1998; Lantos, 2001). These views are often presented within the stakeholder-shareholder debate. The idea which underlies the "shareholder perspective" is that the only responsibility of managers is to serve the interests of shareholders in the best possible way, using corporate resources to increase the wealth of the latter by seeking profits (see, for example, Friedman, 1998;). In contrast, the "stakeholder perspective" suggests that besides shareholders, other groups or constituents are affected by a company's activities (such as employees or the local community), and have to be considered in managers' decisions, possibly equally with shareholders (see, for example, Freeman, 1998; Werhane and Freeman, 1999).

Elements of Social Responsibility

The two main and most commonly used instruments to put CSR activities in place are corporate giving (which does not have to be philanthropic) and corporate volunteering: By *Corporate Giving* one understands the free of charge donation of goods and services of a company to an organization in need (Maaß & Clemens, 2002). The most common tools to do this are donations and sponsorship (Osburg, 2006), which differ with regard to the agreed upon return by the receiver organization and with regard to tax issues (Gazdar & Kirchhoff, 2003; Mutz, 2002; Schrader, 2003).

Corporate Volunteering is the investment of the human resources of a company to the benefit of the society (Reichenau, 2003). One of the major benefits of corporate volunteering can be seen in the interaction between the company and stakeholders in society, thus leading to an improved integration of CSR into the overall company strategy (Reichenau, 2003). Corporate volunteering requires a much stronger civil involvement between the enterprise and its partner organization, making it a highly sustainable approach (Enquete & Kommission, 2002), but does not really exist for the higher education sector.

Different Reserches about Social Responsibility

Anshen looks at the broader view of corporate responsibility from a historical perspective. For him (1983: 98), there has always been some sort of "social contract" between business and society. Though implicit, this contract represents a strong understanding within society about the proper and ideal goals and responsibilities of business. For Anshen, society always moulds the guidelines within which business is allowed to operate so that it can derive certain benefits from the business operations undertaken in its midst.

The concept of CSR has brought another wave of change that is sweeping through business. It is instructive that this change has made leading companies that are recognized around the world, to acknowledge that there is another way of doing business. A number of companies are communicating this very message through their own involvement in work with the environmental defense fund, for example, McDonalds; by promoting fish conservation, for example, Unilever; by including references about human rights in its business principles, or by promoting ethical sourcing which Levi Strauss & Co. does. It goes without saying that bigger companies (Shell, BP, Levi Strauss, etc.) are following in the footsteps of smaller, socially active companies such as Ben & Jerry's and the Body Shop and putting corporate citizenship at the heart of strategic planning. This is, of course, where imitation finds it own place. Companies imitate the actions of others to become equally successful. Men and women must live and work together compatibly in order to increase efficiency (Kangas, 1983: 2). He says compatibility demands an ethical environment in order to function properly. These men and women are the foundation, the cause, and the reason for the existence of all social institutions. According to the European Commission's Green Paper entitled "Promoting a European Framework for

Corporate Social responsibility" (July 2001), CSR is defined as a 'concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interactions with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis'. On a simpler note, CSR are actions, which are above and beyond that required by the law. Frederick (1986: 4) summed up the position as follows: "The fundamental idea of 'corporate social responsibility' is that business corporations have an obligation to work for social betterment.

Chanda (2002) indicates that any analysis of CSR in the present context cannot avoid an understanding of the process of globalisation as marked by two distinct tendencies, one of increasing integration and interdependence and the other of increasing disintegration and dependence. Corporate globalists thus see interdependence as an opportunity not only for profit making but also for economic development amongst the developing and underdeveloped countries. According to the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, "If we cannot make globalisation work for all, in the end it will work for none. Thus it is essential to enlist the help of businesses in building the missing links in social infrastructure of the new global economy".

For Chanda (2002) globalization could lead to benchmarks, better jobs, higher standards of living, but could result in some countries being left behind, with the gap between developed and developing countries broadening to the detriment of all. Thus, two key areas need to be managed by corporations, along with governments in the process of globalisation, talents (and the mobility of people with talents in demand) and trade. Developing countries need to learn to develop and also retain talent, and that requires a revamp of much of its culture including education infrastructure, legal systems, immigration policies and management policies, while arts and entertainment facilities will need to adapt to meet changing demands and more international tastes. A free and open trade and investment environment is necessary, but achieving agreement between many countries and cultures is difficult. A harmonious symbiosis of Global-Local approach incorporating a sense of social responsibility is required by corporations to help developing countries through their transition to knowledge societies. (website)1

Governments and businesses can help each other manage the social transformation. Politicians should openly embrace the changes and use information to empower people. Flexibility is required, as is a willingness to experiment with new ideas. By using the technology now available, governments can help bring about societal breakthroughs. Business will have to work with governments in dealing with crucial and complex issues. The new ethos of corporate social responsibility, that emerges from debates world over including those under the aegis of the World Bank suggest that the difficult choices politicians often have to make in the face of varied socio-economic constraints can be facilitated by businesses. (website)2 The present-day conception of corporate social responsibility (CSR) implies that companies voluntarily integrate social and environmental concerns in their operations and interaction with stakeholders. (European Commission, 2001, p.5)

Conclusion

There has been an ongoing changes and development both in the world and in our country. These changes have also been seen in the structures of organizations. What the society expects from educational institutions and other organizations have been changing according to current conditions day by day. This situation is the main reason for that. As a result of these rapid changes the efficiency of educational institutions and the other organizations are being questioned. The quest to make business reflect a moral face by being socially responsible in its operations and interactions with the human society and the environment can be traced back to Aristotle who is famed as the first economist (Solomon, 1999,82). Increasingly CSR is analysed as a source of competitive advantage and not as an end in itself (Branco and Rodrigues, 2006). In effect, the concept of CSR has evolved from being regarded as detrimental to a company's profitability, to being considered as somehow benefiting the company as a whole, at least in the long run (see, for example, Hess, 2002; Porter and Kramer, 2002; Smith, 2003). Effective educational leaders have an ethical obligation to provide a socially responsible learning environment to meet the needs within a specific school culture while fighting the cynical expectations of the community (Duignan, 2006). Duignan (2005) found that with the increasing need for students to learn civic and social responsibility within the school day, educational leaders are looked upon to exemplify the best example of social responsibility (as cited in Duignan, 2006). This social obligation extends from the campus culture into the community where an educational leader faces high expectations of civic and social responsibility.

The role of companies in society has dramatically changed over the last years (Osburg, 2009). Organizations have been forced to review their aims and duties. If the organizations can orient themselves to these changes, they can be more powerful for the future but the opposite situation may be a frustration for them. One of the distinctive features of the organizations in this meaning is the concept of 'social responsibility'. This term has gained a very big popularity in these days. Whatever accepted from the organizations is not just thinking their own simple profits or duties. It has been also accepted to be socially responsible organizations. As the organizations consist for the soceity, they have to make some contributions to make their soceity more powerful in some ways. Appreciating the social norms, values and expectations have been critacally important for the organizations in our age. As a result of these behaviors soceity will also trust these organizations and try to make them more powerful. With these win-win policies both organizations and the soceity will be more strong for the future.

References

Andriof, J. and McIntosh, M. (2001), "Introduction", in Andriof, J. and McIntosh, M. (Eds.), Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship, Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield, pp. 13-24.

Dr. Önder ŞANLI
544 / Mehmet ALTUN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çetin TAN

EKEV AKADEMİ DERGİSİ

Anshen, M. (1983), "Changing The Social Contract: A Role for business," in Beauchamp, T.L. and Bowie, N.E. (Eds.), Ethical Theory and Business, Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, pp. 97-103.

Baxter, V. (2008). "A communitarian framework for plannin educational leadership preparation programs." Educational Planning, 17(1), 18–26.

Begley, T.M., Lee, C., Fang, Y., & Lie, J. (2001) Power distance as a moderator of the relationship between justice and employee outcomes in a sample of Chinese employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 17(8), 692–711.

Bertelsmann, S. (Ed.). (2005). Die gesellschaftliche Verantwortung von Unternehmen. Detailauswertung. Dokumentation der Ergebnisse einer Unternehmensbefragung der Bertelsmann Stiftung. Gütersloh.

Bowen, Howard R. 1953. *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, (Harper & Row, New York).

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.

Branco, M. C. and Rodrigues, L. L. (2007), "Corporate social responsibility and resource based perspectives", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 12 No. 1, p. 9.

Brennan Linda & Johnson E. Victoria, 2000. *Seventh Annual International Conference Promoting Business Ethics, 2000.Proceedings Vol. 2, pp.* 703–713

Buchholz, R. A. (1991), "Corporate Responsibility and The Good Society: From Economics to Ecology", *Business Horizons,* Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 19–31.

Burkman, A. (2010), 'The Role of Social, Civic and Political Responsibility in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs', OpenStax-CNX module: m33351

Carl, D., Gupta, V. & Javidan, M. (2004). Power distance, in R.J House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (eds.) *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 513–563), Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Carroll, A. B. (1979) "A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Social Performance", *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 497–505.

Carroll, Archie B. 1991. The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Towards the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons* (July/ August), 39–48.

Carroll, A.B. (1999), "Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct", *in Business Society*, 38; 268, Sage Publications, pp. 268–295.

Clarke, J. (1998), "Corporate social reporting: an ethical practice", in Blake, J. and Gowthorpe, C. (Eds.), Ethical issues in accounting, Routledge, London & New York, pp. 184–199.

Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995) "A Stakeholder Framework for Analysing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 92–117.

Cox, P., Brammer, S. and Milligton, A. (2004). "An Empirical Examination of Institutional Investor Preferences for Corporate Social Responsibility", *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 27-43.

David, J.L. (2009). Service learning and civic participation. *Educational Leadership,* 60(8), 83–84.

Davis, Keith. 1960. Can Business Afford to Ignore Corporate Social Responsibilities? *California Management Review* 2, 70–76.

Davis, Keith 1973. The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal* 16, 312–322.

Dentchev, N. (2005/284), Integrating Corporate Social Responsibility in Business Models, Hoveniersberg, Ghent University.

Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence and implications. *Journal of Management,* 24(3), 265–304.

Duignan, P. (2006). *Educational Leadership: Key Challenges and Ethical Tensions*. Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge Press.

Enquete and Kommission. (2002). Bürgerschaftliches Engagement: auf dem Weg in eine zukunftsfähige Bürgergesellschaft, Bericht der Enquete☐Kommission "Zukunft des bürgerschaftlichen Engagements" des Deutschen Bundestages, Deutscher Bundestag, 14. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 14/8900, Berlin.

European Commission (EC) (2001), Promoting a European framework for corporate social responsibility – Green Paper, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxemburg.

Frederick (1986: 4) Frederick, W.C. 1986. Theories of corporate social performance: Much done, more to do. Working paper, University of Pittsburg, Graduate school of Business.

Freeman, R.E. (1994). The politics of stakeholder theory: Some future directions, *Business Ethics Quarterly,* 4(4), 409–421.

Freeman, R. E. (1998), "A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation", in Pincus, L. B. (Ed.), Perspectives in business ethics, McGraw-Hill, Singapore, pp. 171–181.

Friedman, M. (1998), "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits", in Pincus, L. B. (Ed.), Perspectives in business ethics, McGraw-Hill, Singapore, pp. 246–251.

Gazdar, K., & Kirchhoff, K.R. (2003). Unternehmerische Wohltaten: Last oder Lust? Von Stakeholder Value, Corporate Citizenship und Sustainable Development bis Sponsoring. Munich: Unterschleißheim.

Habisch, A. (2003). Corporate citizenship: Gesellschaftliches Engagement von Unternehmen in Deutschland. Berlin: Springer.

Hansen, U., & Schrader, U. (2005). Corporate social responsibility als aktuelles Thema der Betriebswirtschaftslehre. In Die Betriebswirtschaft DBW, 65(4), 373–395.

Hart, D., Youniss, J., & Atkins, R. (2007). High school community service as a predictor of adult voting and volunteering. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), 197–219.

Henderson, D.: The Case Against 'Corporate Social Responsibility'. *Policy vol. 17, no. 2, 2001*

Heinze, K.L. (2005), In the Mood to Give: How and Why Positive Affect Increases the Importance of CSR to Prospective Employees, Northwestern University.

Hess, D., Rogovsky, N. and Dunfee, T. W. (2002) "The Next Wave of Corporate Community Involvement: Corporate Social Initiatives", *California Management Review*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 110–125.

Hess, F. M. & Kelly, A.P. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal preparation programs. *Teachers College Record,* 109(1), 244–274.

Husted, B. W. (2000), "A Contingency Theory of Corporate Social Performance", Business and Society, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 24–48.

Johnson, Harold. L. 1971. *Business in Contemporary Society: Framework and Issues*. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth.

Jones, Thomas. M. 1980. Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. *California Management Review* 22(2), 59–67.

Kangas, E. J. (1983). *Journal of Business Ethics* 2 127–133

Lantos, G. P. (2001) "The boundaries of strategic corporate social responsibility", *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* Vol. 18 No. 7, pp. 595–630.

Lantos, G. P. (2002) "The ethicality of altruistic corporate social responsibility", *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 205–230.

Lynch, W. (2000). A task of leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 82(3), 241–242.

Maaß, F., & Clemens, R. (2002). Corporate citizenship: Das Unternehmen als "guter Bürger". Wiesbaden: Jossey-Bass.

Marrewijk, M. V. (2003) "Conceptions and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion", *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 44 No. 2/3, pp. 95–105.

Matten, D. and Crane, A. (2003), Corporate Citizenship: Towards an extended theoretical conceptualisation, Nottingham University Business School, Nottingham University.

Matten, D., Crane, A. and Chapple, W. (2003) "Behind the Mask: Revealing the True Face of Corporate Citizenship", *Journal of Business Ethics,* Vol. 45 No. 1/2, pp. 109–120.

Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2004), 'Implicit' and 'Explicit' CSR: A Conceptual framework for understanding CSR in Europe, Nottingham University Business School, Nottingham University.

Mbare, O.(2007). 'The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the New Economy' *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 12, No. 2

Mescon, M., Bovée, L.B. and Thill, J.V. (1999), Business Today, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.

Mutz, G. (2002). Corporate Citizenship in Deutschland: Annäherung an ein zivilgesellschaftliches Konzept? Retrieved 13 April, 2004,fromhttp://fesportal. fes.de/pls/portal30/docs/FOLDER/BUERGERGESELLSCHAFT/MUTZ. HTML

Osburg, T. (2006): Grundlagen und Arten des Hochschulsponsoring. In A. Bagusat & A. Hermanns (Eds.), Management-Handbuch Bildungssponsoring. Grundlagen, Ansätze und Fallbeispiele für Sponsoren und Gesponserte (pp. 93–109). Berlin: Soringer.

Osburg, T. (2009): Nachhaltigkeit durch Fokussierung. In American Chamber of Commerce FAZ-Institut (Eds.),

Owen, J. (2007). Getting your political bearings. *Principal Leadership (Middle School Edition),* 8(2), 46–50.

Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2002) "The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy", *Harvard Business Review,* Vol. 80 No. 12, pp. 56–68.

Reichenau, J. (2003). Corporate volunteering: Neue Wege für Unternehmen in der Bürgergesellschaft. Stiftung & Sponsoring, 3, 35–37.

Schrader, U. (2003). Corporate Citizenship: Die Unternehmung als guter Bürger? Berlin: Springer.

Schreuder, H. (1978), "The Social Responsibility of Business", in Dam, C.V. and Stallaert, L.M. (Eds.), Trends in Business Ethics. Implications for Decision Making, H.E. Stenfert, Kroese, B.V.

Schwartz, M. S. and Carroll, A. B. (2003) "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Three-Domain Approach", *Business Ethics Quarterly,* Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 503–530.

Sethi, S. P. (1979) "A Conceptual Framework for Environmental Analysis of Social Issues and Evaluation of Business Response Patterns", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 63-74.

Smith, A. (1991), "The Wealth of Nations", David Campbell Publishers Ltd, London.

Smith, A. (2002), "The Wealth of Nations", in Hartman, Perspectives in Business Ethics, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, pp. 237–241.

Smith, N. C. (2003) "CSR: Whether or How?", *California Management Review,* Vol. 45 No. 4, pp. 52–76.

Solomon, R.C. (1999), "Corporate Roles, Personal Virtues. An Aristotelean Approach to Business Ethics", in Donaldson, T. and Werhane, P.H. (Eds.), Ethical Issues in Business. A Philosophical Approach, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, pp. 81–93.

Valor, C. (2005) "CSR and Corporate Citizenship: Towards Corporate Accountability", *Business and Society Review,* Vol. 110 No. 2, pp. 191–212.

Waldman, D.A., de Luque, M. S., Washburn, N., & House, R.J. (2006). Cultural and leadership predictors of corporate social responsibility values of top management: A GLOBE study of 15 countries. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 37(6), 823–837.

Walker, S.F. & Marr, J.W. Stakeholder Power, A Winning plan for building stakeholder commitment and driving corporate growth (2002)

Wartick, S. L. and Cochran, P. L. (1985) "The Evolution of the Corporate Social Performance Model", *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 758–769.

Werhane, P. H. and Freeman, R. E. (1999) "Business ethics: the state of the art", *International Journal of Management Reviews,* Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1–16.

Windsor, D. (2001), "The Future of Corporate Social Responsibility", *The International Journal of Organisation Studies*, 9 (3), 225–256.

Wood, D. J. (1991) "Corporate Social Performance Revisited", *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", *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis,* Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 229–267.

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), (2000,2002)

WEBSİTES

athttp://www.eauc.org.uk/documents/News/HE%20Benchmarking%20Project%20Report%20Final.pdf (23.02.15) 1

http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/57494/saswati-paper.pdf (23.02.15)2