

# Discovering a Wilderness of Regulatory Mechanisms for Corporate Social Responsibility: Literature Review

Ivan Bozhikin\*, Nikolay Dentchev\*\*

## Summary

The principle of voluntarism dominates Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) literature. However, this principle does not correspond with the empirical evidence of the role of governments in the CSR field. Moreover, studies discuss various regulatory mechanisms to stimulate CSR as used by government, businesses, and society. Since the debates on CSR governance are dispersed across various articles and lack systematic analysis, this paper adopts a structured literature review to study the variety of regulatory mechanisms that influence CSR. In order to explore these regulatory mechanisms, we have made an in-depth analysis of 186 practice-based articles published in the period from 2002 to 2011. These articles were selected from five journals in the CSR field. Based on these 186 empirical articles, (1) we detected 32 different regulatory mechanisms for stimulating CSR and promoting sustainable development; and (2) we offer a discussion of various examples of these mechanisms and an analysis of the effectiveness of their implementation. Based on this discussion,

we argue in favour of a plethora of various regulatory mechanisms in support of CSR.

**Keywords:** corporate social responsibility, government, regulation, business-government relations

**Jel:** M14

## 1. Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) literature is dominated by the principle of voluntarism (Dahlsrud, 2006). According to this principle, responsible business activities begin where the law ends (Carroll, 1979; McWilliams et al., 2006; Carroll and Shabana, 2010). However, various scholars argue that the principle of voluntarism is not a correct representation of the CSR reality (Richard, 2002; Tonge, Greer and Lawton, 2003; Eweje, 2005; Flanagan and Whiteman, 2007; Voliotis, 2011; Lückerath-Rovers and De Bos, 2011) as it does not reflect the involvement of regional and national governments in this topic (Matten and Moon 2008; Gond et al. 2011, Skippari and Pajunen, 2010, Albareda et al., 2007, 2008; Fox, Ward and Howard, 2002; Gond et al., 2011; Midttun, 2008). To the contrary, governments have played a material role to stimulate CSR, and a good example for this are organizations such as CSR Europe and ABIS were created upon the initiative of the European Commission (EC). In addition, government intervention is actually necessary when business organizations are unable to resolve social and environmental problems

\* UNWE, Economics Department and VUB, Department of Business

\*\* Department of Business, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and KU Leuven

(Dentchev, Haezendonck and van Balen, 2017; Bozhikin, Gechev and Dentchev, 2017, Bozhikin, 2016). Therefore we will argue in this paper that CSR initiatives are not only voluntary acts, but also the result of a variety of governmental and non-governmental regulatory mechanisms. We are building our argumentation on the growing number of scholarly studies discussing the role of governments in CSR (e.g. Dentchev, van Balen and Haezendonck, 2015; Brammer, Jackson and Matten, 2012; Lenssen, Dentchev and Roger, 2014; Williamson, Lynch-Wood and Ramsay, 2006; Gainet, 2010).

Albareda (2010) does not only present several tools used by businesses to improve their CSR. She also adds a discussion of a variety of regulatory mechanisms applied by governments to stimulate CSR and thereby stresses the need for cooperation between businesses, governmental and non-governmental actors to improve their social and environmental responsibility. In addition, Aaronson (2005) discusses the tools used by the United States government to ensure that American multinational companies act responsibly abroad. Idemudia (2010) focuses further on the role of state government and the tools applied in the field of CSR. Different state policies for CSR are also studied by Albareda et al (2008) and Albareda, Lozano and Ysa (2007). Aguilera et al. (2007) discuss various mechanisms used by different actors (employees, stakeholders, governments and NGOs) to influence social change. Gond, Kand and Moon (2011) elaborate on this argumentation and expand the variety of CSR-government relations. They present 5 configurations of CSR governance: (1) self-governance, (2) CSR facilitated by government, (3) a CSR partnership with government, (4) CSR mandated by government and (5) CSR as a form of government initiative. In addition to these governance configurations, Rasche,

Bakker and Moon (2013) distinguish between organizing complete CSR (within one firm) and organizing partial CSR (outside and among firms). Overall, there is no shortage of authors discussing the various governance mechanisms used by different actors to stimulate CSR. However, what is plainly missing in our field is a comprehensive overview of the governance mechanisms for CSR. Hence, we aim to fulfill this knowledge gap by conducting a systematic literature review.

Our research builds on Steurer's (2013) framework of CSR regulation by analysing 186 empirical papers selected from five journals in the CSR field. This will lead to a catalogue of 32 different governance mechanisms for stimulating CSR, whose effectiveness to influence social and environmental change we elaborate on. The remainder of this paper is organized in four sections. First, we discuss several types of regulations in CSR field as proposed by Steurer (2013). Secondly, we elaborate on the methodological choices we have followed in our study. Thirdly, we present different regulatory mechanisms for improving CSR and promoting sustainable development and discuss the effect generated by their implementation. Finally, we conclude this paper with conclusions and recommendations.

## 2. Steurer's typology of CSR regulation

One of the most detailed studies about how businesses (and modern society) are regulated in their CSR activities was written by Steurer (2013). He notes that the regulation can be considered as a broader term that includes all regulative mechanisms of social control (Levi-Faur 2010; Jordana and Levi-Faur 2004) implemented not only by government, but also by various business institutions and civil society. Based on this logic, Steurer

(2013) describes nine actor-based types of CSR regulation and co-regulation: (1) hard regulation and (2) soft regulation implemented by governments; (3) industry self-regulation and (4) firm self-regulation; (5) civil regulation; (6) public co-regulation (involves governments and businesses) and (7) public co-management (civil society and government actors are involved in joint management of common pool resources); (8) private co-regulation (joint regulation applied by both civil society and businesses); and (9) tripartite co-regulation (businesses, civil society and government).

Governments can apply hard and soft regulation of CSR. The main difference between soft and hard regulation is the optional character of soft regulation, which means that non-compliance does not lead to sanctions (Joseph, 2002; Steurer, 2011). Hard regulation by contrast is both compulsory and sanctionable. Moreover, CSR regulations implemented by governments have a formal character, whereas CSR regulations for businesses and civil society actors are rather informal (Idemudia, 2010, Steurer 2011).

The industry and individual companies also implement so-called business self-regulation (Albareda, 2010). Industry self-regulation is applied by a group of large companies from a particular industry or by an industry association, and is often based on the voluntary principal of CSR implementation by the affected companies (Steurer, 2013, Steurer, 2010). However, companies that are non-compliant with industry self-regulation can be excluded from some initiatives as a sanction (Christmann and Taylor 2006; Prakash and

Potoski 2007). Yet, firm self-regulation is often implemented by individual companies as a response to government, industry and civil pressure to adopt CSR initiatives (Maxwell et al. 2000, 583; Abbott and Snidal 2008; Gadenne, Kennedy and McKeiver, 2009).

Civil society can steer businesses toward CSR directly (by direct pressure on a particular company or group of companies) or indirectly (by lobbying governments to implement CSR-related policies). Direct civil society regulation is mentioned as being the more dominant one (Yaziji and Doh 2009; Lambell et al. 2008; Vogel 2010; Scherer and Palazzo 2011). Moreover, civil society regulations of CSR become more prominent when governmental regulation of CSR in a particular field is either not adequate or still absent (Zadek, 2004; Kurzer and Cooper, 2007; Porter and Ronit, 2006). After all, the three actors mentioned above (government, businesses and society) can also join forces in the so-called tripartite co-regulation. According to Steurer (2013, p.397), "co-regulation is an umbrella term for co-operative forms of steering in which actors from different societal domains aim to achieve common objectives or supply public services jointly." Steurer (2013) also listed different mechanisms that can enforce each of the above-mentioned CSR regulations (cf. table 1).

Steurer's (2013) work provides a comprehensive picture of possible CSR regulation and therefore we build on this work to present a detailed analysis of CSR governance mechanisms.

Table 1: Steurer's typology of regulation

<u>GOVERNMENT</u>	<u>BUSINESS</u>	<u>CIVIL SOCIETY</u>
<u>1. Hard regulatory instruments</u> - Laws, Decrees and Directives - Taxes - Fees - Cap-and-trade schemes	<u>3. Industry self-regulatory instruments</u> - Agreements - Standards - Codes of conduct - Audit/certification schemes - Initiatives	<u>5. Civil regulatory instruments</u> - Informal pressuring - Formal standard-setting - Civil lobbying - Initiatives and negotiating terms - Campaigns
<u>2. Soft regulatory instruments:</u> - Endorsing statements - Benchmarking reports - Brochures and guidelines - Websites and media campaigns - Green/sustainable public procurement - Soft laws without sanctions - Subsidies - Labels - Public voluntary programs	<u>4. Company self-regulatory instruments</u> - Lobbying - Environmental management systems, - Company codes of conduct - CSR strategies - Reporting on CSR - Business partners impose restraints on a firm	<u>6. Private co-regulatory instruments</u> - Certification schemes - Private-private partnerships
		<u>7. Public co-regulatory instruments</u> - Negotiated agreements - Certification schemes
		<u>8. Public co-management instruments</u> - Public-private partnerships
<u>GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS AND CIVIL SOCIETY</u> <u>9. Tripartite co-regulatory instruments</u> - Standards - Certification schemes - Partnerships		

Source: Drawn by authors based on Steurer's (2013) work

### 3. Method

To conduct this study, we have selected articles published in the five leading academic journals in the field of our research (Paul, 2004; Serenko and Bontis, 2009), viz. *Business and Society (BAS)*, *Business Ethics Quarterly (BEQ)*, *Business Ethics: A European Review (BEER)*, *Journal of Business Ethics (JBE)* and *Business Strategy and the Environment (BSE)*. We have explored these journals based on nine words proposed at two international conferences: *policy, politic, public, regulation, government, law, legislation, partnership, and rule*. These keywords provide an appropriate base to study the regulatory mechanisms of CSR-related issues. Utilizing this list of keywords, we have searched for articles from the above-mentioned five academic journals in the EBSCO database for a 30-year period, from 1982 to 2011. The keywords were flagged (both in the singular and plural) in the title and abstract of the papers.

This resulted in 1,976 articles found. After an evaluation of abstracts by 2 researchers, 703 proved relevant, viz. 67 articles in the 10-year period from 1982 to 1991, 219 from 1992 to 2001 and 417 from 2002 to 2011. In order to explore the most relevant regulatory mechanisms, we will focus on the articles published in the latter 10-year period, from 2002 to 2011. We have selected only the empirical articles from this period as we wish to explore the effectiveness of CSR governance. This reduces our sample to 186 practice-based articles: *JBE* (120 out of 186, or 64.51%), *BAS* (23 out of 186, or 12.37%), *BSE* (19 out of 186, or 10.21%); *BEER* (19 out of 186, or 10.21%), and *BEQ* (5 out of 186, or 2.7%). The large number of articles from *JBE* in our sample can be explained by the publication policy of this journal (in 2011, *JBE* published 35 issues vs. only 4 published by *BAS*). We present an overview of the sample of articles in Table 2, arranged in alphabetic order.

Table 2: *Analysed Articles in Alphabetic Order*

Abreu, 2009;	Dawkins, 2005;	Johan and Najjar, 2010;	Rivera-Lirio and Muñoz-Torres, 2010;
Ackerman et al., 2009;	Di Lorenzo, 2007;	Jovanovic and Wood, 2007;	Robertson et al., 2008;
Adam and Rachman-Moore, 2004;	Dickson and Eckman, 2008;	Kaplan and Schultz, 2007;	Rodford, 2009;
Albareda et al., 2008;	Doh, 2002;	Kennedy, 2007;	Rodriguez, 2009;
Altherr et al., 2007;	Dubbink and Van Der Putten, 2008;	Khuntia and Suar, 2004;	Rogers et al., 2005;
Andersen, 2003;	Eberlein and Matten, 2009;	Kneiding and Tracey, 2009;	Rose, 2007;
Arnold and Hartman, 2005;	Egels-Zandén and Hyllman, 2006;	Kolk and Pinkse, 2007;	Rothenberg, 2004;
Arvidsson, 2010;	Egels-Zandén, 2009;	Konrad et al., 2006;	Runhaar et al., 2008;
Bajo et al., 2009;	Enticott and Walker, 2008;	Laudal, 2010;	Sardžoska and Tang, 2009;
Barboza and Trejos, 2009;	Entwistle et al., 2006;	Le Ber and Branzei, 2010;	Schuler et al., 2002;
Barkemeyer, 2009;	Everett et al., 2008;	Lecker, 2009;	Schwartz, 2006;
Baughn et al., 2010;	Eweje, 2005;	Lennerfors, 2009;	Seppala, 2009;
Beard, 2003;	Eweje, 2006;	Lennerfors, 2007;	Siddiqui, 2010;
Bedicks, 2005;	Fang et al., 2010;	Lewis, 2008;	Skippari and Pajunen, 2010;
Beets, 2005;	Firth et al., 2005;	Lindgreen, 2004;	Smith and Crotty, 2008;
Beggs and Dean, 2007;	Fisher and Downes, 2008;	Lorenzo et al., 2010;	Smith-Hillmann, V.: 2007;
Bender and Moir, 2006;	Flanagan and Whiteman, 2007;	Lückerath-Rovers and de Bos, 2011;	Sogaard and Madsen, 2007;
Benson et al., 2011;	Fowler et al., 2007;	Lund-Thomsen, 2009;	Starik and Heuer, 2002;
Berg and Fryer-Edwards, 2008;	Freeman and Hasnaoui, 2011;	Malloy and Agarwal, 2010;	Suar and Khuntia, 2010;
Bled, 2010;	Frenkel and Lurie, 2003;	Mathis, 2007;	Taylor and Curtis, 2010;
Blumentritt, 2003;	Fukukawa et al., 2007;	Mayer, 2007;	Tencati et al., 2004;
Blumentritt and Rehbein, 2007;	Gadenne et al., 2009;	McCraw et al., 2009;	Tian et al., 2009;
Borg and Stranahan, 2005;	Gainet, 2010;	McGee et al., 2008;	Tonge et al., 2003;
Bowie and Jamal, 2006;	Gendron, 2003;	McGee, 2008;	Vaiman et al., 2011;
Broussine and Miller, 2005;	Glachant et al., 2002;	Meznar, 2005;	Valentine et al., 2006;
Buchan, 2005;	Goode and Cruise, 2006;	Mitchell et al., 2009;	van Zolingen and Honders, 2010;
Cai and Wheale, 2009;	Graafland, 2004;	Mullin, 2002;	Voliotis, 2011;
Calkins, 2009;	Greer and Tonge, 2006;	Murillo and Lozano, 2009;	Vuontisjärvi, 2006;
Campbell and Mínguez-Vera, 2008;	Griffin and Dunn, 2004;	Muthuri and Gilbert, 2011;	Wagner, 2009;
Canary and Jennings, 2008;	Grosvold et al., 2007;	Norén and von Malmborg, 2004;	Wagner, 2010;
Cantó-Milà and Lozano, 2009;	Groves et al., 2011;	Nyquist, 2003;	Wander and Malone, 2007;
Carlson et al., 2011;	Gupta et al., 2004;	Omurgonulsen and Oktem, 2009;	Wang, 2005;
Chen et al., 2009;	Habisch et al., 2011;	Park et al., 2005;	Warren, 2009;
Chen et al., 2008;	Haigh and Guthrie, 2009;	Park-Poaps and Rees, 2010;	Wieland, 2005;
Chih et al., 2010;	Haigh and Guthrie, 2010;	Paul and Mukhopadhyay, 2010;	Wilhelm, 2002;
Cho et al., 2006;	Halter et al., 2009;	Peeples et al., 2009;	Williamson et al., 2006;
Chun, 2009;	Herron and Gilbertson, 2004;	Pelletier and Bligh, 2006;	Wilson et al., 2010;
Chung and Trivedi, 2003;	Holder-Webb et al., 2008;	Pelletier and Bligh, 2008;	Wilson, et al., 2011;
Clarke and Fuller, 2010;	Hong, 2002;	Pol and de Bakker, 2010;	Winstanley et al., 2002;
Collins, 2009;	Hou and Moore, 2010;	Preuss, 2007;	Winter et al., 2004;
Collins et al., 2009;	Houghton et al., 2009;	Quaak et al., 2007;	Woll, 2007;
Cooley, 2003;	Huang and Snell, 2003;	Reast et al., 2010;	Woodward and Day, 2006;
Cordano et al., 2004;	Huang and Su, 2009;	Reed, 2009;	Worthington et al., 2008;
Criado-Jiménez et al., 2008;	Hudson, 2007;	Rein and Stott, 2009;	Wu, 2009;
Dahan and Gittens, 2010;	Jia et al., 2009;	Richards et al., 2004;	Yang et al., 2009;
Dawkins, 2002;	Jing and Graham, 2008;	Richardson, 2008;	Zamoon and Curley, 2008;
			Zapata, 2009;
			Zolingen and Honders, 2010

Source: *Drawn by authors*

We have read all 186 of these papers, aiming at a comprehensive overview of regulatory mechanisms used in the CSR field. The coding procedure followed the logic for regulatory mechanisms introduced in the studies by Aaronson (2005), Aguilera et al (2007), Albareda (2010) and Steurer (2013). In other words, we consider a regulatory mechanism as a formal (within an official legal framework) or informal (without a legal framework) tool used by different actors from various domains (government, social and business) for stimulating CSR. After the

identification of the regulatory mechanism, we have looked for evidence suggesting the effect of the implementation of this mechanism (a positive, negative or neutral effect). Such an effect should be clearly pointed out in the article.

#### 4. Results

Based on the above-mentioned sample of 186 empirical articles, we present different regulatory mechanisms stimulating CSR, while we also classify their effectiveness based on Steurer's (2013) typology (cf. table 3).

**Table 3: Summary of Results**

Nº	Type of regulations	Regulatory mechanisms	Example	Effect
1	<i>Hard regulations implemented by government</i>	<b>Act and legislative action</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Australian Financial Services Reform Act (Haig and Guthrie, 2009)</li> <li>SOX Act in USA (Entwistle, Feltham and Mbagwu, 2006)</li> <li>Producer responsibility legislation in UK (Wilson, Williams and Kemp, 2010)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Australian Financial Services Reform Act had negative effect on the firms self-reporting.</li> <li>The SOX Act was found both necessary and effective.</li> <li>Low levels of compliance with producer responsibility legislation by UK SME. Therefore, the implementation of this legislation was not effective.</li> </ul>
		<b>Taxes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Borg and Stranahan, 2005</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lottery tax has positive effect for society.</li> </ul>
		<b>Penalties</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smith-Hillmann, 2007</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Penalties act as a deterrent to unethical behaviour in UK toy industry, i.e. positive effect.</li> </ul>
		<b>Mandatory Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social, Ethical and Environmental Reporting Standard implemented in Spain in 2002 (Criado-Jiménez et al., 2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEER Standard increased the volume and quality of Social, Ethical and Environmental Reporting. However, there were a significant numbers of firms that non-compliance with SEER standard.</li> </ul>
		<b>Affirmative action programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affirmative programme in Norway on gender equality in BoD (Grosvold, 2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programmes considerably accelerated the growth in female board representation, i.e. a positive effect.</li> </ul>
2	<i>Soft regulations implemented by government</i>	<b>Environmental policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biofuels policy and programme in Brazil (Zapata, 2009)</li> <li>Chemicals policy (Richards, Glegg and Cullinane, 2004)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biofuels policy and programme stimulated production and consumption of biofuels, i.e. a positive effect.</li> <li>UK chemicals policy contributed to decreasing of pollution from UK chemical industry. However, the policy was under some criticisms.</li> </ul>
		<b>Green Subsidies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zapata, 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green subsidies stimulated production and consumption of biofuels in Brazil and therefore contributed to sustainable development (Positive effect in short term).</li> </ul>
		<b>National and Local Procurement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preuss, 2007</li> <li>Executive Order of US federal government (Starik and Heuer, p.226, 2002)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preuss (2007) concluded that the effect of local government procurement in England in terms of achievement sustainable development was patchy.</li> <li>Through this order, the US federal government aimed to increase the use of environmentally friendly products and decreased the consumption of paper by US government agencies. However, the compliance with this policy has been insufficient.</li> </ul>
		<b>Environmental programmes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The US Environmental Protection Agency Green Lights programme (Starik and Heuer, 2002 p.225)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme prevented 46.9 billion pounds of CO2 from being released into the atmosphere and have saved more than \$2.2 billion from energy efficiency.</li> </ul>

## Articles

Nº	Type of regulations	Regulatory mechanisms	Example	Effect
3	<i>Industry self-regulations</i>	<b>CSR Standards and CSR potential</b>	• Laudal, 2010	• Firms in sectors with a high CSR potential have a bigger responsibility for CSR than firms in sectors with a low CSR potential.
		<b>Industry initiative</b>	• 'Responsible Care' initiative (Richards, Glegg and Cullinane, 2004)	• This initiative contributed to environmental improvements, but insufficiently. Hence, chemical policy and legislations were implemented by UK government.
4	<i>Firms self-regulations / or regulation implemented by public owned companies, private owned companies or mix owned companies /</i>	<b>Political spending and lobbying</b>	• Tonge, Greer and Lawton, 2003	• Political spending and lobbying by the American company Enron had negative impact on its CSR.
		<b>Stakeholder relations management</b>	• Konrad and et al, 2006	• Stakeholder relations management indeed promotes sustainable development.
		<b>Code of conduct/ code of ethics</b>	• Graafland , 2004 • Lückerrath-Rovers and De Bos, 2011	• The code of conduct sets out the principles for good conduct and attitude. However, code should contain not only rules, but also values that motivate a change in attitude. Governments and sector organizations are also important for creating of good conduct and attitude as well.
		<b>Annual report/ Disclosures/ Environmental disclosure</b>	• Criado-Jime'nez et al., 2008; Entwistle, Feltham and Mbagwu, 2006; Quaak, Aalbers and Goedee, 2007; Haig and Guthrie, 2009; • Holder-Webb, L., et al., 2008	• Environmental disclosure contributes to influence social and environmental change. However, many companies have continued reporting only positive information related to their environmental performance and hiding negative information. Therefore, government intervention is necessary
		<b>Whistleblowing procedures</b>	• Lewis, 2008	• Whistleblowing is an important mechanism that it is used for fight against corruption. Whistleblowing procedures help for improving CSR as well. However, whistleblowers are not adequately protected by both companies and UK government.
		<b>Environmental management system /EMS/</b>	• Norén and Malmberg, 2004 • Wagner, 2007	• EMS helps for the reduction of the carbon footprint of companies. It also makes company management more efficient. However, not all companies implemented it.
5	<i>Civil regulation</i>	<b>Strike/ Protest</b>	• Eweje, 2006	• The protests and information campaigns done by host communities in the Niger Delta region improved environmental and social responsibility of multinational oil enterprises operating there.
		<b>Campaigns</b>	• Eweje, 2006	• Information campaigns reduced environmental pollutions in the Niger Delta and led to incorporation of environmental impact assessments into corporate strategy of MNEs operating there.
		<b>Public code of conduct</b>	• Graafland, 2004, p. 138	• Public code of conduct contributes for improve codes of conduct implemented by Dutch firms.
		<b>NGO pressure</b>	• Skippari and Pajunen, 2010	• Protection of local people and environment in Uruguay.

Nº	Type of regulations	Regulatory mechanisms	Example	Effect
6	Private co-regulation	<b>Union-NGO Relationships</b>	• Egels-Zandén and Hyllman, 2006	• Co-ordination relationships between NGOs and unions result in a widening of the definition of corporate responsibility for workers' rights in Sweden.
		<b>Society-NGO Partnerships</b>	• Collins, 2009	• Society-NGO Partnership protected environment and water from pollution in El Salvador in Central America. Protection of social health.
7	Public co-management	<b>Government-society partnership</b>	• Abreu, 2009 • Eweje, 2006	• Government-society partnership increased environmental responsibility of firms.
8	Public co-regulation	<b>Public-private partnerships</b>	• Lund-Thomsen, 2009	• Public-private partnership improved environmental protection but caused social problems in Pakistan.
9	Tripartite co-regulation	<b>Partnerships</b>	• Flanagan and Whiteman, 2007	• Price reduction of HIV medications in Brazil (Positive effect)
10	Supranational regulation	<b>Declarations</b>	• The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948 (Frenkel and Lurie, 2003)	• The force of this Declaration is in its inspiration as opposed to its enforcement, since it doesn't set legal obligations. In addition, some of the rights laid down in the Declaration were not properly applied in employee-employer relationship in Israel.
		<b>Conventions</b>	• OECD anti-bribery convention (Baughn et al, 2010)	• OECD anti-bribery convention contributes to decrease the willingness of multinational companies to provide bribe abroad.
		<b>Global initiatives</b>	• UN Global Compact (Barkemeyer, 2009) • UN CSR Initiatives (Seppala, 2009)	• UN CSR initiatives are not so strong regulatory mechanisms for addressing some of the most pressing developmental challenges ( Human rights and labour rights)
		<b>EUstate-aid policies</b>	• State-aid policies for the European industry (Rivera-Lirio and Muñoz-Torres, 2010)	• State-aid policies did not lead to significant improvement of social and environmental responsibility of companies operating in European manufacturing industry.
		<b>EU Directives and Acts</b>	• The EU end of life vehicles directive (Smith and Crotty, 2008) • The European Act on Public Procurement (Lennerfors, p. 382, 2007)	• The directive has not driven product innovation beyond the short-term period. • European Act on Public Procurement might be recognized "not only as fighting corruption, but also to some extent fighting quality and professionalism."

Source: Drawn by authors based on the information gathered

#### 4.1. Regulatory mechanisms implemented by government

In our sample of articles, there are eight regulative CSR mechanisms implemented by governmental legislative action, mandatory standards, taxes, penalties (fees), affirmative action programmes (or environmental programmes), environmental policy, green subsidies, and local government procurement. They were divided into two groups, i.e. hard and soft regulatory

mechanisms according to Steurer's (2013) framework.

##### Hard regulatory mechanisms

Corporate disclosure of CSR activities is often mentioned in our sample of articles as a hard regulatory mechanism. One of the reasons for this is explained by the various failures to disclose voluntarily during the last decades. Enron, for example, failed to disclose its wrongdoing in a misrepresentation in its financial statements, which led to the bankruptcy of



the company, with huge economic losses to society (Tonge, Greer and Lawton, 2003; Lückerath-Rovers and De Bos, 2011). Many disclosure regulations followed in the United States and elsewhere. Overall, our sample reveals examples of government intervention in corporate disclosure, some with a positive effect towards stimulating CSR (Criado-Jiménez et al., 2008; Entwistle, Feltham and Mbagwu, 2006; Quaak, Aalbers and Goedee, 2007) and others with a negative effect (Haig and Guthrie, 2009; Lewis, 2008; Greer and Tongen, 2006).

Criado-Jiménez et al., (2008) analysed the Spanish Social, Ethical and Environmental Reporting (SEER) standard. This mandatory standard obliges organizations to make environmental disclosures in their financial statements, and the authors noted an increase in both the volume and quality of SEER disclosures. Yet, they also mentioned that there is potential for improvement by increasing the compliance with this standard. In addition, many companies reported only positively on CSR and did not report any negative information. The studies of Entwistle, Feltham and Mbagwu (2006) and Quaak, Aalbers and Goedee, (2007) also provide evidence for the positive effect of disclosure-related regulatory measures. Entwistle, Feltham and Mbagwu (2006) studied the SOX Act<sup>3</sup> (Sarbanes–Oxley Act) of 2002 in the USA. They found that this Act substantially reduced misleading disclosure practices by US companies included in the S&P 500<sup>4</sup> (Standard & Poor's 500). They also pointed out that the SOX Act decreased the careless behaviour of managers, and in some cases stopped their misleading reporting practices. Hence, the Act was described as necessary and effective.

<sup>3</sup> Also known as the „Public Company Accounting Reform and Investor Protection Act“ that set new requirements for all public company boards, management and public accounting companies in the USA.

<sup>4</sup> It is an American stock market index based on the market capitalizations of 500 large companies.

Moreover, Holder-Webb et al. (2008) even assert that mandatory disclosures lead to better results than voluntary ones.

Yet, there are also authors who argue the opposite, i.e. that particular government regulations have a negative impact on corporate disclosure (Haig and Guthrie 2009; Lewis, 2008; Greer and Tongen, 2006). According to Haig and Guthrie (2009), the Australian Financial Services Reform Act had a negative effect on the company's self-reporting due to the regulatory *laissez-faire* approach.<sup>5</sup> Lewis (2008) assesses the operation of the UK's Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 (PIDA 1998) during its first 10 years and considers its implications for the whistle-blowing process<sup>6</sup>. He pointed out that whistle blowers are not adequately protected by this Act. In other words, the effectiveness of this Act is diminished due to corporate opposition to regulation and a regulatory *laissez-faire* approach of legislation.

Other examples for hard government intervention are related to a multitude of CSR topics: gender diversity on the board (Grosvold, 2007), oligopolistic price setting (Smith-Hillmann, 2007), producer responsibility for electronic devices waste and its packaging (Wilson, Williams and Kemp, 2010), environmental legislation (Wilson, Williams and Kemp, 2011), and green lights and energy efficiency (Starik and Heuer, 2002).

Grosvold (2007) explored gender diversity in the boardroom in the United Kingdom and Norway. While the Norwegian government has adopted legislative initiatives to set a minimum quota of 40% women on the board of directors, the British only stimulated a voluntary adoption of

<sup>5</sup> While governments can provide a direction for CSR improvement, it is up to the businesses to realize them. This is, however, not always the case, leaving the regulatory intervention as meaningless.

<sup>6</sup> Collins Dictionary: "Whistle-blowing is the act of telling the authorities or the public that the organization you are working for is doing something immoral or illegal".

increasing the number of female members on these boards. Grosvold (2007) found that affirmative action programmes in Norway significantly increased female representation in the boardroom in contrast to the United Kingdom. Hence, this is an example of a hard regulatory mechanism with positive impact. Smith-Hillmann (2007) discussed how collusion between retailers and suppliers in the UK toy industry led to higher average prices. As a result, customers had to pay a premium price, and thus regulatory bodies were seen as a means to protect the public interest. Wilson, Williams and Kemp (2010) studied how UK small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) comply with legislation on waste of electronic devices and their packaging. They saw non-compliance with these legislations being quite common due to the following reasons: (1) many SMEs were not aware of environmental requirements, (2) insufficient supervision by enforcement bodies, and (3) fines for non-compliance were not high enough. Moreover, Wilson, Williams and Kemp (2011) pointed out that the compliance with and therefore the effectiveness of environmental legislation could be heightened by increasing the frequency of the audits and inspections of small and medium-sized enterprises by government authorities. Starik and Heuer (2002) studied the implementation of several environmental policies (i.e. green lights energy efficiency policy, weatherization policy) formulated by the US government. The green lights energy efficiency program, for example, purported to have decreased the amount of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere. After all, environmental policies implemented by national governments are also important mechanisms for stimulating CSR, while examples of these regulation mechanisms are legislation, taxes, subsidies, and sanctions (Zapata, 2009; Richards, Glegg and Cullinane, 2004).

### Soft regulatory mechanisms

Soft regulations are by definition not compulsory (Joseph, 2002; Steurer, 2011). Three soft regulatory mechanisms are noteworthy: local government procurement (Preuss, 2007), green subsidies (Zapata, 2009) and environmental programmes (Starik and Heuer, 2002). Preuss (2007) noted that a significant part of the GDP (Gross Domestic Product) of developing countries (between 8% and 25%) is spent by local government. Hence, local government procurement is an important instrument to address the challenges of social responsibility. In another note, Starik and Heuer (2002, p.226) discussed the importance of government subsidies for achieving social responsibility in the United States, referring to the Executive Order of the US federal government. With this order, the US federal government aimed to increase the use of environmentally friendly products such as recycled paper and decrease the overall consumption of paper by US government agencies. Since the compliance with this policy has been insufficient, the policy is not considered effective. On the other hand, Zapata (2009) studied Brazil's experience with biofuels, i.e. a fuel that is produced through contemporary biological processes, i.e. anaerobic and/or agricultural digestion. Apparently, the Brazilian government has implemented a series of economic incentive instruments (i.e. tax reduction, creation of a specific financial mechanism for biodiesel producers) to stimulate production and consumption of biofuels, which has resulted in a significant growth.

### **4.2. Regulatory mechanisms implemented by industry and companies**

Industrial organizations and individual companies can also implement regulatory mechanisms for CSR, known as business self-regulatory mechanisms. Based on

our sample of articles, we have found two regulatory mechanisms implemented by industry (CSR standards and potential; industry initiative) and seven implemented by companies (political spending and lobbying; stakeholder relations management; code of conduct/ethics; disclosures; whistle-blowing procedures; environmental management system; micro-credit programs and group lending). These are discussed below.

*Industry self-regulatory mechanisms*

Industry self-regulatory mechanisms are often voluntary. We have identified only two self-regulatory mechanisms in our sample: standards (Laudal, 2010) and industry initiatives (Richards, Glegg and Cullinane, 2004) in support of CSR. Laudal (2010) explored the CSR potential of the international rag trade, focusing on the CSR potential of garment retail in developed countries. He argues that international CSR standards in clothing companies in developed countries is higher, as most of these standards are not legally enforceable in developing countries.

Richards, Glegg and Cullinane (2004) studied the policy mechanisms to decrease pollution by the UK chemicals industry. They have noted that the chemical industry contributes to environmental improvements via the 'Responsible Care' initiative, which proves quite useful for improving of health, environmental performance and security.

*Firm self-regulatory mechanisms*

Firm self-regulatory mechanisms are often applied by individual companies as a response to government, industry and civil pressure for CSR improvement (Maxwell et al. 2000; Abbott and Snidal 2008; Gadenne, Kennedy and McKeiver, 2009). Furthermore, company ownership (public, private or mixed) also has an impact on the level of CSR (Chun, 2009; Hou and Moore, 2010). We have identified the following firm self-regulatory mechanisms: codes of

conduct (Lückerath-Rovers and De Bos, 2011; Graafland, 2004); whistle-blowing procedures (Lewis, 2008); environmental management system (Norén and Malmborg, 2004); micro-credit programs and donations (Barboza and Trejos, 2009); political spending and lobbying (Tonge and et al, 2003; Woll, 2007); and stakeholder relations management (Konrad and et al, 2006). Selected examples for the effect of their use are provided below.

Lückerath-Rovers and De Bos (2011) studied the code of conduct for non-executive and supervisory directors. It sets out the principles for good conduct and attitude. In addition, the two scholars noted that a code of conduct may contribute to the further professionalization of directors of companies. Graafland (2004) discussed the usefulness of codes of conduct in the Dutch construction company Heijmans. He noted that, in general, the CEO (Chief Executive Officer) considered such codes of conduct as useless. However, after public pressure was brought to bear on the Dutch firm following unethical behaviour (fixing prices through cartels), the codes of conduct became adopted and did prove their worth. In this context, both stakeholder pressure and government regulation stimulated self-regulatory mechanisms. Yet, Konrad et al (2006) argue that although stakeholder management supports CSR, it is no alternative to government regulation. The need for government regulation with respect to firm self-regulation is also discussed in the case of whistle-blowing. Lewis (2008) noted that whistle blowers are not adequately protected, neither by companies nor by the UK government.

Norén and Malmborg (2004) researched the applicability of standardized environmental management systems (EMSs) in local authorities and municipally-owned companies. They conducted qualitative interviews with public officers in

two municipalities in Sweden. Based on this study, they argued that standardized EMSs improved the environmental management in municipally-owned companies as EMS facilitated the reduction of the carbon footprint of the publicly-owned companies. Elsewhere, Barboza and Trejos (2009) studied micro-credit programs, group lending and donation as important instruments for poverty reduction in Mexico. The two scientists studied 2,151 participations who have benefited from good credit conditions provided by the micro-credit programs<sup>7</sup> in Chiapas, México.

Political spending and lobbying are another type of self-regulatory mechanisms by which some companies strive to escape from social responsibility (Tonge et al, 2003; Woll, 2007). In this context, Zhilong, Taïeb and Wei (2009) argue that companies implement two basic patterns of political strategy: accommodating or defying strategies with respect to government policies. The authors uncovered that accommodating strategies are implemented more frequently where the relationship with the government is well established and formalized. Defying strategies, on the other hand, are used more commonly when companies are larger and have more social and institutional capital. Zhilong, Taïeb and Wei (2009) noted that the larger and more established firms could more easily challenge existing legislation and pressurize governments into modifying it. Other authors also focus on the political strategy adopted by companies (Taïeb and Wei, 2009; Abreu, 2009; Meznar and Johnson, 2005; Blumentritt, 2003).

#### 4.3. Civil society regulatory mechanisms

Our review identified the following four civil society regulatory mechanisms

<sup>7</sup> They have achieved what the government authorities and traditional financial institutions have not been able to, i.e. poverty reduction through lending to the poor as well as significant loan recuperation.

on CSR: strike or protest (Eweje, 2006); campaigns (Eweje, 2006); non-governmental organization (NGO) pressure (Skippari and Pajunen, 2010).

Eweje (2006) focused on the social and environmental impact of multinational oil enterprises operating in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Local communities in the Niger Delta have taken action to reduce environmental pollution and to improve the social responsibility of multinationals operating in the region. Environmentalist NGOs have also put pressure on these companies with an international campaign accusing of environmental degradation in their host communities. Moreover, the government of Nigeria has also taken action, arguing for social and environmental responsibility of multinationals. As result of all this stakeholder pressure, multinational oil enterprises put more effort into improving their CSR initiatives, and reducing their negative footprint. In addition, Egels-Zandén (2009) argues further that one of the basic reasons for international framework agreements to become adopted by corporations is trade union pressure. So, trade union movements contribute to the improvement of social responsibility of transnational corporations.

Gainet (2010) argues that large companies may pay more explicit attention to social and environmental issues, as opposed to their smaller counterparts, since these larger companies are more exposed to heavy societal pressure. Moreover, Abreu (2009) noted that key factors for increasing the environmental responsibility of firms are associated with the pressure of society and the overall perception of environmental risk. Skippari and Pajunen (2010) have also contributed to the debate on civil society pressure. They suggested that in the FDI (foreign direct investment) context the relationships between multinational enterprises (MNEs), NGOs, and host

governments are closely interlinked. This argument was illustrated with the case of Botnia, a multinational that wanted to invest in Uruguay. Both the company and the Uruguay's government had an economic interest in an investment project in a pulp mill. However, they did not take into account the environmental interests of society, which were represented by NGOs. Conflict between environmental, socio-economic, business and political interests led to the failure of this investment project. This case illustrates the potential conflicts of interest between government, NGOs and companies.

#### 4.4. Co-regulatory mechanisms

Relationships between business, government and civil society result in cooperation and in the implementation of various co-regulatory mechanisms. Based on our sample of articles, we detected (1) two private co-regulatory mechanisms, i.e. union-NGO relationship (Egels-Zandén and Hyllman, 2006) and society-NGO partnership (Collins, 2009), (2) two public co-regulatory mechanisms, i.e. government-society partnership (Abreu, 2009; Eweje, 2006) and public-private partnership (Lund-Thomsen, 2009) and (3) one tripartite co-regulatory mechanism (Flanagan and Whiteman, 2007; Lund-Thomsen, p. 67, 2009), which are further discussed below.

##### Private co-regulatory mechanisms

Collins (2009) studied the failure of a Canadian multinational to invest in a gold mining development in El Salvador in Central America. The company contacted the US government in order to obtain a license for this activity. Both the US government and the Canadian multinational had economic interests in the realization of the investment, but the license was not granted due to public and NGO pressure. By cooperating, local communities and NGOs have stopped the investment project by focusing on the

environmental and social threats resulting from its implementation, such as surface area damage, acid drainage, cyanide harming the environment and spreading throughout the region by rainfall, pollution of the water.

Egels-Zandén and Hyllman (2006) studied the effects of union-NGO relationships on corporate responsibility. For this reason, they explored the Swedish garment retailers' responsibility for workers' rights at their suppliers' factories. They stated that trade unions and NGOs are key factors in regulating and widening the definition of workers' rights on an international stage. They found that union-NGO relationships as a whole had a positive effect on transnational company responsibilities for workers' rights. Cooperation is discovered to be more beneficial for both unions and NGOs as opposed to any other form of conflictual relationships.

##### Public co-regulatory mechanisms

Lund-Thomsen (2009) tried to assess the impact of public-private partnerships in developing countries. For this purpose, he focused on the case of the Kasur tanneries pollution control project in Pakistan. The aim of this project was to reduce environmental pollution and improve workers' security in the tannery industry by the construction of a treatment plant, the establishment of a solid-waste collection and disposal system, and training for tannery workers related to occupational health and safety. The project was funded by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the government of Pakistan and the Kasur Tanneries Association. This resulted in improved environmental protection by firms operating in the tannery industry in Pakistan. However, the project overlooked important economic concerns: many tannery companies lost out to the competition over the years and were threatened with bankruptcy. This situation put

many tannery workers at risk of losing their jobs and being reduced to poverty. Therefore, Lund-Thomsen (2009) concluded that in the public-private partnerships, win-win and win-lose outcomes may exist simultaneously. In addition, government-society partnerships also increase the environmental responsibility of firms (Abreu, 2009; Eweje, 2006).

#### Tripartite co-regulatory mechanisms

Flanagan and Whiteman (2007) analysed the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Brazil regarding the access to cheaper HIV-medication. A public HIV-disaster had been spreading around the country and a drastic price reduction of AIDS-medication was needed. However, global pharmaceutical companies refused to lower the price of the drugs combating HIV/AIDS. Therefore, the Brazilian government took action: it negotiated with global companies, the US and the World Bank to achieve lower drug prices. As a result, together with the Brazilian pharmaceutical companies, public and international organizations, the Brazilian government has managed to achieve a price reduction for HIV-medication.

In another example, Lund-Thomsen (2009, p. 67) pointed out that a public-private partnership between the United Nations Children's Fund, the International Labor Organization, NGOs, multinational companies, and Pakistani manufacturers in the soccer ball industry stopped the recruitment and exploitation of child labour in the industry. However, this partnership also had some negative consequences such as a reduction of income for some women.

The tripartite co-regulation in the typology of Steurer (2013) could accommodate governance mechanisms of some supranational organisations. Yet, his typology did not devote an explicit category to supranational regulation, which our sample of articles made clear is needed. Hence, we will present such a category separately below.

#### **4.5. Regulatory mechanisms implemented by supranational organisations**

The most often-used supranational regulatory mechanisms that we found in our sample of articles are the following: declarations (Frenkel and Lurie, 2003), conventions (Baughn et al, 2010), global initiatives (Barkemeyer, 2009; Seppala, 2009), EU Directives and Acts (Smith and Crotty, 2008; Lennerfors, 2007), and EU state-aid policies (Rivera-Lirio and Muñoz-Torres, 2010). Supranational regulatory mechanisms can be divided into "soft" (declarations; conventions; global initiatives) and "hard" regulatory mechanisms (EU directives).

Frenkel and Lurie (2003) focused on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and pointed to its inspirational value versus its limited enforceability, since it does not have legal status. Moreover, the two scholars studied how the standards for a tolerant global society set by this Declaration were applied in the Israeli industry. They concluded that some of the rights laid down in the Declaration (equal pay and privacy) were not properly applied in employee-employer relationships in Israel. In support of their argument, Barkemeyer (2009) emphasized that the UN Global Compact does not provide strong regulatory mechanisms for addressing some of the most pressing developmental challenges (anti-corruption measures, labour rights). This point is well voiced by Seppala (2009, p.401): "the extension of the international regime of human rights to companies has not changed the essentially state-centric nature of the regime."

Baughn (2010) analysed the tendency of companies to become involved in international bribery. He found that international bribery was at its lowest when a country had signed the OECD (The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) anti-bribery

convention and did not tolerate bribery. Lennerfors (2007) also contributed to the debate on corruption by discussing the European Act on Public Procurement, with particular focus on the Swedish context. He concluded that the European Act on Public Procurement might be recognized “not only as fighting corruption, but also to some extent fighting quality and professionalism” (Lennerfors, 2007 p. 382).

Rivera-Lirio and Muñoz-Torres (2010) studied the effectiveness of the state-aid policies for the European industry and whether these policies contribute to sustainable development and better corporate social responsibility. They found that the European Union state-aid for the European manufacturing industry has not led to any significant improvement of social and environmental responsibility of companies, and therefore, contributed little to sustainable development. On the other hand, Smith and Crotty (2008) focused on environmental regulation as a driver for product and technology innovation. To find out whether environmental regulation can stimulate the application of green innovation, they studied the impact of the EU end-of-life vehicles

directive on the UK automotive component manufacturers. The two scientists concluded that this directive has not driven product innovation beyond the short term.

**5. Discussion and concluding remarks**

Based on our sample of 186 practice-oriented articles, we found 32 different regulatory mechanisms in support of CSR (cf. table 4). The majority of these mechanisms are implemented by governments (9 out of 32), firms (7 out of 32), supranational organizations (5 out of 32) and civil society (4 out of 32). Furthermore, our 32 regulatory mechanism can be complemented by three other co-regulatory mechanisms, viz. certification schemes (Cummins, 2004; Greenpeace, 2009; Wright, 2012, 2004); negotiated agreements (Darnall and Sides, 2008; Bressers, de Bruijn and Lulofs, 2009), standards (Ward, 2012, 2011), and on the other hand by four more industry self-regulatory mechanisms, viz; agreements, standards (Rasche, Bakker and Moon, 2013), codes of conduct and audit/certification schemes (Steurer, 2013). These additional seven regulatory mechanisms were not found in our sample of articles, but they were part of the Steurer (2013) framework.

**Table 4:** 32 regulatory mechanisms for CSR

<p><b>1. Supranational regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Declarations;</li> <li>-Conventions;</li> <li>-Global initiatives;</li> <li>-EU state-aid policies;</li> <li>-EU Directives and Acts.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3. Soft regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Subsidies;</li> <li>- National and Local Government Procurement;</li> <li>-Environmental programmes;</li> </ul>	<p><b>6. Civil regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strike/ Protest</li> <li>- Campaigns</li> <li>- Public code of conduct</li> <li>- NGO pressure</li> </ul>
	<p><b>4. Industry self-regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initiative;</li> <li>- CSR Standards and CSR potential;</li> </ul>	<p><b>7. Private co-regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Union-NGO Relationships</li> <li>- Society-NGO Partnerships</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Hard regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Act and legislative action;</li> <li>- Taxes;</li> <li>- Mandatory Standards;</li> <li>- Programmes;</li> <li>- Penalties;</li> <li>- Environmental policy;</li> </ul>	<p><b>5. Company self-regulation mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political spending and lobbying;</li> <li>- Code of conduct/ code of ethics;</li> <li>- Annual reports/Disclosures;</li> <li>- Environmental management system;</li> <li>- Micro Credit programs and donation;</li> <li>- Stakeholder relations management;</li> <li>- Whistleblowing procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>8. Public co-regulatory mechanisms and public co-management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Public-private partnerships</li> <li>- Government-society partnership</li> </ul>
		<p><b>9. Tripartite co-regulatory mechanisms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partnership</li> </ul>

-- Regulatory mechanisms detected by us in our sample. -- Regulatory mechanisms detected by Steurer (2013) as well as us.

Source: Drawn by authors based on the information gathered

While building on Steurer's (2013) framework, we have contributed to the field with clear examples of 32 regulatory mechanisms for CSR governance and have discussed their effectiveness. Moreover, we have extended Steurer's (2013) framework with the supranational level of analysis (cf. also Midttun, 2008; Dentchev, van Balen and Haezendonck, 2015; Lenssen, Dentchev and Roger, 2014; Hoessle, 2014). These transnational organizations implement supranational regulation for promoting sustainable development and CSR. They can be included in a fourth societal domain entitled "supranational unit". Thus, a more complete picture of governance can be presented to show how businesses (and modern societies) are steering towards sustainable development and CSR.

To sum up, the regulatory mechanisms applied by companies and industry do not always lead to the desired social and environmental results (Lewis, 2008). Moreover, political spending and lobbying are two of the regulatory mechanisms that are usually employed by companies to achieve their economic interests instead of improving their social and environmental responsibility (Tonge, Greer and Lawton, 2003). The fundamental factor for a successful implementation of regulatory mechanisms used by supranational units is the strong engagement of national governments in the regulatory process (Seppala, 2009; Frenkel and Lurie, 2003; Barkemeyer, 2009). Furthermore, the implementation of government laws and legislations, aiming to improve social and environmental responsibility of the organizations, does not always culminate in desirable and satisfactory results (Haig and Guthrien, 2009; Wilson, Williams and Kemp, 2010; Haig and Guthrien, 2009; Greer and Tongen 2006; Grosvold, 2007; Wilson, Williams and Kemp, 2011; Preuss, 2007). The reasons for this vary from a lack of

monitoring of the compliance with legislation, regulatory laissez-faire approaches, over low levels of sanction for non-compliance with legislation, political spending and lobbying by companies, to even corruption.

Based on our review and analysis, we conclude that CSR regulatory mechanisms are not that effective by themselves. To enhance their effectiveness, all regulatory mechanisms for CSR should be considered together, as an orchestrated governance of economic, social and environmental issues. Thus, better social and environmental results could be achieved when CSR regulatory mechanisms are applied in a coordinated manner instead of separately or individually. Furthermore, to guarantee effective and sustainable governance, there is a strong need to devise of a holistic package of different regulatory mechanisms. This package can include (1) various regulatory mechanisms from different societal domains (government, businesses and/or civil society) or (2) various regulatory mechanisms applied by one societal domain (e.g. government and its environmental fiscal policy combining various governmental regulatory mechanisms). However, further studies are needed in this field in order to detect the main general principles and find the appropriate combinations of regulatory mechanisms that may lead to their efficient usage and better results in the CSR field.

### Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Rumen Gechev, Simon De Jaeger and Alain Verbeke for their encouraging remarks and suggestions to further develop our thinking of the ideas presented here. We are grateful to thank CEDON members for helping us to improve our arguments.



References

- Aaronson, S. A.: 2005, 'Minding Our Business: What the United States Government has done and can do to Ensure that U.S. Multinationals Act Responsibly in Foreign Markets', *Journal of Business Ethics* 59, 175-198.
- Abbott, K. W., and D. Snidal: 2008, 'The governance triangle: Regulatory standards institutions and the shadow of the state', Retrieved from: <http://www.asil.org/files/abbotsnidalmarch2008.pdf>.
- \*Abreu, M.: 2009, 'How to define an environmental policy to improve corporate sustainability in developing countries', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 18, 542–556.
- \*Ackerman, D., J. Hu and L. Wei: 2009, 'Confucius, cars, and big government: Impact of government involvement in business on consumer perceptions under confucianism', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 473–482.
- \*Adam A. M. and D. Rachman-Moore: 2004, 'The Methods Used to Implement an Ethical Code of Conduct and Employee Attitudes', *Journal of Business Ethics* 54, 225–244.
- Agarwal, J., D. C. Malloy and K. Rasmussen: 2010, 'Erratum to: Ethical Climate in Government and Nonprofit Sectors: Public Policy Implications for Service Delivery', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 1–2.
- Aguilera, R. V., D. E. Rupp, C. A. Williams and J. Ganapathi: 2007, 'Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: a multilevel theory of social change in organizations', *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (3), 836–863.
- \*Albareda, L., J. M. Lozano, A. Tencati, A. Midttun and F. Perrini: 2008, 'The changing role of governments in corporate social responsibility: drivers and responses', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 17 (4), 347-363.
- Albareda, L., J.M. Lozano and T. Ysa: 2007, 'Public policies on corporate social responsibility: the role of governments in Europe', *Journal of Business Ethics* 74 (4), 391–407.
- Albareda, L.: 2010, 'Mapping the Novel Arrangements Adopted to Build the Corporate Responsibility Institutional Setting', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 40, 75-100.
- \*Altherr, W., D. Blumer, H. Oldörp, P. Nagel: 2007, 'How do stakeholders and legislation influence the allocation of green space on brownfield redevelopment projects? Five case studies from Switzerland, Germany and the UK', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 16, 512–522.
- \*Andersen, O.: 2003, 'Environmental reporting and transport – the case of a public transport company', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 12, 386–399.
- \*Arnold, D.G. and L. P. Hartman: 2005, 'Beyond sweatshops: positive deviancy and global labour practices', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 14(3), 206–222.
- \*Arvidsson, S.: 2010, 'Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Study of the Views of Management Teams in Large Companies' *Journal of Business Ethics* 96, 339–354.
- Austin, J., H. Stevenson and J. Wei-Skillern: 2006, 'Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both?', *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 30, 1–22.
- \*Bajo, E., M. Bigelli, D. Hillier and B. Petracchi: 2009, 'The determinants of regulatory compliance: An analysis of insider trading disclosures in Italy', *Journal of Business Ethics* 90, 331–343.
- \*Barboza, G. and S. Trejos: 2009, 'Micro Credit in Chiapas, México: Poverty Reduction Through Group Lending', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 283–299.

- \*Barkemeyer, R.: 2009, 'Beyond compliance - below expectations? CSR in the context of international development', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 18(3), 273–289.
- Bartle, I. and P. Vass: 2007, 'Self-regulation within the regulatory state: Towards a new regulatory paradigm?', *Public Administration* 85 (4), 885–905.
- \*Baughn, C., N.L. Bodie, M. Buchanan and M.B. Bixby: 2010, 'Bribery in international business transactions', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92, 15–32.
- \*Beard, F.K.: 2003, 'College student attitudes toward advertising's ethical, economic, and social consequences', *Journal of Business Ethics* 48 , 217–228.
- \*Bedicks, H. B.: 2005, 'Business Ethics and Corporate Governance in Latin America', *Business & Society* 44, 218–228.
- \*Beets, S. D.: 2005, 'Understanding the demand-side issues of international corruption', *Journal of Business Ethics* 57, 65–81.
- \*Beggs, J. M. and K. L. Dean: 2007, 'Legislated ethics or ethics education?: Faculty views in the post-enron era', *Journal of Business Ethics* 71, 15–37.
- Bell, S. and A. Hindmoor: 2012, 'Governance without government? The case of the Forest Stewardship Council', *Public Administration* 90(1), 144–159.
- \*Bender, R. and L. Moir: 2006, 'Does "best practice" in setting executive pay in the UK encourage "good" behaviour?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 67, 75–91.
- \*Benson, K. L., M. Hutchinson and A. Sriram: 2011, 'Governance in the Australian Superannuation Industry', *Journal of Business Ethics* 99, 183–200.
- \*Berg, C. and K. Fryer-Edwards: 2008, 'The ethical challenges of direct-to-consumer genetic testing', *Journal of Business Ethics* 77, 17–31.
- \*Bled, A.: 2010, 'Technological Choices in International Environmental Negotiations: An Actor-Network Analysis', *Business & Society* 49, 570–590.
- \*Blumentritt, T. and K. Rehbein: 2008, 'The Political Capital of Foreign Subsidiaries: An Exploratory Model', *Business & Society* 47, 242–263.
- \*Blumentritt, T.: 2003, 'Foreign Subsidiaries' Government Affairs Activities', *Business & Society* 42 (2), 202-233.
- \*Borg, M. and H. Stranahan: 2005, 'Does lottery advertising exploit disadvantaged and vulnerable markets?', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 15(1), 23-35.
- \*Bowie, N. E. and K. Jamal: 2006, 'Privacy rights on the internet: self-regulation or government regulation?', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 16(3), 323-342.
- Bracke R. and J. Albrecht: 2007, "'Competing environmental management standards: how ISO 14001 outnumbered EMAS in Germany, the UK, France, and Sweden'", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 25, 611-627
- Brammer, S., G. Jackson and D. Matten: 2012, 'Corporate Social Responsibility and institutional theory: new perspectives on private governance', *Socio-Economic Review* 10, 3–28.
- Bressers, H., T. de Bruijn and K. Lulofs: 2009, 'Environmental negotiated agreements in the Netherlands', *Environmental Politics* 18(1), 58–77.
- \*Broussine M. and C. Millern: 2005, 'Leadership, ethical dilemmas and 'good' authority in public service partnership working', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 14 (4), 379-391.
- Broussine, M. and C. Miller: 2005, 'Leadership, ethical dilemmas and "good" authority in public service partnership working', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 14(4), 379–392.

- Bruijn, H. D.: 2002, 'Performance measurement in the public sector', *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 15(3), 578–594.
- \*Buchan, H. F.: 2005, 'Ethical decision making in the public accounting profession: An extension of Ajzen's theory of planned behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics* 61, 165–181.
- Bozhikin, I., Gechev, R., Dentchev, N. (2017). Environmental fiscal policy and other instruments for sustainable and efficient municipal solid waste management: A cooperative study of Belgium and Bulgaria. *Waste management*, 65, I-III.
- Bozhikin, I., (2016). Environmental fiscal policy for sustainable development: a comparative study. *Accountancy & Bedrijfskunde*, 39-51.
- \*Cai, Z., and P. Wheale: 2009, 'Managing efficient capital allocation with emphasis on the chinese experience', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 111–135.
- \*Calkins, M.: 2009, 'King car and the ethics of automobile proponents' strategies in China', *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, 157–172.
- \*Campbell, K. and A. Mínguez-Vera: 2008, 'Gender diversity in the boardroom and firm financial performance', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 435–451.
- \*Canary, H. E. and M.M. Jennings: 2008, 'Principles and influence in codes of ethics: A centerifying resonance analysis comparing pre- and post-sarbanes-oxley codes of ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics* 80, 263–278.
- \*Cantó-Milà, N. and J. M. Lozano: 2009, 'The spanish discourse on corporate social responsibility', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 157–171.
- \*Carlson, J. R., D.S. Carlson and M. Ferguson: 2011, 'Deceptive Impression Management: Does Deception Pay in Established Workplace Relationships?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 100, 497–514.
- Carroll, A. B.: 1979. A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review* 4(4), 497–505.
- \*Chen, M. F., C. T. Pan and M. C. Pan: 2009, 'The joint moderating impact of moral intensity and moral judgment on consumer's use intention of pirated software', *Journal of Business Ethics* 90, 361–373.
- \*Chen, Y., M. Yaşar and R. M. Rejesus: 2008, 'Factors Influencing the Incidence of Bribery Payouts by Firms: A Cross-Country Analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* 77, 231–244.
- \*Chih, H.-L., H.H. Chih and T.Y. Chen: 2010, 'On the Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility: International Evidence on the Financial Industry', *Journal of Business Ethics* 93, 115–135.
- \*Cho, C. H., D. M. Patten and R. W. Roberts: 2006, 'Corporate Political Strategy: An Examination of the Relation between Political Expenditures, Environmental Performance, and Environmental Disclosure', *Journal of Business Ethics* 67, 139–154.
- \*Chun, R.: 2009, 'Ethical Values and Environmentalism in China: Comparing Employees from State-Owned and Private Firms', *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, 341–348.
- \*Chung, J. and V. U. Trivedi: 2003, 'The Effect of Friendly Persuasion and Gender on Tax Compliance Behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics* 47, 133–145.
- \*Clarke, A. and M. Fuller: 2010, 'Collaborative Strategic Management: Strategy Formulation and Implementation by Multi-Organizational Cross-Sector Social Partnerships', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 85–10.
- Coase, R. H.: 1937, 'The nature of the firm', *Economica* 4(16), 386–405.
- \*Collins, D.: 2009, 'The Failure of a Socially Responsive Gold Mining MNC in El Salvador:

- Ramifications of NGO Mistrust', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 245–268.
- \*Collins, J. D., K. Uhlenbruck and P. Rodriguez: 2009, 'Why firms engage in corruption: A top management perspective', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 89–108.
- \*Cooley, D. R.: 2003, 'Strict Joint and Several Liability and Justice', *Journal of Business Ethics* 47, 199–208.
- \*Cordano, M., I.H. Frieze and K. M. Ellis: 2004, 'Entangled affiliations and attitudes: An analysis of the influences on environmental policy stakeholders' behavioral intentions', *Journal of Business Ethics* 49, 27–40.
- \*Criado-Jime'nez, I., M. Ferna'ndez-Chulia'n, F. J. Husillos-Carque's and C. Larrinaga-Gonza'lez: 2008, 'Compliance with Mandatory environmental reporting in financial statements: The case of Spain', *Journal of Business Ethics* 79, 245–262.
- Christmann, P. and G. Taylor: 2006, 'Firm self-regulation through international certifiable standards: Determinants of symbolic versus substantive implementation', *Journal of International Business Studies* 37(6), 863–878.
- CSR Europe: 2015, 'CSR Europe calls for the new EU CSR strategy 2015-2019 to support a move from CSR compliance to innovation', Retrieved from: <http://www.csreurope.org/csr-europe-calls-new-eu-csr-strategy-2015-2019-support-move-csr-compliance-innovation>.
- Cummins, A.: 2004, 'The marine stewardship council: A multi-stakeholder approach to sustainable fishing', *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 11(2), 85–94.
- \*Dahan, N. M. and M. Gittens: 2010, 'Business and the public affairs of slavery: A discursive approach of an ethical public issue', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92, 227–249.
- Dahlsrud, A. 2006.: 'How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions', *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15 (1), 1–13.
- Darnall, N. and S. Sides: 2008, 'Assessing the performance of voluntary environmental programs: Does certification matter?', *Policy Studies Journal* 36(1), 95–117.
- \*Dawkins, C. E.: 2002, 'Corporate Welfare, Corporate Citizenship, and the Question of Accountability', *Business & Society* 41, 269–291.
- \*Dawkins, C.E.: 2005, 'First to Market: Issue Management Pacesetters and the Pharmaceutical Industry Response to AIDS in Africa', *Business & Society* 44(3), 244-282.
- Dentchev, N. A., E. Haezendonck and M. van Balen: 2017, 'The Role of Governments in the Business and Society Debate', *Business & Society*, 527-544.
- Dentchev, N. A., M. van Balen and E. Haezendonck: 2015, 'On voluntarism and the role of governments in CSR: towards a contingency approach', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 24(4), 378–397.
- \*Di Lorenzo, V.: 2007, 'Business ethics: Law as a determinant of business conduct', *Journal of Business Ethics* 71, 275–299.
- \*Dickson, M. and M. Eckman: 2008, 'Media portrayal of voluntary public reporting about corporate social responsibility performance: Does coverage encourage or discourage ethical management?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 725–743.
- \*Doh, J. P.: 2002, 'Private Investment, Entrepreneurial Entry, and Partner Collaboration in Emerging Markets Telecommunications: The Impact of Country, Industry, and Firm-Level Factors', *Business & Society* 41, 345–352.
- \*Dubbink, W. and F. P. Van Der Putten: 2008, 'Is competition law an impediment to CSR?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 381–395.
- \*Eberlein, B. and D. Matten: 2009, 'Business Responses to Climate Change Regulation in

## Articles

- Canada and Germany: Lessons for MNCs from Emerging Economies', *Journal of Business Ethics* 86, 241–255.
- EC: 2001, 'Green paper: Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility', European Commission, Brussels.
- EC: 2011, 'A renewed strategy 2011-2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility', European Commission, Brussels.
- EC: 2015, 'Commission staff working document on implementing the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights', European Commission, Brussels.
- \*Egels-Zandén, N. and P. Hyllman: 2006, 'Exploring the Effects of Union-NGO Relationships on Corporate Responsibility: The Case of the Swedish Clean Clothes Campaign', *Journal of Business Ethics* 64, 303–316.
- \*Egels-Zandén, N.: 2009, 'TNC Motives for Signing International Framework Agreements: A Continuous Bargaining Model of Stakeholder Pressure', *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, 529–547.
- \*Enticott, G. and R. M. Walker: 2008, 'Sustainability, performance and organizational strategy: An empirical analysis of public organizations', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 17, 79–92.
- \*Entwistle, G., G. Feltham and C. Mbagwu: 2006, 'Misleading Disclosure of Pro Forma Earnings: An Empirical Examination', *Journal of Business Ethics* 69, 355–372.
- \*Everett, J. S., D. Neu and D. Martinez: 2008, 'Multi-stakeholder labour monitoring organizations: Egoists, instrumentalists, or moralists?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 81, 117–142.
- \*Eweje, G.: 2005, 'Hazardous Employment and Regulatory Regimes in the South African Mining Industry: Arguments for Corporate Ethics at Workplace', *Journal of Business Ethics* 56, 163–183.
- \*Eweje, G.: 2006, 'Environmental Costs and Responsibilities Resulting from Oil Exploitation in Developing Countries: The Case of the Niger Delta of Nigeria', *Journal of Business Ethics* 69, 27–56.
- \*Fang, T., C. Gunterberg and E. Larsson: 2010, 'Sourcing in an increasingly expensive china: Four Swedish cases', *Journal of Business Ethics* 97, 119–138.
- \*Firth, M., P. L. L. Mo and R. M. K. Wong: 2005, 'Financial statement frauds and auditor sanctions: An analysis of enforcement actions in China', *Journal of Business Ethics* 62, 367–381.
- \*Fisherand, C. and B. Downes: 2008, 'Performance measurement and metric manipulation in the public sector', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 17 (3), 245-258.
- \*Flanagan, W. and G. Whiteman: 2007, "'AIDS is Not a Business'": A Study in Global Corporate Responsibility – Securing Access to Low-cost HIV Medications', *Journal of Business Ethics* 73, 65–75.
- \*Fowler, K. L., N. D. Kling and M. D. Larson: 2007, 'Organizational Preparedness for Coping With a Major Crisis or Disaster', *Business & Society* 46, 88–103.
- Fox, T., H. Ward and B. Howard: 2002, 'Public sector roles in strengthening corporate social responsibility: A baseline study', Washington DC: The World Bank. Retrieved from <http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2005/12/19/>.
- \*Freeman, I. and A. Hasnaoui: 2011, 'The Meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility: The Vision of Four Nations', *Journal of Business Ethics* 100, 419–443.
- \*Frenkel, D. A. and Y. Lurie: 2003, 'Human rights in industrial relations – the Israeli approach', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 12 (1), 33-40.

- \*Fukukawa, K., W. E. Shafer and G. M. Lee: 2007, 'Values and attitudes toward social and environmental accountability: A study of MBA students', *Journal of Business Ethics* 71, 381–394.
- \*Gadenne, D. L., J. Kennedy and C. McKeiver: 2009, 'An Empirical Study of Environmental Awareness and Practices in SMEs', *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, 45–63.
- \*Gainet, C.: 2010, 'Investigated Exploring the Impact of Legal Systems and Financial Structure on Corporate Responsibility', *Journal of Business Ethics* 95, 195–222.
- Gamble, A.: 2000, 'Economic governance. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance: Authority, steering and democracy*', Oxford: Oxford University Press, 110–137.
- Gechev, R.: 2005, 'Sustainable Development: Economic Aspects', University of Indianapolis Press
- \*Gendron, C.: 2003, 'Business, Economy, and the Environment Toward a New Development Paradigm', *Business & Society* 42, 485–495.
- \*Glachant, M., S. Schucht, A. Bultmann and F. Watzold: 2002, 'Companies' participation in EMAS: The influence of the public regulator', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 11, 254–266.
- Gond, J.-P., N. Kang and J. Moon: 2011, 'The government of self-regulation: On the comparative dynamics of corporate social responsibility', *Economy and Society* 40, 640–671.
- \*Goode, S. and S. Cruise: 2006, 'What motivates software crackers?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 65, 173–201.
- \*Graafland, J. J.: 2004, 'Collusion, reputation damage and interest in codes of conduct: the case of a Dutch construction company', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 13(2/3), 127–142.
- Greenpeace: 2009, 'Assessment of the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Certification Programme', Briefing.
- \*Greer, L. and A. Tongen: 2006, 'Ethical foundations: a new framework for reliable financial reporting', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 15 (3), 259–270.
- \*Griffin, J. J. and P. Dunn: 2004, 'Corporate Public Affairs: Commitment, Resources, and Structure', *Business & Society* 43, 196–220.
- \*Grosvold, J., S. Brammer and B. Rayton: 2007, 'Board diversity in the United Kingdom and Norway: an exploratory analysis', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 16 (4), 344–357.
- \*Groves, Ch., L. Frater, R. Lee and E. Stokes: 2011, 'Is There Room at the Bottom for CSR? Corporate Social Responsibility and Nanotechnology in the UK', *Journal of Business Ethics* 101, 525–552.
- \*Gupta, P. B., S. J. Gould and B. Pola: 2004, 'To pirate or not to pirate': A comparative study of the ethical versus other influences on the consumer's software acquisition-mode decision', *Journal of Business Ethics* 55, 255–274.
- \*Habisch, A., L. Patelli, M. Pedrini and C. Schwartz: 2011, 'Different Talks with Different Folks: A Comparative Survey of Stakeholder Dialog in Germany, Italy, and the U.S', *Journal of Business Ethics* 100, 381–404.
- \*Haigh, M. and J. Guthrie: 2009, 'A political economy approach to regulated Australian information disclosures', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 18 (2), 192–208.
- \*Haigh, M. and J. Guthrie: 2010, 'Management practices in Australasian ethical investment products: a role for regulation?', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 19, 147–163.
- \*Halter, M. V., M. C. de Arruda and R. B. Halter: 2009, 'Transparency to reduce corruption?: Dropping hints for private organizations in

## Articles

- Brazil', *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, 373–385.
- Heritier, A. and S. Eckert: 2008, 'New modes of governance in the shadow of hierarchy: Self-regulation by industry in Europe', *Journal of Public Policy* 28(01), 113–138.
- \*Herron, T. L. and D. L. Gilbertson: 2004, 'Ethical Principles Vs. Ethical Rules: the Moderating of Moral Development on Audit Independence Judgments', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 14, 499–523.
- Hirshhorn, R. and A. Kaell: 1988, 'A Framework For Evaluating Public Corporations', *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* 59(2), 141–156.
- Hoessle, U.: 2014, 'The Contribution of the UN Global Compact towards the Compliance of International Regimes: A Comparative Study of Businesses from the USA, Mozambique, United Arab Emirates and Germany', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 53, 27–60.
- \*Holder-Webb, L., J. Cohen, L. Nath and D. Wood: 2008, 'A Survey of Governance Disclosures Among US Firms', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 543–563.
- \*Hong, Y.: 2002, 'Business ethics: is it useful? - An empirical study of Chinese enterprise', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 11, 335–343.
- \*Hou, W. and G. Moore: 2010, 'Player and Referee Roles Held Jointly: The Effect of State Ownership on China's Regulatory Enforcement Against Fraud', *Journal of Business Ethics* 95, 317–335.
- \*Houghton, S. M., J. T. Gabel and D. W. Williams: 2009, 'Connecting the two faces of CSR: Does employee volunteerism improve compliance?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 477–494.
- \*Huang, L. J. and R. S. Snell: 2003, 'Turnaround, Corruption and Mediocrity: Leadership and Governance in Three State Owned Enterprises in Mainland China', *Journal of Business Ethics* 43, 111–124.
- \*Huang, Y. H. and S. H. Su: 2009, 'Public relations autonomy, legal dominance, and strategic orientation as predictors of crisis communicative strategies', *Journal of Business Ethics* 86, 29–41.
- \*Hudson, S.: 2007, 'To go or not to go? Ethical perspectives on tourism in an "outpost of tyranny."', *Journal of Business Ethics* 76, 385–396.
- Hysing, E.: 2009, 'Governing without government? The private governance of forest certification in Sweden', *Public Administration* 87(2), 312–326.
- Idemudia, U.: 2010, 'Corporate Social Responsibility and the Rentier Nigerian State: Rethinking the Role of Government and the Possibility of Corporate Social Development in the Niger Delta', *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 30, 131–152.
- \*Jia, C., S. Ding, Y. Li and Z. Wu: 2009, 'Fraud, enforcement action, and the role of corporate governance: Evidence from China', *Journal of Business Ethics* 90, 567–576.
- \*Jing, R. and J. L. Graham: 2008, 'Values Versus Regulations: How Culture Plays Its Role', *Journal of Business Ethics* 80, 791–806.
- \*Johan, S. and D. Najar: 2010, 'The Role of Corruption, Culture, and Law in Investment Fund Manager Fees', *Journal of Business Ethics* 95, 147–172.
- Jordan, A.: 2008, 'The governance of sustainable development: Taking stock and looking forwards', *Environment and Planning C Government and Policy* 26(1), 17–33.
- Jordana, J. and D. Levi-Faur: 2004, 'The politics of regulation in the age of governance. In J. Jordana & D. Levi-Faur (Eds.), *The politics of regulation: Institutions and regulatory reforms for the age of governance*', Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1–30.

- Joseph, E.: 2002, 'Promoting corporate social responsibility: Is market-based regulation sufficient? *New Economy*', 96–101.
- \*Jovanovic, S. and R. V. Wood: 2007, 'Dialectical Interactions: Decoupling and Integrating Ethics in Ethics Initiatives', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 17(2), 217–238.
- \*Kaplan, S. E. and J. J. Schultz: 2007, 'Intentions to report questionable acts: An examination of the influence of anonymous reporting channel, internal audit quality, and setting', *Journal of Business Ethics* 71, 109–124.
- \*Kennedy, S.: 2007, 'Transnational Political Alliances An Exploration With Evidence From China', *Business & Society* 46, 174–201.
- \*Rooplekha K. and S. Damodar: 2004, 'A Scale to Assess Ethical Leadership of Indian Private and Public Sector Managers', *Journal of Business Ethics* 49: 13–26.
- \*Kneiding, C. and P. Tracey: 2009, 'Towards a performance measurement framework for community development finance institutions in the UK', *Journal of Business Ethics* 86, 327–345.
- \*Kolk, A. and J. Pinkse: 2007, 'Multinationals' Political Activities on Climate Change', *Business & Society* 46, 201–228.
- \*Konrad, A., R. Steurer, M. E. Langer and A. Martinuzzi: 2006, 'Empirical Findings on Business--Society Relations in Europe', *Journal of Business Ethics* 63, 89–105.
- Kurzer, P. and A. Cooper: 2007, 'Consumer activism, EU institutions and global markets: The struggle over biotech foods', *Journal of Public Policy* 27(02), 103–128.
- Lafferty, W.: 2002, 'Adapting government practice to the goals of sustainable development', Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/30/54/1939762.pdf>.
- Lambell, R., G. Ramia, C. Nyland and M. Michelotti: 2008, 'NGOs and international business research: Progress, prospects and problems', *International Journal of Management Reviews* 10(1), 75–92.
- \*Laudal, Th.: 2010, 'An Attempt to Determine the CSR Potential of the International Clothing Business', *Journal of Business Ethics* 96, 63–77.
- \*Le Ber, M. J. and O. Branzei: 2010, 'Value Frame Fusion in Cross Sector Interactions', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 163–195.
- \*Lecker, M. J.: 2009, 'The smoking penalty: Distributive justice or smokism?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 84, 47–64.
- \*Lennerfors, T. T.: 2007, 'The transformation of transparency - On the act on public procurement and the right to appeal in the context of the war on corruption', *Journal of Business Ethics* 73, 381–390.
- \*Lennerfors, T. T.: 2009, 'The Vicissitudes of Corruption: Degeneration, Transgression, Jouissance', *Business & Society* 48, 406–419.
- Lenssen J., N. A. Dentchev and L. Roger: 2014, 'Sustainability, risk management and governance: towards an integrative approach', *Corporate governance* 14 (5), 670–684.
- Levi-Faur, D.: 2010, 'Regulation and regulatory governance', *Jerusalem Papers in Regulation & Governance*, Working Paper No. 1.
- \*Lewis, D.: 2008, 'Ten Years of Public Interest Disclosure Legislation in the UK: Are Whistleblowers Adequately Protected?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 82, 497–507.
- \*Lindgreen, A.: 2004, 'Corruption and unethical behavior: Report on a set of Danish guidelines', *Journal of Business Ethics* 51, 31–39.
- \*Lorenzo, O., P. Esqueda and J. Larson: 2010, 'Safety and ethics in the global workplace: Asymmetries in culture and infrastructure', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92, 87–106.
- \*Lu"ckerath-Rovers, M. and A. De Bos: 2011, 'Code of Conduct for Non-Executive and Supervisory Directors', *Journal of Business Ethics* 100, 465–481.



- \*Lund-Thomsen, P.: 2009, 'Assessing the Impact of Public-Private Partnerships in the Global South: The Case of the Kasur Tanneries Pollution Control Project', *Journal of Business Ethics* 90, 57-78.
- \*Malloy, D. C. and J. Agarwal: 2010, 'Ethical climate in government and nonprofit sectors: Public policy implications for service delivery', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 3-21.
- Matten, D. and J. Moon: 2008, "'Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility', *Academy of Management Review* 33, 404-424.
- Mathis, A.: 2007, 'Corporate Social Responsibility and Policy Making: What Role Does Communication Play?', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 16, 366-385.
- Mathis, A.: 2008, 'Corporate social responsibility and public policy-making: Perspectives, instruments and Consequences', Twente: University of Twente.
- Martinelli, A. and A. Midttun: 2010, 'Globalization and governance for sustainability', *Corporate governance* 10 (1), 6-17.
- Maxwell, J. W., T. P. Lyon and S.C. Hackett: 2000, 'Self-regulation and social welfare: The political economy of corporate environmentalism', *Journal of Law and Economics* 43(2), 583-618.
- \*Mayer, D.: 2007, 'Kasky V. Nike and the Quarrelsome Question of Corporate Free Speech', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 17(1), 65-96.
- \*McCraw, H., K. S. Moffeit and J. R. O'Malley: 2009, 'An analysis of the ethical codes of corporations and business schools', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 1-13.
- \*McGee, R. W.: 2008, 'Ethical aspects of using government to subvert competition: Antidumping laws as a case study of rent seeking activity', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 759-771.
- \*McGee, R. W., S. S. M. Ho and A. Y. S. Li: 2008, 'A comparative study on perceived ethics of tax evasion: Hong kong vs the united states', *Journal of Business Ethics* 77, 147-158.
- McWilliams, A., D. Siegel and P. Wright: 2006, 'Corporate Social Responsibility: Strategic Implications', *Journal of Management Studies* 43(1), 1-18.
- \*Meznar, M.B. and J.H. Johnson: 2005, 'Business-Government Relations Within a Contingency Theory Framework: Strategy, Structure, Fit, and Performance', *Business & Society* 44, 119-143.
- Midttun, A.: 2008, 'Partnered governance: Aligning corporate responsibility and public policy in the global economy', *Corporate Governance* 8, 406-418.
- Midttun, A.: 2008b, 'Global governance and the interface with business: new institutions, processes and partnerships Partnered governance: aligning corporate responsibility and public policy in the global economy', *Corporate governance* 8 (4), 406-418.
- \*Mitchell, V. W., G. Balabanis, B. B. Schlegelmilch and T. B. Cornwell: 2009, 'Measuring unethical consumer behavior across four countries', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 395-412.
- \*Mullin, R. P.: 2002, 'What can be learned from Du Pont and the freon ban: A case study', *Journal of Business Ethics* 40, 207-218.
- \*Murillo, D. and J. M. Lozano: 2009, 'Pushing forward SME CSR through a network: an account from the Catalan model', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 18(1), 7-20.
- \*Muthuri, J.N. and V. Gilbert: 2011, 'An Institutional Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility in Kenya', *Journal of Business Ethics* 98, 467-483.

- \*Norén H. and F. von Malmborg: 2004, 'Are standardized EMSs useful in local authorities? A study of how a tool from the private sector is used in the public sector', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 13, 187–197.
- \*Nyquist, S.: 2003, 'The legislation of environmental disclosures in three Nordic countries—a comparison', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 12, 12–25.
- OECD: 2002, 'Governance for sustainable development: Five OECD case studies', Paris: OECD.
- \*Omurgonulsen, U. and M. K. Oktem: 2009, 'Is There Any Change in the Public Service Values of Different Generations of Public Administrators? The Case of Turkish Governors and District Governors', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 137–156.
- \*Park, H., M. T. Rehg and D. Lee: 2005, 'The influence of confucian ethics and collectivism on whistleblowing intentions: A study of South Korean public employees', *Journal of Business Ethics* 58, 387–403.
- \*Park-Poaps, H. and K. Rees: 2010, 'Stakeholder Forces of Socially Responsible Supply Chain Management Orientation', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92, 305–322.
- Paul, K.: 2004, 'Business and society and business ethics journals: a citation and impact analysis', *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 35 (2), 103–117.
- \*Paul, P. and K. Mukhopadhyay: 2010, 'Growth via intellectual property rights versus gendered inequity in emerging economies: An ethical dilemma for international business', *Journal of Business Ethics* 91, 359–378.
- \*Peebles, D. K., P. Stokes and S. S. Wingfield: 2009, 'When the Whistle Is Blown: Legal Defenses and Practical Guidelines for Managing Reports of Organizational Misconduct', *Business & Society* 48, 467–488.
- \*Pelletier, K. L. and M. C. Bligh: 2006, 'Rebounding from corruption: Perceptions of ethics program effectiveness in a public sector organization', *Journal of Business Ethics* 67, 359–374.
- \*Pelletier, K. L. and M. C. Bligh: 2008, 'The aftermath of organizational corruption: Employee attributions and emotional reactions', *Journal of Business Ethics* 80, 823–844.
- Pol P. K. C. and F. G. A. de Bakker: 2010, 'Direct-to-Consumer Advertising of Pharmaceuticals as a Matter of Corporate Social Responsibility?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 211–224 .
- Porter, M. E. and M.R. Kramer: 2011, 'Creating shared value', *Harvard Business Review* 89(1-2), 62-77.
- Porter, T. and K. Ronit: 2006, 'Self-regulation as policy process: The multiple and criss-crossing stages of private rule-making', *Policy Sciences* 39(1), 41
- Prakash, A. and M. Potoski: 2007, 'Collective action through voluntary environmental programs: A club theory perspective', *Policy Studies Journal* 35(4), 773–792.
- \*Preuss, L.: 2007, 'Buying into our Future: Sustainability Initiatives in Local Government Procurement', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 16, 354–365.
- \*Quaak, L., T. Aalbers and J. Goedee: 2007, 'Transparency of Corporate Social Responsibility in Dutch Breweries', *Journal of Business Ethics* 76, 293–308.
- Rasche, A., F. Bakker and J. Moon: 2013, 'Complete and Partial Organizing for Corporate Social Responsibility', *Journal of Business Ethics* 115, 651–663.
- \*Reast, J., A. Lindgreen, J. Vanhamme and F. Maon: 2010, 'The Manchester Super Casino: Experience and Learning in a Cross-Sector Social Partnership', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 197–218.

## Articles

- \*Reed, K.: 2009, 'A Look at Firm Regulator Exchanges: Friendly Enough or Too Friendly?', *Business & Society* 48, 147-180.
- \*Rein, M. and L. Stott: 2009, 'Working Together: Critical Perspectives on Six Cross-Sector Partnerships in Southern Africa', *Journal of Business Ethics* 90, 79-89.
- \*Richard, M.: 2002, 'What Can Be Learned from DuPont and the Freon Ban: A Case Study', *Journal of Business Ethics* 40, 207-218.
- Richards, J.P., G.A. Glegg and S. Cullinane: 2004, 'Implementing chemicals policy: leaders or laggards?', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 13, 388-402.
- \*Richardson, A. J.: 2008, 'Due process and standard-setting: An analysis of due process in three canadian accounting and auditing standard-setting bodies', *Journal of Business Ethics* 81, 679-696.
- \*Rivera-Lirio, J.M. and M.J. Muñoz-Torres: 2010, 'The Effectiveness of the Public Support Policies for the European Industry Financing as a Contribution to Sustainable Development', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 489-515.
- \*Robertson, C., K. M. Gilley and W. F. Crittenden: 2008, 'Trade liberalization, corruption, and software piracy', *Journal of Business Ethics* 78, 623-634.
- \*Rodford, P.: 2009, 'APACS response to "irresponsible lending? A case study of a credit industry reform initiative."' , *Journal of Business Ethics* 86, 535-539.
- \*Rodríguez, O. J. C.: 2009, 'Poverty reduction approaches in Mexico since 1950: Public spending for social programs and economic competitiveness programs', *Journal of Business Ethics* 88, 269-281.
- \*Rogers, R. K., J. Dillard and K. Yuthas: 2005, 'The accounting profession: Substantive change and/or image management', *Journal of Business Ethics* 58, 159-176.
- \*Rose, J. M.: 2007, 'Corporate directors and social responsibility: Ethics versus shareholder value', *Journal of Business Ethics* 73, 319-331.
- \*Rothenberg, S.: 2004, 'Technical Assistance Programs and the Diffusion of Environmental Technologies in the Printing Industry: The Case of SMEs', *Business & Society* 43, 366-397.
- \*Runhaar, H., C. Tigchelaar and W. J. V. Vermeulen: 2008, 'Environmental Leaders: Making', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 17, 160-178.
- \*Sardžoska, E. G. and T. L. Tang: 2009, 'Testing a model of behavioral intentions in the republic of macedonia: Differences between the private and the public sectors', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 495-517.
- Scherer, A. G. and G. Palazzo: 2011, 'The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy', *Journal of Management Studies* 48(4), 899-931.
- Scherer, A., G. Palazzo and D. Matten: 2014, 'The Business Firm as a Political Actor: A New Theory of the Firm for a Globalized World', *Business & Society* 53(2), 143-156.
- \*Schuler, D.A., K.E. Schnietz and L.S. Baggett: 2002, 'Determinants of Foreign Trade Mission Participation: An Analysis of Corporate Political and Trade Activities', *Business & Society* 41, 6-35.
- \*Schwartz, M. S.: 2006, 'A Business Ethics National Index (BENI): Measuring Business Ethics Activity Around the World', *Business & Society* 45, 382-405.
- \*Seppala, N.: 2009, 'Business and the international human rights regime: A comparison of UN initiatives', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 401-417.
- Serenko, A. and N. Bontis: 2009, 'A citation-based ranking of the business ethics scholarly

- journals', International', *Journal of Business Governance and Ethics* 4 (4), 390-399.
- Short, J. L. and M.W. Toffel: 2010, 'Making self-regulation more than merely symbolic: The critical role of the legal environment', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55(3), 361–396.
- \*Siddiqui, J.: 2010, 'Development of corporate governance regulations: The case of an emerging economy', *Journal of Business Ethics* 91, 253–274.
- \*Skippari, M. and K. Pajunen: 2010, 'MNE–NGO–Host Government Relationships in the Escalation of an FDI Conflict', *Business & Society* 49, 619-653.
- \*Smith, M. and J. Crotty: 2008, 'Environmental regulation and innovation driving ecological design in the UK automotive industry', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 17, 341–349.
- \*Smith-Hillmann, V.: 2007, 'Socially irresponsible, unethical or business as usual? UK case of Argos Ltd. and Littlewoods Ltd. v. OFT', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 16 (2), 150-162.
- \*Sogaard, V. and S. O. Madsen: 2007, 'The Red Queen and the environment: reconciling public regulation and business strategy', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 16, 430–441.
- Stafford, E. R., M. J. Polonsky and C.L. Hartman: 2000, 'Environmental NGO–business collaboration and strategic bridging: A case analysis of the Greenpeace–Fonon Alliance', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 9 (2), 122–135.
- \*Starik, M. and M. Heuer: 2002, 'Strategic inter-organizational environmentalism in the US: A multi-sectoral perspective of alternating eco-policy roles', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 11, 221–235.
- Steurer, R.: 2010, 'The role of governments in corporate social responsibility: characterising public policies on CSR in Europe', *Policy Sciences* 43, 49–72.
- Steurer, R.: 2011, 'Soft Instruments, Few Networks: How 'New Governance' Materializes in Public Policies on Corporate Social Responsibility Across Europe', *Environmental Policy and Governance* 21, 270–290.
- Steurer, R.: 2013, 'Disentangling governance: a synoptic view of regulation by government, business and civil society', *Policy Sciences* 46 (4), 387-410.
- \*Suar, D. and R. Khuntia: 2010, 'Influence of Personal Values and Value Congruence on Unethical Practices and Work Behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics* 97, 443–460.
- \*Taylor, E.Z. and M.B. Curtis: 2010, 'An Examination of the Layers of Workplace Influences in Ethical Judgments: Whistleblowing Likelihood and Perseverance in Public Accounting', *Journal of Business Ethics* 93, 21–37.
- Taïeb Z. T. and H. W. Wu: 2009, 'Institutional Determinism and Political Strategies An Empirical Investigation', *Business & Society* 48 (3), 284-325.
- Telenor: 2015, 'Telenor and the Royal Norway Embassy organize Corporate Responsibility Conference. Press release', Retrieved via: <http://www.telenor.bg/en/news/telenor-and-royal-norway-embassy-organize-corporate-responsibility-conference>.
- \*Tencati, A., F. Perrini and S. Pogutz: 2004, 'New tools to foster corporate socially responsible behavior', *Journal of Business Ethics* 53, 173–190.
- \*Tonge, A., L. Greer and A. Lawton: 2003, 'The Enron story: you can fool some of the people some of the time ...', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 12 (1), 4-22.
- UNCED: 1992, 'Rio declaration on environment and development', Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>.

- UNCHE: 1972, 'Declaration of the United Nations conference on the human environment', Stockholm: The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.
- UNIDO press: 2015, 'UNIDO'S approach: overcoming the challenges CSR poses on SMEs', Retrieved via: <http://www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/trade/csr/unidos-approach.html>.
- Uggla, Y.: 2008, 'Strategies to create risk awareness and legitimacy: the Swedish climate campaign', *Journal of Risk Research* 11 (6), 719–734.
- \*Vaiman, V., T. O. Sigurjonsson and P. A. Davidsson: 2011, 'Weak Business Culture as an Antecedent of Economic Crisis: The Case of Iceland', *Journal of Business Ethics* 98, 259–272.
- \*Valentine, S., L. Godkin, E. Cyrson and G. Fleischman: 2006, 'Perceived ethical values and small business problems in Poland', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 15(1), 76–85.
- \*Van Zolingen, S. J. and H. Honders: 2010, 'Metaphors and the application of a corporate code of ethics', *Journal of Business Ethics* 92, 385–400.
- Vogel, D.: 2012, 'The politics of precaution: Regulating health, safety, and environmental risks in Europe and the United States', Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vogel, D.: 2010, 'The private regulation of global corporate conduct', *Business & Society* 49(1), 68–87.
- \*Voliotis, S.: 2011, 'Abuse of Ministerial Authority, Systemic Perjury, and Obstruction of Justice: Corruption in the Shadows of Organizational Practice', *Journal of Business Ethics* 102, 537–562.
- \*Vuontisjärvi, T.: 2006, 'The European context for corporate social responsibility and human resource management: an analysis of the largest Finnish companies', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 15(3), 271–292.
- \*Wagner, M.: 2010, 'Corporate social performance and innovation with high social benefits: A quantitative analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, 581–594.
- \*Wagner, M.: 2009, 'National culture, regulation and country interaction effects on the association of environmental management systems with environmentally beneficial innovation', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 18, 122–136.
- \*Wander, N. and R. E. Malone: 2007, 'Keeping public institutions invested in Tobacco', *Journal of Business Ethics* 73, 161–176.
- \*Wang, H. Z.: 2005, 'Asian transnational corporations and labor rights: Vietnamese trade unions in Taiwan-invested companies', *Journal of Business Ethics* 56, 43–53.
- \*Warren, R. C.: 2002, 'The responsible shareholder: a case study', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 11(1), 14–25.
- Ward, H.: 2011, 'The ISO 26000 international guidance standard on social responsibility: Implications for public policy and transnational democracy', *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 12 (2), 665–718.
- Ward, H.: 2012, 'ISO 26000 and global governance for sustainable development' International Institute for Environment and Development: London.
- WCED: 1987, 'Our common future', Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \*Wieland, J.: 2005, 'Corporate Governance, Values Management, and Standards: A European Perspective', *Business & Society* 44, 74–93.
- \*Wilhelm, P. G.: 2002, 'International Validation of the Corruption Perceptions Index: Implications for Business Ethics and Entrepreneurship Education', *Journal of Business Ethics* 35, 177–189.

- \*Williamson, D., G. Lynch-Wood and J. Ramsay: 2006, 'Drivers of Environmental Behaviour in Manufacturing SMEs and the Implications for CSR', *Journal of Business Ethics* 67, 317–330.
- Williamson, O. E.: 2010, 'Transaction Cost Economics: The Natural Progression', *Journal of Retailing* 86, 215–226.
- Williamson, O. E.: 1981, 'The Economics of Organization: The Transaction Cost Approach', *American Journal of Sociology*.
- \*Wilson, C., I.D. Williams and S. Kemp: 2010, 'Compliance with Producer Responsibility Legislation: Experiences from UK Small and Medium', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 1-21.
- \*Wilson, C., I.D. Williams and S. Kemp: 2011, 'An Evaluation of the Impact and Effectiveness of Environmental Legislation in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Experiences from the UK1', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 1-16.
- \*Winstanley, D., J. Clark and H. Leeson: 2002, 'Approaches to child labour in the supply chain', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 11(3), 210–223.
- \*Winter, S. J., A. C. Stylianou and R. A. Giacalone: 2004, 'Individual Differences in the Acceptability of Unethical Information Technology Practices: The Case of Machiavellianism and Ethical Ideology', *Journal of Business Ethics* 54, 275–296.
- \*Woll, C.: 2007, 'From National Champions to Global Players? Lobbying by Network Operators During the WTO's Basic Telecommunication Negotiations', *Business & Society* 46 (2), 229-252.
- \*Woodward, Th. and R. Day: 2006, 'Disability disclosure: a case of understatement?', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 15 (1), 86-94.
- \*Worthington, I., M. Ram, H. Boyal and M. Shah: 2008, 'Researching the drivers of socially responsible purchasing: A cross-national study of supplier diversity initiatives', *Journal of Business Ethics* 79, 319–331.
- \*Wu, X.: 2009, 'Determinants of bribery in Asian firms: Evidence from the world business environment survey', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 75–88.
- \*Yang, D., M. Sonmez, D. Bosworth and G. Fryxell: 2009, 'Global Software Piracy: Searching for Further Explanations', *Journal of Business Ethics* 87, 269–283.
- Yaziji, M., and J., Doh: 2009, 'NGOs and corporations: Conflict and collaboration', Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zadek, S.: 2004, 'The path to corporate responsibility', *Harvard Business Review*, December, 125–132.
- \*Zamoon, S. and S. P. Curley: 2008, 'Ripped from the headlines: What can the popular press teach us about software piracy?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 83, 515–533.
- \*Zapata, C.: 2009, 'Driving on liquid sunshine – the Brazilian biofuel experience: a policy driven analysis', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 18, 528–541.
- Zhilong, T., H. Taïeb and W. Wei: 2009, 'Institutional Determinism and Political Strategies An Empirical Investigation', *Business & Society*, 48, 284-327.
- \*Zolingen, S. and H. Honders: 2010, 'Metaphors and the Application of a Corporate Code of Ethics'.