

Corporate Citizenship in Switzerland: Institutional, organizational, and individual considerations according to the model of Corporate Social Performance

Christian Lorenz, Center for Organizational and Occupational Sciences at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Switzerland, christianlorenz@ethz.ch

Gian-Claudio Gentile, Center for Organizational and Occupational Sciences at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Switzerland, ggentile@ethz.ch

Theo Wehner, Center for Organizational and Occupational Sciences at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Switzerland, twehner@ethz.ch

Abstract

Drawing on Wood's (1991) Corporate Social Performance model this paper presents data concerning the current Corporate Citizenship (CC) practice of 2096 Swiss enterprises. The focus lies on the description of extent and nature of CC activities, the underlying motivational considerations of organizational decision makers, as well as the processes of societal responsibility, i.e. the enterprises' environmental assessments and stakeholder dialogue. Results show that 78% of the enterprises pursue CC activities. The charitable acts assume mainly traditional forms (e.g. donations, corporate giving), yet more active forms (e.g. supporting employees' private volunteering) are not uncommon. Main motivating factor to the CC endeavors is a genuine concern for the communities that the firms operate in. Their environmental assessment is rather global than specific, but perceiving CC to be on the rise is associated with a greater likelihood to be involved in CC. The German speaking part of Switzerland is more active in CC than the French and Italian speaking parts. Size wise analyzes reveal bigger companies to pursue CC activities more intensively, self-reliantly, and aimed at their own benefit than SME. In total, CC practices are mostly employed autonomously from economic demands as well as business strategies and are conducted flexibly to serve personal interests of the decision makers. Connections between CC and other responsible behaviors, individual outcomes on side of the employees, as well as the development of psychometric scales to assess corporate motivations to CC are discussed as future research goals.

Author Note: We express our gratitude to the Swiss Confederation's innovation promotion agency (*CTI*) for funding our research as well as the Swiss Employers' Association, the Economiesuisse, and the Swiss Trade and Crafts Association for their support in addressing Swiss companies. Many thanks to Sarah Seyr, Olga Samuel, and Axel Schilling for their collaboration in the research project, and Mathias Gasser, Vesna Belan, Fabian Probst, Dalit Jäckel-Lang, Mirjam Baur, Ulrich Leicht, and Angela Cho for their support in data acquisition.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Christian Lorenz, Center for Organizational and Occupational Sciences, KPL G16, Kreuzplatz 5, CH-8032 Zurich, Switzerland. Electronic mail may be sent to christianlorenz@ethz.ch.

Introduction

National pieces to a global puzzle

Beginning in the 1990s there is a tendency to be observed that within the voluminous body of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) literature considerable attention is given to the metaphorical notion of enterprises being “Good Corporate Citizens”. In brief, there are two reasons accounting for the prevailing of the Corporate Citizenship (CC) concept: First, CC is compatible with profound valuable aspects of CSR, e.g. the notion that corporations’ responsible behavior is next to their core business a significant means of interacting with their environments (Sen, Bhattacharya, & Korschun, 2006; Brown & Dacin, 1997). However and secondly it emancipates itself from the CSR inherent notion of being reactive and compensatory in emphasizing the voluntary and proactive nature of charitable corporate acts (Matten, Crane, & Chapple, 2003).

Accordingly, the many varying conceptualizations of Corporate Citizenship all have a semantic proximity to CSR, with which it has been intertwined from the very beginning of its academic considerations (Windsor, 2001), as can be seen in Maignan and Ferrell’s (2001) definition of CC as the “extent to which businesses assume the economic, legal, ethical [,] and discretionary responsibilities imposed on them by their various stakeholders“ (Maignan & Ferrell, 2001: 459). Inherent in this definition is a) the traditional CSR notion of hierarchically arrayed areas of responsibility (cf. Carroll, 1991) and b) the understanding of diverse target groups of responsible business behavior (cf. Clarkson, 1995).

Whereas the layers of CSR are appropriate to describe businesses’ responsibility to others, who in turn expect firms to comply with these responsibilities (i.e., the voluntariness of this behavior is limited), we understand CC to consist of actions that serve society and that are taken by businesses on a discretionary, however strategically usable, basis (cf. Marsden, 2000; Wood & Logsdon, 2001; Swanson & Niehoff, 2001). According to this view, to qualify as good corporate citizen, certain behaviors need to be shown which represent the top of Carroll’s (1991) CSR pyramid and as such exceed basic ethical behaviors of corporations.

According to Matten and Moon (2008) common CC practices vary among nations due to differences in the national business systems, that are determined by historically grown institutional conditions, such as financial, cultural, educational, and political factors (see also Maurice, Sorge, & Warner, 1980; Whitely, 1992). Supporting this notion, empirical investigations cautiously suggest that CC practices of continental European enterprises are unlike those of Anglo-Saxon companies (e.g. Chapple & Moon, 2005; Maignan & Ferrell,

2000). In the recent past, it has been demanded to assess various national status quos in CC in order to map a coherent picture of the international variation in CC practice and understand the underlying effects producing it (e.g. Graafland & van de Ven, 2006; Basil, Runte, Easwaramoorthy, & Barr, 2009; Houghton, Gabel, & Williams; 2009).

Therefore, it is the objective of this paper to present data from a large nationwide sample of Swiss enterprises pertaining to the current constitution of CC in the Swiss national economy. Moreover, we strive to shed light on the motivational basis of charitable corporate acts in Switzerland. Finally, we gain insights into the processes of assuming societal responsibility by focusing on the enterprises' environmental assessments and stakeholder management practices.

We do so by framing CC within Wood's model of Corporate Social Performance (Wood, 1991) as this allows for a systematic and differential approach to institutional, organizational, and individual aspects of CC and the description of both, objective degree of a national economy's CC practice and the underlying behavioral processes.

CC in the framework of Corporate Social Performance

The increased interest of practitioners as well as the scientific community in the idea of corporations as "good citizens" is due to its high potential to negotiate the institutional (cf. Wood, 1991) relationship between business and society in response to current developments in the societal contract (Windsor, 2001; Embacher & Roth, 2010). Rising societal expectations of corporate action in an age of governmental cutbacks increasingly challenge enterprises to become involved in their communities as good corporate citizens (Matten & Moon, 2008; Moon, Crane & Matten, 2005). At the same time, corporations operate under the pressure of being ever accountable for their actions and profitable – even in their charitable activities (Altman & Vidaver-Cohen, 2000). Strategic management (e.g. and foremost Porter & Kramer, 2002, cf. Basu & Palazzo, 2008) therefore began early to argue for a business case of CC – introducing the innovation at the point where external demands are commensurable with self-interest. However, advocates of the business case too often argue for ready to gain merits of CC, thereby contributing to the overextension of the rationale of mutual benefits (van der Voort, Glac, & Meijs, 2009; Basu & Palazzo, 2008, Embacher & Roth, 2010). Accordingly, more and more scholars publicly demand organizations to emancipate themselves from short-term benefit expectations in favor of a non-negotiable CC understanding (e.g. Thielemann, 2010). This consequently leads to a business case of a different quality, in that companies gain societal legitimacy and therefore a basis for their

corporate operations (Liu, Liston Heyes, & Ko, 2010; Palazzo & Scherer, 2006; Suchman, 1995; Davis, 1973). After all, it is still Wood's (1991) reprocessing of the model of Corporate Social Performance (CSP) that constitutes the most comprehensive framework to describe and understand the legitimacy generating effects of CC practices as the model goes beyond the reflection of specific CC behavior but allows to integrate its antecedents, processes, and consequences. Wood (1999) defines CSP as "a business organization's configuration of principles of social responsibility, processes of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships" (Wood, 1991; p. 693). Crucial to the understanding of the Wood model is the tripartition of CSP into the motivating principles of CSR, behavioral processes to it (i.e. responsiveness), and only then observable outcomes of corporate social behavior on a micro-level (which, according to some authors (e.g. Matten et al., 2003) have stood in the focus of CC research too much and to detached).

Concerning the motivation to responsible behavior, CC activities emerge following the three principles of CSR. Those are first the institutional principle of CSR, which focuses on expectations toward business as societal actor in general. The basic assumption is, that companies adhere to societies' expectations to their corporate social behavior to maintain the legitimacy to operate their businesses (cf. Palazzo & Scherer, 2006). According to this notion, legitimacy is a corporate resource, which can be positively influenced by strategic CC activities (Suchman, 1995; Liu et al., 2010). If corporate power is misused, society withdraws the legitimacy (cf. Davis, 1973). Second, the organizational principle, that states specific responsibilities each organization has toward the public according to their fields of operations (cf. Preston & Post, 1975). Third, the principle of individual discretion, implying a personal responsibility that results from the position inherent latitude decision makers in organizations enjoy (or suffer) (cf. Carroll, 1991). Once the motivation is assured, three behavioral processes come into play that are characteristically displayed by firms responsive to social pressures (cf. Frederick, 1978; Wood, 1991). Those are the monitoring and assessment of corporate environmental conditions, the attendance to various stakeholder demands, and the design of plans and policies to assume and maintain corporate social behavior. Finally, the outcomes category consists of further three facets: the social impacts of corporate behavior, the programs companies install to act responsibly and/or responsively, and the policies companies develop to deal with social issues and stakeholder interests (Wood, 1991).

Immanent in the Wood model is a dimensional assembly of foci, ranging from individual reflections (i.e. motivation to engage in a certain behavior) via organizational considerations

(e.g. specific issues management related to the firm's primary field of action; outcomes of organization specific forms of CSR) to macro-level processes and realities (e.g. economy's bargain with the civil society to obtain operational legitimacy). Hence the model's demand to make the entire field of CSR, and CC, scholarly accessible.

Our research sets out to gain empirical knowledge on the *institutional level*, i.e. the macro-level of the Swiss national economy, assuming that CC behavior contributes to organizations' legitimacy to operate. Therefore, this work will render descriptive information on the degree to and forms by which business organizations in Switzerland are engaged as corporate citizens.

This leads to research question 1: How is the present constitution of CC?

- To explore the current CC situation in Switzerland we obtained data concerning
- the prevalence of CC practices in the Swiss economy,
 - the nature of the CC practices, as well as
 - the areas the CC efforts are targeted at.

To assess the Swiss status quo in CC we gathered data from persons who are responsible for their respective organizations' endeavors – thereby enabling us to also assess the key motivating moments on an *individual level*.

Research question 2: What are the reasons for CC efforts and can motivational orientations be summarized in a factorial structure?

The dual drive behind the development of CC suggested by Windsor (2001) (i.e. changes in the societal contract demand companies to become involved in welfare and economic changes demand companies to act strategically in virtually all fields of operations) suggests different potentially motivating aspects: Whereas voluntarily implementing charitable behavior in response to societal changes presents a rather idealistic motivation, making strategic use of CC adds a functionalistic motivation to this behavior (Windsor, 2006). Therefore, we assessed multiple motivating factors of the CC practices that have been used in previous similar studies with the intention of examining a potential underlying factorial structure on an exploratory basis.

We further strive to shed light on the *process level* and focus in the following on the questioned enterprises' environmental assessment practices as well as their communicative stakeholder management.

Research question 3: Are environmental assessment practices common among engaged companies?

To answer this we assessed

- companies' retro- and prospective reflections on the relevance of the CC concept
- whether the environments of engaged companies provide them with CC examples
- their systemic reflections on obstacles obstructing a sustained CC engagement
- support needs as uttered by the companies and
- whether they retrospectively assess the benefits created by CC (evaluation).

We present differences in the environmental assessment practices that are evident between engaged and non-engaged companies as well as between the engaged firms of the culture system and size-wise subsamples.

Research question 4: Do companies communicate their CC engagement to key stakeholders?

We differentiate

- communication efforts aimed at internal stakeholders (e.g., employees, managers)
- communication efforts aimed at external stakeholders (e.g., the public media).

This study's research questions and their affiliation to the Wood model are depicted in Figure 1.

 Insert Figure 1 here

Associations between CC prevalence and firm sizes

Further determinants of companies' CC practices have been suggested to be the firm sizes and the geographical and cultural environments they operate in.

Various authors suggest the probability of CC occurrence in general and specific parameters of it, as for example the strategic exploitation of it, to increase with the firm size. Variations in socially responsible behaviors along with company sizes have been attributed to a greater public visibility of large companies, greater personnel and financial resources at their disposal, larger scales of operations, and more evolved business administration processes (Russo & Perrini, 2010; Slater & Dixon-Fowler, 2009; Udayasankar, 2008; Graafland, van de Ven, & Stoeffele, 2003; Donaldson, 2001). Empirically, CSP has indeed been reported to occur more often on the part of bigger firms. Basil, Runte, Basil, and Usher (in press) for example recently showed for a Canadian sample of 990 companies that bigger companies make more use of a special form of CC, i.e. employee volunteering, and use it more strategically to create company benefits. Similar findings have been put forth by Graafland and van de Ven (2006).

Therefore, our main analyses will each be presented with an additional section concerning differences between small and medium-sized enterprises (SME; i.e. 1-250 employees) and bigger companies (251 and more employees; cf. BFS, 2010a).

Associations between CC prevalence and subnational culture systems

Concerning potential differences in CC emergence pertaining to cultural environments it has been subject to debate and research that CC occurrence varies internationally (e.g. Matten & Moon, 2008; Basu & Palazzo, 2008, Lenssen & Vorobey, 2005; Katz, Swanson, & Nelson, 2001; Habisch, Jonker, Wegner, & Schmidpeter, 2005; Küskü & Zarkarda-Fraser, 2004; Maignan & Ferrell, 2000). International disparities are commonly explained drawing on (neo-)institutionalist theory, taking into account that historical and cultural specifics contribute to heterogeneous relationships between business and society, and thereby to diverse expectations the public raises against corporate actors. For example, Matten and Moon (2008) explain the observable explicitness of US CC activities by the weaker welfare state, which results a) in higher public expectations of corporate contributions to the social system and b) in increased legitimacy of corporate community involvement. Katz et al. (2001) and Lenssen and Vorobey (2005) draw on Hofstede's cultural dimensions to identify four cultural systems prevalent in European national economies. The UK and Ireland constitute the Anglo-Saxon culture system, which comes close to the general affinity to explicit CC practices as performed in the US. Other Northern European countries (constituting the Germanic and Scandinavian culture system in Lenssen and Vorobey's (2005) categorization) resemble the US proneness to CV, yet the view of companies' community involvement as being a matter of course is not as widely shared as in the Anglo-Saxon system. However, in the more southern countries social welfare is publicly regarded business of public authorities, rendering companies to be confronted with more skepticism when actively engaging in CC (Lenssen & Vorobey, 2005; van der Voort, Glac, & Meijs, 2009). According to Lenssen and Vorobey (2005) in the trilingual country of Switzerland two different culture systems are evident: In the larger German speaking part the Germanic system prevails, which is characterized by a wider stakeholder concept readily incorporating the public, by socially active companies, and a tendency toward more participative structures within companies (cf. Lenssen & Vorobey, 2005). The Western and Southern parts of Switzerland (speaking French and Italian, respectively) are dominated by more secular and legal structures, as traditionally common in the Latin culture system (Lenssen & Vorobey, 2005), hereby contributing to public suspicion upon corporate community involvement. Consequently, we will present the results to our analyses in

consideration of the involved culture systems. Thereby we apply the Lenssen and Vorobey categorization to explore the hypothesized subnational CC variation for the first time.

Method

Overview

This study was part of a larger research project involving two Swiss universities located in Zurich and Basel, respectively. The project's goal was to examine current and future CC practices in Swiss organizations. Our work is funded by the *Confederation's innovation promotion agency (CTI)*.

Questionnaire

We realized the study as nationwide web-based survey among companies of all industries. As psychometric scales are missing in the CC field researchers usually make use of single item questions tackling the subject of the research question directly. Wherever possible, we modeled our items on the ones used in the few studies, which partly addressed similar issues, thereby enhancing possibilities to compare our study results to the ones of other authors (see results tables).

Recruiting procedure and sample

The three most representative and influential employers' associations in Switzerland, i.e. the Swiss Employers' Association (Schweizerischer Arbeitgeberverband), the Economiesuisse (both representing mostly large companies and industry sectors in all three parts of Switzerland), and the Swiss Trade and Crafts Association (Schweizerischer Gewerbeverband; mostly representing small and medium-sized enterprises), supported our study. Calls for participation in our research were sent to the respective members of the associations in their periodically issued journals as well as via internal e-mail delivery systems. Each publication, newsletter, and e-mail issued on our behalf contained the link to the online survey.

The software we used distinguishes mere visits from more thorough approaches to the survey. Eventually, we gathered 2142 completed questionnaires and 2310 questionnaires, which were started but left unfinished. However, 46 of 2142 persons indicated in the first question that they did not know, whether their organization had ever been engaged in any charitable behavior and were excluded from the study as unformed respondents. Thus, we computed a response-visit ratio of 47.1% indicating sufficient acceptance of the survey.

Mapping the Swiss economical structure quite well our sample consisted mainly of SME. A total of 89.5% of the participating organizations belongs to the subsample of enterprises occupying 1 to 250 employees (the respective Swiss population consists of 99.6%; BFS, 2010b). A further 8.5% of our participants spoke for firms employing 251 and more persons (rest: missing). In most cases (56.4%) respondents were owners of the respective firms. Further 22.1% were CEOs, 14.1% were employees in leading positions, 4.0% stemmed from the human resources department, and 2.0% indicated “other”.

To gather information concerning the fields our participants operate in we deployed the official categorizations of industry branches defined by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (BFS, 2009), which is adjusted to other international standards. In summary, our sample maps the Swiss economical structure well, with an over representation in the building sector and slight under representations in the sectors of: commerce, maintenance and repair, consulting, education, health care, public administration, social insurance, as well as provision of public and private services.

The online questionnaire was provided in three language versions. The majority of 87.2% chose to answer the questions in German and constitute the subsample Germanic culture system. A portion of 7.7% of the respondents stemmed from the French speaking part, and another 5.1% from the Italian speaking part of Switzerland (taken together the francophone and Italian speaking parts constitute the Latin culture system in this study, rendering a subsample size of 12.8%). Thereby, our sample represents the trilingual Swiss population well (cf. swissworld.org, 2009).

Results

In the following, we present the assent percentages to each item in general and separately for the respective subsamples. Sample sizes differ minimally from item to item as not all questions were issued to all participants (e.g. only participants who had stated to have been engaged in CC were asked for their motivational orientation) and because participants were – for the sake of higher compliance – not forced to answer each question, thereby resulting in differing missing rates. Error margins were computed for each indicator of each subsample (Basil et al., 2009; see note below Table 1). Percentages flagged boldly represent significant differences (i.e. 95%-confidence intervals do not overlap) between the subsamples of different firm sizes, geographic origins, and engaged vs. non-engaged companies. Detailed computations may be obtained from the authors of this paper.

Attend to Tables 1 to 4 for all descriptive results to the respective research questions. Cells contain assent rates to the respective items.

Insert Table 1 here

RQ 1: How is the present constitution of CC?

Engagement rates: CC efforts are common among Swiss enterprises: more than three quarters of our sample state to have been involved in charitable practices.

We assessed those forms of engagement that were pursued in the last five years. Traditional forms of engagement (e.g. donations or gifts) are still widespread. However, more than half of the already-engaged respondents indicated to provide beneficiary services that are otherwise provided for pay and to grant their employees leaves of absences without payroll deduction (so they may engage in volunteer work). The more time intensive engagement form of providing schoolings and trainings for beneficiary reasons is somewhat less common.

Areas of engagement: Respondents indicated most often to focus their contributions on sports, culture, and education with roughly every second respondent, who has ever been engaged in CC, indicating charitable investment in these areas.

The bigger the company the more likely it is engaged in CC practices: More than nine out of ten companies employing more than 250 persons indicate some CC engagement. Concerning the forms of CC behavior, larger companies display higher assent rates across the board of the various forms – indicating a well-balanced engagement portfolio. Moreover, they significantly more often agree to donating corporate gifts, maintaining foundations, granting their employees leaves of absences than SME, and providing cost-free trainings. The larger firms are engaged in a wider array of areas, as the mostly consistently higher assent rates to this question show. They are especially engaged more extensively in the areas of culture, education, social matters, ecology, and health care.

Companies located in the German-speaking part of Switzerland display significantly higher engagement rates than the ones in the Western and Southern parts. Companies from the two culture systems differ only in the granting of leaves of absences, with the Germanic firms more often agreeing to this CC form. Latin culture-system firms engage less often in the areas of education and environmental protection.

Insert Table 2a here

RQ 2: Motivating factors of CC efforts

The motivation for CC practices in Swiss enterprises is multidimensional in nature with few motives being mentioned very often and numerous others playing secondary roles: Respondents give two main reasons for their CC efforts: they attribute it to the personal concern of the decision maker and consider CC an expression to the social responsibility they have as companies. Semantically closer to a genuine self-interest is the third ranked motive of the cultivation of their corporate image, named by about half of the respondents. With less than ten percent recruiting advantages and the development of profits only seldom serve as incentive to engage in CC practices. Analyses of the multiple answer sets reveal each respondent to admit to a mean of 3.4 motives.

Bigger firms more frequently than SME agree to CC being a way to express their corporate social responsibility. It is noteworthy that they also more often expect CC to contribute to constructs relevant to strategic management in presuming merits in the fields of corporate image, employee morale, teamwork, and recruitment.

According to the findings that companies from the Germanic system and bigger companies more actively pursue CC activities, respondents from these firms admit to absolutely more motivational aspects driving their charitable efforts: Mean assent rates range from 3.5 for Germanic to 2.9 for Latin culture systems companies, and from 4.3 for big firms to 3.4 for SME. In other words, companies from the respective subsamples are more involved in CC because they expect more benefits to be gained by it. Further, firms operating in the Germanic system significantly more often agree to CC being a personal concern of the decision maker and to its being part of their corporate social responsibility than firms in the Latin system, supporting the notion that corporate contributions to social matters are more deeply rooted in the Germanic system. Additionally, Germanic system firms seem to perceive CC a resource for regional networking and team development more often.

Insert Table 2b here

To test the second part of RQ 2, i.e. whether motives may be summarized in a factorial structure, a principal component analysis (PCA) for dichotomous variables was conducted (Kubinger, 2003). Preliminary analyses revealed the data suited for this approach: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin criterion reached a value of .681 thereby exceeding the lowest acceptable

threshold of .5; Bartlett's sphericity test proved the correlations between singular items to be sufficiently large to justify a principal components analysis ($\chi^2(55) = 1298.185, p < .001$). The PCA revealed three components to have eigenvalues above Kaiser's criterion of 1. Table 2b displays varimax-rotated factor loadings, the portion of explained variance, eigenvalues, and mean assent rates to each factor across subsamples. The three components explain in concert 63.6% of the variance. On the basis of the convention that loadings above .5 are relevant (Backhaus, Erichson, Plinke, & Weiber, 2008), every item can be assigned to exactly one of the principal components. The respective item loadings suggest component 1 to represent motives that are related to the middle to long-term pecuniary growth of business within the region the firm operates in (hereinafter termed *regionally concentrated business development*); items loading on component 2 belong to the realm of *human resource management*; component 3 represents motives that are characterized by a *genuine concern for the community* the firm belongs to, however, essential is that they are not readily translated in pecuniary advantages but rather originate in the self-perception of being a societal actor (thereby coming close to legitimacy). The three-factorial structure was backed-up by a bootstrapping procedure with 999 drawings, rendering a good stability of the three-factor-solution of 68.9%. Frequency analysis of the three factors reveals genuine concern for the community to be the most dominant motivational aspect of companies' CC endeavors (76.8% of the respondents agree to one or more items loading on this factor), followed by regionally concentrated business development (17.3% assent) and expectancies related to HR management (5.9% assent). Bigger companies significantly more often admit to expecting positive business development and significantly less often express a genuine concern for the community they operate in. Companies from the different culture systems do not vary in their assent to the respective factors.

Insert Table 3 here

RQ 3: Are environmental assessment practices common among engaged companies?

According to the Wood model (1991) on the process level of CC we gathered information about the firms' environmental assessment practices.

About 90% of the respondents expect the relevance of CC to remain at the present level or to increase in the future; a slightly smaller portion of the sample reports to have perceived the analog development in the past three years. However, the process dynamic is limited with

more than two thirds perceiving and expecting stagnation. The awareness of CC relevance developments is clearly associated with the engagement itself: companies actively pursuing CC have perceived the past increase in CC relevance to a significantly greater extent than non-engaged firms.

In total, a majority of the respondents indicated that they knew relevant other companies who are engaged in CC practices. Much more engaged than non-engaged companies do so.

Obstacles: In general, our sample does not perceive many obstacles impeding their charitable engagement. The most mentioned obstacle to CC efforts was a perceived lack of benefit followed by lack of governmental support. Not surprisingly companies that pursue CC report more often to not perceive any barriers to their engagement. Yet, it is noteworthy that the perception of specific obstacles differs between engaged and non-engaged companies: Non-engaged companies see a greater barrier in their lack of experience and benefit than the engaged companies. CC active firms pursue their engagement despite a perceived lack of governmental as well as public support. These obstacles seem not to be anticipated by non-engaged firms.

Need for support: A majority of the respondents explicitly indicates no need for support in their CC endeavors. However, almost one third of the participants would appreciate financial support. Compared to the engaged companies non-engaged firms are more interested in support by consultancy (corresponding to their lack of experience in CC matters) whereas engaged firms are more interested in financial support.

The bigger firms expect an increase in CC relevance and obviously perceive this to be part of an already ongoing process. There is a tendency in the data – however, the difference is statistically not significant – that bigger firms also know of more other engaged firms in their corporate environment. Interesting patterns emerge from the questions considering perceived obstacles and support needs: SME seemingly need more, and presumably pecuniary, support by the government and the public; bigger firms complain about too little employee compliance to their CC activities and wish for experience exchange with others (albeit the difference to SME is marginally not significant). Despite the so far supported notion that bigger companies pursue CC endeavors with more strategic rigor and professionalized administration processes, evaluation efforts are equally rare among firms of all sizes. This seems especially remarkable as it suggests considerable and probably matchless degrees of freedom in managerial activity when it comes to a company's charitable engagement as invested resources need little justification and its return on invest not to be proven. Analyzes of the culture system subsamples reveal that the past and future CC development is perceived

equally among the companies. Corresponding to the generally higher engagement level in the Germanic culture system, companies here know of more other engaged firms. Interestingly, the less engaged firms in the Latin culture system see fewer obstacles and indicate fewer support needs, pointing to some CC potential in this part of Switzerland.

Insert Table 4 here

RQ 4: Do companies communicate their CC engagement to key stakeholders?

Communication efforts that accompany respondents' CC efforts are seldom found: Respondents more often deny communicating their efforts externally than they admit to it. Internal communication is significantly more common than external communication, however, respondents again by the majority refrain from communicating their CC efforts to internal stakeholders.

In line with the presumption that bigger firms possess more professionalized administration processes data reveal their internal and external stakeholder dialogue about CC to be further developed than in SME.

According to the presumably wider spread acceptance of corporations' involvement in social matters in the Germanic system, it could be assumed that firms here are less reluctant to communicate their CC endeavors. However, there is no difference in CC communication habits evident between firms from the different parts of Switzerland.

Discussion

It was the objective of this paper to present data from a nationwide sample of companies to gain insights into the current constitution of CC Switzerland, its motivational basis, and accompanying processes.

We did so by framing CC within Wood's model of Corporate Social Performance (Wood, 1991) as this allows for a systematic and differential approach to institutional, organizational, and individual aspects of CC as well as the description of both, objective degree of a national economy's CC practice and the underlying processes. We strived to objectify the extent and nature of CC practices in Switzerland, as pronounced in research question 1. Our work rests upon the thesis of Wood (1991) and others that CC contributes to the valuable corporate asset

of its societal legitimacy (cf. Suchman, 1995; Liu et al., 2010). Whereas this explains the motivation to engage in CC on an institutional level, it is the individual latitude of decision makers within business organizations that accounts for their specific CC activities and in which we were interested in research question 2. The behavioral processes underlying the assumption of corporate responsibility was subject to research questions 3, tackling the environmental assessment practices, and 4, asking for companies' stakeholder communication habits.

On the macro-level of the Swiss national economy the results of our study suggest CC to be quite common, with the passive forms of donating money or in kind dominating over the more active forms of supporting employees' volunteer work activities of the provision of cost-free trainings. Remarkably, the contribution of beneficiary services that are otherwise provided for pay is quite popular among Swiss enterprises. Regarding the targets of CC activities sports is the field that most companies choose as their CC's beneficiary, followed by cultural activities and contributions to the educational system.

On the level of organizational expectations from the charitable engagement, three motivational clusters emerged from the data, with the genuine concern for the community in which companies operate being the most important one. However, respondents also agreed to expecting conducive effects of CC to business development and to a lesser extent to using CC as HR management tool. Hence, the motivation to actively pursue CC activities is multidimensional. Therewith, our results further complement other studies pointing in similar directions: Graafland and van de Ven (2006) distinguish two main motivational orientations of moral (intrinsic) and strategic (extrinsic) reasoning behind responsible corporate behavior (albeit from a sustainability management perspective). Our first cluster of genuine concern corresponds well with their intrinsic motivation; regarding the second motivational factor we deem it necessary to further differentiate what they merely call "strategic" expectations from CC: Firstly, there is the development of the corporate environment, presumably taking place on an extended time-scale. Secondly, our respondents indicate to be further motivated by personnel development aspects of CC, which probably earlier yield fruit. This finding is in line with the studies of Hahn and Scheermesser (2006) as well as Brønn and Vidaver-Cohen (2009) who also suggest a three-dimensional motivational structure behind CC activities, incorporating one intrinsic aspect and two extrinsic factors that differ on the time-scale by which they serve the company's self-interest. Whilst their factors are differently termed it seems worthwhile to invest further in the development of sound psychometric instruments to validly and reliably assess corporations' motivational attitudes to CC. However, and here our

findings contradict widely shared views on the potential benefits of CC activities (e.g. Zappalà, 2004; Rochlin et al., 2005) – and as well calls for corporate action –, CC does not appear to be broadly used for the benefit of personnel or organizational development. Still, the strategic potential ascribed to CC is not necessarily dismissed, yet. CC may e.g. contribute to a favorable corporate reputation, which in turn will eventually pay off in increased sales, more customers, investors, etc. However, on a short-term basis companies do not demand CC effects to become visible in increased profits.

When it comes to environmental assessments, the perception of a positive dynamic in CC matters is associated with a greater likelihood of the company to be involved in CC endeavors. Firms that pursue CC today also state that the concept had gained in importance in the recent three years. As this study was realized as a cross-sectional survey and longitudinal data are missing until now it can only be speculated that the fact that it is mostly the non-engaged companies who see CC on the rise points to increasing CC rates in the upcoming years. Yet, as our data were gathered in the midst of the financial crisis that caused considerable trouble for some Switzerland's major economical players as well as public attention on their wrong- and right-doings the fact that more than 90% of participating companies expect CC to remain stable suggests it to be somewhat resistant to economic crisis-situations (for a similar notion, cf. Darigan & Post, 2009).

Knowing other corporate citizens in the business neighborhood further seems to foster one's own CC engagement. Obstacles to a CC engagement are on the one hand a lack of perceived benefit and knowledge pertaining to the management of CC. Not surprisingly, mostly non-engaged companies mention these barriers. On the other hand, engaged companies bemoan lacking governmental support (which they state to appreciate in the form of financial concessions) and too little compliance to CC endeavors on behalf of the employees. However, in sum, our respondents name but few obstacles to their CC activities and not very much support needs, either. This indicates a well-developed managerial self-efficacy when it comes to the implementation of CC. Further, lacking resources or uncertain returns on investment do not seem to prevent the gross of Swiss enterprises from becoming involved.

Finally, it is global, rather than specific environmental assessment that firms conduct: four out of five companies refrain from detailed evaluation efforts securing a measurable benefit for themselves or others. Again, we notice a certain tolerance with which CC is judged and which contributes to its diversity in forms and areas benefiting from it.

The (self-)confidence with which enterprises waive the assurance of their own benefits in CC is not mirrored in their communication habits. Dialogue with internal as well as external

stakeholders is the exception rather than the rule. This may be due to an uncertainty as to how the engagement will be received by the public or media (cf. Braun & Kukuk, 2007). But also internal stakeholders are in less than half of all cases kept informed about CC engagements, giving way to the impression that they are private endeavors of the firms' decision makers and not yet part of the corporate culture.

Bigger firms are more intensively involved in CC activities; e.g. they display activity in a wider array of CC forms indicating a well-balanced engagement portfolio. Moreover, and supporting the resource argument for the allegation that bigger firms should be more engaged as corporate citizens, they significantly more often agree to resource intensive engagement forms as for example corporate gifts, or maintaining foundations. Their tendency to support employee volunteering or to offer cost free trainings might be attributed to policies and standardized processes that come along with the higher degree of professionalism in the business administration of larger companies (Udayasankar, 2008). In a similar vein, large corporations associate CC stronger with benefits to be gained on their own behalf and weaker with a genuine concern for their communities. Among the bigger firms the CC evolution seems to be more fast-paced than for SME as the big firms more often report that CC has gained and will continue to gain in importance for them. In addition, they act more self-reliantly than SME indicating fewer resource-based obstacles and less financial support needs. However, big firms significantly more often agree to a lack in employee support of their CC endeavors. It is remarkable that despite the presumed further professionalized administrative systems in bigger corporations they equally often refrain from controlling the achieved merits of CC – either for themselves or the beneficiaries. Nonetheless, bigger firms are used to a greater extent in corporate communication and display this in CC matters, too. Yet, it is still less than half of the questioned big companies that communicate their CC activities to external stakeholders.

The explorative analyzes of subnational differences in engagement characteristics reveal CC in the German-speaking part of Switzerland to be a different CC than in the parts belonging to the Latin culture system. In line with more a more secularized concept of the welfare system, corporations in the Latin culture systems are less often involved in CC activities and expect less benefits from it; although they do admit equally to the same three motivational orientations. Interestingly, environmental assessment practices do not differ significantly between culture systems, with the counter-intuitive exception that the less engaged companies from the Latin system perceive fewer obstacles and express lesser need for support. We interpret this finding in accordance to Lenssen and Vorobey (2005) as reluctance to become

involved in CC on behalf of companies operating in a more secularized social system, which in itself renders less justification for corporate charitable acts. Supporting this notion, companies from the Latin culture system significantly less often admit to CC being part of their corporate responsibility and to being a personal concern of the decision maker. That indicates CC not to be as integral a part of the companies' self-concept in the Latin culture system. Yet, to fully support this interpretation companies there should communicate their engagements even less than their Germanic counterparts, as they have more reason to fear public skepticism and disaffirmation (Braun & Kukuk, 2007). However, reservation to communicate CC activity is equally high in both culture systems. Thus, our interpretation must remain tentative and awaits future research efforts.

In sum, bigger companies are more visible to the public, dispose of more resources, and display more professionalized administrative processes (Russo & Perrini, 2010; Slater & Dixon-Fowler, 2009; Udayasankar, 2008; Graafland et al., 2003; Donaldson, 2001). Consequently, they display greater engagement rates, are more self-reliant in their CC implementation and execution, connect it more closely to strategic wins, and communicate it more offensively to internal and external stakeholders. Companies in the German speaking part of Switzerland show a greater tendency to be engaged as corporate citizens and presumably do so in accordance with their self-conception of doing their share for the communities they strive to prosper in. Latin culture system companies are more reluctant to become involved in CC, however, do not justify their reservation by greater obstacles and, thus, leave us with the open question, whether they have other reasons to be engaged (which they did not utter, although they did have the opportunity in the survey) or whether they have a different understanding of CC altogether, prompting them to rather deny any involvement in the first place.

International comparisons

As mentioned above the survey instrument made use of similar questions of other studies published in the field to allow for some comparisons. Naturally, these must remain tentative as neither study was designed to replicate the others, they differed in the employed methodologies, samples, and not all questions could be parallelized. However, it is interesting to note that CC rates in Switzerland are somewhat lower than the ones reported from the Northern neighbor Germany (96%, Braun & Kukuk, 2007; 82.4%, Maass & Clemens, 2002). Equivalent data from the US are not reported. The engagement characteristics resemble each other in the studies of Braun and Kukuk (2007) for Germany and Rochlin et al. (2004) for the

US, with passive forms of engagement (e.g. donations) dominating over more active forms; besides supporting employees in their volunteering activities is wider spread in the US (Rochlin et al., 2004; MacPhail & Bowles, 2009). Concerning the areas benefiting from firms involvements it is communal political activities that are more common in Germany and the health system targeted by US companies. It will be interesting to observe whether US companies concentrate on other fields now that the US health system is going to be reformed and public need of compensatory actions will probably decrease.

The motivational aspects reported resemble each other as well. An exception is a much higher agreement to the reason of company tradition in Germany and the US. The Rochlin et al. (2004) study also reports higher assent rates to the expected improvement of regional networks, recruitment, and uplifting profits.

Maass and Clemens (2002) report German companies to be equally determined to continue their CC engagements as respondents to our study expressed. Concerning barriers to corporate charitable engagement Swiss companies appear somewhat more skeptical than companies in Germany or the US as to whether there is a benefit to be achieved by it (Braun & Kukuk, 2007; Maass & Clemens, 2002; Rochlin et al., 2004). Finally, detailed evaluation efforts are equally sparse in Germany, as reported by Braun and Kukuk (2007) to be in action in only 12.3% of the companies. Communication efforts are even lower in the US (not included in the German study), with 21% admitting to external and 35% agreeing to internal communication efforts (Rochlin et al., 2004).

In sum, corporate engagement seems to be determined by similar processes in Switzerland, Germany, and the US – giving us further confidence in our data. Detailed comparative analyses are, however, still missing and will likely render valuable insights into e.g. differing stakeholder expectations and varying acceptance rates of diverse CC activities and the accompanying processes.

Implications for research and practice

Our results offer a couple of interesting research questions, as for example how CC efforts – rather elaborated in the degree of discretionary assumption of societal responsibility – are related to more “pyramid-bottom” CSR behaviors, such as avoiding excessive pollution or abstaining from child labor. In a similar vain it would be interesting to learn whether corporations being decided good corporate citizens are also socially responsible employers. To address this issue, it seems worthwhile to explicitly address employees of firms that are active in CC and gather data on their job satisfaction, work motivation, or promotional activities of their work-life-integration, to name just a few compelling constructs. Finally, but

definitely not exhaustively, future research will have to address the measurement issue of lacking scales. These will become necessary to reliably measure less objective aspects of CC, such as employee or customer attitudes.

For practitioners we deem our research valuable as its results provide insights into the common CC practice in Switzerland. E.g., whereas the majority of enterprises pursues some charitable engagement, it is still a minority that offers trainings and schoolings for beneficiary reasons. This information may lead managers who want to implement CC in their company to set it apart from local competitors. Also, corporate volunteering as a specific form of CC becomes increasingly common in continental Europe (Herzig, 2006). Our results show that many firms already grant their employees leaves of absences. Thus the ground seems prepared for managers to further this development. Communities wanting to sustain their corporations' citizenship behavior may further benefit from our study as its results enable them to address companies' needs differentially. E.g., whereas firms that already pursue an engagement articulate a wish for more public support, firms still contemplating about a possible engagement are in need for consultancy that helps to clarify obtainable benefits and compensates missing experience. Moreover, it is especially SME that are in need for financial support by communal authorities.

Limitations

Our study has some limitations that need to be taken into account when considering the results. One weakness is certainly that in the absence of generally binding definitions in the field our CC concept must remain idiosyncratic. Thereby our results may not be easily compared to the ones of other authors who make use of a wider or narrower meaning of the concept. However, we tried to solve this problem by explicating the terms of our concept in detail and by locating it in the proximity of CSR. Furthermore, we operationalized the term for our empirical study according to other studies we know of. Therefore, comparability with at least certain studies should be granted. Another limitation pertains our sample. We addressed potential respondents via many channels, mostly in written form including the link to our online survey. Naturally, this fosters a self-selection bias, possibly resulting in an overrepresentation of participants who have a special interest in the topic and especially favor it or disapprove of it. This procedure was consciously chosen because it has the benefit of addressing a much larger number of potential participants at the same time than alternative approaches, such as telephone surveys, and because it was our declared goal to obtain data from a large sample. We tackled the problem by explicitly calling on both, enterprises who do

and who do not engage in CC practices. Despite our effort to overcome this limitation we recognize it as being a threat to the external validity of our results.

Below the line, we consider these weaknesses to be outweighed by the strengths of our study. Drawing on Wood's (1991) CSP model allows for a differential approach to institutional, organizational, and individual aspects of CC and permits to describe the objective degree of a national economy's CC practice and its principal processes. Beyond a description of the status quo in CC matters, our results provide insights into motivational aspects of charitable corporate behavior. The dimensional analyzes of the motivational orientations represent a further development in the individual-centered CC research and will be a crucial preliminary to the design of psychometric scales assessing CC motivational states. Further, this is one of the first studies that may claim to come close to representativeness for a country's corporate landscape. We obtained data from a sufficiently large sample of companies of all sizes, thereby mapping the Swiss corporate population well, of all branches, and across all regions of Switzerland. Thus, for the first time we gained a thorough insight in the Swiss CC reality.

Conclusion

Business organizations are increasingly challenged to become involved in their communities as good corporate citizens to compensate the decreasing influence of states in societal matters. Our research shows *that, how, and why* the majority of Swiss enterprises does live up to their social responsibility. At the same time, corporations must justify most of their actions and are being held accountable to make profits – even in their charitable activities. Our results reveal that CC practices are yet employed mostly independently from a measurable short-term return on investment and the business strategy. Thereby, CC efforts are run autonomously from economic demands and flexibly to serve personal interests of the decision makers that they perceive to be conform to community needs. The business environments of larger companies and in the German speaking part of Switzerland are arguably more prone to produce CC involvements. Results in these subsamples suggest CC engagements to be on the rise in volume and to slowly become more professionalized and better attuned to corporate strategy.

References

- Backhaus, K., Erichson, B., Plinke, W., & Weiber, R. (2008). *Multivariate Analysemethoden – Eine anwendungsorientierte Einführung*. Berlin: Springer.
- Basil, D., Runte, M., Easwaramoorthy, M., & Barr, C. (2009). Company support for employee volunteering: A national survey of companies in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, 387-398.
- Basil, D., Runte, M., Basil, M., & Usher, J. (in press). Company support for employee volunteerism: Does size matter? *Journal of Business Research*.
- Basu, K. & Palazzo, G. (2008): Corporate social responsibility: A process model of sensemaking. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 122-136.
- BFS Bundesamt für Statistik. (2009). Eidgenössische Betriebszählung. Wirtschaftsstruktur. Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft, Neuchâtel.
- BFS Bundesamt für Statistik. (2010a). Online document, retrieved on 04/13/2010. URL: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/infothek/definitionen.html>.
- BFS Bundesamt für Statistik. (2010b). Online document, retrieved on 04/13/2010. URL: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/06/02/blank/data.Document.20931.xls>
- Braun, S. & Kukuk, M. (2007). *Kommentierter Datenbericht zum Forschungsprojekt: Corporate Citizenship – Gesellschaftliches Engagement von Wirtschaftsunternehmen in Deutschland*. Arbeitspapier des Forschungszentrums für Bürgerschaftliches Engagement. Paderborn, Working Paper Nr. 01/2007.
- Brønn, P. S. & Vidaver-Cohen, D. (2009). Corporate motives for social initiative: Legitimacy, sustainability, or the bottom line? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 91-109.
- Brown, T. J. & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 61I, 68-85.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39-48
- Chapple, W. & Moon, J. (2005). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A seven-country study of CSR web site reporting. *Business Society*, 44, 415-441.
- Clarkson, M. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 92-117.
- Darigan, K. H. & Post, J. E. (2009). Corporate citizenship in China: CSR challenges in the 'Harmonious Society'. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 35, 39-53.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 312-322.
- Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Embacher, S. & Roth, R. (2010). *Ein neuer Gesellschaftsvertrag. Rahmungen für Corporate Citizenship*. Berlin: Centrum für Corporate Citizenship Deutschland.
- Graafland, J. & van de Ven, B. (2006). Strategic and moral motivation for corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 22, 111-123.
- Graafland, J., van de Ven, B., & Stoeffele, N.C.G.M. (2003). Strategies and instruments for organizing CSR by small and large enterprises in the Netherlands. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47, 45-60.
- Habisch, A., Jonker, J., Wegner, M., & Schmidpeter, R. (eds.). (2005). *Corporate Social Responsibility Across Europe*. Berlin: Springer.
- Hahn, T. & Scheermesser, M. (2006). Approaches to corporate sustainability among German companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 13, 150-165.
- Herzig, C. (2006). Corporate volunteering in Germany: survey and empirical evidence. *International Journal of Business Environment*, 1, 51-69.

- Houghton, S. M., Gabel, J. T. A., & Williams, D. W. (2009). Connecting the two faces of CSR: Does employee volunteerism improve compliance? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 477-494.
- Katz, J., Swanson, D., & Nelson, L. (2001). Culture-based expectations of corporate citizenship: A propositional framework and comparison of four cultures. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9, 149-171.
- Kubinger, K. (2003). On artificial results due to using factor analysis for dichotomous variables. *Psychology Science*, 45, 106-110.
- Küskü, F. & Zarkada-Fraser, A. (2004). An empirical investigation of corporate citizenship in Australia and Turkey. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 57-72.
- Lenssen, G., & Vorobey, V. (2005). The role of business in society and Europe. In A. Habisch, M. Wegner, R. Schmidpeter, & J. Jonker (eds.). *Corporate Social Responsibility Across Europe*. Berlin: Springer. 357-375.
- Liu, G., Liston Heyes, C., & Ko, W.-W. (2010). Employee participation in cause-related marketing strategies: A study of management perceptions from British consumer service industries. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92, 195-210.
- Maass, F. & Clemens, R. (2002). *Corporate Citizenship - Das Unternehmen als "guter Bürger"*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag.
- MacPhail, F. & Bowles, P. (2009). Corporate social responsibility as support for employee volunteers: Impacts, gender puzzles and policy implications in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 405-416.
- Maignan, I. & Ferrell, O. C. (2000). Measuring corporate citizenship in two countries: The case of the United States and France. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23, 283-297.
- Maignan, I. & Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Corporate citizenship as a marketing instrument: Concepts, evidence, and research directions? *European Journal of Marketing*, 3, 457-484.
- Marsden, C. (2000). The new corporate citizenship of big business: Part of the solution to sustainability? *Business & Society Review*, 105, 9-25
- Matten, D., Crane, A., & Chapple, W. (2003). Behind the mask: Revealing the true face of corporate citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45, 109-120.
- Matten, D. & Moon, J. (2008). "Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 404-424.
- Maurice, M., Sorge, A., & Warner, M. (1980). Societal differences in organizing manufacturing units: A comparison of France, West Germany, and Great Britain. *Organization Studies*, 1, 59-86.
- Palazzo, G. & Scherer, A. G. (2006). Corporate legitimacy as deliberation. A communicative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 71-88.
- Porter, M. E. & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 56-68.
- Rochlin, S., Witter, K., Mirvis, P., Jordan, S., & Beevas, D. T. (2004). *The state of corporate citizenship in the U.S. A view from inside 2003 - 2004*. Retrieved from <http://www.bcccc.net/index.cfm?fuseaction=Home.actUserLogin&nodeID=1> on 01/15/2009.
- Rochlin, S., Sapna, S., Witter, K., Jordan, S., Taylor, C., Williams, K., Freyvogel, R., & Dyer, B. (2005). *The state of corporate citizenship in the U.S. business perspectives in 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.bcccc.net/index.cfm?fuseaction=Home.actUserLogin&nodeID=1> on 01/15/09.
- Russo, A. & Perrini, F. (2010). Investigating stakeholder theory and social capital: CSR in large firms and SMEs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91, 207-221.

- Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 158–166.
- Slater, D. J. & Dixon-Fowler, H. R. (2009). CEO international assignment experience and corporate social performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 472-489.
- Suchman, M. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571-610.
- Swanson, D. & Niehoff, B. P. (2001). Business citizenship outside and inside the organizations. In J. Andriof & M. McIntosh (Eds.). *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship*. 83-103. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Thielemann, U. (2010). Die Macht des Kapitals und die Ohnmacht der Moral. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*. Online available:
http://www.nzz.ch/blogs/nzz_votum/nzzvotum_wirtschaft_ethik/die_macht_des_kapital_s_und_die_ohnmacht_der_moral_1.5339875.html
- Udayasankar, K. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and firm size. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83, 167-175.
- Van der Voort, J. M., Glac, K., & Meijjs, L. C. P. M. (2009). „Managing“ corporate community involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, 311-329.
- Windsor, D. (2001). Corporate citizenship. Evolution and interpretation. In J. Andriof & M. McIntosh (Eds.). *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship*. 39-52. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Windsor, D. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Three key approaches. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 39-52.
- Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691-718.
- Wood, D. J., & Logsdon, J. M. (2001). Theorising business citizenship. In J. Andriof & M. McIntosh (Eds.). *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship*. 83-103. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Zappalà, G. (2004). Corporate citizenship and human resource management: A new tool or a missed opportunity? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 42, 185-201.

Research levels according to the Wood model (Wood, 1991)		Empirical foci of this study; research questions
Principles of Corporate Social Responsibility		
Motivating principles (reflection)	Institution: Enterprises (the economic system) as societal subsystem	RQ 1: Extent and nature of Swiss enterprises' charitable engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engagement rates - Form of engagement - Area of engagement
	Organisation: The enterprise as specific actor interrelated with other stakeholder groups	
	Individual: The management as key decision maker in the enterprise	RQ 2: Decision makers' motivations for engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assent rates to various motivational aspects - Factorial structure of the CC motivation
Processes of Corporate Social Responsiveness		
Processes (action)	Environmental Assessment	RQ 3: Retrospective and prospective assessment, social comparison, systemic reflections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation efforts - Relevance of CC in the past and future 3 years - Known examples of CC in the corporate environment - Perceived obstacles to CC and need for support
	Stakeholder Management	RQ 4: Stakeholder dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal communication - External communication
	Issues Management	
Outcomes of Corporate Social Behavior		
Results (objectifiable)	Social impacts	
	Social programs	
	Social policies	

Figure 1: Research levels according to the Wood model and empirical foci of this study

Table 1: Descriptive results to research question 1: Present constitution of CC

How is the present constitution of CC?	Total	Firm size		Culture system	
		SME: ≤250 employees	Big companies: >250 employees	Germanic system	Latin system
	N = 2096 (100%)	n = 1876 (89.5%)	n = 179 (8.5%)	n = 1827 (87.2%)	n = 269 (12.8%)
Engagement rate ^{1,2} Has your company ever been engaged in any charitable activity on a voluntary basis?	78.3%	77.3%	92.2%	81.3%	58.0%
	Total engaged n = 1642	Engaged ≤250 n = 1451	Engaged >250 n = 165	Engaged Germanic n = 1486	Engaged Latin n = 156
Engagement form (in the last 5 years) ^{1,2,3}					
Donations	80.3%	80.6%	83.0%	81.1%	73.1%
Beneficiary services	69.7%	70.8%	65.5%	70.6%	61.5%
Corporate gifts	65.2%	64.4%	76.4%	65.6%	61.5%
Assignments for beneficial use (e.g. vehicles)	63.3%	63.7%	66.7%	63.7%	59.0%
Company leaves without deduction from wages	55.2%	52.8%	83.0%	56.8%	39.7%
Company leaves with deduction from wages	24.7%	22.5%	44.2%	26.1%	10.9%
Provision of training	22.7%	21.4%	37.0%	23.4%	16.0%
Supporting or maintaining foundations	6.5%	4.2%	27.3%	6.3%	8.3%
Other	2.7%	2.4%	6.7%	2.5%	4.5%
Area ^{1,2,3}					
Sports	67.9%	68.6%	68.5%	68.6%	60.9%
Culture	56.6%	55.8%	70.3%	56.8%	55.1%
Education	51.1%	49.5%	70.9%	52.4%	38.5%
Social welfare	37.3%	35.8%	50.9%	37.1%	39.7%
Political activities	29.5%	29.5%	32.7%	30.1%	24.4%
Environment protection	26.9%	24.5%	49.7%	27.8%	17.9%
Rescue	24.4%	24.2%	29.1%	25.1%	17.9%
Children / youth	23.9%	24.3%	21.2%	24.4%	18.6%
Religion	19.3%	20.3%	12.1%	18.8%	23.7%

Health care	17.8%	15.0%	44.2%	18.2%	13.5%
Other	6.0%	5.9%	7.3%	5.9%	7.7%

Note: Items taken / adapted from:

¹ - Braun & Kukuk, 2007

² - Maass & Clemens, 2002

³ - Rochlin, Witter, Mirvis, Jordan, & Beevas, 2004

⁴ - Authors' item

Error margins for the 95% probability were computed conservatively for observed frequencies at 50% as:

±2.2 for N = 2096 (total sample); ±2.5 for n = 1642 (subsample engaged companies); ±4.7 for n = 454 (subsample non-engaged companies); ±2.3 for n = 1827 (subsample Germanic culture system companies); ±6.1 for n = 269 (subsample Latin culture system companies); ±2.3 for n = 1876 (subsample SME); ±7.5 for n = 179 (subsample big companies); ±2.6 for n = 1486 (subsample engaged Germanic culture system companies); ±8.0 for n = 156 (subsample engaged Latin culture system companies); ±2.6 for n = 1451 (subsample engaged SME); ±7.8 for n = 165 (subsample engaged big companies).

Table 2a: Results to research question 2: Reasons for CC efforts

Reasons for CC efforts ^{1,2,3}	Total	Firm size		Culture system	
	Engaged n = 1642	Engaged ≤250 n = 1451	Engaged >250 n = 165	Engaged Germanic n = 1486	Engaged Latin n = 156
Personal concern of the decision maker	70.1%	71.7%	62.4%	71.9%	52.6%
Social responsibility	69.6%	68.6%	81.2%	71.1%	54.5%
Image	47.9%	46.4%	66.1%	47.8%	48.1%
Tradition	35.4%	34.9%	43.6%	35.3%	36.5%
Regional networking	29.4%	28.9%	36.4%	31.4%	10.3%
Employee morale	28.3%	25.6%	53.3%	27.9%	32.1%
Teamwork abilities	21.6%	20.6%	32.1%	22.8%	9.6%
External expectancy	20.8%	20.3%	27.9%	20.9%	20.5%
Promotion of sales	16.6%	17.0%	13.9%	17.0%	12.8%
Recruiting advantages	7.2%	5.6%	21.2%	7.5%	3.8%
Profit	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.3%	4.5%

Note: Items taken / adapted from:

¹ - Braun & Kukuk, 2007

² - Maass & Clemens, 2002

³ - Rochlin, Witter, Mirvis, Jordan, & Beevas, 2004

Table 2b: Results of dimensional analyzes of motivational orientations

Reasons for CC efforts	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
	Regionally concentrated business development	HR management	Genuine concern for community
Item 3: Image	.704		
Item 5: Regional networks	.593		
Item 8: External expectancy	.558		
Item 9: Promotion of sales	.813		
Item 11: Profit	.873		
Item 6: Employee morale		.872	
Item 7: Teamwork		.861	
Item 10: Recruitment		.641	
Item 1: Social responsibility			.707
Item 2: Personal concern			.664
Item 4: Tradition			.743
Explained variance	33.9%	15.6%	14.1%
Eigenvalues	> 3.5	> 1.5	> 1.5
Assent rates			
Total	17.3%	5.9%	76.8%
Engaged ≤250	16.6%	5.6%	77.8%
Engaged ≤250	25.0%	9.4%	65.6%
Engaged Germanic	17.6%	5.9%	76.5%
Engaged Latin	14.3%	6.3%	79.5%

Table 3: Results to research question 3: Environmental assessment practices

Environmental assessment	Firm size			Culture system			
	Total N = 2096	Engaged n = 1642	Non- engaged n = 454	Engaged ≤250 n = 1451	Engaged >250 n = 165	Engaged Germanic n = 1486	Engaged Latin n = 156
CC relevance in the next 3 years ²							
Will increase	19.7%	18.2%	25.1%	17.0%	26.0%	18.6%	14.1%
Will stagnate	69.5%	74.5%	51.1%	76.1%	70.3%	74.6%	74.4%
Will decrease	4.3%	4.8%	2.2%	5.0%	2.4%	4.6%	7.1%
Missing	6.6%	2.5%	21.6%	1.9%	1.2%	2.3%	4.5%
CC relevance in the past 3 years ²							
Has increased	18.3%	20.7%	9.9%	19.3%	30.9%	20.4%	23.1%
Has stagnated	68.7%	70.3%	63.0%	72.2%	61.2%	70.8%	65.4%
Has decreased	6.0%	6.6%	3.7%	6.6%	7.3%	6.4%	8.3%
Missing	7.0%	2.5%	23.3%	1.9%	0.6%	2.4%	3.2%
Known examples in the corporate environment ⁴	60.1%	70.5%	22.2%	70.4%	77.0%	71.3%	62.8%
Obstacles ^{1,2,3}							
None	42.2%	49.9%	15.2%	50.4%	48.5%	49.3%	56.4%
Lack of							
- benefit	29.7%	26.7%	40.5%	26.6%	30.9%	27.8%	16.7%
- governmental support	19.5%	21.7%	11.5%	23.2%	12.1%	22.5%	14.7%
- public support	17.0%	19.5%	7.9%	20.9%	9.1%	20.7%	7.7%
- experience	16.0%	9.3%	40.1%	9.0%	12.1%	9.5%	7.7%
- employee support	10.3%	9.7%	12.6%	8.6%	17.6%	9.6%	10.9%

Support needs ⁴							
None	53.4%	52.4%	57.3%	52.2%	57.0%	51.3%	62.8%
Financial support	31.2%	33.0%	24.7%	35.4%	15.8%	33.6%	26.9%
Experience exchange	21.0%	21.9%	17.8%	21.1%	29.1%	22.7%	14.7%
Consultancy	15.1%	13.6%	20.3%	12.2%	19.4%	13.7%	13.5%
Assessment of obtained benefits ¹		17.1%		17.0%	17.4%	16.8%	19.2%

Note: Items taken / adapted from:

¹ - Braun & Kukuk, 2007

² - Maass & Clemens, 2002

³ - Rochlin, Witter, Mirvis, Jordan, & Beevas, 2004

⁴ - Authors' item

Table 4: Results to research question 4: Stakeholder dialogue

Stakeholder dialogue	Engaged n = 1642	Engaged ≤250 n = 1876	Engaged >250 n = 179	Engaged Germanic n = 1486	Engaged Latin n = 156
External communication ¹	24.1%	22.1%	41.2%	24.0%	24.4%
Internal communication ¹	41.8%	39.0%	64.2%	42.3%	36.5%

Note: Items taken / adapted from:

¹ - Braun & Kukuk, 2007