



# Globalisierung und Multinationale Unternehmen

## Teil III: Theoretische Reflexionen zu Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Vorlesung 17/18: Die neue politische Rolle der Multinationalen Unternehmung



Universität Zürich, FS 2018; 25./30. April 2018



Prof. Dr. Andreas Georg Scherer



## Übersicht

1. Die Neuausrichtung des CSR-Konzepts in einer globalen Wirtschaft
  - 1.1. Governance Modelle im Vergleich
  - 1.2. Der Wandel des Rechts- bzw. des Regulierungsverständnisses
  - 1.3. Ein neues Verständnis von Verantwortung
  - 1.4. Die Relevanz unterschiedlicher Legitimitätsquellen  
Exkurs zum Legitimitätsbegriff
  - 1.5. Demokratiemodelle im Vergleich  
Exkurs zu Demokratiemodelle und Politikverständnis
2. Forschungsfragen und Lernziele



# Die Neuausrichtung des CSR-Konzepts in einer globalen Wirtschaft: Zentrale Fragestellungen (Scherer/Palazzo 2011)

## JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

*Journal of Management Studies* 48:4 June 2011  
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00950.x

### The New Political Role of Business in a Globalized World: A Review of a New Perspective on CSR and its Implications for the Firm, Governance, and Democracy

Andreas Georg Scherer and Guido Palazzo

*University of Zurich; University of Lausanne*

**ABSTRACT** Scholars in management and economics widely share the assumption that business firms focus on profits only, while it is the task of the state system to provide public goods. In this view business firms are conceived of as economic actors, and governments and their state agencies are considered the only political actors. We suggest that, under the conditions of globalization, the strict division of labour between private business and nation-state governance does not hold any more. Many business firms have started to assume social and political responsibilities that go beyond legal requirements and fill the regulatory vacuum in global governance. Our review of the literature shows that there are a growing number of publications from various disciplines that propose a politicized concept of corporate social responsibility. We consider the implications of this new perspective for theorizing about the business firm, governance, and democracy.

### Reception:

• bis April 2018 424 mal zitiert (ISI Web of Science)  
(Nr. 1 in JMS) (abgerufen 19.04.2018).

25./30.04.2018

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
<b>Governance model</b>		
• Main political actor	State	State, civil society, and corporations
• Locus of governance	National governance	Global and multilevel governance
• Mode of governance	Hierarchy	Heterarchy
• Role of economic rationality	Dominance of economic rationality	Domestication of economic rationality
• Separation of political and economic spheres	High	Low
<b>Role of law</b>		
• Mode of regulation	Governmental regulation	Self-regulation
• Dominant rules	Formal rules and 'hard law'	Informal rules and 'soft law'
• Level of obligation	High (enforcement)	Low (voluntary action)
• Precision of rules	High	Low
• Delegation to third parties	Seldom	Often
<b>Responsibility</b>		
• Direction	Retrospective (guilt)	Prospective (solution)
• Reason for critique	Direct action	Social connectedness (complicity)
• Sphere of influence	Narrow/local	Broad/global
<b>Legitimacy</b>		
• Pragmatic legitimacy	High (legitimacy of capitalist institutions via contribution to public good)	Medium-low (capitalist institutions under pressure, market failure and state failure)
• Cognitive legitimacy	High (coherent set of morals that are taken for granted)	Medium-low (individualism, pluralism of morals)
• Moral legitimacy	Low	High-low (depending on level of discursive engagement)
• Mode of corporate engagement	Reactive (response to pressure)	Proactive (engagement in democratic politics)
<b>Democracy</b>		
• Model of democracy	Liberal democracy	Deliberative democracy
• Concept of politics	Power politics	Discursive politics
• Democratic control and legitimacy of corporations	Derived from political system, corporations are de-politicized	Corporate activities subject to democratic control
• Mode of corporate governance	Shareholder oriented	Democratic corporate governance



# Die Neuausrichtung des CSR-Konzepts in einer globalen Wirtschaft: Zentrale Fragestellungen

## 1. Governance Modell

- Wer ist der zentrale politische Akteur? Auf welcher Ebene findet Governance statt?

## 2. Rolle des Rechts und der Regulierung

- Auf welche Art und Weise findet Regulierung statt? Welches sind die zentralen Regeln?

## 3. Verantwortung

- Was ist ein angemessenes Konzept der Verantwortung?

## 4. Legitimität

- Wie kann die Legitimität politischer und wirtschaftlicher Akteure gewährleistet werden?

## 5. Demokratie

- Was ist ein angemessenes Demokratiemodell?



## Governance Modelle im Vergleich (Scherer/Palazzo 2011)

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
Governance model		
• Main political actor	State	State, civil society, and corporations
• Locus of governance	National governance	Global and multilevel governance
• Mode of governance	Hierarchy	Heterarchy
• Role of economic rationality	Dominance of economic rationality	Domestication of economic rationality
• Separation of political and economic spheres	High	Low
• Entstehung eines neuen Regelungssystems jenseits nationalstaatlichen Regierens: „Governance by/with/without government“		
• Vgl. Studien in der Politikwissenschaft/Internationalen Beziehungen: Risse (2002), Ruggie (2004)		



## Der Wandel des Rechts: Von „hard law“ zu „soft law“ (Scherer/Palazzo 2011)

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
Role of law		
• Mode of regulation	Governmental regulation	Self-regulation
• Dominant rules	Formal rules and ‘hard law’	Informal rules and ‘soft law’
• Level of obligation	High (enforcement)	Low (voluntary action)
• Precision of rules	High	Low
• Delegation to third parties	Seldom	Often

- Zunehmende Selbstregulierung und Ko-regulierung (Vogel 2008; Waddock 2008); hard law versus soft law (Mörth 2004; Sheldon 2000)
- Abbott/Snidal 2000, S. 422: „The realm of ‘soft law’ begins once legal arrangements are weakened along one or more of the dimensions of obligation, precision, and delegation. This softening can occur in varying degrees along each dimension and in different combinations across dimensions.“
- Beispiele: *Equator Principles*, *UN Global Compact*



# Beispiel für „governance *without* government“



[Equator Principles](#)

[Members & Reporting](#)

[Documents & Resources](#)

[News](#)



## The Equator Principles (EPs)

A risk management framework, adopted by financial institutions, for determining, assessing and managing environmental and social risk in development projects.

[Learn more](#)



### THE EQUATOR PRINCIPLES

About the Equator Principles (EP) and the Association.



### MEMBERS & REPORTING

EP Association Members and annual reporting.



### DOCUMENTS & RESOURCES

Key documents and implementation resources.



### NEWS

Latest news and media coverage.





# Beispiel für „governance *with* government“

**United Nations Global Compact**

About | News | Sign In | Translate | Search

WHO WE ARE | THE SDGs | PARTICIPATION | TAKE ACTION | ENGAGE LOCALLY | EXPLORE OUR LIBRARY

## The world's largest corporate sustainability initiative

A call to companies to align strategies and operations with universal principles on human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption, and take actions that advance societal goals.

**OUR MISSION**

### Explore our focus areas

Driving change across all aspects of corporate sustainability.

**Our work**

### A New Era of Action and Impact

We are mobilizing a global movement of sustainable companies & stakeholders to create the world we want.

### See who's involved

9,500+ companies based in over 160 countries, both developed and developing, representing nearly every sector and size.

### Learn about our integrity measures

Holding high standards for our participants, and ourselves.

### We are Making Global Goals Local Business

Our multi-year strategy to drive business awareness and action in support of achieving the SDGs by 2030.





## Ein neues Verständnis von Verantwortung (Scherer/Palazzo 2011)

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
Responsibility		
• Direction	Retrospective (guilt)	Prospective (solution)
• Reason for critique	Direct action	Social connectedness (complicity)
• Sphere of influence	Narrow/local	Broad/global

- Social Connection Model of Responsibility: „All agents who contribute by their actions to the structural processes that produce injustice have responsibilities to work to remedy these injustices“ (Young 2008, S. 137) → Erweiterung des Verantwortungsbegriffs
- Vgl: UN Global Compact Prinzip 2: Businesses make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses. Beispiel: PetroChina in Sudan,  
[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/susan-morgan/petrochina-the-un-and-blo\\_b\\_155794.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/susan-morgan/petrochina-the-un-and-blo_b_155794.html)



## Exkurs: Die drei Legitimitätsquellen (Suchman 1995)

### Legitimität

„A generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions“ (Suchman 1995, S. 574).

- **Pragmatische Legitimität:**  
calculation of benefits as the result of the entity's (individual, organization, institution, etc.) existence or behavior
- **Kognitive Legitimität:**  
subconscious acceptance of the entity (individual, organization, institution, etc.) and its behavior as the natural way of how things are
- **Moralische Legitimität:**  
result of an explicit moral discourse about the acceptability of the entity (individual, organization, institution, etc.) and its behavior



## Relevanz unterschiedlicher Legitimitätsquellen

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
Legitimacy		
• Pragmatic legitimacy	High (legitimacy of capitalist institutions via contribution to public good)	Medium–low (capitalist institutions under pressure, market failure and state failure)
• Cognitive legitimacy	High (coherent set of morals that are taken for granted)	Medium–low (individualism, pluralism of morals)
• Moral legitimacy	Low	High–low (depending on level of discursive engagement)
• Mode of corporate engagement	Reactive (response to pressure)	Proactive (engagement in democratic politics)

- Moralische Legitimierung auf Grundlage diskursiver Aushandlungsprozesse gewinnt zunehmend an Bedeutung. Vgl. Palazzo/Scherer 2006; Scherer et al. 2013
- Beispiel: Puma und die Banzer Gespräche:  
<http://about.puma.com/en/sustainability/stakeholders/talks-at-banz>

## Ein neues Politikverständnis

### Die alte Sichtweise (lobbyism & power politics):

- Fokus liegt auf „political strategies“; „to shape government policy in ways favorable to the firm“ (Hillman et al. 2004, S. 838)
- Dieser Literaturzweig basiert auf der Sichtweise dass „managers choose to engage in political activity to enhance the value of the firm“ (Hillman et al. 2004, S. 839).



### Die neue Sichtweise:

- Unter „politisch“ versteht man einen Prozess „in which people organize collectively to regulate or transform some aspects of their shared social conditions, along with the communicative activities in which they try to persuade one another to join such collective actions or decide what direction they wish to take“ (Young 2004, S. 377).
  - es geht um öffentliche Belange (Produktion öffentlicher Güter/externer Effekte)
  - es geht um das Gemeinwohl



## Demokratiemodelle im Vergleich (Scherer/Palazzo 2011)

Table I. Characteristics of the instrumental and the new political approach to CSR

	<i>Instrumental CSR</i>	<i>Political CSR</i>
Democracy		
• Model of democracy	Liberal democracy	Deliberative democracy
• Concept of politics	Power politics	Discursive politics
• Democratic control and legitimacy of corporations	Derived from political system, corporations are de-politicized	Corporate activities subject to democratic control
• Mode of corporate governance	Shareholder oriented	Democratic corporate governance

- Zentrale Frage: Wie können die regulatorischen Tätigkeiten von MNU in bestehende Demokratie-Konzepte integriert werden?
- Präferenzformation kann nicht über Aggregation von Wählerstimmen erfolgen  
→ alternatives Demokratiemodell notwendig
- Vgl. Scherer/Palazzo 2007; Habermas 1996



## Exkurs: Liberal conception of politics (public/social choice theory)

Was heisst „Power politics“ in der instrumental CSR?

- Instrumentelle Auffassung von Politik (Elster 1986, S. 103), d.h. Politik als Durchsetzung schon gegebener privater Interessen

Politische Institutionen (z.B. Staat) dienen

- der Aggregation von privaten Interessen
- der Bearbeitung von Marktversagen
- der Versorgung mit öffentlichen Gütern

Wie funktioniert der Aggregationsmechanismus?

- „the goal of politics is the optimal compromise between given, and irreducibly opposed, private interests“ (Elster 1986, S. 103)
- Politisches Verhalten wird verstanden wie privates Verhalten (am Eigeninteresse orientiert, auf den privaten Bereich konzentriert/keine externen Effekte)
- Aggregationsmechanismus Wahlen: Konzipiert wie Marktentscheidung



## Exkurs: Kritik an der „liberal conception of political theory“

- Kritik der gegebenen Präferenzen
- „it embodies a confusion between the kind of behaviour that is appropriate in the market place and that which is appropriate in the forum. The notion of consumer sovereignty is acceptable because, and to the extent that, the consumer chooses between courses of action that differ only in the way they affect him. In political choice situations, however, the citizen is asked to express his preference over states that also differ in the way in which they affect other people.“ (Elster 1986, S. 111)
- „the task of politics is not only to eliminate inefficiency, but also to create justice“ (Elster 1986, S. 111)
- „politics must be an open and public activity, as distinct from the isolated and private expression of preferences that occurs in buying and selling.“ (Elster 1986, S. 111)
- „rather than aggregating or filtering preferences, the political system should be set up with a view to changing them by public debate and confrontation“ (Elster 1986, S. 112)





## **Exkurs: Drei normative Modelle der Demokratie (Habermas 1996)**

### **Liberales Auffassung von Politik:**

- Politik als Kampf um Positionen, die Verfügung über administrative Macht einräumen
- Politischer Erfolg bemisst nach der Anzahl der Wählerstimmen für Programme und Parteien: „In ihrem Votum bringen die Wähler ihre Präferenzen zum Ausdruck. Ihre Wahlentscheidungen haben dieselbe Struktur wie Wahlakte erfolgsorientierter Marktteilnehmer“

### **Republikanische Auffassung von Politik:**

- Politik als „Medium, in dem sich die Angehörigen naturwüchsiger Solidargemeinschaften ihrer Angewiesenheit aufeinander innewerden und als Staatsbürger die vorgefundenen Verhältnisse reziproker Anerkennung mit Willen und Bewußtsein zu einer Assoziation freier und gleicher Rechtsgenossen fortbilden und ausgestalten.“ (Habermas 1996, S. 276 f.)
- Goal of politics: not optimal compromise, but unanimous agreement (consensus) (Elster 1986)



## **Exkurs: Probleme republikanischer Politikkonzeptionen (Habermas 1996, S. 283 ff.)**

- Zu idealistisch (Habermas)/utopisch (Elster): „Ethische Engführung politischer Diskurse“ (Habermas)
- Paternalismusvorwurf, Groupthink-Phänomen etc.
- Pluralismus von Interessen und Wertorientierungen
- Interessenausgleich und Kompromiss

### **Modell einer deliberativen Politik:**

- Politische Rationalität steckt nicht im Bewusstsein des „Voluntée generale“ des ganzen Volkes (Republikanismus) und auch nicht in den Machtprozessen, die sich aufgrund von Wahlakten eigeninteressierter Akteure vollziehen (Liberalismus), sondern in den Kommunikationsbedingungen des politischen Prozesses als Ganzes
- „Es kommt ... alles auf die Kommunikationsbedingungen und Verfahren an, die der institutionalisierten Meinungs- und Willensbildung ihre legitimierende Kraft verleihen.“ (Habermas 1996, S. 287)



## Forschungsfragen

### Forschungsfragen

- Wo liegen die Grenzen von Verantwortung? Beispiel iPhone und afrikanische Bürgerkriege/Selbstmorde in asiatischen Produktionsstätten. Siehe z.B. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kSvT02q4h40>
- Wo beginnt die Verantwortung der Konsumenten? Sollen wir auf den Kauf von Smartphones verzichten?
- Wer kontrolliert die Selbstregulierung globaler Industrien?
- Wie lässt sich demokratische Autorisierung und Kontrolle in der postnationalen Konstellation denken?



## Lernziele

Nach dieser Vorlesung sollten Sie ...

- ... die zentralen Fragestellungen bzw. fünf Dimensionen (Governance, Law, Responsibility, Legitimacy, Democracy) in Bezug auf die Neuausrichtung des CSR-Konzeptes in einer globalen Weltwirtschaft kennen und erläutern können.
- ... die Unterschiede zwischen der instrumentellen Auffassung von CSR und der politischen Auffassung von CSR kritisch diskutieren können.
- ... die verschiedenen Demokratiemodelle und Politikverständnisse vergleichen und kritisch diskutieren können.



## Literatur

- Abbott, K. W./Snidal, D. (2000): Hard and Soft Law in International Governance, in *International Organization* Vol. 54, S. 421–456.
- Elster, J. (1986): The Market and the Forum: Three Varieties of Political Theory. In: Elster, J./Aanund, A. (Eds.) *The Foundations of Social Choice Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, S. 103–132.
- Habermas, J. (1996): Drei normative Modelle der Demokratie, in: ders.: *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen. Studien zur politischen Theorie*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, S. 277–292.
- Habermas, J. (2001): *The Postnational Constellation. Political Essays*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hillman, A./Keim, G./Schuler, D. (2004): Corporate Political Strategies: A Review and Research Agenda, in: *Journal of Management* Vol. 30, S. 837–857.
- Margolis, J. D./Walsh, J. P. (2003): Misery Loves Companies. Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business, in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48, S. 268–305.
- Mörth U. (2004): *Soft Law in Governance and Regulation. An Interdisciplinary Analysis*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Palazzo, G./Scherer, A. G. (2006): Corporate Legitimacy as Deliberation. A Communicative Framework, in: *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 66, S. 71–88.
- Risse, T. (2002): Transnational Actors and World Politics, in: von Carlsnaes, W./Risse, T./Simmons, B. (Hrsg.): *Handbook of International Relations*, London: Sage, S. 255–274.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2004): Reconstructing the Global Public Domain: Issues, Actors, and Practices, in: *European Journal of International Relations*, Volume 10, S. 499–531.
- Sheldon, D. (2000) (Hrsg.): *Commitment and Compliance. The Role of Non-binding Norms in the International Legal System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, A. G./Palazzo, G. (2007): Toward a Political Conception of Corporate Responsibility. Business and Society Seen From a Habermasian Perspective, in: *Academy of Management Review*, Volume 32, S.1096–1120.
- Scherer, A. G./Palazzo, G. (2011): The New Political Role of Business in a Globalized World – A Review of a New Perspective on CSR and its Implications for the Firm, Governance, and Democracy, in: *Journal of Management Studies*, Volume 48, S. 899–931.
- Scherer, A. G./Palazzo, G./Seidl, D. (2013): Managing Legitimacy in Complex and Heterogeneous Environments. Sustainable Development in a Globalized World. *Journal of Management Studies*, Volume 50, S. 259–284.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995): Managing Legitimacy. Strategic and Institutional Approaches, in: *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, S. 571-610.
- Vogel, D. (2008): Private Global Business Regulation, in: *Annual Review of Political Science*, Volume 11, S. 261–282.
- Waddock, S. (2008): Building a New Institutional Infrastructure for Corporate Responsibility, in: *Academy of Management Perspectives*, S. 87–108.
- Young, I. M. (2004). Responsibility and Global Labor Justice, in: *Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 12, S. 365–388.
- Young, I. M. (2008): Responsibility and Global Justice. A Social Connection Model, in: Scherer, A. G./Palazzo, G. (Hrsg.), *Handbook of Research on Global Corporate Citizenship*; Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, S. 137–165.