

5<sup>TH</sup> INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC-BUSINESS CONFERENCE  
LEADERSHIP, INNOVATION, MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS:  
INTEGRATED POLITICS OF RESEARCH



**LIMEN 2019**



December 12, 2019  
Graz University of Technology  
GRAZ, AUSTRIA  
[www.limen-conference.com](http://www.limen-conference.com)



# SELECTED PAPERS



Association of Economists  
and Managers of the Balkans  
**UdekoM Balkan**



FIFTH INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC-BUSINESS CONFERENCE  
LIMEN 2019

*Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics:  
Integrated Politics of Research*

**SELECTED PAPERS**

Graz, Austria  
December 12, 2019

**Fifth International Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN**

*Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research*

ISSN 2683-6149

Selected Papers (part of LIMEN conference collection)

**Editor:**

Vuk BEVANDA, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

**Scientific Committee:**

1. **Jasmina Starc**, PhD, Full Time Professor, Dean, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, Novo Mesto, Slovenia
2. **Čedomir Ljubojević**, PhD, Full Time Professor, Director, Modern Business School Belgrade, Serbia
3. **Cvetko Smilevski**, PhD, Full Time Professor, President of Teaching and Scientific Council, BAS Institute of Management Bitola, Macedonia
4. **Vlado Radić**, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Belgrade, Serbia
5. **Kanita Imamović-Čizmić**, PhD, assistant professor, Faculty of Law, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
6. **Tatjana Cvetkovski**, PhD, Full Time Professor, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia
7. **Drago Pupavac**, PhD, Professor, Polytechnic of Rijeka, Polytechnic „Nikola Tesla“ Gospić, Croatia
8. **Ana Langović Miličević**, PhD, Full Time Professor, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjaska Banja, University of Kragujevac, Serbia
9. **Snežana Kirin**, PhD, Associate Professor, Innovation Centre of Mechanical Engineering Faculty in Belgrade, the Head of the Branch Office in Novi Sad, Serbia
10. **Mirjana Šekarić**, PhD, Associate Professor, Business Faculty, Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia
11. **Malči Grivec**, PhD, Lecturer, Dean, Faculty of Business, Management and Informatics Novo Mesto, Slovenia
12. **Bojan Krstić**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, University of Niš, Serbia
13. **Lidija Stefanovska**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Director, BAS Institute of Management Bitola, Macedonia
14. **Duško Tomić**, PhD, Full Time Professor, College of Security and Global Studies, American University in the Emirates
15. **Saša Virijević Jovanović**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Applied Management, Economics and Finance, Belgrade, Serbia
16. **Srdan Tomić**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Engineering Management, Belgrade, Serbia
17. **Toni Soklevski**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business Academy Smilevski BAS, Skopje, Macedonia
18. **Tatjana Ilić-Kosanović**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Engineering Management, Belgrade, Serbia
19. **Aleksandara Brakus**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Modern Business School, Belgrade, Serbia
20. **Sonja Cindori**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Financial Law and Financial Science, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb, Croatia
21. **Sergej Gričar**, PhD, Lecturer, School of Business and Management Novo Mesto, Slovenia
22. **Dragana Nešović**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, Security and Management “Konstantin Veliki”, Nis, University Union “Nikola Tesla”, Belgrade, Serbia
23. **Janevski Zoran**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Institute of Economics – “Ss. Cyril and Methodius” University Skopje, North Macedonia
24. **Slobodan Bracanović**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics, Priština, Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia
25. **Dragana Trifunović**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
26. **Anton Vorina**, PhD, Senior Lecturer, Vocational College, Celje, Slovenia
27. **Ana Jurčić**, PhD, Associate Professor, Modern College of Business & Science, Muscat, Oman
28. **Denis Tomšé**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Commercial and Business Sciences, Celje, Slovenia
29. **Tatjana Boshkov**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics – Gevgelija, “Goce Delcev” University Stip, North Macedonia
30. **Filip Đoković**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Business Faculty Valjevo, Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia
31. **Biljana Petrevska**, PhD, Associate Professor, “Iustinianus Primus School of Law”, University “Ss. Cyril and Methodius”, Skopje, North Macedonia
32. **Tanja Stanišić**, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjaska Banja, University of Kragujevac, Serbia
33. **Milenko Đeletović**, PhD, Associate Professor, Educons University, Belgrade, Serbia
34. **Momčilo Živković**, PhD, Full Professor, Faculty of Business Studies, Megatrend University, Belgrade, Serbia
35. **Brankica Pažun**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Engineering Management, Belgrade, Serbia
36. **Zlatko Langović**, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism, Vrnjaska banja, Serbia

**Organizational Committee:**

Nikolina Vrcelj, PhD candidate

Nevena Bevanda, PhD student

Ivana Mirčević, BSc

Uroš Mirčević, Ing.

Goran Stevanović, BSc

**Published by:**

Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans, Belgrade, Serbia

**Printed by:**

SKRIPTA International, Belgrade

Belgrade, 2019

ISBN 978-86-80194-27-1

ISSN 2683-6149

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31410/LIMEN.S.P.2019>

**Disclaimer:** The author(s) of each paper appearing in this publication is/are solely responsible for the content thereof; the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in the papers are those of the authors and do not reflect the view of the editor, reviewers, scientific committee members, the publisher, conference partners or anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering this publication.

CIP - Katalogizacija u publikaciji  
Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Beograd

005(082)

336(082)

658.114(082)

330(082)

628.4(082)

**INTERNATIONAL Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research (5 ; 2019 ; Graz)**

Selected Papers / Fifth International Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research, Graz, Austria December 12, 2019 ; [organizer Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans ; editor Vuk Bevanda]. - Belgrade : Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans, 2020 (Belgrade : Skripta International). - 163 str. : graf. prikazi, table ; 30 cm

Tiraž 100. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz tekst. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad. - Registri.

ISBN 978-86-80194-27-1

a) Menadžment -- Zbornici b) Finansije -- Zbornici v) Preduzetništvo -- Zbornici g) Ekonomija -- Zbornici d) Otpadne materije -- Upravljanje -- Zbornici

COBISS.SR-ID 15676169

## CONTENTS

INDEX OF AUTHORS .....	V
INDEX .....	VII
PREFACE.....	XIII
AUTHORS' AFFILIATION.....	XV
THE IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF BRAND EQUITY .....	1
Tina Vukasović	
MANAGERIAL COMPETENCIES AND SUCCESSION IN FAMILY FIRMS.....	9
Piotr Bartkowiak	
EARNED VALUE MANAGEMENT IN AGILE PROJECTS.....	17
Filip Popović Tatjana Atanasijević Srdjan Atanasijević	
<b>ETHICS COMMITTEES FOR CORPORATE CULTURE OF SUSTAINABILITY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Francesca Gennari	
IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS ON THE SUCCESS OF EU PROJECTS.....	37
Matúš Drotár Miroslav Šipikal	
FINANCIAL MARKETS OF THE LAC REGION: CONVERGENCE AFTER THE FINANCIAL CRISIS?.....	45
Paula Heliodoro Paulo Alexandre Rui Dias	
ANALYSIS OF TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION COUNTRIES .....	53
Eva Kolářová Blanka Jarolímová	
THE ROLE OF THE VISEGRAD GROUP'S MACROECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN EXCHANGE RATE DETERMINATION.....	61
Kitty Klacsánová Mária Bohdalová	
RESEARCH OF CONSISTENCY AS A STABILITY FACTOR OF COMPANIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA.....	69
Snežana Kirin Gordana Gavrić Dragana Vojteški Kljenak	
USING THE QUALITY FUNCTION DEPLOYMENT METHODOLOGY FOR EFFECTIVE PLANNING OF TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESSES .....	77
Ida Verna Elia Pizzolitto	
RISK TRANSMISSION AMONG STOCK MARKETS IN LAC REGION: FINANCIAL CRISES IMPACT.....	91
Rui Dias Paula Heliodoro Paulo Alexandre	
DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH-TECH ENTREPRENEURSHIP ECOSYSTEM: CASE OF UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD .....	99

<b>Đorđe Ćelić</b> <b>Zorica Uzelac</b> <b>Zoran Drašković</b>	
<b>WHO WANTS TO DO BUSINESS? .....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Alice Reissová</b> <b>Jana Šimsová</b>	
<b>ONLINE PLATFORMS AND THE STIMULATION OF CREATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP – THE ROLE OF CREATIVITY AND THE PERCEPTION ABOUT WORK AND SELF-EMPLOYMENT .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Ioana Crina Pop-Cohuț</b>	
<b>SECURITY ASPECTS OF WASTE DISPOSAL.....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Vladimir Tomašević</b> <b>Mubarak Saeed Ahmed Burshaid Al Dhaheri</b> <b>Tatjana Ilić-Kosanović</b>	
<b>E-WASTE CHALLENGES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.....</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Predrag Tončev</b> <b>Dragan Ugrinov</b> <b>Jalal Guider</b>	
<b>THE CHALLENGES OF ACHIEVING SMART, SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH IN BULGARIA.....</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Christo Ivanov</b>	
<b>MODEL FOR CADASTER OF HOUSING FACILITIES AS G2G SOLUTION FOR BETTER E-GOVERNMENT .....</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Mimoza Bogdanoska Jovanovska</b> <b>Renata Petrevska Nechkoska</b> <b>Arif Mehmedali</b>	
<b>PACKAGING WASTE ECONOMY: INSIGHT INTO EFFICIENCY OF MONOPOLISTIC AND COMPETITIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS IN THE EU.....</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Aleš Rod</b> <b>Pavel Peterka</b> <b>Radek Soběhart</b>	
<b>LABOR PRODUCTIVITY, WAGE INCREASE AND INFLATION, AN EASTERN EUROPEAN APPROACH.....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Negrea Adrian</b> <b>Benea Ciprian Beniam</b> <b>Săcară Adina Onița</b>	

## INDEX OF AUTHORS

A	I	R
Aleš Rod, 151 Alice Reissova, 105 Arif Mehmedali, 143	Ida Verna, 77 Ioana Crina Pop-Cohuț, 113	Radek Soběhart, 151 Renata Petrevska Nechkoska, 143 Rui Dias, 45, 91
B	J	S
Benea Ciprian Beniam, 159 Blanka Jarolímová, 53	Jalal Guider, 129 Jana Šimsová, 105	Săcară Adina Onița, 159 Snežana Kirin, 69 Srdjan Atanasijević, 17
C	K	T
Christo Ivanov, 135	Kitty Klacsánová, 61	Tatjana Atanasijević, 17 Tatjana Ilić-Kosanović, 121 Tina Vukasović, 1
D	M	V
Dragana Vojteški Kljenak, 69 Dragan Ugrinov, 129	Mária Bohdalová, 61 Matúš Drotár, 37 Mimoza Bogdanoska Jovanovska, 143 Miroslav Šipikal, 37 Mubarak Saeed Ahmed Burshaid Al Dhaheri, 121	Vladimir Tomašević, 121
Đ	N	Z
Đorđe Ćelić, 99	Negrea Adrian, 159	Zoran Drašković, 99 Zorica Uzelac, 99
E	P	
Elia Pizzolitto, 77 Eva Kolářová, 53	Paula Heliodoro, 45, 91 Paulo Alexandre, 45, 91 Pavel Peterka, 151 Piotr Bartkowiak, 9 Predrag Tončev, 129	
F		
Filip Popović, 17 Francesca Gennari, 25		
G		
Gordana Gavrić, 69		





## INDEX

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p>Accounting, 77 Agile, 17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>F</b></p> <p>Factors which influence starting a business, 105 Financial integration, 45 Forecasting, 17</p>	<p>Programming period, 37 Projects burden, 37</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p>Board of directors, 25 Brand, 1 Brand equity, 1 Business ethics, 25 Business profile, 113</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <p>G2G, 143 GARCH models, 91 GDP, 61 Gender, 105</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Q</b></p> <p>QFD, 77 Quality Function Deployment, 77</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <p>Cadaster of Housing Facilities, 143 Cohesion policy, 37 Complexity, 61 Consistency, 69 Control, 17 Corporate social responsibility, 25 Creative economy, 113 Creative entrepreneurship, 113 Creativity and business, 113</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p>Headline targets, 135 High-tech entrepreneurial ecosystem, 99 Higher Education, 77 House of Quality, 77</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>R</b></p> <p>Recycling, 129 Regression, 61 Regulation, 151 Release, 17 Risk diversification, 45 ROI, 17</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p>Denison Model, 69 Developing competences, 9 Developing countries, 129 Dynamic linear models, 45</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p>Income tax, 53 Indicator, 61 Inflation, 159 Interest, 105</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>S</b></p> <p>Serbia, 69 Slovak Republic, 37 Slovenia, 1 Small and medium-sized enterprises, 1 Sprint, 17 Stability, 69 Startups, 99 Stock markets, 91 Strategy implementation, 135</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></p> <p>e-Government, 143 E-waste, 129 Effectiveness, 9 Efficiency, 9 Emerging markets, 45 Entrepreneurship, 105 European Union, 135 EVM, 17 Extended producer responsibility, 151</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>K</b></p> <p>Knowledge management, 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>L</b></p> <p>Labor productivity, 159 Learning Outcomes, 77</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>T</b></p> <p>Tax payer, Tax relief, 53 Teaching Methods, 77 Teaching Quality, 77 the Republic of Serbia, 121 Transitional economy, 99 Type of university, 105</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>M</b></p> <p>Mapping stakeholders, 143</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>O</b></p> <p>On-line platforms, 113 On-line start-up entrepreneurship, 113 Organization, 69 Organizational culture, 69 Outliers, 61</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>U</b></p> <p>United Arab Emirates, 121</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>V</b></p> <p>Volatility, 91</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>W</b></p> <p>Wages, 159 Waste management, 121, 151</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>P</b></p> <p>Producer responsibility organization, 151</p>	



## PREFACE

The organizing is an evolutionary phenomenon, distinctive because of laws of existence and maintaining all structures in all processes of their functioning. As such, it is a civilizational phenomenon also that occurs as a component of human, individual and social activities and as a factor in the overall development of man and society. On the other hand, as a deliberate human activity, organizing involves seeking solutions to problems that occur on the way to achieving specific goals. No goal can be achieved without appropriate or necessary, or at least minimal organization of conditions, factors and processes needed for goal achievement. However, the modern era requires new types of leaders and managers, and new forms of organization; demands those who are willing and able to lead the company / corporation / state, in a distinct competitive environment, with all the good and bad sides brought by the globalization of world economy.

Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans headquartered in Belgrade – Serbia at premises of the Graz University of Technology – Austria organized 5th International Scientific-Business Conference titled: Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research – LIMEN 2019 on December 12, 2019.

Bearing in mind the challenges of a dynamic engagement in contemporary organizations, it is clear that within the analysis of these important subjects should be applied interdisciplinary approach. For this reason, the main theme of the conference LIMEN 2019 was processed through the following key topics:

- Leaders and Leadership
- Entrepreneurship
- Innovation
- Creativity
- Management of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
- Contemporary Strategic Management
- Financial Management and Banking
- Marketing Management
- Project Management
- GREEN Management
- Natural Resource Management
- Quality Management
- Management of New Technologies
- Management Information Systems
- Education Management
- Intercultural Management
- Public Sector Management
- Human Resources Management
- Organizational Behavior
- Business Ethics
- Macroeconomics
- Microeconomics
- Finance
- Marketing
- Labour Law
- Business Law

The aim of this year's conference is also achieved – bring together the academic community of the Balkans region and other countries and publication of their papers with the purpose of popularization of science and their personal and collective affirmation. The unique program combined presentation of the latest scientific developments in these areas, interactive discussions and other forms of interpersonal exchange of experiences.

The conference was opened by professor Vladimir Tomašević, Faculty Council Chair of the Faculty of Engineering Management – Belgrade and a member of the Scientific Committee of the conference and professor Stefan Grbenić from the University of Technology Graz, Institute of Business Economics and Industrial Sociology, Graz, Austria.



Within publications from LIMEN 2019 conference:

- **20 double peer reviewed papers** have been published in the International Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN: Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research – **Selected Papers**,
- **24 double peer reviewed papers** have been published in the International Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN: Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research – **Conference Proceedings**,
- **31 abstracts** have been published in the International Scientific-Business Conference LIMEN: Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research – **Book of Abstracts**.

LIMEN 2019 publications have more than 380 pages. All papers have been scanned with Cross-check (powered by Turnitin) and have Orcid iD integration.

Besides that, 16 papers have been accepted for publication in the conference partner journals namely:

1. **Littera Scripta** (Economics, Corporate finance, Finance and Valuation) is a multidisciplinary journal published by the Institute of Technology and Business in České Budějovice (Czech Republic). The journal is currently indexed on the list of reviewed non-impacted journals published in the Czech Republic, in CEJSH, in EZB, and in ERIH PLUS. In May 2018 Littera Scripta was suggested to be included in Scopus. At present it is being reviewed by the Scopus Content Selection & Advisory Board (CSAB) and Web of Science database.
2. **Journal of Innovative Business and Management** is published by DOBA Faculty, Maribor (Slovenia) and referred in international scientific journal bases DOAJ, Google Scholar, Econ-Papers, ResearchGate and RePec. It has been published since 2009 and since then it has been attracting more and more interest among the readers, who predominantly come from academia and business practice.
3. **Balkans Journal of Emerging Trends in Social Sciences (Balkans JETSS)** is an international scientific journal, published by the Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans. Aims and scope are economics, management, law and tourism. Balkans JETSS have

following indexations: Google Scholar, CEEOL (Central and Eastern European Online Library), ProQuest's Serial Solutions, Summon, Primo Central, Alma, EBSCO's EDS Discovery Service and Knowledge Base, TDNet and OCLC. Until the end of 2020, it will be submitted to indexation in SCOPUS and WoS, too.

4. **Journal of Sustainable Development (JSD)** is an international journal published by the Integrated Business Faculty – Skopje, Macedonia. JSD area includes three pillars of economic, social and environmental development issues. All these aspects are considered relevant for publishing in the JSD. The journal is officially listed in the respected EBSCO database, CEEOL database, as well as the databases of Business Source Complete and Sustainability Reference Center. All articles published in the journal are also indexed in these databases.

Participation in the conference took **129 researchers** with the paper representing **20 different countries** (Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Spain), different universities, eminent faculties, scientific institutes, colleges, etc.



## AUTHORS' AFFILIATION

### Albania

- Agriculture University of Tirana, Kodër Kamëz, SH1, Tirana 1000
- “Marin Barleti” University, Rruga Sami Frashëri 41, Tirana 1000

### Austria

- Graz University of Technology, Institute of Business Economics and Industrial Sociology, Kopernikusgasse 24/ II, 8010 Graz

### Belgium

- Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Tweekerkenstraat 2, BE-9000 Ghent

### Bosnia and Herzegovina

- University Sinergija, Raje Banjicica bb, 76300 Bijeljina

### Bulgaria

- University of Economics – Varna, 77 Knyaz Boris I Blvd., Varna
- University of National and World Economy – Sofia, Studentski grad, “8-mi dekemvri” blvd., 1700 Sofia

### Croatia

- College of Applied Sciences „Lavoslav Ružička” in Vukovar, Županijska 50, 32000 Vukovar
- Faculty of Law, University of Split, Domovinskog rata 8, 21000 Split
- Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Primorska 42, 51410 Opatija
- Regional Wholesale Market Osijek Inc., Ul. Svetog Leopolda Bogdana Mandića, 31000 Osijek
- University of Applied Science in Šibenik, Trg Andrije Hebranga 11, 22 000 Šibenik

### Czech Republic

- Charles University in Prague, Urbankova 3360, Prague
- Department of Economy and Management of the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies,

Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, 400 96 Ústí nad Labem

- Department of Mathematics and Statistics of the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies, Jan Evangelista Purkyně University, 400 96 Ústí nad Labem
- Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Moskevská 54, Ústí nad Labem
- Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Faculty of Management and Economics, Department of Finance and Accounting, Mostní 5139, 760 01 Zlín

### Hungary

- Budapest Business School - University of Applied Sciences, H- 1054 Budapest, Alkotmány utca 9-11
- Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Pécs, Rákóczi Street 80. Pécs, Hungary

### Ireland

- Comtrade Group, Comtrade Digital Services, Dublin

### Italy

- Department of Economics and Management, University of Brescia, via S. Faustino 74/b, 25122 Brescia
- Department of Management and Business Economics, University D’Annunzio, Pescara-Chieti
- Department of Management, Polytechnic University of Marche, P.le Martelli, 8; 60121 Ancona
- University Giustino Fortunato, via r. Delcogliano 12, 82100 Benevento

### Latvia

- Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies, Inčukalana novads, Krustiņū, Ievaklanu iela 15, Latvia, LV2141

### North Macedonia

- Faculty for Information and Communication Technologies – Bitola, St. Kliment Ohridski

University in Bitola, St. "Partizanska" No. bb,  
7000 Bitola

- Faculty of Economy – Prilep, St. Kliment Ohridski University in Bitola, St. "Prilepski branitelji" No.143, 7500 Prilep
- FTU - Ohrid, University „St. Kliment Ohridski” - Bitola, Kej Makedonija br.95, Ohrid

#### **Poland**

- Poznań University of Economics and Business; Department of Investment and Real Estate; Al. Niepodległości 10; 61-875 Poznań
- University of Wrocław, Plac Uniwersytecki 1 50-137 Wrocław

#### **Portugal**

- Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, School of Business and Administration, Esce, Campus do Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal, Estefanilha, 2914-503 Setúbal
- Portucalense University – Department of Economics and Management REMIT – Research on Economics, Management and Information Technologies IJP – Portucalense Institute for Legal Research

#### **Romania**

- Faculty of Finance, Banking and Accounting – Christian University Dimitrie Cantemir, Splaiul Unirii no. 176, sector 4, Bucharest
- Highest Court of Justice, Bucharest
- School of Law – Romanian-American University, Bd. Expozitiei no. 1B, sector 1, Bucharest
- University of Oradea, University street, no.1, Oradea, Bihor
- Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara, Piata Eftimie Murgu 2, 300041, Timisoara
- West University of Timisoara, Bd.V.Parvan, no 4, Timisoara

#### **Russia**

- St. Petersburg State University, 199034, St Petersburg, 11 Lieutenant Shmidt Emb.
- Ural federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N.Yeltsin, Yekaterinburg, Sverdlovsk Oblast

#### **Serbia**

- ALFA BK University, Belgrade
- Banca Intesa a.d.
- Čačak School of Business, Gradski park 2, 11090 Belgrade
- Faculty of Applied Ecology 'Futura', Požeška 83a, 11000 Belgrade
- Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Mitropolita Petra 8, Belgrade
- Faculty of Economics, University of Pristina, Kosovska Mitrovica
- Faculty of Hotel and Tourism, University of Kragujevac, Vojvođanska no. 5a, 36000 Vrnjačka Banja
- Faculty of Law, Union University, Belgrade
- Faculty of Sciences and Mathematics, University of Niš, Višegradska no. 33, 18000 Niš
- Faculty of Technical Sciences, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 6, 21000 Novi Sad
- Innovation Centre of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Kraljice Marije 16, Belgrade
- JKP Informatika Novi Sad, Bul. cara Lazara 3, Novi Sad
- Modern Business School – Terazije 27, 11000 Belgrade
- School of Engineering Management, University "Union - Nikola Tesla", Bulevar vojvode Mišića 43, 11000 Belgrade
- UNION Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade
- University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Agriculture, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 8, 21000 Novi Sad
- University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Economics Subotica, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica
- University of Novi Sad, Institute of Food Technology, Bulevar cara Lazara 1, 21000 Novi Sad

#### **Slovak Republic**

- Comenius University, Šafárikovo nám. 6, 810 00 Bratislava
- Faculty of Management, Comenius University, Odbojarov 10, 820 05 Bratislava
- University of Economics in Bratislava, Dolnozemska cesta 1, 852 35 Bratislava



**Slovenia**

- Celje School of Economics, Vocational College, Mariborska 2, 3000 Celje
- Doba Business School Maribor, Prešernova ulica 1, 2000 Maribor
- Doba Faculty Maribor, Prešernova ulica 1, 2000 Maribor
- Faculty of Business and Management, University of Novo mesto, Na Loko 2, 8000 Novo mesto
- Osnovna šola Frana Metelka Škocjan, Škocjan 51, 8275 Škocjan
- VIZ II. OŠ Rogaška Slatina, Ulica Kozjanskega odreda 4, 3250 Rogaška Slatina

**Spain**

- University of Granada (Spain), Plaza de la Universidad, s/n. 18001 Granada
- University of the Basque Country, Barrio Sarriena s/n, 48940 Bilbao (Vizcaya)



# ETHICS COMMITTEES FOR CORPORATE CULTURE OF SUSTAINABILITY

Francesca Gennari<sup>1</sup> 

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31410/LIMEN.S.P.2019.25>

---

**Abstract:** *This theoretical paper considers the role of ethics committees in the promotion of business ethics and corporate culture of sustainability, and aims at contributing to the debate about the leadership role of board of directors as a real source of competition in global markets. Ethics committees within the boards can support leaders' commitment to corporate social responsibility, encourage stakeholder protection, reinforce the board's expertise about ethics and sustainability issues and safeguard the independence of decision-making processes in situations characterized by potential conflicts of interest. This paper could also have practical implications, encouraging policy makers to translate the good practices in managing corporate sustainability culture into actions and sending a message to investors sensitive to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) aspects. In fact, the establishment of ethics committees could be an indicator about the degree of maturity of corporate sustainability culture for investors and stakeholders in general.*

**Keywords:** *Business ethics, Corporate social responsibility, Board of directors.*

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The corporate scandals of recent decades highlight a scarce ethical orientation by companies, together with the essential inability to manage relations with broad stakeholder categories. In fact, while some failures were the result of fraudulent accounting and other illegal practices, many of the same companies exhibited real corporate governance risks such as conflicts of interest, inexperienced directors, excessive directors' remuneration, or the unequal share of voting rights (Anderson & Orsagh, 2004; Arjoon, 2005; Salvioni, Gennari, & Astori, 2015).

Corporate governance standards, starting from the Sarbanes Oxley Act, focus, inter alia, on board structure, with the aim of strengthening the safeguarding of minority shareholders and other stakeholders. Corporate governance systems, according to the agency theory (Fama, 1980; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Ross, 1973), are based on a proxy tie between shareholders and corporate governance bodies (OECD, 1999). The board is empowered by the shareholders to define and realize goals and strategies that safeguard their interests, and the board structure and composition is one of the mechanisms to mitigate the so-called agency conflicts (Bathala & Rao, 1995; Daily, Dalton, & Cannella, 2003; Eisenhardt, 1989; Jensen, 2000; Weisbach, 1988; Zahra & Pearce, 1989).

The shareholder view (Friedman, 1962) has emphasised for a long time the dominance of economic responsibility in satisfying the financial expectations of shareholders. This often means excessive stress on short-term results for boards of corporate governance systems characterized by wide dispersed ownership (so-called outsider systems), with the aim of obtaining positive judgements from the financial market and reconfirming their position. This attention to short-term performance could be the cause of unethical conduct by boards oriented towards personal or relevant shareholders' interests to the detriment of other stakeholder categories. In the same

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Economics and Management, University of Brescia, via S. Faustino 74/b, 25122 Brescia, Italy

way, unethical and fraudulent action in corporate governance systems with concentrated and stable shareholding (so-called insider systems), are often caused by the will of majority shareholders, usually members of the board, to focus on economic performance over time, increasing the company's value in terms of personal assets.

Stressing the economic dimension in corporate goals and actions can imply the board structure is not an effective controlling mechanism for managing agency conflicts and avoiding scandals. Byrne (2002) noted that in the post-Enron and post-bubble world, the realization that many companies played fast and loose, allowing performance disconnected from meaningful corporate values, was leading to a re-evaluation of corporate goals, values, and purpose. The economic and financial disasters led to a new corporate model in which corporate culture puts greater emphasis on ethics, integrity and trust (Arjoon, 2005).

Such changes include the triumph of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) principles and sustainability values (Gladwin, Kennelly, & Krause, 1995; Elkington, 1998), which, together with the enhancement of stakeholder perspective (Freeman, 1984; Freeman, 1994; Harrison, Bosse, & Phillips, 2010; Freeman & Dmytriiev, 2017), emphasise the concept of global corporate responsibility. According to this approach, corporate goals defined by the boards should involve clear awareness of the responsibilities towards different stakeholders, adopting methods and tools of governance aimed at improving economic, social, and green/eco-friendly performance.

To this regard, the effectiveness of corporate governance depends on the members of boards that should be able to manage the equilibrium between short-term and long-term chances of company survival, positively valued by the stock market. Board structure has been extensively studied as a factor determining a higher or lower corporate orientation towards social responsibility and sustainability (Driscoll, 2001; Zhang, Zhu, & Ding, 2013) being capable of managing the complexity along the so-called 'triple bottom line', and the establishment of dedicated committees within the board can be a further guarantee that stakeholders' interests are considered in a balanced way, preventing and managing potential conflicts of interests among them and with managers. The establishment of board committees encourages stakeholder protection, reinforces the board's expertise and commitment and safeguards the independence of decision-making processes in awkward situations (OECD, 2015). National binding laws (e.g. Sox, 2002; the Swedish Companies Act, 2006; Portuguese Law 76-A, 2006), international institutions (e.g. the OECD, the United Nations with Global Compact initiative, the ICGN, the European Commission) and national market regulators have governed board committees, with particular focus on audit, nomination and remuneration committees because of the high risks of conflicts of interest characterizing these areas. Clearly, the management of conflicts of interests by the aforementioned committees assumes ethical implications, having positive effects on relations with stakeholders and long-term sound corporate development.

Globalization and the emergence of the concepts of corporate social responsibility and sustainable development have undoubtedly underlined the need for the institutionalization of business ethics. This has gradually led to the diffusion of certain ethics committees, rarely as a legal requirement and more frequently as a recommended self-discipline practice or autonomous corporate initiative.

Sharing the concept that companies need leadership commitment to become sustainable (Eccles, Miller, & Serafeim, 2012), we first focus on the influence of board structure on corporate social performance (CSP). We acknowledge that the board affects corporate performance through its

goals and decisions, but we share the limitations of input-output methods that attempt to identify a direct and measurable relation between board structure and the social dimension of corporate performance. For this reason, we suggest a different perspective, focusing on the board structure for the promotion of a corporate culture inspired by CSR.

Then we discuss the ethics committees. Scholars and regulators have paid very little attention to such committees but, in this void, companies are submitting themselves to self-regulation to shape actively their future and to create their own conditions for success and sustainable development in global markets. These corporate efforts can be considered voluntary investments in the governance decision-making process, which means investments in sustainable and long-term success (Lin-Hi & Blumberg, 2011). Finally, we make some considerations. Globalization is gradually changing the traditional performance indicators; monitoring committee boards can provide important information to investors and market regulators on how companies are moving towards ethics and sustainability.

## 2. BOARD STRUCTURE AND CORPORATE CULTURE

Ongoing debates about the relations and overlapping between corporate governance and CSR have become a priority for companies and policy makers. Since the board is responsible for the corporate goals and internal processes promoting the achievement of these goals in the organisation, scholars, international organisations, regulators and politicians have focused on the relationship between board structure and sound governance, considering in particular the presence of non-executive and independent members and the separation of CEO and Chairman position as a means to guarantee an objective judgement capacity for the protection of the interests of minority shareholders and other stakeholders.

The most popular approach in the study of board effectiveness has been to relate board composition to various measures of firm performance (Bathala & Rao, 1995; Rao & Tilt, 2016): if boards are capable of controlling agency problems and enhancing value for stakeholders, this should result in better corporate performance, in the short as well as the long term. The measurement of a board's commitment to social responsibility includes environmental and social output, in addition to financial considerations (Haugh & Talwar, 2010; Prahalad & Hammond, 2002).

Some scholars have found positive relationships between the number of outside, independent directors and Corporate Social Performance (CSP), in terms of employee orientation (Wang & Dewhirst, 1992), philanthropic activities (Ibrahim & Angelidis, 1995; Ibrahim, Howard, & Angelidis, 2003), environmental standards and product quality (Johnson & Greening, 1999). Vice versa, Surroca and Tribò (2008) and Bear, Rahman, and Post (2010) affirm that diversity of directors' resources (insider directors with expertise in corporate strategies and operations and outsider directors with expertise in monitoring and advising) is not directly associated with social ratings. Also, Zhang et al. (2013) do not offer significant results to support the positive effects of the number of outside directors on a firm's reputation in the industry. Other scholars show neutral findings (McKendall, Samchez, & Sicilian, 1999; Wang & Dewhirst, 1992).

The lack of clear evidence of a direct relationship between board structure and CSP is not entirely surprising; in this regard, other scholars have considered corporate performance to be a function of a number of other factors (Bathala & Rao, 1995). This research approach, called the input-output model (Pettigrew, 1992), attempts to link the board structure (input) directly to company perfor-

mance (output), ignoring the processes involved in the board's performance of its tasks (Dalton, Daily, Johnson, Ellstrand, 1999; Forbes & Milliken, 1999; Gabrielsson & Huse, 2004; Golden & Zajac, 2001; Macus, 2008). A number of factors, primarily determined by the structure of ownership, the characteristics of corporate governance systems, the structure and values that dominate the board and the ability to transfer them to the organisation, heavily influence business behaviour. The limitations of the input-output model lead us to change perspective, or at least to consider the input-output model together with an additional perspective, linking board structure with its potential power to promote a corporate culture inspired by social responsibility and sustainability. Whilst the damaging consequences of a negative (unethical) corporate culture are widely discussed, there are not many discussions focused on culture as a driver of sustainability (BlackSun, 2017).

Corporate culture, defined as ways of thinking, values and beliefs that influence people's behaviour (Green, 1988; Kerr and Slocum, 2005; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1973) can be considered the real drive behind a board's processes. Authors have argued that corporate culture, instead of management technique, is the key to corporate excellence (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982). It is corporate culture, rather than strategy, that is the key to understanding an organisation's success. If the culture is right, then the right strategy will emerge or will be implemented; in this sense, culture is one of the key immaterial factors of success (Brondoni, 2010; Green, 1988;). Companies themselves declare that culture is one of the most important immaterial factors of value creation (BlackSun, 2017).

Changes in corporate culture start at the leader level and leadership commitment allows companies to become sustainable (Eccles, Kathleen, & Serafeim, 2012). According to Eccles et al. (2012), this cultural shift is not immediate, but the path to a sustainable company considers two ongoing stages: the first involves reframing the company's identity through leadership commitment and external engagement; the second involves codifying the new identity through employee engagement and mechanism of execution. For Marlow, Beale and Burn (2010), the corporate pathway to sustainability consists of gradual steps from compliance, focusing on the reduction of risk, through the integration of sustainability into business strategy, to full commitment to sustainability, with the aim of improving the overall wellbeing of the company, community and environment.

According to these views, the presence of dedicated directors within the board can be considered a visible manifestation (Schein, 1984) of the culture of sustainability, a tool to promote and monitor the spread of ethics and the sharing of the triple bottom line in all the behaviours of an organisation. In more complex organisations, effective liability management may also be supported by the adoption of a plan of ethical corporate culture, with the appointment of an Ethics Officer (EO) or a Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO), and the creation of a Social and Ethics Committee (S&EC).

### **3. ETHICS COMMITTEES. A LITERATURE REVIEW**

All over the world, corporate governance bodies foresee the establishment of internal committees, usually made up of independent members. The most widely used committees are those of risk management and audit, remuneration and nomination. By affirming the principles of social responsibility and sustainability, companies more conscious of the importance of the spread of a culture of ethics have also begun to introduce committees for this purpose.

The increase in number of ethics committees is an indication of the board's desire to promote ethically accountable behaviours and implementing initiatives to increase the awareness and

importance of corporate social responsibility in all players of the organisation (Gennari and Salvioni, 2019). Therefore, the existence of social and ethics committees is expected to have a positive impact on corporate governance and it is recommended by numerous researchers (Sims, 1991; Singh, 2011; Weber, 1981; Wood, 2002).

The main purpose of the social and ethics committee is to review and recommend to the management and board of directors objectives, policies and procedures that serve the company's interest to maintain a company committed to high standards of ethics and integrity, legal compliance and integrated corporate responsibility. There are good reasons for the establishment of an ethics committee within a board (Purcell, 1982). First, the committee gives emphasis and visibility to the structuring of ethical issues, as a significant instrument holding management accountable for its administration of the company. Such a committee can be a significant aid in diffusing CSR culture throughout the organisation and obtaining corporate legitimacy within the community. In fact, this committee should ensure the establishment and formalization of policies on corporate ethics and codes of ethics provide the actual practices and documents that are to be monitored, extended or revised over time. Furthermore, ethics committee can contribute to the board's decision-making processes, according to a long-term value creation approach.

The typical activities carried out by ethics committees are: planning an ethics program that usually includes the proposal and updating of the Code of Ethics, the review of results, the assessment of resource allocation, the monitoring of company activities with regard to social and economic development, good corporate citizenship, environment, health and public safety, stakeholder relationships (Deloitte & Touche, 2014; Felo, 2001). In addition to than these tasks, considering that due diligence towards social responsibility can create, in the short term, potential conflict between the shareholders' immediate profit expectations and the long-term creation of value, the presence of ethics committees helps to solve such trade-offs. Where trade-offs exist, the CSR approach recommends prioritizing the long-term sustainable creation of value as fundamental to a company's future life and success, promoting the creation of stakeholder value (shareholders included) over time.

Well-structured ethics committees (also referred to as conduct, corporate responsibility, CSR, sustainability committees and so on) not only serve as a critical coordinating function, but they can also steer a CSR strategy to becoming a competitive advantage, acting as a mediator among possibly conflicting interests. Furthermore, in this case, the board's commitment to value creation in the long-term is more visible to financial markets and external stakeholders than when the responsibility for social issues is assigned to other committees (audit, remuneration) or to the board as a whole.

The importance of ethics committees increases in the light of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with its 17 goals to be reached in the coming years: committee members should promote the consideration of these goals in the board discussions about corporate objectives and strategies, focusing on a fair balance between opportunities and risks. In fact, sustainability risk management has also become a crucial issue, as corporate strategy now must ensure that sustainability policies and impacts do not deflect the achievement of primary business objectives (Salvioni et al., 2016; Burke, Hoitash & Hoitash, 2017; COSO, 2017; Gennari, 2019).

Nevertheless, little attention has been paid to ethics committees until recently, and the majority of interventions are in the area of self-regulation. Some market regulators (stock exchanges supervisors, government commissions, associations of particular categories of stakeholders, etc.) promote the formation of these committees by means of self-discipline codes that often follow

the ‘comply or explain’ principle, which means that companies have to justify non-compliance with the code when they fail to meet certain requirements. There are exceptions, such as South Africa and India, where the establishment of such a committee is mandatory by law.

Ethics committees have been debated in literature in the past, with greater focus in the last twenty years. Many studies have attempted to find a direct association between the existence of such committees and performance outcome (Baxter, Bedard, Hoitash, & Yezegel, 2013; Beasley, Berrone & Gomez-Mejia 2009; Conyon & Peck 1998; Klein 1998; Rodrigue, Magnan, & Cho, 2013; Uzun, Szewczyk, & Varma, 2004; Walls, Berrone, & Phan 2012), but this is not our intended perspective.

The increasing presence of ethics committees is proved by some studies: Spitzack (2009) indicated that there has been an increasing trend in forming corporate responsibility committees in the CSR Index (CRI) in the UK; Eccles, Iannou, and Serafeim (2014) found that US companies with high sustainability adopt such a committee; Burke, Hoitash, and Hoitash (2017) found that sustainability committees in public companies became increasingly prevalent over the period 2003–2013. In addition, practitioner publications (Calvert Asset Management & The Corporate Library, 2010; Institute of Business Ethics, 2016) have reported the increasing presence of sustainability committees. However, these results are not sufficiently comforting: research by Kiron et al. (2015) shows that only 22% of managers perceive that their boards provide substantial oversight on sustainability issues, confirming the results of the UNEP Integrated Governance report (2014) of 2011 Bloomberg corporate data on 60,000 businesses.

For Miller and Serafeim (2014), the way the authority and responsibilities for sustainability differ across organisations indicates the stages of sustainability commitment. During the *compliance stage*, the point when most companies first engage with sustainability, companies do not have a formal chief sustainability position and those primarily responsible for sustainability have a wide range of responsibilities, but are not positioned at high levels of authority. The activities are neither strategic nor centralized. During the next stage, called the *efficiency stage*, companies begin to focus on how they can respond to stakeholder pressures, legitimizing sustainability by means of internal stakeholder engagement. The ultimate responsibility for sustainability is assigned to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who works in partnership with the new Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) to develop strategies and educate the organisation to sustainability. The last stage is the *innovation stage*. The strategies become market-driven and the ultimate responsibility for sustainability shifts from the CEO to the CSO accordingly; the incidence of the board having a special committee on sustainability increases dramatically.

Gennari and Salvioni (2019), analysing more than 22,000 boards of European companies in 2000–2016 found that the number of companies with social and ethics committees gradually increases from 2.46% to 6.70% and the committees’ names developed. In particular, the word ‘sustainability’ becomes the most recurrent word in the committee names from 2010. Up until then, the terms ethics/ethical prevail, examining the big business scandals such as Enron, WorldCom, Ahold, Parmalat and the financial crisis that began in early 2000 and the consequent need for companies to recover the confidence of stakeholders. The concept of sustainability starts to spread at the end of the first decade of the 2000s, also in consideration of the great emphasis first placed first on concepts such as business ethics and CSR, and then on the stakeholder model, sustainability and the triple bottom line. In any case, the word ethics or ethical continues to be used very frequently, showing a correspondence between corporate ethical behaviour and corporate legitimacy to operate. It is also worth



pointing out that, as a first stage, businesses tend to separate the aspects of social and environmental responsibility and link ethics predominantly to compliance. Subsequently, a broader concept of social responsibility has emerged, understood as the liability of companies for their impact on society, where compliance and the internal diffusion of ethical culture are the relative prerequisites. Furthermore, the Authors, according with the institutional theory, examined the relation between external country-variables and the establishment of CSR committees confirming that the only variable impacting on such committees is the mandatory non-financial disclosure ex Directive 2014/95/EU.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Starting with the existing literature, we aim to contribute to the debate on the importance of ethics committees as tools to promote the continuous commitment of the board to ethical and sustainability issues. The presence of special committees is of dual advantage: externally, it can serve as an important message to stakeholders about the management of social responsibility; internally, it expresses the progress of sustainability culture into corporate levels. Corporate culture should be considered a critical, primary intangible factor for the long-term creation of value and for competitive advantage (Salvioni, Franzoni & Gennari, 2016); for this reason, it should be formalized, monitored and managed. This vision combines the traditional focus of corporate responsibility on the measurement of external impact with the focus on what drives behaviours within the organisation. Furthermore, committees can play a useful role in identifying, on behalf of the board, problems and patterns of behaviour that may indicate risk (Institute of Business Ethics, 2016).

Based on these considerations, we think that our paper can contribute to keep alive the international debate on corporate ethics and the role of boards committees for a sound and sustainable corporate governance. In general, the cultural issue should be debated further. When the culture becomes a critical intangible factor of competitive success in global markets, ethics committees should provide key performance indicators to measure and monitor corporate culture, together with socio-environmental indicators expressing the multidimensionality of performance across the triple bottom line. In other words, committee tasks should go beyond the recommendation of sustainable strategies to the board; ethics committees should engage dedicated directors to support dialogue between the board and the figures responsible for internal control systems aimed at spreading the board's goals within the organisation. The contribution of ethics committees extends to external relations with key stakeholders, since such committees can design, together with the Investor Relations function, the information architecture to comply with the change in the mandatory disclosure of the different EU countries deriving from the 2014/95/EU Directive on non-financial and diversity information.

We suggest integrating the traditional literature review about the effects of CSR on company performance with a perspective that focuses on creating and strengthening a strong corporate social culture. This culture of sustainability and the creation of shared value in the long-term, thanks to risk reduction and exploitation of opportunities by means of continuous and bidirectional relations with stakeholders (stakeholder engagement), is an intangible and unique driver for success in global markets. In fact, global markets have replaced the traditional markets of 20<sup>th</sup> century industrial systems, introducing new development models, relations between companies and institutions and market relations. In this environment, companies develop complex models of competitive interaction and long-term corporate success is conditioned more by the level of sophistication of the intangible assets than corporate culture (Brondoni, 2010).

This debate could also have practical implications, encouraging policy makers to translate good practices in managing corporate sustainability culture into actions. The regulators can be passive and let sustainability emerge as the result of market dynamics. Alternatively, regulators can choose to introduce mandatory (to stimulate fast cultural change) or self-disciplinary measures, promoting continuous dialogue among involved actors. In this sense, a significant boost could come from the UN Agenda 2030 that defines Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and explicitly sustains joint action among the institutional, civil and business world. Other measures could be the introduction of incentives for companies to encourage the adoption of certain behaviours, the proposal of voluntary guidelines with reference to international standards, the transfer of regulatory powers to self-regulating authorities, such as stock exchanges. All these rules should promote cultural changes when they are coherent with the national historical, social and economic background, as well as the transposition of international principles. The respect of laws and recommendations cannot provide the expected results when it is perceived by companies to be mere and formal compliance activity. The value of compliance should be embedded into the corporate culture, as a shared principle that guides the behaviour of the entire organisation and constitutes the basis for managing any type of risk related to global corporate responsibility.

Finally, we would like to send a message to investors in consideration of both sustainability performances and indicators. The corporate structure, in terms of board committees, can be one of these indicators, providing information on the leadership commitment to including CSR in the corporate goals. Where there are trade-offs among the interests of different stakeholders, the CSR approach recommends prioritizing the long-term sustainable creation of value as fundamental to the company's future life and success. The foundation of ethics committees and their composition could be a clear indicator of the degree of maturity of the sustainability culture of a company for investors and stakeholders in general.

The story of social and ethics committees is a story about how CSR issues should be expressed and managed in the interest of stakeholders. The task for corporate governance bodies and organisations is not easy and has short-term results, but the direction of travel seems right.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, G., & Orsagh, M. 2004. The Corporate Governance Risk. *Electric Perspectives*, 29(1): 68.
- Arjoon, S. 2005. Corporate Governance: An Ethical Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61(4): 343-352.
- Bathala, C. T., & Rao, R. P. 1995. The Determinants of Board Composition: An Agency Theory Perspective. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 16: 59-69.
- Baxter, R., Bedard, J. C., Hoitash, R., & Yezegel, A. 2013. Enterprise risk management program quality: Determinants, value relevance, and the financial crisis. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 30, 1264–1295.
- Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. 2010. The Impact of Board Diversity and Gender Composition on Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(2): 207-221.
- Beasley, M. S., Carcello, J. V., Hermanson, D. R., & Lapides, P. D. 2000. Fraudulent financial reporting: Consideration of industry traits and corporate governance mechanisms. *Accounting Horizons*, 14, 441–454.
- Black Sun. 2017. *On the Culture Trail*. Black Sun Plc Report.

- Brondoni, S. M. 2010. Intangibles, Global Networks & Corporate Social Responsibility. *Symphonya. Emerging Issues in Management*, 2: 6-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4468/2010.2.02brondoni>
- Burke, J. J., Hoitash, R., & Hoitash, U. 2017. The Heterogeneity of Board-Level Sustainability Committees and Corporate Social Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Forthcoming.
- Byrne, J. 2002. How to Fix Corporate Governance. *Business Week*, 6: 69-78
- Calvert Asset management & The Corporate Library, 2010. *Board Oversight of Environmental and Social Issues: An Analysis of Current North American Practice*. Available on line.
- Canyon, M., & Peck, S. I. 1998. Board control, remuneration committees, and top management compensation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 146–157.
- COSO - Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2017. *Enterprise Risk Management Integrating with Strategy and Performance*. COSO Publishing.
- Daily, C. M., Dalton, D. R., & Cannella A. A. 2003. Corporate governance: Decades of dialogue and data. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3): 371-382.
- Dalton, D. R., Daily, C. M., Johnson, J. L., & Ellstrand, A. E. 1999. Number of Directors and Financial Performance: A Meta- Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 674-686.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. 1982. *Corporate Culture: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Deloitte & Touche 2014. *The Social and Ethics Committee and the management of the Ethics Performance of the Company*. Johannesburg: Deloitte & Touche.
- Driscoll, D. (2001). Ethics and Corporate Governance: Lessons Learned from a Financial Services Model. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(1), 145-158.
- Eccles, R. G., Iannou, I., & Serafeim, G. 2014. The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance. *Management Science*, 6: 2835-2857.
- Eccles, R., Kathleen, M. P., & Serafeim G. 2012. How to become a sustainable company, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53(4), 43-50.
- Eccles, R. G., Miller P. K., & Serafeim, G. 2012. How to Become a Sustainable Company. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53(4): 42-51.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 57-74.
- Elkington, J. 1998. *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21<sup>st</sup> century business*. Canada: New Society.
- Fama, E. F. 1980. Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 88(2): 288-307.
- Felo, A. J. 2001. Ethics Programs, Board Involvement, and Potential Conflicts of Interest in Corporate Governance, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32(3), 205-218.
- Forbes, D. R., & Milliken, F. J. 1999. Cognition and Corporate Governance: Understanding Boards of Directors as Strategic Decision-Making Groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 489-505.
- Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E. 1994. The Politics of Stakeholder Theory: Some Future Directions. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4(4): 409-421.
- Freeman, R. E., & Dmytriyev, S. 2017. Corporate Social Responsibility and Stakeholder Theory: Learning From Each Other. *Symphonya. Emerging Issues in Management*, 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4468/2017.1.02freeman.dmytriyev>
- Friedman, M. 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gabrielsson, J., & Huse, M. 2004. Context, Behavior, and Evolution: Challenges in Research on Boards and Governance. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 34(2): 11-36.

- Gennari, F., & Salvioni, D. M. 2019. CSR committees on boards: the impact of the external country level factors. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 23(3): 759-785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-018-9442-8>
- Gennari, F. 2019. How to Lead the Board of Directors to a Sustainable Development of Business with the CSR Committees. *Sustainability*, 11(24): 6987. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11246987>
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. 1995. Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 874-907.
- Golden, B.R., & Zajac, E. J. 2001. When Will Boards Influence Strategy? Inclination x Power = Strategic Change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 1087-1111.
- Green, S. 1988. Understanding Corporate Culture and Its Relation to Strategy. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 18(2): 6-28.
- Harrison, J. S., Bosse, D. A., & Phillips, R. A. 2010. Managing for stakeholders, stakeholder utility functions, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31: 58-74.
- Haugh, H. M., & Talwar, A. 2010. How Do Corporations Embed Sustainability Across the Organization? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(3): 384-396.
- Ibrahim, N. A., & Angelidis, J. P. 1994. Effect of board members' gender on corporate social responsiveness orientation. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10(1), 35—41.
- Ibrahim, N. A., Howard, D. P., & Angelidis, J. P. 2003. Board members in the service industry: An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility orientation and directorial type. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(4): 393-401.
- Institute of Business Ethics, 2016. *Culture by Committee: the pros and cons*. London: Institute of Business Ethics.
- Jensen, M. C. 2000. *A Theory of the Firm: Governance, Residual Claims and Organizational Forms*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling W. 1976. Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4): 305-360.
- Johnson, R. A., & Greening, D. W. 1999. The effects of corporate governance and institutional ownership types on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5): 564-576.
- Kerr, J., & Slocum, J. W. 2005. Managing Corporate Culture through Reward Systems. *The Academy of Management Executives*, 19(4): 130-138.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, B. L. 1973. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Lin-Hi, N., & Blumberg, I. 2011. The relationship between corporate governance, global governance, and sustainable profits: lessons learned from BP. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 11(5): 571-584.
- Macus, M. 2008. Board Capability. An Interactions Perspective on Boards of Directors and Firm Performance. *International Studies of Management & Organisation*, 38(3): 98-116.
- Marlow, D., Beale, D. J., & Burn, S. 2010. Linking asset management with sustainability: Views from the Australian sector. *American Water Works Association*, 102(1): 56-67.
- McKendall, M., Sanchez, C., & Sicilian, P. 1999. Corporate governance and corporate illegality: The effects of board structure on environmental violations. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 7(3), 201:223.
- Miller, K., & Serafeim, G. (Eds) 2014. *Chief Sustainability Officers: Who Are They and What Do They Do?* Leading Sustainable Change. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pettigrew, A. 1992. On Studying Managerial Elites. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13: 163-182.

- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. 2002. Serving the World's Poor, Profitably. *Harvard Business Review*, September.
- Purcell, T. V. 1982. The Ethics of Corporate Governance. *Review of Social Economy*, 40 (3): 360-370.
- Rao, K., & Tilt, C. 2016. Board Composition and Corporate Social Responsibility: The Role of Diversity, Gender, Strategy and Decision Making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138(2): 327-347.
- Rodrigue, M., Magnan, M., & Cho, C. H. 2013. Is environmental governance substantive or symbolic? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 107–129.
- Ross, S. 1973. The Economic Theory of Agency: The Principal's Problem. *American Economic Review*, 63(2): 134-139.
- Salvioni D. M., Franzoni S., & Gennari F. 2016. Corporate Governance Systems and Sustainability: CSR as a Factor of Convergence between Outsider and Insider Systems. *Corporate ownership & control*, 14: 139-150.
- Salvioni, D. M., Gennari, F., & Astori, R. 2015. Corporate Responsibility and Ethical Culture in Pharmaceutical Industry. *Journal of Business & Economic Policy*, 2(2): 62-84.
- Salvioni, D. M., Gennari, F., & Bosetti L. 2016. Sustainability and Convergence: The Future of Corporate Governance Systems? *Sustainability*, 8(11): 1203. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8111203>
- Schein, E. H. 1984. Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 25(2): 3-16.
- Sims, R. R. 1991. The institutionalization of organizational ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(7): 493-506.
- Singh, J. 2011. Determinants of the Effectiveness of Corporate Codes of Ethics: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101(3): 385-395.
- Spitzeck, H. 2009. The development of governance structures for corporate responsibility. *Corporate Governance*, 9(4): 495-505.
- Surroca, J., & Tribò, J. A. 2008. Managerial Entrenchment and Corporate Social Performance. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 35(5-6): 748-760.
- Uzun, H., Szewczyk, S. H., & Varma, R. 2004. Board composition and corporate fraud. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 60, 33–43.
- Walls, J. L., Berrone, P., & Phan, P. H. 2012. Corporate governance and environmental performance: Is there really a link? *Strategic Management Journal*, 33, 885–913.
- Wang, J. & Dewhirst, H. D. 1992. Boards of directors and stakeholder orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(2): 115-123.
- Weber, J. 1981. Institutionalizing Ethics into the Corporation. *MSU Business Topics*, Spring: 47–51.
- Weisbach, S. M. 1988. Outside directors and CEO turnover. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20: 431-460.
- Wood, G. 2002. A Partnership Model of Corporate Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 40(1): 61-73.
- Zahra, S. A., & Pearce, J. A. 1989. Boards of directors and corporate financial performance: a re- view and integrative model. *Journal of Management*, 15: 291-334.
- Zhang, J. Q., Zhu, H., & Ding, H. 2013. Board Composition and Corporate Social Responsibility: An Empirical Investigation in the Post Sarbanes-Oxley Era. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(3): 381-392.

