

Chapter 5

Corporate Social Responsibility. State of the Question in Ecuador



Ronny Correa-Quezada, María de la Cruz del Río-Rama,
Claudia Patricia Maldonado-Eraza, and Diego Fernando García-Vélez

Abstract The purpose of this chapter is to examine the background, regulations, main practices and initiatives, as well as the pending issues regarding corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Ecuador. The methodology used focuses on carrying out a search and presentation of the most relevant facts and background that gave rise to the adoption of strategies and programmes by Ecuadorian companies in terms of social responsibility. In addition, it examines the international influence on the social, labour, and environmental responsibilities that the Ecuadorian business sector must fulfil. Among the main findings, it can be mentioned that the concern for the issue of corporate social responsibility in Ecuador is shared by a series of agents, international organizations, several public sector organizations, civil society associations, business associations, and universities. Although this interest is shared in a general way, by making a more detailed analysis, it can be seen that the initiatives only come from the State, with little promotion by the Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GADs) towards this issue. However, the initiative of the Municipality of Quito is worth mentioning, which is one of the 24 GADs in the territory that carries out actions aimed at motivating companies in the area to launch CSR actions. On the other hand, it is observed that in Ecuador, the subsidiaries of transnational companies are established as pioneers in social responsibility practices and processes, thus demonstrating the international influence on the local business environment. It is also noteworthy that most of the companies that make up important economic groups in the country perform or collaborate with corporate social respon-

R. Correa-Quezada · D. F. García-Vélez

Department of Economics, Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja (UTPL), Loja, Ecuador
e-mail: rforrea@utpl.edu.ec; dfgarciax@utpl.edu.ec

M. de la C. del Río-Rama (✉)

Department of Business Management and Marketing, University of Vigo,
Ourense, Galicia, Spain
e-mail: delrio@uvigo.es

C. P. Maldonado-Eraza

Department of Tourism, Escuela Superior Politécnica de Chimborazo – ESPOCH,
Riobamba, Ecuador

sibility practices. Finally, it is observed that business initiatives in this area respond to palliative and/or short-term issues of incentives, promotion, and social marketing.

Keywords Corporate social responsibility · Corporate social performance · Stakeholder theory · Theory of business ethics · Triple bottom line · Ecuador

5.1 Introduction

The conceptualization and study of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is recent. Although in its origins, it was related or close to the different “Management Theories” as stated by Milian (2015), its individual interest as an area of study began between 1950 and 1960 in the United States. According to Vázquez-Carrasco and López-Pérez (2013), its origin is in the first definition given by Bowen (1953) in his work entitled “Social Responsibilities of the Businessmen”, which placed the responsibility that the business sector had with society on the Business Table.

Until then, large corporations focused their progress on increasing the production levels and improving services, leaving aside the impact that their presence had on the life of the society in which they had set up their business (Kolb 2007). Following this line, the so-called father of CSR, Howard R. Bowen encourages companies to focus to a certain extent on returning to society part of what they have been provided with in the space in which they are located; a statement that gives way to debate within society, the business, and the academic world (García 2016).

The different debates that arose led to promoting the study of the effects generated by companies. Thus, after a long period of analysis, almost half a century ago, CSR began with the introduction of a series of regulations, laws, and policies within the different States, whereby its presence was consolidated. In this way, CSR arises as a particular obligation of companies, ceasing to be perceived as a mere fashion trend (García 2016).

Currently, there is extensive literature on CSR that is addressed from large companies and global economic powers. However, the CSR of small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as those of developing countries, has hardly been analysed. Taking into account this reality, the aim of this research is to examine the background, regulations, main practices and initiatives, as well as pending issues on corporate social responsibility within Ecuador. In this sense, Ecuador is characterized as a developing country, which has opted for a change within its productive matrix and that despite this, has an emerging industry with a business predominance of small and medium-sized enterprises of which the Study of CSR has not been addressed.

This chapter is structured in five sections. After a brief introduction in which the first ideas of the study are introduced, the second section presents a review of the literature in relation to the CSR concept. Next, the methodology used is presented and in the fourth section, the state of the question of CSR in Ecuador is raised at different levels. Finally, the conclusions of the investigation are discussed in the last section.

5.2 Literature Review

The concept of CSR has evolved since its emergence. It began in the 1950s with a positivist vision, on which it is established that business activity generates impacts within society. This responsibility extends to executives, who must deal with all those realities that go “beyond” accountability (Bowen 1953; Milian 2015).

After this definition, in the 1960s, a considerable increase in researchers’ interest in conceptualizing this new area of study is observed. It begins with Davis (1960), who states that CSR is a set of decisions and actions that entrepreneurs take with a vision “beyond” the interest or direct benefit of companies, and that if they are accounted for can generate benefits in the long term, as well as returning to the company as a socially responsible perspective.

As for Frederick (1960), he promotes a public position for social responsibility, where it is proclaimed that the economic and human resources of society should be used with a social will of general benefit and not only be related to the interests of a limited group of people or private companies. On the other hand, the first outline of “business ethics and corporate citizenship” is also mentioned and incorporated through the contributions of McGuire (1963). This author states that companies do not only have economic or legal obligations, these obligations are broader. Although they are not clearly defined by this author and at that time, it is observed that they are aimed at integrating the welfare of the community and employees, that is to say, of society in general, but in a fair way.

An important milestone for this decade is the identification of the interest groups that surround the company, which are given the name of “stakeholders”; term used by the Standford Research Institute in 1963 (Sabogal 2008). Although this denomination arose during this period, it was not until the 1980s, when Freeman (1984) popularized it through his stakeholder theory, allowing its use in the formulation of numerous models (Milian 2015).

In the 1970s, philanthropy was positioned as the most frequent CSR action. Subsequently, it was observed that this was insufficient to alleviate the social unrest arising from the social movements of that moment (Milian 2015). During this period, stakeholders are more clearly identified (Carroll 1999) and it is considered that the company is not only responsible for generating profits for its owners or shareholders, but its responsibility is also to ensure the interests of its employees and families, suppliers, community and the country in general (Johnson 1971). All this shows that CSR shows a multiplicity of interests that are not being addressed by companies.

On the other hand, the Committee for Economic Development (CED), an organization made up of entrepreneurs and academics, promotes a change in the CSR perspective (Carroll 1999). This Committee (CED 1971) declares that commercial functions with public consent have the basic purpose of serving and contributing to satisfying society’s needs. Thus, companies must expand their purpose, from entities focused on the production of goods and services to carrying out actions that favour and improve their stakeholders’ quality of life. Insofar as companies broaden their purposes, serving society, their permanence in the market will be determined

by the management they have with their stakeholders. In addition, the CED with the conceptual theory of the three concentric circles clarifies the coverage of the objectives set by companies and their relationship with society (Carroll 1999). This model is the basis of the model developed later by Carroll (1979), where the third circle of the CED is made up of all the discretionary activities proposed by Carroll, so these parts focus on the identification of forms of external assistance that include society in general (Carroll 1999).

Everything stated so far is ratified by Steiner (1971), who affirmed that the role of the company cannot be denied as a business and that it should continue to be so, but that it must also be aware that it has a leading role in achieving the basic objectives of society, a fact that attributes it social responsibilities with society. Thus, it is observed that the goal is no longer in the individual interest, which is left aside, but long-term collective results are now predominant (Kolb 2007; Steiner 1971).

In 1972, there was a debate between Manne and Wallich about the meaning of CSR, promoted by the American Enterprise Institute. Although many and varied contributions were provided, one of them is highlighted, which questions Bowen's positivist vision (1953); the actions must be voluntary. However, currently in practice, it is most certainly difficult to distinguish CSR actions developed with the purpose of complying with a norm or a social standard from those that have a real social volunteering intention (Manne and Wallich 1987) because social responsibility does not always mean the same for everyone (Votaw and Sethi 1973). Davis (1973) changes direction in his definition and contributes further by going deeper into the obligation of the business sector to take decisions that achieve not only social benefits, but also integrate the achievement of economic benefits for companies.

Until then, CSR had been defined as the application of good neighbourliness, in other words, not generating actions that harm the neighbourhood, while working to resolve existing problems (Eells and Walton 1969). These authors were among the first to measure CSR through the introduction of organizational variables. Thus, the denomination of corporate social performance (CSP), which focuses on establishing CSR results in a measurable way (Milian 2015), begins to emerge within the literature. Sethi (1975) is the precursor of establishing that one thing is the formulation of actions and a totally different element is to measure the results obtained by those actions. As for Fitch (1976), he defines it as the responsibility of companies to solve social problems, generated totally or partially by the corporation's actions. To do so, company management must identify and define what problems have been developed, and then establish an order to solve them.

At the end of this decade, Carroll (1979) states that social responsibility is made up of economic expectations (fulfilment of its production function of selling products and services as indicated by the capitalist model, in addition to contributing to the economic viability of areas), legal expectations (obedience of its economic purpose based on compliance with the rules and regulations established by the law), ethical expectations (implementation of different types of behaviour and ethical standards that society expects business to follow) and discretionary expectations (those expectations that go "beyond" what is legal, they are the voluntary roles of

the company, which although they are not well defined or specified, they are implemented according to the choice of the corporation; despite their ambiguity, society remains hopeful that companies fulfil those expectations). All these expectations are developed within society and they are transferred to organizations at a given time (Carroll 1979, 1991, 1999).

When the 1980s arrived, a strong tendency in the development of alternative concepts, models, and theories was observed. In this sense, CSR started expanding towards issues that had not been addressed until then, one of them being environmental awareness (Strand 1983). Thus, Jones (1980) makes a great contribution on the basis established for CSR until that moment, by highlighting that it is not only a set of results that is reflected in certain measures, but it is also a process. In 1981, the definition established by Carroll (1979) is confirmed as appropriate and used as the basis for the formulation of a model of hierarchies of needs developed by Tuzzolino and Armandi (1981), which sought to facilitate the operationalization of CSR, and not contribute to the improvement of its definition. In the following years, Carroll further defines its four-part definition and states that when the first two parts are fulfilled (economic and legal expectations), spaces are created to discuss business ethics and establish the extent to which it develops support for society, with which the 4th part of the concept is being reconsidered from discretionary to voluntary or philanthropic expectations (Carroll 1983).

As shown in the previous decade, a growing interest arises, which in this decade gives rise to an increase in the acceptance of CSP as an umbrella theory in which CSR could be integrated (Carroll 1999), which arouses in Drucker (1986) a new approach. CSR should not only be results, but should also give rise to benefits; when working towards the solution to social problems, the “obligation” should be transformed into an economic opportunity that generates benefits, in his own words “the company must tame the dragon it faces” (Drucker 1986). As a result, the evaluation of the four-part concept of Carroll was considered, which resulted in economic responsibility not being considered as part of social responsibility, but considered as something innate by commercial companies (Aupperle et al. 1985). Thus, it is argued that a company’s social orientation can be evaluated in terms of the importance it assigns to the three non-economic parts of the concept versus the economic one (Aupperle et al. 1985; Carroll 1999). By the end of this decade, Epstein (1987) integrated the so-called “corporate social policy process” proposed in order to achieve the institutionalization of business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social response capacity within organizations.

During the following decade, the definition of CSR was established as the basis for the formulation of other concepts or subjects with the following standing out: CSP, the stakeholder theory, the theory of business ethics and corporate citizenship. Regarding the main subject of this review, it can be seen that no significant contributions were made within its definition. The most representative in the 1990s is the Wood’s model (Wood 1991), which is based on the definition of Carroll (1979) and the three-dimensional model of Wartick and Cochran (1985), where corporate social participation is based on the principles of social responsibility, the process of social receptivity and problem management policies. Although each dimension has a

distinctive direction and orientation, as a whole, they reflect the broad CSP process that integrates the extremely flexible CSR, together with its concerns (Wartick and Cochran 1985).

Wood's Model is categorized as a more useful framework or template for organizing research on the CSP theory, since it is established as a complete model that articulates the three principles of social responsibility at institutional, organizational, and individual levels, as well as integrating receptive processes and collective impacts generated. Specifically, it allows for the development of more pragmatic evaluations (Wood 1991) because it addresses elements that were not explained in depth by their predecessors, but which Wood managed to explain within a process, this being his major contribution (Carroll 1999; Wood 1991).

In addition, in this period, Carroll (1999) is able to convey how each part of the concept relies on obtaining other responsibilities, through a graphic representation of the concept (García 2016). Thus, he is convincing in his attempt to add a new meaning to the four-part definition by stating that these parts support each other, but does not raise the need to obtain each one of them in the order shown in the graph due to fulfilling all responsibilities to some extent at all times. The economic part is at the base of the pyramid and the rest of the parties (legal, ethical and philanthropic) are placed towards the top (Carroll 1991).

As mentioned by Carroll (1999), as the new millennium passes, progress in defining this concept will show adequate changes as empirical research increases. In fact, the first contributions of the millennium focused on the development of definitions that fall upon the same principles, such as the one shared by Davidson and Griffin (2000), where they classify CSR as a set of obligations that an organization has to promote and execute within the society in which it is integrated. Moreover, they emphasize that the level of social responsibility shown by an organization can be identified as social obstruction, social obligation, social response, and social contribution (Abreu and Badii 2007).

On the other hand, Vélez (2011) highlights that during this period, a long-term vision has been consolidated, in which CSR takes the value and importance it deserves. One of the major driving forces it received came from the European Union (EU), considered the cradle of Social Responsibility (Echaiz 2006). Although previous events promoted by the EU in relation to CSR are identified, the drafting of the Green Paper "Promoting a European framework for Corporate Social Responsibility", presented by the European Commission (2001) is highlighted as the most important. It promotes the social responsibility of "companies at European and international level, through existing experiences, fostering the development of innovative practices, increasing transparency and increasing the reliability of evaluations and validation" (Social Responsibility Portal 2017). This document is considered as the beginning for the formulation of the first government policies that deal with this field (European Commission 2001). With this, faced with an increasingly inclusive dynamics for the execution of CSR within companies at different levels, Porter and Kramer (2006) state that it is necessary to develop strategies from which CSR can be linked to each of the phases that make up the value chain more precisely, thereby encouraging its execution to be better.

Throughout this section, we have discussed the international vision from which the basis of CSR has been created, as stated by Carroll (1999). In the future, it will be adapted to new fields, stakeholders, technologies, making its final definition still be underway, so that it manages to capture the greatest concerns that arise from commercial and social relationships.

5.3 Methodology

The methodology used in this chapter is based on the development of a descriptive analysis on the state of the question of CSR in Ecuador. It is developed by reviewing the scientific literature provided by several researchers affiliated to this country that have addressed this issue; as well as by reviewing secondary sources (exploration of physical, digital documents, and websites) of the main regulatory bodies of CSR. It must be mentioned that in Ecuador, the terms corporate social responsibility (CSR), social entrepreneurial responsibility (SER), or social responsibility (SR) are used interchangeably.

5.4 Results

5.4.1 Background

In Ecuador, as in other Latin American countries, the essence of corporate responsibility existed long before the term was generalized (Silva 2000). Social responsibility has increased since the second half of the twentieth century after the experience of two world wars that leads to the development of new social movements and emphasizes the implementation of social reconstruction processes. Despite this, the concept and good practices of this subject have not been consolidated and seem to be in their early stages (Lima and Lopez 2012). In addition to this, there is great confusion about the CSR concept. All kinds of terms are used and mixed interchangeably: Business Social Investment, triple bottom line, corporate citizenship, corporate quality and philanthropy, social action, and green marketing among others.

In the case of Ecuador, the first companies to incorporate CSR comprehensively were multinationals, a particular segment of export companies, large private extractive companies and national companies, that due to their nature generate higher expectations among their stakeholders (Villacís Laínez et al. 2016); while small and medium-sized enterprises have adopted or initiated good social responsibility practices recently.

In effect, for more than eight decades, since the mid-1920s, international corporations have extracted oil from Ecuadorian subsoil, a lack of instruments and laws that regulate the environmental impact and in the communities produced the

exploitation of this product in the Ecuadorian Amazon by not following good CSR practices. This issue was somewhat corrected with the promulgation of the Environmental Law in 1999. A similar situation occurs in mining, especially in the south of the country where transnational companies and informal mining have been operating for many years, beginning in 1942, without environmental responsibility.

A turning point on social responsibility (SR) were the changes in the Ecuadorian legislation from the year 2007, which consider demands and incentives to companies; as well as public policies whose aim is for the increase in production and economic growth to have synergy with environmental development.

The few and limited studies and official statistics on companies and their SR in Ecuador make it difficult to establish and monitor the development and behaviour of these activities. The following studies serve as reference: (a) Torresano (2012) conducted 743 surveys of companies in the country, where it was concluded that in Ecuador, especially since 2007, about half of the companies have introduced issues related to SR, 51–80% have done it in the last decade, and 57% only in the last 5 years. However, 49% are companies that have not implemented SR strategies yet; (b) the consulting firm Deloitte conducted a survey based on a sample of 91 organizations since 2015. According to Deloitte (2016), 53% of the companies surveyed have a SR strategy, while 34% are in process; and (c) the study carried out by Molina et al. (2017) with the objective of evaluating how the dissemination of socially responsible practices by large and medium-sized enterprises in Ecuador affects the company's corporate image and financial performance. Some 52 companies participated in the study. These authors state that

companies maintain an increased application of CSR practices within the ethical, social and environmental dimensions. Their application has contributed significantly to the income performance and liquidity of organizations, while environmental activities have a positive influence on the corporate image.

5.4.2 Legal and Normative Framework

Ecuador has a comprehensive legal framework in social, environmental, and economic issues. This regulation defines companies' obligations and has promotion or support mechanisms for companies to carry out SR practices. Such is the case of the Constitution or the Organic Code of Production (Torresano 2012). In this sense, Lima and Lopez (2012) conducted a study of the Legal Framework of SR in Ecuador, noting that social responsibility is mentioned in several areas in the Political Constitution and that the current legislation is aimed at four dimensions that address several legal bodies transversally. These four dimensions are the following: (i) those that link the relationship with the environment; (ii) those that mediate between the State, society, and the company – third parties; (iii) those that regulate customers/users – external public- and the company; and (iv) those that intervene in the worker–internal public–and the company relationship.

Due to the high number of laws, regulations, rules, and codes in which the SR of Ecuadorian companies is developed, we will consider those legal bodies and articles that cover and guide every activity related to CSR in general without forgetting to point out that many of them are complementary and become multipurpose instruments depending on the nature and approach from which they are analysed.

Concerning SR of public and private companies, the different levels of governments and economic activities with “the environment and the population”, Art. 14 and 15 of the 2008 Constitution “recognizes the right of the population to live in a healthy and ecologically balanced environment, which ensures sustainability and good living, *sumak kawsay*”, and “guarantees people the right to develop economic activities, individually or collectively, in accordance with the principles of solidarity, social and environmental responsibility” (Ecuadorian Constituent Assembly 2008).

In Art. 395 of the Constitution of the Republic in section 1, it is determined “that the State will guarantee a sustainable model of development, environmentally balanced and respectful of cultural diversity, that preserves biodiversity and the capacity for the natural regeneration of ecosystems”; while in the section related to environmental management policies, it is indicated that “they will be applied transversally and will be mandatory by the State at all levels and by all natural or legal persons in the national territory” (Ecuadorian Constituent Assembly 2008).

Regarding the “direct responsibility” of companies, Art. 396 of the Constitution establishes that the State will adopt the appropriate policies and measures to avoid negative environmental impacts, when there is certainty of damage. (...) Each of the actors involved in production, distribution, marketing, and use of goods or services will assume direct responsibility for preventing any environmental impact, mitigating and repairing the damage caused, and maintaining a permanent environmental control system.

In what has to do with “fiscal policy and international trade”, in Art. 285, the objective of fiscal policy is: “The generation of incentives for investment in different sectors of the economy and for the production of socially desirable and environmentally responsible goods and services”. Whereas Article 306 lays down the state obligation to promote environmentally responsible exports, preferably those that generate more employment and added value, and in particular the exports of small and medium producers and the artisanal sector. Complementary to all this, in Art. 278, paragraph 2, it is stated that: “In order to achieve good living for individuals and communities, and their various organizational forms, they are responsible for: (...) Producing, exchanging and consuming goods and services with social and environmental responsibility” (Constitutional Assembly of Ecuador 2008).

As for “production and work”, the Constitution in Art. 66, paragraph 15 recognizes and guarantees the following: “The right to develop economic activities, individually or collectively, in accordance with the principles of solidarity, social and environmental responsibility”; while Art. 319 states that “various forms of organization of production in the economy are recognized (...). The State will promote the forms of production that ensure good living and discourage those that infringe their rights or those of nature (...)”; and art. 320 indicates that: “(...) production, in any

of its forms, will be subject to the principles and standards of quality, sustainability, systemic productivity, job evaluation and economic and social efficiency”.

The National Plan for Good Living also includes 3 objectives directly related to the SR of companies: Objective 3: “To improve the quality of life of the population”; Objective 7: “To guarantee the rights of nature and promote territorial and global environmental sustainability”; and Goal 8: “To consolidate the social and solidary economic system in a sustainable way” (SENPLADES 2013).

5.4.3 *Main Initiatives*

The Ecuadorian state defines CSR as:

“a new form of management, with which organizations manage their operations in a sustainable way, generating value at economic, social and environmental levels, recognizing the interests and needs of different publics who they are related with, such as shareholders, employees, the community, suppliers, customers (also called stakeholders), considering the environment and future generations” (MIPRO 2010).

In this context, since 2011, the “Hace Bien, Hace Mejor” seals have been promoted, which are quality certificates granted by the State to Ecuadorian companies that comply with the minimum CSR practices and with the four business ethics promoted by the National Government: ethics with workers, with the community, with the State and with the environment. To access this certification, companies must comply with the requirements and requisites of the following agreements and standards: United Nations Global Compact, Millennium Goals, OECD, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), ILO Declaration, ETHOS Institute, Principles of Ecuador, ISO 26000, SGE-21, ISO 9001, ISO 14000, Accountability 1000, SA 8000, OSHAS 18001.

Another instrument of public policy and business incentive is set out in the Ministerial Agreement 131 of 2010, whereby the Punto Verde Ecuadorian Environmental Recognition can be obtained. Its objective is to encourage the public and private sector to use new and better production and service practices. This initiative refers to the application of Good Environmental Practices in buildings. The evaluation is established through a comparison of indicators (of at least 2 years of execution) of activities in the thematic areas of waste management, paper management, efficient use of water, energy and fuels; training and responsible purchasing (MAE 2011).

Although the two aforementioned initiatives include financial, fiscal, and labour incentives for companies that are certified, the results are hardly significant at national level until 2015, as Viera (2016) points out. The companies that have CSR programmes represent a small number, 27 to be precise. However, although both initiatives started almost simultaneously, it is the “Punto Verde” seal that has received the most attention, with 17 private companies; while the seal “Hace Bien, Hace Mejor” has certified 13 companies (85% public and 15% private); 11% of the

certified companies have adopted the two schemes proposed by the National Government; 25% of certified companies have renewed and/or extended their commitment to social responsibility, and/or their environmental commitment.

Another initiative to be highlighted is the Metropolitan Ordinance No. 84 of 2015, of the Municipality of the Metropolitan District of Quito, which replaced Ordinance 333 of 2010, which is based on ISO 26000. Based on this Ordinance, the Municipality of the capital of Ecuador has been recognized nationally and internationally for the public management model, and public–private partnership, which is implemented focusing on social responsibility and sustainable development.

5.4.4 Social Responsibility Organizations in Ecuador

According to the Mapping of CSR Promoters in Latin America in 2012, there are 40 organizations in Ecuador that work together with companies to develop a culture of responsible management; CSR promoters are organizations within the academic sector, mass media, international organizations, public bodies, civil society organizations, business associations, and organizations engaged exclusively in CSR that seek to promote responsible business practices through lines of action such as coordination, advice, training, standardization, dissemination, financing, research, and awards and recognition (Ekos 2012) (see listing Table 5.1).

Although there are several institutions in Ecuador that adopt and participate in corporate and business responsibility processes and actions, two of them are currently playing a leading role: the Ecuadorian Consortium for Social Responsibility and the Institute of Corporate Social Responsibility of Ecuador.

The Ecuadorian Consortium for Social Responsibility (CERES) originated when in 1998 the Esquel Ecuador Foundation, a pioneer in the promotion of SR, together with other organizations in the country and the Synergos Institute of the United States took the first steps, and in 2005, this NGO was set up as a member of the Continental Network of Forum Empresa (Garbay et al. 2017).

The mission of this NGO “is to promote the concept and practices of Social Responsibility through a group of strengthened organizations and that are committed to the sustainable development of Ecuador” (CERES 2012). It is currently made up of more than 50 organizations, public and private companies, civil society organizations, and educational institutions that link sustainable development and the incorporation of CSR as part of their management model (CERES 2018). The CERES yearbook (2015) reports that 65% of the companies or organizations that are members of this NGO are considered by their size as large companies and 35% are small and medium-sized enterprises; these institutions generate altogether 64,500 direct jobs and more than 193,000 indirect jobs.

The Institute of Corporate Social Responsibility of Ecuador (IRSE) is a private, non-profit organization. Large companies and economic groups in Ecuador are among its promoters. This institute is part of the Horizontes Foundation, under the form of Legal Person, approved by Agreement No. 472, of December 29, 2005, by

Table 5.1 List of organizations

	Institutions
1	Agencia Cuenca para el Desarrollo e Integración Regional (ACUDIR)
2	Asociación Nacional de Empresas del Sector Floricultor (Expoflores)
3	Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID) en Ecuador
4	Banco Mundial (BM) en Ecuador
5	Bolsa de Valores de Quito
6	Cámara de Comercio Ecuatoriano Americana (AmCham)
7	Cámara de Industrias y Comercio Ecuatoriano–Alemana (AHK)
8	CARE Ecuador
9	Comité Gestor de RSE de Cuenca y su Región
10	Comité para la Organización de la Informática (CDI)
11	Consejo Empresarial para el Desarrollo Sustentable del Ecuador (CEMDES)
12	Consortio Ecuatoriano para la Responsabilidad Social (CERES)
13	Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF) en Ecuador
14	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) en Ecuador
15	Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia (UNICEF) en Ecuador
16	Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Ecuador
17	Fundación Avina Ecuador
18	Fundación Esquel
19	Fundación General Ecuatoriana
20	Gobierno de la Provincia de Pichincha
21	IDE Business School
22	Innpulsar – Incubadora de Empresas
23	Instituto de Altos Estudios Nacionales (IAEN)
24	Instituto de Responsabilidad Social Empresarial (IRSE)
25	Ministerio de Coordinación de la Producción, Empleo y Competitividad (MCPEC)
26	Ministerio de Inclusión Económica y Social (MIES)
27	Ministerio del Ambiente
28	Municipio del Distrito Metropolitano de Quito (DMQ)
29	ONU Mujeres en Ecuador
30	Organización de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo Industrial (ONUDI) en Ecuador
31	Organización de los Estados Americanos (OEA) en Ecuador
32	Plataforma de Responsabilidad Social (PRS)
33	Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD) en Ecuador
34	Red del Pacto Global de Ecuador

(continued)

Table 5.1 (continued)

	Institutions
35	Red Ecuatoriana de Ciudades y Comunidades Justas, Democráticas y Sustentables
36	Revista EKOS NEGOCIOS
37	Techo Ecuador
38	The Nature Conservancy (TNC) en Ecuador
39	Universidad del Pacífico
40	Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja (UTPL)

Source: Ekos (2012)

the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Ecuador (IRSE 2018). Among the objectives of this institution is to approach CSR technically and methodologically and to guide organizations of all kinds in their management towards sustainable development. It also provides diagnostic services, planning, support, ad hoc training, the design of sustainable social projects, and preparation of sustainability reports according to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) in accordance with the ISO 26000 standards and the Ethical and Socially Responsible Management System SGE 21 (IRSE 2018). According to reports of the IRSE, about 80 organizations have been counselled in its 10 years.

When reviewing the reports of these two institutions, as well as reports from the public sector and several academic papers, it is very difficult to find common characteristics that allow for a classification or grouping of these activities and projects, except in the social or economic areas. In addition, it is observed that the actions have focused on the “stakeholders”, leaving aside the workers’ behaviour, who are the core of the organization. Furthermore, a leading role and greater knowledge about SR by managers and middle managers responsible for image and marketing has been observed, and the employees or workers who make up the organizations do not participate in SR actions.

5.5 Conclusions

In general, in recent years the obligations of companies in Ecuador have changed significantly; the Ecuadorian state currently demands greater commitments and responsibilities. However, the complexity of the term “social responsibility” is confused with other terms and concepts, which makes it very difficult to establish monitoring and evaluation systems for these practices, a fact which limits their study within the country.

The review of the literature and reports shows that despite the existence and functioning of several institutions and organizations that support and encourage the public and private sector in activities and projects related to SR, its presence is mainly in multinationals and their subsidiaries, as well as in large companies,

leaving the practice of SR within small and medium-sized companies in an incipient or almost non-existent state. These practices are carried out in isolation and not as a comprehensive strategy within organizations.

The companies involved in these practices are from different sectors and are heterogeneous in terms of their nature, characteristics, and personnel. It is further observed that CSR is a commitment that has been assumed by Ecuadorian companies in their strategic planning, although in many cases, they associate it with an action for the improvement of the corporate image based on communication strategies that have been implemented by companies.

The indicators that are part of the requirements for the certifications are particularly important because they enable to reach international standards qualified by third parties, which promotes the economic, environmental, and social competitiveness of companies. At the same time, they allow for the positioning of national companies within other markets.

In Ecuador, the participation of SMEs involved in aspects of SR is minimal. In view of this situation, a more detailed and careful study will probably be needed if the established regulations and incentives are established based on the characteristics of large companies.

References

- Abreu, J., & Badii, M. (2007). Análisis del concepto de responsabilidad social empresarial (Analysis of the corporate social responsibility concept). *Mexico: Daena: International Journal of Good Conscience*, 2(1), 54–70.50.
- Aupperle, K. E., Carroll, A. B., & Hatfield, J. D. (1985). An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 28(2), 446–463.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1983). Corporate social responsibility: Will industry respond to cutbacks in social program funding. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 49(19), 604–608.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39–48.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>.
- CERES. (2012). *Presentación eCRES*. from <http://www.redceres.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Que-es-CERES-enero-2012.pdf>
- CERES. (2015). *Anuario*. Retrieved September 02, 2018, from http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/8c779e_90f594ef57d34948b0e23575d0d027a5.pdf
- CERES. (2018). *Web institucional*. Retrieved September 01, 2018, from <http://www.redceres.com/>
- Comisión Europea. (2001). *Libro Verde “Fomentar un marco europeo para la Responsabilidad Social de las Empresas”*. Lisboa.
- Committee for Economic Development. (1971). *Social responsibilities of business corporations*. New York: The Committee.
- Davidson, P., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). *Management: Australia in a global context*. Wiley.

- Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*, 2(3), 70–76.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 16(2), 312–322.
- Deloitte. (2016). *La Responsabilidad Social (RS). Como modelo de negocio Estudio 2016*.
- Drucker, P. (1986). *The Frontiers of management*. London: Routledge.
- Echaiz, D. (2006). *Antecedentes de la responsabilidad social corporativa en la Unión Europea*. Lima: Editora Normas Legales.
- Ecuadorian Constituent Assembly (2008) / Constitución del Republica del Ecuador (2008). Available online: https://www.oas.org/juridico/pdfs/mesicic4_ecu_const.pdf
- Eells, R. S. F., & Walton, C. C. (1969). *Conceptual foundations of business*. RD Irwin.
- Ekos. (2012). Panorama Empresarial. *Revista de Economía y Empresa*, 10–18(221).
- Epstein, E. M. (1987). The corporate social policy process: Beyond business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social responsiveness. *California Management Review*, 29(3), 99–114.
- Fitch, H. G. (1976). Achieving corporate social responsibility. *The Academy of Management Review*, 1(1), 38–46.
- Frederick, W. C. (1960). The growing concern over business responsibility. *California Management Review*, 2(4), 54–61.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. London: Pitman.
- Garbay, J., Carangui, P., & Morales, K. (2017). La responsabilidad social empresarial en las empresas extractivas mineras de la provincia de morona santiago, cantón Morona-estudio de caso de la empresa “Grupo ICCA”. *Killkana Social*, 1(3), 53–60.
- García, Q. (2016). Los orígenes de la RSE, desde los años 50 hasta ahora. Retrieved August 7, 2018, from <https://mansunides.org/es/rsc/responsabilidad-social-corporativa/historia-rsc>
- IRSE. (2018). ¿Qué es el IRSE? Retrieved September 02, 2018, from <http://www.irse-ec.org/irse/>
- Johnson, H. L. (1971). *Business in contemporary society: Framework and issues*. Belmont: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Jones, T. M. (1980). Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. *California Management Review*, 22(3), 59–67.
- Kolb, R. W. (2007). *Encyclopedia of business ethics and society*. Sage Publications.
- Lima, M., & Lopez, M. (2012). Consorcio Ecuatoriano para la Responsabilidad Social. Retrieved September 01, 2018, from <http://www.redceres.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Informaci%C3%B3n-Traversal-cobre-la-RSE-Ecuador.pdf>
- MAE. (2011). Ministerio del Ambiente: Comunicación Sello Punto Verde. Retrieved September 01, 2018, from <http://www.ambiente.gob.ec/punto-verde/>
- Manne, H. G., & Wallich, H. (1987). *The modern corporation and social responsibility*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- McGuire, J. W. (1963). *Business and society*. New York: McGraw-hill.
- Milian, L. (2015). *Origen y Evolución del Concepto de RSC en el entorno Empresarial Europeo y Español*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas.
- MIPRO. (2010). *Guía de Aplicación de los sellos hace bien hace mejor*. Ecuador: Ministerio de Coordinación de la Producción, Empleo y Productividad.
- Molina, E. C., Córdova, J. D., Meza, E. Z., & López, P. P. (2017). La responsabilidad social empresarial en las empresas del Ecuador. Un test de relación con la imagen corporativa y desempeño financiero. *Ingeniería Industrial. Actualidad y Nuevas Tendencias*, 18, 23–44.
- Portal de la Responsabilidad Social, d. E. y. d. I. E. d. B. C. (2017). Libro Verde “Fomentar un marco europeo para la Responsabilidad Social de las Empresas”, presentado por la Comisión Europea el 18 de julio de 2001 (COM/2001/0366 final), from http://www.economiasostenible.org/marco_normativo/libro-verde-fomentar-un-marco-europeo-para-la-responsabilidad-social-de-las-empresas-presentado-por-la-comision-europea-el-18-de-julio-de-2001-com20010366-final/
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92.

- Sabogal, J. (2008). Aproximación y cuestionamientos al concepto de responsabilidad social empresarial. *Revista Facultad de Ciencias Económicas: Investigación y Reflexión*, 16(1), 179–195.
- SENPLADES. (2013). *Plan Nacional del Buen Vivir*. Quito.
- Sethi, S. P. (1975). Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytical framework. *California Management Review*, 17(3), 58–64.
- Silva, E. (2000). *Modelos Empresariales de Responsabilidad Social*. Quito: Ed. Fundación Esquel.
- Steiner, G. A. (1971). *Business and society*. New York: Random House.
- Strand, R. (1983). A systems paradigm of organizational adaptations to the social environment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 8(1), 90–96.
- Torresano, M. (2012). *Estudio de responsabilidad social de empresas del Ecuador*. Avina, Cooperación Alemana del Desarrollo e IDE Business School Ecuador.
- Tuzzolino, F., & Armandi, B. R. (1981). A need-hierarchy framework for assessing corporate social responsibility. *The Academy of Management Review*, 6(1), 21–28.
- Vázquez-Carrasco, R., & López-Pérez, M. E. (2013). Small & medium-sized enterprises and corporate social responsibility: A systematic review of the literature. *Quality and Quantity*, 47(6), 3205–3218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-012-9713-4>.
- Vélez, A. M. (2011). Un recorrido hacia la responsabilidad social corporativa. *Revista Ciencias Estratégicas*, 19(25), 20.
- Viera, M. (2016). *Ecuador: Incentivos públicos para la Responsabilidad Social*. Paper presented at the IV Simposio Internacional de Responsabilidad Social de las Organizaciones (SIRSO), Universidad Santo Tomás, Colombia.
- Villacís Laínez, C., Suarez Núñez, Y., & Güillín Llanos, X. (2016). Análisis de la Responsabilidad Social en el Ecuador. *Revista Publicando*, 3(8), 454–463.
- Votaw, D., & Sethi, S. P. (1973). The corporate dilemma: Traditional values versus contemporary problems.
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 758–769. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279099>.
- Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(4), 691–718. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258977>.