

Kurskod: SKOM12
Termin: Vårterminen 2017
Handledare: Henrik Merckelsen
Examinator: Åsa Thelander

CSR – A matter of Distance and Technology

- A qualitative study about CSR with its cross-boarder character and its implications on strategic communication

VICTOR MÅRTENSSON

Lund university
Department of Strategic communication
Thesis for master degree



Abstract

CSR – A matter of distance and technology: *A qualitative study about CSR with its cross-boarder character and its implications on strategic communication*

This study examines the challenges of managing CSR in modern society. It explores how the image of companies is affected in an ethical sense, when CSR-activities and CSR-responsibility are divided among a variety of different parties. Through a qualitative study of the company Big Heart, semi-structured interviews was made, including interviews from all parties in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon, with a focus on how CSR-activities conducted by companies are perceived in an ethical sense.

The results indicate that, when CSR-responsibility is divided among different parties it is perceived to be ethical, while literature suggest the opposite. Therefore is becomes sufficient for companies to be seen in an ethically positive context in order to be perceived as ethically responsible. CSR could therefore work as protection for companies from being perceived as unethical, which is a consequence of modern society and the existence of division of labor.

Keywords: CSR, strategic communication, division of labor, consumer involvement, ethics, business ethics

Characters (with spaces): 113 507

Sammanfattning

CSR – En fråga om distans och teknologi: *En kvalitativ studie om CSR med dess gränsöverskridande karaktär och vilka implikationer det får på strategisk kommunikation*

Denna studie ämnar undersöka utmaningarna med att bedriva CSR i ett modernt samhälle. Den undersöker hur företags image påverkas när CSR-aktiviteter och CSR-ansvar är uppdelat mellan olika parter. En kvalitativ studie har gjorts om företaget Big Heart där semi-strukturerade intervjuer har använts som metod för att uppnå en djupare förståelse av fenomenet. I intervjuerna har perspektiv från alla parter inkluderats där fokus har legat på hur företags CSR-aktiviteter uppfattas på ett etiskt plan.

Resultaten indikerar att när CSR-ansvar är uppdelat mellan olika parter så uppfattas det som etiskt rätt samtidigt som litteraturen antyder på motsatt effekt. Därför blir det tillräckligt för företagen att bli sedda i en etisk positiv kontext för att bli uppfattade som etiskt ansvarsfulla. CSR kan därför användas som skydd för företag mot att bli uppfattade som oetiska, vilket är en direkt konsekvens av det moderna samhället och existensen av arbetsdelning.

Nyckelord: CSR, strategisk kommunikation, arbetsdelning, konsumentinvolvering, etik, affärsetik

Antal tecken (inkl blanksteg): 113 507

Scientific article

Corporate social responsibility in a society divided

The phenomenon of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is becoming a more and more mainstream activity in today's business society and social, environmental and ethical factors are of highest importance for consumers. In addition, consumers expect companies to conduct their CSR work in an ethical way, serving society's best interest ahead of their own. This ought to include a close collaboration between companies and their stakeholders where companies should take consumers perspectives into consideration. But in modern society, where bureaucracy and a division of labor are present, CSR becomes merely protection for companies instead of purely helping society.

Zygmunt Bauman, one of the most highly esteemed social critics in Europe, used the holocaust as a reference and an example to describe what modern society has become. Society today, as in the case with the holocaust, is colored by a separation where work is lead by purely technological bureaucratic ways. His theory lies in the fact that people today are asserted specific roles within organizations where their only responsibility is to complete their specific assignments, thus creating a distance between their actions and the result of the entire organization. This furthermore results in that the participants never fully understand the effects of their actions, which in turn excludes their moral judgments on the organizations results. According to Bauman, this points to a society where there exists a division of labor where the goal is to reach organizational goals in the most effective way possible.

With Baumans theory as reference and in relation to CSR, the company Big Heart serves as an example of how CSR can be examined today. Big Heart provides an app where users of the app actively can give money to charity organizations without changing their daily behavior. By unlocking the home screen on their smartphones, money will automatically be transferred to an account asserted to the user of the app. The money originally comes from a diversity of companies collaborating with Big Heart. These companies pay Big Heart in order for them to have their ads be visible on the users background picture. Big Heart furthermore takes a sum for them selves, giving the rest to the users. The users are henceforward able to donate that money to whichever charity organization they see fit without wasting a lot of their energy.

Just as Bauman stipulates, people, in this case, are asserted different roles and different assignments consisting of different areas of responsibility. The companies responsibility lies in providing money and ads, Big Heart provides a platform where users are able to choose which charity organization to donate to, and lastly, the users responsibility is to actually make sure that the money is donated. Having

conducted ten interviews, where eight of them were users of the app and the other two was from Big Heart and one of the companies, interesting results were found. When CSR responsibility is divided among a number of actors, it becomes sufficient for companies to be acknowledged in an ethically positive context in order to be perceived as ethically responsible. Therefore the whole construct of dividing CSR-responsibility is perceived as ethical, while general theories suggest the opposite. Further analysis on the subject therefore tells us that CSR can be used as a protection for companies from being seen as unethical, which is a direct consequence of modern society and a division of labor. In addition, conducting CSR isn't always as complex as literature suggest.

Content

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose and questions	3
2. The case study – Big Heart	5
3. Theoretical framework	7
3.1 Ethics	7
3.2 Ethics and morality in a functionally differentiated society	8
3.2.1 Social closeness and moral responsibility	8
3.2.2 Conditions contributing to moral indifference	9
3.2.3 The hierarchic and functional division of labor	11
3.2.4 Moral invisibility	12
3.2.5 The freely flowing responsibility	13
3.3 Business ethics.....	13
3.3.1 Corporate social responsibility (CSR).....	15
3.3.2 Different perspectives on CSR	17
3.3.3 Consumer involvement.....	18
3.3.4 Stakeholder involvement strategy	19
3.4 Theoretical synthesis	21
4. Method.....	23
4.1 Choice of case study	23
4.2 Scientific perspective.....	24
4.3 Choice of method	25
4.3.1 Qualitative interviews.....	25
4.4 Analytical approach.....	28
4.5 Strengths and weaknesses.....	29
5. Analysis.....	30
5.1 CSR through Big Heart	30
5.1.1 The meaning of distance.....	30
5.1.2 Technology becomes morality	31
5.1.3 Positive context – the tool for CSR success	32
5.1.4 Implications of communicative rationality.....	35
5.2 Routine based CSR-activities and what it means on an ethical plane	35
5.2.1 Integration as a way of liberating moral reflection	36
5.2.2 Perceptions of being active.....	37
5.2.3 Feelings of collaboration	38

5.2.4 Nobodies become somebodies	40
5.3 The role of CSR in a functionally differentiated society.....	42
5.3.1 Is CSR through Big Heart correct CSR?	42
5.3.2 Common room.....	44
5.3.3 CSR becomes a protection from dehumanization	46
6. Conclusions and discussion.....	49
6.1 Conclusions	49
6.2 Discussion.....	49
6.3 Contributions to the field of strategic communication	52
6.4 Future research	53
References	54
Appendix	59
Appendix A: Interview guide – Users of Big Heart	59
Appendix B: Interview guide – Employee at Big Heart.....	62
Appendix C: Interview guide – Employee at company providing ads to Big Heart	65

Preface

I want to start by thanking Big Heart for their co-operation and their valuable information, but also for their willingness to help me find interview subjects. It has truly been valuable! Furthermore, I would like to thank those of you who were willing to do the interviews, thank you for your enthusiasm and for excellent answers.

I am also grateful for my supervisor, Henrik Merkelsen, who has helped me a long the way with valuable feedback.

Last but not least, I want to thank my parents for always being there for me and for always believing in me. You are my source of inspiration!

1. Introduction

In today's society, where focus on ethics increases; CSR has become a central dimension in strategic communication. According to Habermas (1996) ethics (as well as CSR) can only be founded within a communicative rationality. Meaning, consensus concerning ethical norms can only be found through communication, and within the area of CSR the strategic communicator therefore plays a major part.

In theoretical terms Schwartz & Carroll (2003) define corporate social responsibility (CSR) as: "The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time" (Schwartz & Carroll, 2003, p. 503). Within this view of CSR there are two main aspects: protecting and improving. Protecting, in this sense, mean companies need to protect society by avoiding their negative impacts (e.g. pollution, discrimination, unsafe products). Improving the welfare of society, in this sense, means companies need to create positive benefits for society (e.g. philanthropy, community relations) (Carroll, 2015).

A more practical description of the phenomenon is: a collective agreement between social partners where the enterprise should have a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical, human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations (The European Commission, 2011). The concept of CSR has furthermore become an important factor in what we today call social entrepreneurship where business principles are applied to social problems (Cochran, 2007). In addition, questions arise concerning whether CSR activities are ethical or not, meaning if its purpose is to actually help society or if it is driven by economic remuneration.

The ethical views are affected by the development of society. Society has undergone a shift in which the idea is to reach goals in the most effective way possible, using purely technological bureaucratic ways (Bauman, 1989). This means society has become more divided and specialized where individuals conduct their

specific activities without considering the impact it has on the overall results. As a consequence, the connection between the individual activity and the end result of all activities disappear, which in turn means only the individual success of the individual activity will be judged. The technological bureaucracy increases both physical and psychological distances to the final result and as a consequence the moral inhibitions become repealed, suppressing the meaning of the moral act as it does so. Bureaucracy in this sense makes technology moral. The acts technology therefore decides whether something is good or not, not the acts content (Bauman, 1989).

When talking about moral and ethics and the development of society, Prasad & Holzinger (2013) suggests that corporations will need to surrender some of their power to their external stakeholders. This is due to the fact that CSR has to be consequential and effective, and not to be considered as promoting false marketing. As a first step it is of importance to have an inclusive and open dialogue in order to empower stakeholders and overcome cynicism (Prasad & Holzinger, 2013). In other words, stakeholder involvement is crucial in order for companies to understand and adapt to consumer concerns. Therefore companies should have a frequent and systematic dialogue with their stakeholders in order to explore mutually beneficial action and through this develop their CSR initiatives (Morsing & Schultz, 2006).

In conclusion, CSR has today become a cross-boarder activity covering various social domains ranging from economic to political. This results in more people and more actors becoming involved within the value chain starting from the producer and ending with the consumer. In this sense it becomes impossible to connect CSR to a specific perspective. However, this thesis explores CSR and its cross-boarder character with a focus on the division of labor within it. More specifically a paradox is created, where CSR is expected to solve the problems with a society where labor is divided, to make sure that externalities from the market doesn't harm society. But at the same time CSR itself becomes a more and more divided activity, which includes multiple actors in multiple domains due to new types of communication forms, as will be exemplified later.

Within the context of CSR, one can argue that companies' strategic communication should, as a rule, be ethical by its very procedure. However, despite its ethical aspirations, CSR is a part of a division of labor, which according to Bauman

(1989) implies a limitation of responsibility and thus inhibits ethical behavior. This thesis will explore this phenomenon further, speaking of when limited responsibility is reflected in the CSR communication procedure. Furthermore, the thesis will grasp on what that means for the field of strategic communication as well as the strategic communicator and their role as a mediator between the different domains.

To help me explain this phenomenon, I am going to use a case study in order to support my argumentation and to make my case. The case study concerns a company called Big Heart who is basically supplying a possibility of consumer involvement where the consumers can select the cause for CSR funds. Big Heart will serve as an example of what society has become and will help explaining the consequences a division of labor has on strategic communication. Therefore it will play an essential part in the analysis.

1.1 Purpose and questions

This thesis intends to explore different phenomena within the fields of business ethics, CSR and consumer involvement, where the main contributions will lie in insights within the area of CSR. Furthermore, the purpose is to explore the paradox within CSR today, where CSR is expected to solve the problems with a society where labor is divided simultaneously as it itself becomes a more and more divided activity. Furthermore, this thesis will try to capture what that means for the strategic communicator as well as how the moral views of consumers are influenced when CSR-activities are divided among several actors. More specifically, the concept of morality will be central where the main contribution lies in how moral views of CSR-activities are affected when CSR-responsibility is divided among several actors ranging from company to consumer. The findings will be gathered by empirically studying a new CSR-technology, Big Heart, from three different perspectives. The study will henceforth be conducted through a business-perspective, from Big Hearts perspective and from a consumer/citizen-perspective in order to shed light on the development of CSR as a social phenomenon and its cross-boarder character. With this in mind, I ask the following research questions where the first question is an overarching question and is answered through three

sub questions. The questions will furthermore be answered through the case study mentioned.

- How can CSR be managed ethically when CSR-responsibility is divided among several actors?
 - What is required from companies in order to be perceived as socially responsible in a functionally differentiated society?
 - How are consumers' moral views on companies influenced when being part of CSR-activities conducted by routine?
 - What role does CSR have in a society where CSR-responsibility and thus moral responsibility is divided?

2. The case study – Big Heart

Big Heart is a social startup company, which was founded in the fall of 2015 and is today consisting of five employees (fundedbyme.com). The aim was to create an app where use of advertisement would be on users terms and where advertisement indirect could serve as a contributory factor to challenges of the world (bghrt.se). Within the past two years Big Heart has released the app on Android phones, reached 50 on boarded advertisers and collected more than 50 000 SEK to charity (fundedbyme.com). Big Heart is currently engaged in three types of partnerships consisting of charity organizations, tech partnerships and business advisory partnerships. The charity organizations enable users to read about and select charity organizations as benefactor directly in the Big Heart app. The tech partnerships, Dynamo and Protoyp Stockholm, help Big Heart in their development of the app. And the business advisory partnerships, Almi, Connect, Lund University Innovation and THINK Accelerate, are there to ensure commercial success (fundedbyme.com).

The apps' functionality is described as: when activating the app on your smartphone you allow your background lock screen picture to change every time you click on the "home button". More specifically an ad, provided by one of the companies collaborating with Big Heart, replaces the current background picture. The users of the app can furthermore decide how often and when the ads will show on the screen. This means that the users have the control to create their own profile, making sure they only see the ads the user want to see. For every ad displayed on the screen, there is a small amount of money transferred from the company making the ad to the user, with which the user directly can send to any charity organization he or she want to. This way, the concept CSR becomes a relevant factor as the goal is to support charity.

How much money you are able to donate is furthermore dependent on the frequency of how many times you allow the ads to appear on the screen. This is fur-

thermore dependent on the frequency of how much you actively use your phone and the settings you have chosen for the app. (bghrt.se)

Big Hearts key objectives over the next two years are to release the app to iPhone, create a national marketing campaign to boost user recruitment and to reach 10 000 users in Sweden. (fundedbyme.com)

Furthermore, Big Heart is built on the bases of companies providing ads, themselves and consumers/users of the app, where all participants are connected by the structure of Big Heart.

3. Theoretical framework

In this theoretical framework I will explain basic principles of ethics. In relation to this, ethical and moral concerns will be presented in Baumans theory, explaining the development of modern society and its key concepts. Furthermore, ethics will be looked at from a business perspective, following a more detailed description of the term CSR and the effects of consumer involvement. Baumans theory is applicable to my research as it explains the complexities with division of labor and what consequences it has on the basics of morality and ethics. As CSR is studied as a way to apply ethics and morality to society within business it becomes relevant to bring up central theories within the field of ethics. CSR, in this case, ties back to Baumans theory as CSR with its cross-boarder character, as described earlier, is used as a way to counteract negative consequences followed by a division of labor. But as CSR it self are becoming a more and more divided activity it, itself, contributes to Baumans theory rather than solves the problem. The theories below will furthermore serve as a ground stone as the phenomenon is later explored in the analysis.

3.1 Ethics

Ethics comes from the word “ethos” meaning character. In this context, the word character refers both to the individual’s character and the culture of a certain community (Sahu, 2016). Ethics is defined as “obedience to the unenforceable”, where it tries to distinguish right from wrong and good from bad (Baumane-Vitolina, Cals & Sumilo, 2016). With this in mind two ethical traditions are described, explaining on a deeper level what ethics really mean.

The first, *teleological ethics*, are drawn from the classical teleological theory utilitarianism, which assumes a pursuit towards a higher satisfaction level on the basis of human morality. Teleological ethics tells us that a decision has to be based on an assessment of a respective outcome, meaning that an act neither can

be good or bad. However, the outcome derived from the act could either be positive or negative. Therefore, all acts are good if it increases satisfaction and happiness – and bad if opposite (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa 2016). In the context of CSR the theory relates to a maximization of economic value and in addition, it explains how companies use it to avoid negative outcomes (Hoover & Pepper, 2014). The second, *deontological ethics*, stands for that universal ethical principles must be followed no matter the outcome (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016; Hoover & Pepper, 2014). Therefore, the motives behind the act are more important than the outcome (Hoover & Pepper, 2014), which makes ethical behavior driven by duty, not by remuneration (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016). Defined by Immanuel Kant, the non-conditional principles have become universal and are valid regardless of the context and consequences of the decision made (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016; Hoover & Pepper, 2014). In relation to teleological ethics, Kant's duty theory does not fit classical economics rationality, which is based on utilitarianism (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016).

Furthermore, deontological theories, stipulates that the non-conditional principles are based on the choice of rational humans. The deontological theory's explanation for being rational is because of it's idea to promote the entire society's welfare – where the common behavior would be in everyone's interest to follow (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016). Morality here, is described as the presence of certain rules and standards in society, serving as a basis to ensure human intercommunication that is mutually beneficial (Baumane-Vitolinaa, Calsa & Sumiloa, 2016). Morality is furthermore explored in what Zygmunt Baumann refers to as the modern society where the idea is to, in the most effective way, reach the desired goal. This will be further described in the next section.

3.2 Ethics and morality in a functionally differentiated society

3.2.1 Social closeness and moral responsibility

Responsibility is, according to Bauman (1989), the ground stone in all moral behavior. It is created in the presence or closeness with the other. In this case, closeness means responsibility and responsibility is closeness. The very explanation of the disbandment of responsibility, and the neutralization of the moral driving force, is because of the closeness is replaced by a physical and social separation. The alternative for closeness is in this case social distance, where the closeness' moral attribute is responsibility and the social distances' moral attribute is the lack of a moral connection. When the closeness is buried, the responsibility becomes more silent. This sort of separation is a consequence of the modern society and it's technological bureaucratic ways. In other terms, this move towards concentration rests on an idea of reaching the desired goals in the most effective way. (Bauman, 1989)

A consequence of the modern society and its bureaucratic instances is that actions, in this case, have no inner moral value – and neither are they immoral. Judgments on morality are something that happens externally in relation to the act itself. The assessments are therefore decided through other criteria than from the ones designing the act, meaning the individual become morally indifferent. It means people within a certain organization are willing to give their devotion to their superiors in favor of the organizations' welfare. The idea of total obedience points to a total identification to the organization, which in turn means obliteration of your identity and your personal interests (not compliant with the organizations'). By obeying someone above your status also gives you the chance not to worry about moral assessments of your actions. In addition, you are able to rationally transfer the responsibility to the one ordering you to act by stipulating that you are not in a position to judge whether the superiors' actions are moral or immoral. (Bauman, 1989)

3.2.2 Conditions contributing to moral indifference

There are three conditions contributing to why moral inhibitions can become somewhat hollowed, these three are: when the act is authorized, conducted by routine and when human beings become dehumanized. To be more specific, an act that is authorized means placing your devotion to the entire organization and

obeying demands from superiors no matter where your loyalty lies. Outer influences, like peoples' own opinions and preferences are deleted, meaning a total identification to the organization. An act conducted by routine is henceforth an act, which is integrated in an organizations decision making, which is therefore subjected to disciplinary rules. As a consequence all actions are liberated from moral judgment. In other words everything is to be conducted in the most effective way, serving the organizations common goal. Dehumanization is about how distances can reduce any object into merely quantitative measures. For example, for a railway director, the object is only meaningful when spoken in terms of tones per kilometers. In this sense, they don't handle people because of their unite being specified only to work with measurements and is therefore lacking human characteristics. In this sense, they are only interested in the economical consequences of their actions – which means their object is money. When human objects are reduced to merely quantifiable measures they lose their distinctiveness – they become dehumanized. Meaning, the language used to describe what happens to people is a means to protect oneself from ethical judgments. In conclusion, human beings lose their ethical character when being reduced to merely numbers. Dehumanization is in this sense associated with the modern bureaucracy's fundamental tendency of rationalization. (Bauman, 1989)

When dividing certain groups into specific categories, you simultaneously rip certain general agreements and replace the closeness with physical and mental distances. The concentration, as earlier mentioned, then becomes the phenomenon, which completes the process of creating the distance that Bauman is referring to. The communication stops at the end of what is referred to as your authority and any events happening in groups separate from your own is none of your concern. It means that you as an individual is only responsible for the tasks that is asserted to your department. Any tasks asserted to other individuals that are not part of your department are cut of, and are by rule not your responsibility. Hence, you are responsible for your specific task, not the outcome of all tasks within the organization. This results in; the further away the sequential act is in relation to the original act the more it was led by purely rational and technical considerations. The consequence is that less moral considerations has to be taken into account. This is defined as the intermediary human being, which is referred to as the person that stands between my actions and my possibility to experience the effects.

This phenomenon Bauman refers to as the hierarchic and functional division of labor and serves as a central theory within this thesis. (Bauman, 1989)

3.2.3 The hierarchic and functional division of labor

All division of labor creates a distance between those who contribute and the final results of the entire organization. Bauman (1989) refers to this as the *meticulously functional division of labor*, where the *moral responsibility is replaced with technical responsibility*. The meticulously functional division of labor is the very reason of the distance created between those who define the collective and the collective's results. What this ideally means is that the authority of each individual, within an organization, has no idea of the consequences his or her actions may result in. In other words, there is a lack of conformity between the actual assignment and the assignment of the office as a whole (Bauman, 1989).

Moral responsibility being replaced with technical, is closely linked to the meticulously functional division of labor in that the technical responsibility deletes the moral responsibility by neglecting the fact that the act is a means for something else than your self. Therefore, it is only the inner success criteria that are judged, meaning that which is within your department and what you are responsible for. As a consequence outer connections disappear – meaning those parts of the organization that isn't specifically connected to your department and that that aren't your responsibility. The consequences of practical and psychological distance to the final result are that the participants in such an organization never fully understand the effects of their actions. This means that they only have an abstract idea of what really is happening, for example such information you can find through statistical results. This in turn means that judgments, and especially moral judgments, on the results are excluded. Thus, it results in that moral norms become irrelevant for the bureaucratic organizations technical success. It is however important to remember that the bureaucratic authority system is not incompatible with moral norms and emotional feelings. However, you look at it from a different angle in the sense that bureaucracy achieves two things. It makes technology moral in that it makes you judge your righteousness by how thoroughly you obey the organizational rules and how dedicated you are to the assignment given to you.

The second thing that bureaucracy achieves is that the moral meaning of non-technical questions is neglected. In this sense it is the acts' technology that decides whether something is good or not, not the acts' content. (Bauman, 1989)

This is in line with what Habermas (1996) refers this to as the rationalization of the natural world. Habermas claims that, communicative rationality is based on not only the formation of consensus but also on structures of consent in an inter-subjective divided world. In this sense the structures of the world limits peoples' current conversation at the same time as it is the ground stone in all mutual understanding. Communicative rationality is therefore embedded within structures of stable inter-subjectivity, where mutual understanding is already decided by the world we live in and created by the participants. Like Bauman, Habermas points to the fact that in a bureaucracy the connections between meaning and intention as well as the connections between meaning and action execution is cut of, which furthermore disables peoples' ability to shift their rational perspective (Habermas, 1996) or to look beyond their inner success (Bauman, 1989). According to Habermas, this is one of the reasons why communication in some cases becomes distorted. This is a direct consequence of a division of labor where different departments are isolated from each other.

3.2.4 Moral invisibility

In keeping with actions' moral sides aren't visible at first sight, the person at hand doesn't have to take a stand when moral questions arise. The reason for this is because of the actions moral character either being invisible or intentionally hidden. This is defined as the acts intermediation and explains how it is impossible to actually experience the consequences of ones actions if someone else are enacting them, posing as a middle hand. The middle hand shields the actor's view of the acts results. Therefore, we find ourselves in a world where no one consciously takes responsibility for his or her actions. The person who then actually is performing the act will, in the same way, suggest that the act is mainly someone else's and is therefore just an innocent instrument acting on the basis of a foreign will. As a consequence, as both the physical and psychological distances increases, the moral inhibitions become repealed and at the same time it suppresses the

meaning of the moral act. A similar method is to make the people involved, psychologically invisible, or in other words to make ethical norms into a question of distance and technology. What it ideally means is that a person becomes incapable of doing anything wrong if the consequences of his or her actions is distant from that person. The connection between what the person does at a distance and the consequences of that action becomes merely a theoretical conception of the reality. (Bauman, 1989)

3.2.5 The freely flowing responsibility

Actors find themselves in a situation where they are agents, acting out another persons' wishes. It is in this sense, psychologically, easy to neglect the responsibility when your position is that of a middle hand and thereby are far away from the acts final consequences. From this we can derive that it in fact means a freely floating responsibility where every member would say, if asked, that they obeyed someone else. However, if the same members would be seen as responsible they would wallow the responsibility on someone else. As mentioned before, the organization becomes an instrument in order to eliminate the responsibility. (Bauman, 1989)

What really happens is that the causal connection, in coordinated actions, are left in the dark, which in it self contributes a big deal to the acts effectiveness. In this case it is impossible to point out the responsible because of everyone's certainty about the responsibility refers to another competent authority. This means that the freely flowing responsibility becomes the very foundation in order for immoral actions to be accepted by people who usually are incapable to break the conventional moral law by their own hand. In practice, the freely flowing responsibility therefore removes responsibility from the moral authority without it being questioned or denied (Bauman, 1989). With Baumans theory concerning division of labor within organizations, and the ethical and moral challenges embedded within it, the role of business ethics becomes an important factor to explore.

3.3 Business ethics

According to Carroll (2000) business ethics has not changed dramatically since the beginning of the 21st century. The way people see businesses in the context of ethics has been quite bad since 30 years back. In relation, Carroll (2000) proposes there being two ways in which companies could implement changes in order to make up for how the business society looks today. Those two changes imply management of morality and CSR. Moral management more and more becomes a common goal in business today, where executives can use defining moments as an opportunity to redefine their company's role in society. It also includes the idea of understanding stakeholder thinking (Carroll, 2000). Furthermore, business ethics is defined as a specialized study of moral right and wrong, concentrating on business institutions, organizations behavior and implementing moral standards. It is described as what is right or wrong in the workplace and simultaneously implies doing the right thing in the relationship with stakeholders. Therefore, business ethics are not just about analyzing moral norms and standards but also tries to apply it to the business context. Business ethics is valued through how much the businessman incorporate moral values in the corporate decision making process. This is later analyzed in the context of how these implementations affect various stakeholders like costumers, community and the environment. An important factor to remember is the fact that business ethics, in this sense, should not be enforced by law but rather through a more self-disciplinary nature (Sahu, 2016). In addition it should be more concerned with engaging with other people's perspective than to search for a universal solution to ethical conundrums. By engaging with stakeholders you put yourself in their shoes and see things from their point of view (Fryer, 2015).

As proposed by Carroll (2000) the second way of making changes to the daily business is implementing CSR-strategies. CSR becomes a central debate within business ethics due to it relating to what sort of obligations companies have. The debate consists of two sides where one argues that the obligation is to include shareholders but extends to stakeholders and individuals with an interest in the company due to how they are affected. Stakeholders have an idea of companies generally having a wider net of responsibilities (Allhoff & Vaidya, 2005). The other, which is also the source of why criticism has been raised, tells us that the sole moral obligation of companies is to maximize the profits of its shareholder (Allhoff & Vaidya, 2005).

3.3.1 Corporate social responsibility (CSR)

Up until today the concept of CSR is seen as a corporate issue and as a consequence the literature often takes a management perspective (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013). In modern business the concept of CSR has become vital in terms of that stakeholders today expects companies to do more than making money and obeying law (Carroll, 2015; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; Davis, 1960). Prasad & Holzinger (2013) argues that CSR translates into a company's commitment to the cause of improving the well-being of the community through their business practices and contributions of corporate resources. The obligation for companies to apply ethical standards to their businesses is no longer a fringe activity. It has more and more become a mainstream, highly visible, and commonplace practice (Skarmeas, Leonidou, 2013). In addition, social entrepreneurship gains more and more focus. The term social entrepreneurship, Pierre, von Friedrichs & Wincent (2014) describes as, a process of creating value by combining recourses in new ways. By stimulating social change or meeting social needs, these recourses have a purpose of explore and exploit opportunities for creating social value. With this in mind, the word business is defined as a social enterprise and is, according to Alter (2000) (in Rahdari, Sepasi & Moradi, 2016, p. 351), defined as a “generic term for a nonprofit enterprise, social-purpose business or revenue-generating venture founded to support or create economic opportunities for poor and disadvantaged populations while simultaneously operating with reference to the financial bottom line”. It is a way to use recourses to create benefits for society (Rahdari, Sepasi & Moradi, 2016), in this case in terms of creating social value and/or social change (Gawell, 2014) (in Lundström, Zhou, von Friedrichs & Sundin, 2014).

The Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative (2008) tries to grasp on what companies not only do with their profits, but also how they make them. This definition points to how companies manage their economic, social and environmental impacts. But it also analyses companies' relationships in all key spheres of influence, including the workplace, the marketplace, the supply chain, the community, and the public policy realm (Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative, 2008).

When it comes to socially responsible expectations within modern organizations, ethics and philanthropy helps when striving towards sustainability in a competitive, dynamic and global marketplace. In this sense, special efforts are made by socially responsible firms to integrate concerns for other stakeholders in their policies, decisions and operations (Carroll, 2015).

Criticism on CSR

Critique directed to the phenomenon of CSR asks whether or not CSR is treated as a way to achieve corporate goals rather than social goods (Prasad, Holzinger, 2013; Carroll, 2015). Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry (2013) argue that there is a risk of threatening ones legitimacy if there is a mismatch between the organizations values and those of society on which they depend. Organizations therefore sometimes also communicate their social responsibility but are reluctant to publicize what they actually did because of fear of criticism. But if there exist criticism of some sort, scholars propose that organizations rather would create strategies to project a positive socially responsible impression, than to react to public criticism (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013).

A number of critics also claim CSR is defined by business interests. Therefore it works as a way to strengthen the influence and power of organizations rather than to meet expectations from the society. One explanation for this is the fact that organizations, in some cases, are unable to fulfill their part of the social contract (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013), meaning the principles that everyone would, in context of social and environmental circumstances, agree to as constraining their separate pursuits of their ends (Narveson, 2016). Instead the organizations focus on mitigating the effects of social and environmental actions (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013). Therefore, as Falck & Heblich (2006) stipulates, the CSR approach should be built on society's basic order to cause the desired conduct rather than enterprises assuming responsibility. In other words there are two active aspects of CSR, protecting and improving. In this sense protecting means companies need to avoid their negative impacts (pollution, discrimination, unsafe products for example). In addition, society suggests, in terms of improvement on the welfare, that companies should create positive benefits for society (for instance, philanthropy and community relations) (Carroll, 2015).

3.3.2 Different perspectives on CSR

Businesses voluntary responsibilities are not to be discussed in a legal sense. They are merely desired by society and have come to be expected by the public as well. And it is within these philanthropic contributions and community relations we find the best way in which businesses seek to improve society or the community. According to Carroll (2015) CSR activities should include motivations (responsibility), actions (responsiveness) and results (performance), but through time other frameworks have become popular, such as business ethics, stakeholder management, corporate citizenship, and sustainability (Carroll, 2015). Considering CSR and stakeholder management, there have been advancements in finding different approaches linked to CSR. These approaches are divided into descriptive, instrumental, normative and strategic CSR approaches – all involving different arguments, considerations and implications (Boesso, Kumar & Michelon 2013):

The descriptive approach: The descriptive approach includes describing how managers manage the interests of corporate constituencies together with outlining specific corporate characteristics and behaviors. Having a descriptive approach to CSR means reflecting on past, present and future states of affairs of corporations and their stakeholders, while simultaneously focusing on transparent accountability. Meaning, a focus on providing information on the indicators that comprises the triple bottom line (TBL), which is translated into a company's social, environmental and financial performance. (Boesso, Kumar & Michelon, 2013)

The instrumental approach: When using an instrumental approach to CSR, companies tries to engage those stakeholder groups that can influence corporate performance. By doing this companies want to create accountability in order to accomplish mutual important goals, as efficiently as possible. In other terms, the instrumental approach provides a framework where connections between the practice of stakeholder management and the achievement of various corporate performance goals are examined. (Boesso, Kumar & Michelon, 2013)

The normative approach: Taking a normative approach means accepting the notion that all stakeholders' interests are of intrinsic value. This means stakeholders merits consideration for their own sake and, as a consequence, do not further the interests of some other group. To be more exact, a normative approach means

acting as thou you are a good corporate citizen by honoring ethical values and respect people, communities and the environment, irrespective of the impact of such actions on corporate performance. (Boesso, Kumar & Michelin, 2013)

The strategic approach: The strategic approach to CSR offers a framework used to identify the social issues that benefit stakeholders, and at the same time being able to strengthen the companies' competitiveness. A strategic CSR approach implies companies to focus on social issues closely linked to the company's business. Therefore the companies at hand try to undertake social initiatives where the social and the business benefits of the initiatives are of a large and distinctive nature (Boesso, Kumar & Michelin, 2013).

3.3.3 Consumer involvement

The European Commission (2011) defines CSR as a collective agreement between social partners where the enterprise should have a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical, human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations. And all of this also ought to include a close collaboration with their stakeholders. With this in mind, marketers need to pay particular attention to consumers' views on CSR due to their central role in corporate marketing. According to Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Murphy (2013) marketing managers should integrate both corporate and consumer perspectives of CSR in order to fully understand how and under what conditions CSR impacts consumer attitudes and behavior.

Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López (2016) suggests that if consumers participate in CSR activities it will lead to a greater involvement, greater understanding and deeper knowledge. This is likely to result in perceptions of more CSR effort, which in turn will lead to greater CSR associations from consumers. Furthermore, if we stipulate that CSR associations are influenced by corporate efforts, the literature tells us that it in some way has to do with effective firm communication with external audiences and represent consumers' perceptions (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). However, Prothero, Dobscha, Freund, Kilbourne, Luchs, Ozanne & Thøgersen, (2011) suggests a change in which companies need to adopt a more expansive vision of people see-

ing them not only as consumers but also as concerned citizens. This broader view of the consumer also implies seeing consumers as more than self-interested consumers. One should in other words examine the civic elements of consumption. This change in consumption is labeled the “consumer-citizen” and implies a balance of duties and rights (Prothero et al., 2011). Choosing as a citizen, according to Prothero et al. (2011), may lead to different social, environmental, and ethical evaluations of alternatives. Bullen & Whitehead (2005, p. 512) defines this as sustainable citizenship, which translates into “a brand of citizenship which stretches the spatial, temporal and material bounds of citizenship”. The purpose is to develop a citizenship, which would mean people taking action in the private sphere being able to handle the responsibility towards global issues and affect future issues as well (Barkman, 2014). In conclusion, it suggests that it would be different than to choose as an individual, only serving one’s own interests. Therefore, one can assume that consumers have some responsibility for the impact of their choices (Prothero et al., 2011).

The responsibility given to the citizen is decided through self-reflexivity rather than general rules or through specific virtues (Barkman, 2014). However, as Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López (2016) describes, it is not sufficient enough to just be consumer oriented in today society, at least not when trying to compete in today’s marketplaces. What companies need to do is to learn from and collaborate with consumers. Through this the company has a better chance of creating value that meets the consumers individual and dynamic needs. Also, companies have a better chance of generating favorable attitudinal responses from consumers when the consumers are allowed to react proactively within the CSR activities instead of acting reactively (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). In other words, research underscores the importance of the degree to which the consumer is involved in producing and delivering the service (Dabholkar, 1990). In this sense, consumers become active co-producers of value as opposed to passive audiences (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016).

3.3.4 Stakeholder involvement strategy

Stakeholder theory points to the importance of engaging stakeholders in long-term value creation and focuses more on the relationship between company and consumer than making profits. With that said profits are not unimportant, but in order to be profitable, stakeholder theory suggests companies need to engage frequently with stakeholders whom they depend on. Therefore stakeholder theory has undergone a shift, focusing more on the interaction between companies and their stakeholders than how stakeholders are managed by companies. As a consequence, participation, dialogue and involvement become ground stones for stakeholder theory pointing towards more democratic ideals. (Morsing & Schultz, 2006)

It is within stakeholder theory we find the stakeholder involvement strategy. Stakeholder involvement strategy implies a need for companies to understand and adapt to stakeholders current concerns, which can only be achieved by involving stakeholders. Through stakeholder involvement companies have the opportunity to promote positive support as well as develop their CSR initiatives. In order to explore mutually beneficial action, stakeholder involvement strategy therefore suggests companies should engage frequently and systematically in dialogue with their stakeholder. Communication, in this sense, become vital to ensure a two-way dialogue where it, in an Habermasian sense, have the aim to bring about mutual understanding, rational agreement and consent. The success of companies' CSR programs is therefore dependent on its ability to integrate not only organizational members' CSR concerns but also on how well external stakeholders' CSR concerns are integrated in a concurrent dialogue. (Morsing & Schultz, 2006)

Habermas (1996) claims that in a dialogue a common social room is created between the participants, enabling a mutual understanding and acceptance to one another. This room, Habermas explains to be key to how interactions are connected and why language, world perspectives and life forms are intertwined. Furthermore, our language becomes a cross-boarder medium enabling different totalities to meet and, despite their different perspectives, come to a mutual understanding by meeting on a middle ground. Communication, in this sense, is vital in order to ensure rational agreement between the participants.

3.4 Theoretical synthesis

If we consider business ethics, CSR and how they relate to each other it becomes interesting to acknowledge what impact modern society has had. Bauman (1989) stipulates that modern society has become highly technical and bureaucratic where the overall idea is to reach desired goals in the most effective way possible. In other words there exists a division of labor, creating distances between those who define the collective and the collective's results. As described by Bauman (1989), the lack of closeness to one another is the reason for the disbandment of responsibility, meaning when closeness is buried the responsibility becomes more silent. The participants' responsibility, in this sense, becomes merely technical, which furthermore means moral judgments on the results are excluded. More specifically, moral norms become irrelevant for the bureaucratic organizations technical success (Bauman, 1989). This becomes highly relevant when discussing CSR as critics pose is just another mean for achieving corporate goals rather than social goods (Prasad, Holzinger, 2013; Carroll, 2015). Critics also propose that organizations would rather create strategies to project a positive socially responsible impression, than to react to public criticism (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013). Therefore it works as a way to strengthen the influence and power of organizations rather than to meet expectations from the society despite the fact that consumer participation in CSR activities leads to perceptions of more CSR effort, which in turn will lead to greater CSR associations from consumers (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). Furthermore, CSR is, according to Carroll (2000), one way in which companies today makes changes in their business in order to apply ethical values to their business.

With this in mind, CSR will be explored in the context of modern society, meaning how it today represents a paradox in which CSR are expected to solve the problems with a society where labor is divided, to make sure that externalities from the market doesn't harm society. But at the same time CSR itself becomes a more and more divided activity, as exemplified through Big Heart, which includes multiple actors because of its cross-boarder character. This thesis will explore this phenomenon further, speaking of when limited responsibility is reflected in the CSR communication procedure. Furthermore the thesis will grasp on what that

means for the field of strategic communication as well as for the strategic communicator and their role as a mediator between the different domains.

4. Method

4.1 Choice of case study

My choice of having Big Heart as a case study is based on my huge interest in their work, which was awakened when I was doing my internship at THINK Accelerate in Helsingborg. THINK Accelerate help start-ups to grow by creating a program where the start-ups learn different techniques in order to be profitable. Within this program Big Heart was one of the start-ups participating. I find Big Heart interesting because of its innovative way of thinking when it comes to charity work and within this there are very interesting components concerning both CSR and communication in general.

Big Heart is going to serve as an example of a more extensive set of events (Merriam, 1994). Conducting a case study gives me the ability to deal with contextual conditions (Yin, 1998), meaning it could also serve as a way to describe a more common general phenomenon (Alvehus, 2013). Big Heart will also help me to bind my initial research questions with the final results (Yin, 1998). In addition, Big Heart serves my purpose perfectly as it is a clear example of CSR and is cross-boarder character. Furthermore, it relates to Baumans theory as Big Heart serves as an empirical example of a division of labor between companies, Big Heart and consumers/users.

I am therefore able, by using Big Heart as reference, to create a more rich and detailed knowledge about a certain phenomenon, which furthermore can explain and create a deeper understanding about a bigger phenomenon in our society (Daymon & Holloway, 2011). In addition, CSR is most commonly studied from an integration perspective, meaning how companies use CSR in order to integrate society's ambient demands of everything to be conducted morally in accordance with norms, values and so on. The case of Big Heart is therefore unique, as it looks at CSR from a differentiation perspective, meaning how CSR contributes to division of labor and as a consequence, a differentiation of the morality of society. This way of approaching CSR is as opposed to an integration perspective quite

uncommon, making it very interesting and relevant in this case. In addition, Big Heart sheds light on the fact that distinguishing if CSR is pure ethics or if it is marketing isn't always without its complexities. With these characteristics in mind, the use of a case study is well suited in my research and is therefore useful within the field of strategic communication (Heide & Simonsson, 2014) simultaneously as it will serve as help exploring the different phenomena mentioned.

4.2 Scientific perspective

I have chosen to conduct my study through a social constructive perspective. This means I believe there is more than one truth where the knowledge is drawn from the researchers interpretations on the interaction between the participants (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). In a qualitative method like this, the interpretation of the empirical material is central and it is within this interpretation of a specific phenomenon one can contribute to increase the knowledge about it (Alvehus, 2013). Within this, I am also fully aware of the analysis being affected by my own assumptions (Eksell & Thelander, 2014). In accordance to this I am going to take a hermeneutical approach, meaning that the parts becomes understandable when they are put together to a bigger totality (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008). The meaning of an act is hereby defined by the one interpreting it (Åkerström, 2014) and gives me the chance to work through all the empirical parts in order to find connections between them (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008; Alvehus, 2013). Simultaneously, by using a hermeneutical approach I can go deeper in the empirical material in order to find a united understanding of the interviews and be able to draw parallels between them (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008). With a hermeneutical frame of reference I can move back and forth in the empirical material, giving me a chance of identifying what is hidden in the text. It will furthermore give me the opportunity to understand more than what is obvious at first sight. This way I hope I get a broad understanding about the material and it's meaning (Prasad, 2005). This is why the primary instrument for a qualitative method is the researcher and his or hers interpretations (Daymon & Holloway, 2011).

4.3 Choice of method

I have chosen to conduct qualitative semi structured interviews, where the goal is to understand more about the division of labor within CSR activities by taking the interviewees perspectives into account (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). I believe this to be the best available method considering that I, through this, assume to have greater possibility to take part of the interviewees' experiences, expectations and insights concerning the subject. Semi structured interviews, can also, take me beyond my own understanding and my biased image, and can serve as a tool in order to bring me knowledge that I could not foresee.

I have of course thought about limitations within my choice of methods. The interviews, for example, can only give me some sort of second hand information, meaning the interview subjects perception (Eksell & Magnusson, 2014). In addition, I could have conducted a focus group interview in order to get a deeper understanding of a group of peoples motives, experiences and thought patterns. The method is suitable when different opinions of a specific subject can arise and when you are interested in exploring how people talk about the subject rather than hearing separate statements (Gustafsson, 2014). But since all participants were widely spread out in the country, it made it physically impossible for me to gather everyone in one place at the same time. But semi structured interviews turned out to be a very effective way of collecting empirical facts.

4.3.1 Qualitative interviews

My main method for this study is semi structured interviews. Here the interviewer is referred to as a traveller by Brinkmann & Kvale (2015), meaning that by being coherent and open the interviewer is part of a journey through the interviewees' thought patterns, perspectives and their experiences and at the same time ready for unexpected turn arounds. I am also well aware of the fact that I, as an interviewer, have to be able to ask questions in order for me to deepen my knowledge in the interviewees' experiences and views. Of course I am well aware of the fact that the interview demands proper preparations, good questions and that I as an interviewer is attentive to be able to follow the interviewees story. I have chosen to conduct semi-structured interviews due to the fact that I think it is important to let

the interview be steered by the interviewees' experiences and knowledge. Furthermore, I am prepared to be as open as possible and prepared to adapt my research to new circumstances and widen my view and knowledge (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). This means I asked spontaneous follow-up questions to answers that were unexpected.

Selection

What I want to achieve through this study is to develop an understanding of how CSR is perceived by consumers when the distances between companies and consumers increases due to technological instances. More specifically I want to explore how consumers perceive the image of these companies. With this in mind I pose that it becomes important to incorporate all parties involved with Big Heart in order to incorporate more perspective of the phenomenon. Therefore, I interviewed 8 users of the app, the founder of Big Heart and one employee from one of the companies providing ads to Big Heart. By doing this, I could get perspectives from both the ones providing the money for the charity work, the ones providing the possibility for the companies (Big Heart) and the ones actually donating to charity. This enabled me to get a more general picture of the whole sum of events. By the time 10 interviews had been conducted I felt I had rich empirical material that could answer my questions. In addition, I felt as though no new theoretical insights could be derived from the data and therefore saturation was achieved (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). I found myself being able to find reoccurring themes among the answers given by the interview subjects that were similar to each other, which enabled me to make parallels between the interviews, giving me a clear picture of every ones perceptions concerning the CSR activities. The longest interview I had was with the employee of the company, which took approximately 1 hour and 10 minutes to conduct. The rest was lengthwise similar, spanning from approximately 35 minutes to one hour. One interview however was shorter, being finished within 25 minutes.

The selection of interview subjects is always going to be a problem in research because of the impossibility to interview every person and study every case (Becker, 1998). But due to the fact that I had plenty of help from my contact person at Big Heart I was able to conduct interviews with people closely connected to

the work Big Heart are doing and who were compliant with my requirements. My requirements, in this case, were people who are using the app, or have used it, and who are engaged with questions closely linked to charity work. But also who could give me a nuanced image of the phenomena, meaning they were not afraid to be critical in their judgment. Granted, there are some issues concerning the use of a gatekeeper in order to get hold of interview subjects. In this case, the gatekeeper could choose to only refer me to interview subjects, which from his or hers perspective is perceived as safe informants or safe data. Meaning, the gatekeeper holds control over what type of people I interview. This, on the other hand, didn't seem to bother my research as I received truthful statements from all subjects, where a lot of them were useful in my analysis (Spencer, 1973).

Conducting the interviews

One of the first things I thought about when preparing interview questions was the fact that the relationship to and the trust between me and the interviewee is of highest importance. This includes what sort of questions I ask and how I ask them. Therefore, I spent a lot of time preparing my self for the interviews and creating interview guides: one for the employee of the company, one for the founder of Big Heart and one for the users of the app. Within these interview guides there are a few reoccurring themes, which I created using Brinkmann and Kvaales (2015) way of thematizing, meaning asking why-, what-, and how-questions in relation to the research questions. My plan was that I, in this way, could get answers to different aspects, which furthermore could answer my research questions and thus fulfilling the purpose of the study. I also added a few questions, which worked as icebreakers and could serve as a way to create trust, as they simultaneously could work as a bridge between different conversation subjects. Other wise I feared these questions would be perceived as to direct. After the first interview, I made small changes to make the interview guide a little better. The interview guides however, were only used as guides, meaning I was not strictly tied to it. I simply chose to ask the questions in the best possible order to conduct the interview in a natural way.

I am well aware that the quality in the interviews isn't judged by if the answer is right or wrong, but by how strong the statement is and by the value of knowledge the statement produces (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). In this sense, eve-

ry answer is “correct”, but of course I am aware of that qualitative interviews gives me only the interviewees knowledge and views of the subject. In addition, their knowledge is affected by the context their in, which is why I am not going to search for answers that I want to hear, but that actually can visualize reality in some way.

At first, my goal was to interview as many as possible face to face, but since they were widely spread out in the country (Stockholm, Linköping, Lund and Alnarp) I didn't have the time, except for the employee of the company who I met with in Lund. The other interviews were conducted via Skype, which I found to be both effective and good in terms of gathering empirical information. Furthermore, all the interviews are anonymous which means I have numbered them, in order for the reader to keep better track of who is saying what. They are numbered as followed: Users nr. 1-8 means users of the app, and the employee of Big Heart and the employee of the company providing ads where simply labeled Big Heart and Company.

4.4 Analytical approach

When coding the material I have moved between theory and the empirical material and as a consequence I have found patterns and different themes, both from my own interpretations and in relation to my theoretical framework. In order to create meaning from this I had to code and create bridges between different meanings in the text (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). I started by transcribing all of the interviews. Then I started coding where I used a so called pattern coding, where interesting observations worked as starting points for my code categories. By doing this I could examine what is happening regularly and simultaneously, but also see patterns and other events corresponding with each other (Hatch, 2002). This gives meaning to the empirical material and therefore explains the material. This furthermore gave me the chance to move in a more horizontal manner, which helped me see and identify reoccurring themes within the texts. I then connected theory to the empirical material and made them interact, reaching a deeper understanding of the material as I did so.

4.5 Strengths and weaknesses

The study's greatest strength lies in the interviewees' rich answers to all my questions, making my interviews much more qualitative. They were all very interesting in the subject and answered with great depth, honesty and enthusiasm. Another strength is that multiple perspectives of the phenomena have been taken into account, meaning the company's', Big Heart's and the users view. Although it would be even better with more face to face interviews it still, according to me, is important to incorporate many voices, resulting in a multifaceted material (Heide & Simonsson, 2014)

A weakness in my study is that more interviews would be helpful. Even though I don't see it as a necessity in this case it would help in order to create a more reliable image of the people's perception of the phenomenon. Another weakness is the fact that Big Heart still is a quite newly started company, which points to that future research is preferable in order to form an even better perception of how both companies in general and users perceive it.

5. Analysis

This analysis will be structured by three themes starting with explaining the implications of conducting CSR-work through Big Heart, where the study shows that companies only need to be present within ethically appropriate contexts in order to be perceived as ethical.

The second theme will grasp on how routine based CSR-activities influence people's moral views, where the main contribution lies in the fact that it in fact is perceived as the ethically right way to conduct CSR, when general theories suggest the opposite.

Finally, in the third theme, CSRs role in a functionally differentiated society is explored, explaining why CSR today can be seen as a merely protection for companies not to be considered to be unethical.

5.1 CSR through Big Heart

5.1.1 The meaning of distance

The literature suggests CSR activities achieve greatest success when there exist a collective agreement between social partners. Companies should therefore strive towards a closer collaboration with their stakeholders where they ought to integrate consumer concerns in their business operations (The European Commission, 2011). When conducting the interviews however, a lot of the reactions concerning the users relation to the companies were that there exist a significant distance between the two as stipulated by this quote:

You don't have any direct contact with the companies except that advertisement pops up, so it feels pretty screened from them. (...) So, it feels like they [Big Heart] does all the work – User nr. 8

In relation to Bauman's (1989) theory, the closeness to the companies is here replaced by a physical and a social separation, excluding any dialogue and thus counteracting what Morsing & Schultz (2006) believes to be one of the groundstones in successful CSR. With Big Heart being the ones in the position of handling all sorts of contact with the companies, one of the consequences, according to Bauman (1989), is that the closeness is buried, which in turn means the question of who is carrying responsibility becomes more silent. In other words, the collaboration with consumers and the integration of consumer concerns (The European Commission, 2011) also disappears. According to the literature, this would mean a huge disadvantage for companies due to consumer views on CSR being central in corporate marketing (The European Commission, 2011). What is noteworthy, however, is the fact that the users don't appear to want a collaboration with the companies in Big Heart, as proposed by one of the users:

My relationship with the advertisers, the more discreet it is the better, I think. Rather it is important that Big Heart have a good relationship with the advertisers, that they have a dialogue and that the advertisers can get feedback and data concerning the events – User nr. 7

What the user describes is a scenario where Big Heart, rather than the users, should have a close relation to the companies where the user would have a much more discreet role. According to Bauman (1989), this phenomenon could be labeled a hierarchic and functional division of labor, meaning the further away the sequential act is in relation to the original act the more it was led by purely rational and technical considerations. In this context, Bauman's theory suggests the users of Big Heart would take less moral considerations into account when using the app (Bauman, 1989).

5.1.2 Technology becomes morality

Elaborating further on the effects distance creates is that an increase of distance makes outer connections disappear out of sight. This means, those parts of the chain where the tasks aren't specifically connected to what you do or are responsible for, shouldn't be yours to take care of (Bauman, 1989). But as stipulated by one of the users, this way of working should be more of a rule than an exception when saying:

It was mainly Big Heart you felt connected to and not so much the companies, Big Heart took care of that. (...) So, for the most part I have only had contact with Big Heart, which I don't see as a problem because it is exhausting if you ought to have contact with all three [parties] just because you do one thing (...). – User nr. 5

According to Bauman (1989) a result of practical and psychological distances being created is that the moral judgments on the entire chains result are excluded. Consequently only the inner success criteria are judged, meaning that which you yourself are responsible for (Bauman, 1989). In the case of Big Heart, the advertisers responsibility lies in providing adds to Big Heart, Big Heart ought to enable a platform for the adds and enable users to choose charity organizations to donate money to, and lastly the users only responsibility is to use their phone and actually donate the money they draw from Big Heart. In this sense it is not the company, Big Heart nor the users individually that are doing good deeds, it is rather the chains collaboration that contribute to the final results. Therefore the technology and the collective action becomes the very thing contributing to charity. Meanwhile each individual part of the chain judges their righteousness by how thoroughly they obey the rules of the entire chain and how dedicated they are to the assignment given to them (Bauman, 1989). In this case that would mean users, for example, would rate their righteousness by how much money they collect and to which charity organizations they donate the money. The moral responsibility therefore becomes replaced by technical responsibility. Furthermore, the acts' technology become the thing deciding whether something is good or not – not the acts' content, which in turn means the moral meaning of non-technical questions are neglected (Bauman, 1989). According to Bauman, as suggested before, the result subsequently would be that moral judgments on the entire chains result are excluded.

5.1.3 Positive context – the tool for CSR success

Furthermore, the literature tells us that marketing managers should have a process to integrate both corporate and consumers' perspectives of CSR (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013) in order to create value that meets the consumers

individual and dynamic needs (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). By doing this there is a bigger chance of fully understanding how and under what conditions CSR impacts consumer attitudes and behavior (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013). In other words, a social separation between company and consumer would suggest conducting CSR to be harder. However, as the employee of Big Heart claims, conducting CSR actually becomes easier to work with:

I think that, as for all other CSR, if companies are visible in good or good hearted contexts then a receiver who bumps into that on two or three different occasions then they will automatically get a subconscious image of this company representing human rights, environmental care or whatever it is. And what you have done doesn't have to be that detailed, it is enough that they are visible in a context that you relate to it. – Big Heart.

In this sense, companies' collaboration with consumers isn't as important as the literature makes it out to be. Rather it ought to be enough for companies to just be visible in the right context in order to be perceived as a company doing good deeds. It excludes theories saying that companies should have close collaborations with consumers due to the fact that, according to Big Heart, it is merely the image that matters. Meaning, if the context is good hearted than so is the company connected with the context. As opposed to the instrumental and strategic approach of CSR (Carroll, 2015; Boesso, Kumar & Michelon, 2013), companies, in this sense doesn't have to give in to the notion that CSR activities ought to be closely connected with the companies' business. This is also emphasized by Big Heart saying:

(...) creating engagement in society that doesn't have anything to do with this company at all, it is about this company contributing to charity in some way just like a civilian does. – Big Heart.

This quote ideally points to the same paradigm in which companies, while being expected to give to charity (Carroll, 2015; McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; Davis, 1960), doesn't necessarily have to consider causes that in some way are connected with what they do. However, according to Mattila & Hanks (2012), that part is indeed crucial in order for consumers to feel as though the cause is relevant for them, leading to further engagement within the CSR-programs. Furthermore,

companies are able to avoid communicating the wrong identity to consumers (Mattila & Hanks, 2012). This is also suggested by one of the users:

(...) it would have been interesting to have a relation with the customers (...) that you have a dialogue surrounding what you value, what you find important, how you want us to move on with our vision and with our concept, our products and services in order to do more good in society simultaneously as we do what we do. I think it is important for the companies, that I have a relation with, to reflect my values. I want to see that they think it is important not to just be interested in making money. – User nr. 7

The quote describes why CSR in this sense become a very interesting topic due to the fact that consumers have different views on what constitutes as successful CSR-work when comparing their views with Big Hearts' view. The user in this case points more to the fact that socially responsible companies should integrate concerns from their stakeholders when making decisions relating to CSR, both in terms of policymaking and how they operate (Carroll, 2015). It would also minimize the risk of mismatching the values of the organization and those of society on which the companies depend on (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013). However, while users have a profound idea of how CSR successfully should be managed, they still see the companies as being good and caring just by being present in a good context, as confirmed by the next quote:

Their brand gets stronger on an ethical plane. It [Big Heart] is a good thing to be associated with. If someone says they give money to charity or runs a project concerning charity, then automatically a positive thought is created. – User nr. 6

Distance in this case becomes key. While the literature suggests closeness and dialogue with the consumers to be crucial components when conducting CSR, it is in fact the distance in this case that makes the CSR-work easier and successful. The distance to the users, in this case, deletes the users moral considerations regarding the companies, as suggested by Bauman (1989), making the context more important. As a consequence, being present in the right context and being a part of a good-hearted move towards improving society is, in this case, all that matters in order to be perceived as a company with good ethical values.

5.1.4 Implications of communicative rationality

What is previously discussed is strongly connected to communication and the effects it has on how people make rational judgments. Habermas (1996) explains how communicative rationality is based on not only consensus but also on structures of consent in an inter-subjective divided world, which he claims to be the reason for all mutual understanding. As a consequence, communicative rationality is found within structures of inter-subjectivity where mutual understanding already is decided by the world we live in and created by its participants. This in turn is the reason why people have trouble shifting rational perspective, or in Baumanns (1989) terms, look beyond each inner success. The term structure in this sense, becomes an important factor when taking Big Heart into consideration. Big Heart becomes the very structure, which all participants depend on and where all communication makes sense and is perceived as rational. What it ideally means is that when agreeing to participate, or in this case download the app, start using it etcetera you simultaneously reach a collective consensus with all participants.

The consensus in this sense is translated into every participant's commitment to Big Heart, meaning Big Heart becomes the very foundation in which every action is considered to be ethical. The participants have in other words reached mutual understanding and mutual agreement on an ethical plane because of Big Heart and Big Heart therefore become the reason why companies communicating through there are believed to be ethical. In other words, everything enacted through Big Heart becomes ethically right. This will be further elaborated on later in the analysis but the next section will grasp on how routine based CSR-activities, such as Big Heart, influence consumers' ethical views on companies. This will furthermore serve as a complement to the previous section, and will serve as yet another central part of the analysis.

5.2 Routine based CSR-activities and what it means on an ethical plane

According to Bauman (1989), an act conducted by routine is an act that is integrated in an organizations decision-making. In relation to this, Big Heart provides a service where you as an individual can donate money to charity without having

to change the way you live. That means that you don't actively, for instance, have to look up and read upon how to donate money, and all that comes with it. You simply have to unlock the home screen on your smartphone and money will automatically be transferred to an account asserted to the user of the app. The money comes indirectly from the companies seeing as how they pay Big Heart to be able to get exposure on the users phone. Big Heart is in this sense dependent on the companies in order to exist, taking a sum of money for them selves and giving the rest to the users. The users are henceforward able to donate that money to whichever charity organization they see fit without wasting a lot of their energy. In this sense the act in it self becomes routine based and, as a consequence, contributes to why people see companies in a positive light. This will be further discussed below, starting with the effects of the donating act being integrated in the users everyday life.

5.2.1 Integration as a way of liberating moral reflection

The fact that the act of donating money is routine based is also stipulated by one of the users when saying:

(...) the way Big Heart do it is incredibly smart. That you, instead of doing it [donating money] as an extra thing, where you have to change your behavior and have to ad something in order to be able to contribute to charity, you rather should integrate it in everything you do. – User nr. 1

The user indicates that this way of donating money is a positive way to go when managing charity work. According to Bauman (1989), conducting activities by routine as in the case with Big Heart, is one of the reasons why peoples' moral judgments are liberated as it, in Baumans terms, already is integrated in the organizations decision making. In the case of Big Heart disciplinary rules apply as donations is already decided how to be done. What happens when disciplinary rules are applied is that it affects the way people make moral judgments by making people morally indifferent (Bauman, 1989). This is furthermore, according to Bauman, one of the functional division of labors' effects and is one of the fundamental components in what Bauman refers to as the modern society. The aim of such a phenomenon is furthermore to conduct everything in the most effective

way possible. The fact that disciplinary rules exist within Big Heart is further elaborated on by one of the users:

As a student it is really good because of the fact that it doesn't cost me anything to do it and it is very comfortable, I don't have to make an active choice after installing the app. – User nr. 8

What we can derive from this quote is that the user is comfortable with not having to choose actively, meaning the user feel perfectly fine if the initial choice already has been made by someone else – in this case, Big Heart. The team behind Big Heart is in this sense responsible for why the initiative of donating to charity was made from the beginning. Therefore they are the ones enabling the users to donate money to charity in the first place. Subsequently, if Big Heart wouldn't exist, the user would have had to put more energy and more reflection into making a similar choice. To get back to what the quote said, my analysis is that the users find themselves in a position of total identification to the organization (Bauman, 1989), or chain if you will, simply doing what they are asked to do. And this they do without changing any behavior in their daily life what so ever and as a consequence they exclude any type of reflection on the matter, and therefore excluding their moral judgment (Bauman, 1989) as they do so. This is furthermore adding to why this way of conducting CSR has positive effect on a company's image, due to the fact that the user doesn't have to make any further reflections, making it easier for companies to appear as good hearted.

5.2.2 Perceptions of being active

Even though the act of donating is integrated in the users everyday life they still seem to perceive a sense of real activity, as stipulated by one of them:

(...) it is also good to feel as though you have a part in it. Even though you are kind of passive you can still make an active choice. – User nr. 6

In keeping with that users feel active, even though it is within a passive context, companies have a better chance of creating value that meet the consumers, or in this case the users, individual and dynamic needs. Speaking of CSR, companies

therefore have a better chance of generating favorable attitudinal responses from the users when they are allowed to react proactively within the CSR activities instead of acting reactively (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). This is further emphasized by this next quote:

(...) you should feel as though you are involved and gets to be a part of what is happening with the money or that work you do in order to help this charity work. And that it has meaning, that you, not by your self but together with the company can make a difference. – User nr. 5

What the user suggests is that it is important for the users to feel as though they are involved in producing and delivering the service (Dabholkar, 1990), and that they get a sense of being active co-producers of value as opposed to passive audiences (Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). As a consequence the users also get positive associations of the company:

If you could get a sense of responsibility or if you have the opportunity to influence, then it becomes more positively associated. – User nr. 3

Meaning, another effect routine-based CSR-activities have is the fact that even though consumers consider their role as rather passive they still perceive the act as an active one, making them think of the companies in a more positive way. More specifically, they believe the companies CSR-work to be of a more positive nature than negative.

5.2.3 Feelings of collaboration

If we would go even deeper into the subject, there is evidence showing more effects of how technologies such as Big Heart influence consumers. What has already been suggested is that by using Big Heart as a medium, companies have a chance of enhancing their image in terms of better consumer associations towards their brand. But, what is maybe even more interesting is how it effect consumers' perceptions of collaboration, meaning their collaboration with the companies. This is what one of the users said:

By giving the consumers the responsibility (...) you feel in some way that you do it together, (...) I get a better experience out of the company if they for example would do it in the Big Heart way. (...) I think it has a lot to do with trust and a perception of a collective thing you do together and closer contact. – User nr. 6

Meaning that even though, as mentioned earlier, there exist a division of labor (Bauman, 1989), including a clear distance between the users and the companies, the user still considers this to be a collective move – and more specifically the user perceive it as a collaboration between the companies and the user in order to reach a common goal (Boesso, Kumar & Michelon, 2013). Therefore it works as a way to both strengthen the influence and power of the companies, while they simultaneously meet expectations from the society (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013), which in this case is the demand of companies collaborating with stakeholders (The European Commission, 2011; Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). It points towards an instrumental approach to CSR, meaning engaging those stakeholder groups that can influence corporate performance (Boesso, Kumar & Michelon, 2013), simultaneously as it becomes a way for companies to understand how and under what conditions CSR impacts consumer attitudes and behavior (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013). This is also indicated and agreed upon by one of the users:

Through this [Big Heart] you involve costumers more, so that is good. It is positive for their CSR-work I think. – User nr. 5

In conclusion, while there exist a disbandment of CSR-responsibility and, in this sense, a functional division of labor, Big Heart still works as a way for users to perceive the move as a collaborative act together with the companies. What this indicates is a classic example of the consequences division of labor in modern society has. Meaning, while users perceive to be involved, they are still a separate, disentangled part within the whole machine, working as a way to reach the desired goal in the most effective way possible (Bauman, 1989). However, key here lies in the fact that the users perceive it as a common goal, which furthermore explains why users see it as a collaborative activity, which in turn leads to positive CSR associations.

5.2.4 Nobodies become somebodies

Morsing & Schultz (2006) furthermore believes collaboration and interaction between company and consumer to be ground stones in stakeholder theory today as it explains why more focus should lie on the relationship between company and consumer, as suggested by one of the users:

(...) you want to feel as though you are involved and that you are able to make a difference. – User nr. 5

In this sense it has become increasingly important to, not just care about how stakeholders should be handled, but to actually interact with them. Therefore participation, dialogue and involvement become important components within CSR-activities pointing towards more democratic ideals (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). This too was something the users emphasized to be satisfying:

The companies give their customers a chance to affect too. If there are a lot of people able to vote where the money should go to then you get a somewhat correct answer according to society. Those who have the app; it is fair that all of them gets to decide where it [the money] should go to, then they feel more involved and the companies are satisfied because the costumers is involved within their CSR-work and where the money goes to. That charity organization is likely to be good, or the money is likely to be needed there if the majority wants the money to go there. Then I absolutely think this way is fair and is a good way. – User nr. 5

As suggested by the user and as mentioned before companies ought to involve stakeholders in order to understand and adapt to their concerns. Stakeholder involvement theory furthermore points to how stakeholder involvement have the opportunity to promote positive support as well as it is useful when developing CSR initiatives (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). However, while dialogue and participation can be beneficial for all constituents it, according to Morsing & Schultz (2006), can also be expensive, time-consuming and lead to counterproductive activities that in no way can build trust, facilitate collaboration or enhance the value of the company. On a similar note they argue that dialogue, as opposed to what Prasad & Holzinger (2013) says, in fact could lead to cynicism and distrust with the pre-assumption of course that the dialogue is instrumentally and superficially employed and not genuinely adopted (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). As Big Heart in

this case is a disentangled communication channel for the companies it must also be considered to be instrumental and superficially employed. This is also stipulated by one of the users:

I am going back to what I said earlier about that it has to come from within. Meaning, it has to come from the fact that we [the company] believes in this or that we want to do this and not from the fact of what we believe our costumers want us to do because it will make us look good. – User nr. 7

In this sense companies CSR initiatives should come from within the company and not just pose as something that will look good in the eyes of consumers. One could therefore ask why this way of conducting CSR is not seen as cynical as Big Heart isn't a part of the company as such. This goes back to what was recently said about the users feeling as though they are in collaboration with the company to reach a common goal. As stipulated by one of the users, having more responsibility actually leads to greater personal contact with the company:

I think it is a good way of showing that both the company and me have a responsibility. It is like they are reaching out a hand where I get to decide, as I said, it is a very smart way of in order to feel more personal contact, that they [the companies] give you the responsibility. Instead of paying them and hope that they will do what they should do, the responsibility becomes more divided. I believe this to be a good thing. – User nr. 6

This personal contact, as said before, is likely to result in positive support and greater CSR associations from consumers (Morsing & Schultz, 2006; Ruiz de Maya, Lardín-Zambudio & López-López, 2016). Big Heart therefore, despite not coming from within the companies, actually works as a way for the users to feel more connected to the companies, which according to Carroll (2000) is considered to be ethical and morally right within the business context. As the quote indicates, personal contact is created through that the user feels as though it has more responsibility. A divided responsibility is in this sense seen in a positive light and contributes to a stronger sense of participation within the companies' CSR-activities, which is also indicated by these next quotes:

You feel more involved, and that sort of, guarantees the money to go to where you intended it. If they [the companies] wouldn't have had it this way, then maybe you would have felt as though you

didn't know where the money goes to or if the money even gets donated. And then maybe fewer people would of used the app, because of the fact that they would have less influence in the decision-making and less control. – User nr. 2

You should manage charity work in the most effective way possible. And to be able to be a part of and contribute to where the money should go to is pretty nice. Above all, that is what is good with being able to control more. – User nr. 3

You can in some way decide what the corporate world wants to help with according to what you find appropriate. It is maybe not always the best but it still feels as though you are able to contribute in a hole different way. – User nr. 8

In terms of communication, Big Heart provides a platform where companies not only can outsource their CSR-responsibility but it also makes sure that the users feel as though they are involved within something bigger. What we furthermore learn from the quotes is that people want to feel as somebodies instead of nobodies, which is solved by giving and communicating a sense of responsibility to the user/consumer. In this case a division of labor actually creates a positive image of the company in the sense that it is seen as a more ethical and more democratic way of conducting CSR. When responsibility henceforth is divided in CSR activities it is actually seen as more ethical than unethical, which is quite the opposite from Bauman's theory.

5.3 The role of CSR in a functionally differentiated society

5.3.1 Is CSR through Big Heart correct CSR?

The debate surrounding CSR today is often concerned with whether or not CSR is treated as a way to achieve corporate goals rather than social goods (Prasad, Holzinger, 2013; Carroll, 2015). Therefore, communicating CSR as opposed to actually publicizing your actions within CSR-activities becomes two different things. The criticism points out that companies when only communicating CSR only wants to improve the companies' image without really caring about social questions. In this sense, critics claim CSR is often defined by business interest instead

of pursuing society's wellbeing (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013). This subject is also discussed by one of the users:

You should do something good for the environment, you should do something good for social conditions, and then you can start thinking about making a profit and gain financial value. Wrong CSR is when CSR is used to strengthen the company's financial position or image or similar, that is wrong, wrong, wrong. They [the companies] have to do it in order to improve of the world, that should be their main concern. If they don't do that, it will in the end be revealed and then the CSR will have opposite effect. – User nr. 1

Meaning CSR initiatives, with the primary goal of achieving corporate goals is wrong CSR according to the user as well as critics. Therefore we can assume that, in the interest of consumers, solely communicating CSR is not enough in order to be perceived as someone caring about social problems. What the user indicates is that companies should commit more to the cause of improving the well-being of society (Prasad & Holzinger, 2013) and that it furthermore should be companies' main concern. In this sense, as the user says, CSR is not to be confused with financial value or company image. However, it seems as though there are different opinions when asking users and the company as shown in the next quote:

I think it is very important, within this reasoning our purpose, in order to achieve our goals, in order to be able to educate as many people as possible, we need to achieve economical results (...).
– Company

Why debate exist concerning the motives behind CSR is not hard to believe in other words. Clearly there still is an existing incompleteness concerning the conformity in how CSR should be handled and what goals one should have with CSR-work. Just like in general theories in business ethics there are two sides of the debate where one side have the idea that CSR should concern how much the businessman incorporate moral values into corporate decisions (Sahu, 2016) as proposed by the user. Companies should according to this strive towards creating positive benefits for society (Carroll, 2015). The other side however is under the impression that the sole moral obligation of companies is to maximize profits (Allhoff & Vaidya, 2005), as proposed by the company in my study. In other words, this view points more towards PR and marketing in the sense that it rather

would be more important to project a positive socially responsible impression than to react to public opinion (Perks, Farache, Shukla & Berry, 2013). This is also suggested by one of the users:

But at the same time I think that the company is connected with good PR because of the fact that it is for charity. So, it is seen both in terms of marketing for their ad but also in order to get connected with charity. – User nr. 3

What the user is referring to is the fact that this way of doing CSR is a little bit of both, meaning it could be seen from a CSR perspective as well as from a marketing perspective. According to many of the users and the literature this is not the ultimate way of conducting CSR, and it should rather have negative than positive consequences on the company image. Therefore we must ask ourselves why it works. Why is it that the companies within this context are still perceived as ethically good while the use of Big Heart could be perceived as merely a marketing channel? This will be further elaborated on in the next section.

5.3.2 Common room

Going back to Habermas (1996) idea of communicative rationality, this too (the answer to my previous question) has to do with consensus between the participants. Morsing & Schultz (2006) talks about mutually beneficial action and refers it to where, as also discussed by Habermas, participants reach mutual understanding towards each other. According to Morsing & Schultz (2006), communication is vital in order to ensure a two-way dialogue where the aim is to bring about mutual understanding, rational agreement and consent. Discussing charity and ethics this is important according to one of the users:

Do you manage to make it work well, then it isn't...if everyone has the same image or the same goal in some way, then I think it is ok. User nr. 3

What the user points out is the fact that if everyone has the same idea of something or reaching for the same goal it becomes ok, meaning if every participant within CSR-initiatives have agreed upon what goals to reach for and why, then

doing CSR-work in this sense shouldn't be a problem. In the next quote another user points out one of the reasons why:

The whole idea with Big Heart is that you agree to advertisement, which is a little different, because otherwise we are exposed to advertisement. So, the fact that you approach the companies' advertisement with a different state of mind (...) makes you feel as though you are maybe not that easily irritated towards all advertisement. – User nr. 4

As the quote suggests the users' attitude towards the ads is received with a different attitude than in regular cases due to the fact that this way of approaching advertising is made by choice. This also becomes the reason why the source of irritation is removed. This is further elaborated on by this next user, saying:

The fact that I have decided on what I want to see and that I have made that choice removes the source of irritation for me entirely. So, my opinion is that I think this is a very good thing. The fact that it is advertisement doesn't bother me that much, at least not as much when it is by choice as opposed to the same type of advertisement where it is not made by choice, where it can be extremely irritating. – User nr. 7

The message of the ad is then strengthened by the fact that the intentions behind it is known to every participant, meaning every participant is more open to the message because of its connection to charity. The charity connection seems, according to Big Heart, to be an important component in this context as suggested by this next quote:

And then I believe the users are more open towards the advertisement showed in the app because they know that there exist a good thought behind it and that makes them more receptive of the message. – Big Heart

The fact that the users have made the choice of being exposed to advertisement together with its connection to charity and that the users have more control of where the money is to be distributed this all works. In this sense mutual beneficial action (Morsing & Schultz, 2006) is achieved, meaning the companies have the chance of doing advertisement through a medium, not only self-elected by the receivers but which is also perceived to be ethical. Furthermore, the users are given responsibility in the sense that they are able to donate money to causes most ap-

appropriate according to them. Therefore, mutual understanding and a sense of rational agreement are created where every participant in some way wins or feel satisfied.

In conclusion, Big Heart provides a medium where participants from different domains meet and in a simple, rational way have the opportunity to reach consensus. Habermas (1996) refers this to as the social room, where participants not only reach mutual understanding but also actually accept each other. Habermas (1996) explains that it is within the social room we find the key to how social interactions are connected and to how different world perspectives and life forms are intertwined. He furthermore explains how language is the soul cross-boarder medium enabling different totalities to meet on a middle ground and reach mutual understanding. This means that Big Heart therefore become the reason why different people from different domains, with different ideas and goals with CSR can come to a rational agreement on how CSR can be managed ethically. In other words, Big Heart is transformed into the social room Habermas is talking about, posing as a middle ground for those who choose to participate and where every participant “speaks the same language”, meaning speaking in the same ethical terms. This in turn means that everything conducted and communicated through Big Heart becomes rational and is all together perceived as ethical.

5.3.3 CSR becomes a protection from dehumanization

In Big Heart companies have the chance of engaging with consumers and listen to their perspectives instead of trying to come up with a universal solution on how to manage CSR themselves. By doing this, companies are able to put themselves in the shoes of stakeholders and see things from their point of view (Fryer, 2015) making it easier for them to withhold a more ethical way of conducting CSR-initiatives in the eyes of consumers. This way of redefining ones role in society is, according to Carroll (2000), one of two ways for companies in order to be perceived as ethically good. One of which, as mentioned earlier, is to manage CSR-activities. The other way, meaning this one, of redefining ones role in society is to implement management of morality. Moral management more and more becomes a common goal within business of today and implies understanding stakeholder

thinking (Carroll, 2000). In accordance, as two of the users said, why stakeholders find this way of conducting CSR-work to be appropriate is its ability to make the stakeholders partly responsible of where companies CSR-money should go:

If you could get a sense of responsibility or if you have the opportunity to influence, then it becomes more positively associated. – User nr. 3

(...) if I can (...) choose where this company's CSR-money goes I feel as though (...) I have consumer power. That feels good. – User nr. 6

Meaning, companies that give consumers influence as to how the CSR-money should be distributed is acting in a way that is seen as correct and is ethically appreciated by consumers. This is according to Falck & Heblich (2006) central when talking about CSR in general, saying a CSR approach should be built on society's basic order to cause the desired conduct rather than companies assuming responsibility. In addition it becomes important to acknowledge the civic elements in this context, meaning seeing consumers as concerned citizens (Prothero et al., 2011) and to respect their desire to take responsibility in the private sphere (Barkman, 2014). In other words, marketers need to pay particular attention to consumers' views on CSR (The European Commission, 2011) rather than to only have the company's perspective in mind. As stipulated by the employee of the company I interviewed; being a part of Big Heart makes them accomplish this while simultaneously having the company's best interest in mind:

We can pay more to those organizations that in the end collect these recourses, which ultimately allows those who want to be recipients of this [Big Heart] to get more resources, so everybody wins in some way. Because the consumers believe that they are consuming more consciously and that it is more unanimous with what they believe in. We get more costumers, the ones managing the [charity-] organizations gets a more extensive operation and the receivers gets more recourses, there is no losers in using CSR-work in that way. – Company

What I draw from this is that if companies in some way would be criticized of not being legit when conducting CSR in this way, they could always refer to users desire of wanting to have more influence in how companies' money should be distributed. In other words, they always have the chance of saying that they obeyed

another authority (Bauman, 1989), meaning societies and the consumers' demands of having more responsibility and a bigger saying within companies' CSR-activities. Subsequently, the users are not in a position to judge whether the companies actions are moral or immoral (Bauman, 1989), which in turn leads to that a freely floating responsibility is created where every member would say, if asked, that they followed another authority. The collaboration, or Big Heart if you will, then becomes an instrument in order to eliminate responsibility and to protect oneself from ethical judgments (Bauman, 1989). By pointing to a rational way of thinking (Bauman, 1989; Habermas, 1996), companies therefore could use Big Heart as an argument, explaining why they should not be seen as acting in a dehumanizing way. Why it works is, as mentioned before, because of the already existing mutual agreement (Habermas, 1996) between all parties, in which there is no need to criticize any ethical or moral matters. In other words, the structures of consent (Habermas, 1996) have already been made before hand and by participating in the first place you also agree upon the very structure of conducting CSR in this way – embracing all ethical and moral implications. CSR and the structure, or technology (Bauman, 1989) if you will, in this sense becomes a solid protection for companies in order to remove all suspicions concerning if the company contributes to dehumanization.

6. Conclusions and discussion

6.1 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the paradox within CSR today, where CSR is expected to solve the problems with a society where labor is divided, simultaneously as it itself becomes a more and more divided activity. Furthermore, this thesis tried to capture what this means for the strategic communicator as well as how the moral views of consumers/users are influenced when CSR-activities are divided among several actors. The main contribution lies in how moral views of CSR-activities are affected when CSR-responsibility is divided among several actors ranging from company to consumer. By empirically studying the app Big Heart from a business perspective, from Big Hearts perspective and from a consumer/user-perspective this study was able to shed light on the development of CSR as a social phenomenon and its cross-boarder character. The result showed that companies were able to get positive associations towards their brand just by being present in an ethically positive context. This was due to the fact that the CSR-activities were conducted by routine by the users of the app, thus liberating a large part of their ability to reflect upon the moral implications. In addition, contrary to Baumans theory, a division of labor within CSR-activities or in other words, CSR-responsibility, is seen as ethical as opposed to unethical. CSR can in this sense be seen as a protection for companies not to be considered as a company with dehumanizing attributes.

6.2 Discussion

The main question asserted to this study was: How can CSR be managed ethically when CSR-responsibility is divided among several actors? Three sub questions were then asked as a way to answer this overarching question and in order to deepen the understanding of CSR as a phenomenon. These three questions were the following:

- What is required from companies in order to be perceived as socially responsible in a functionally differentiated society?
- How are consumers' moral views on companies influenced when being part of CSR-activities conducted by routine?
- What role does CSR have in a society where CSR-responsibility and thus moral responsibility is divided?

The answer to the first question was that CSR becomes easier to conduct in a successful way due to that a practical and social distance is created between the company and the user. The distance, as suggested by Bauman (1989) and as shown in the case of Big Heart, deletes a major part of the users moral considerations regarding the companies. As a consequence, being present in an ethically positive context becomes the soul foundation when explaining to which extent the companies' are ethical or not. In other words, according to my findings, being present in an ethically positive context and being part of a goodhearted move towards improving society is, in this case, the most important component in order to be perceived as a company with good ethical values.

Communication in this sense becomes a vital component, explaining why mutual understanding and consensus between all participants are achieved. This is, according to Habermas (1996), achieved by structures already created by the participants. Meaning, Big Heart in this case, pose as an already created structure where the participants agrees upon all premises beforehand by participating in the activity. Therefore, Big Heart becomes the soul reason why companies and everything communicated through Big Heart are considered to be ethical. The companies and the users, in other words, reach mutual understanding on an ethical plane, simply because it is agreed upon before hand.

The answer to the second question is that CSR-activities conducted by routine, and therefore integrated in the users' daily life, results in exclusion of the users' moral judgments concerning the companies. This furthermore contributes to why context is vital (as suggested above) when wanting to be perceived as being ethical. It is explained through the fact that because of it being integrated in the users' daily activities, they don't feel the need to make any further reflections on the matter, making it that much easier for companies to appear good hearted.

Routine based CSR-activities, while liberating moral reflections, also makes the users feel as though they are involved in producing and delivering the service, creating a sense of being co-producers as opposed to passive audiences. As a consequence, by feeling more active, the users perceive the companies' CSR-work to be of a more positive nature than negative and are all together perceived to be a collaborative act involving both company and user.

A division of labor within CSR-activities in this sense, makes the users feel more in control over how the companies' CSR-work should be conducted, which makes them feel as though they have more responsibility. Responsibility furthermore makes the users feel as though they are somebodies instead of nobodies, which in turn have positive consequences for the companies' CSR work, seeing as how the users feel participatory. By giving and communicating a sense of responsibility to the user/consumer, the companies' are seen as more democratic and is therefore considered to be more ethical. A division of labor within CSR-activities is henceforth perceived to be more ethical than unethical, which in turn contradicts Bauman's theory.

Answering my third question, CSR becomes a protection for companies in order to be able to withhold a positive ethical image. Big Heart becomes an instrument in order to eliminate responsibility and to protect oneself from ethical judgments (Bauman, 1989), stipulating that they responded back to the demands of society in wanting a bigger saying within companies' CSR-activities. By pointing to a rational way of thinking (Bauman, 1989; Habermas, 1996), companies therefore could use Big Heart as an argument, explaining why they should not be seen as acting in a dehumanizing way. Why it works is, as mentioned before, because of the already existing mutual agreement (Habermas, 1996) between all parties, in which there is no need to criticize any ethical or moral matters. In other words, the structures of consent (Habermas, 1996) have already been made before hand and by participating in the first place you also agree upon the very structure of conducting CSR in this way.

In this sense, Big Heart becomes what Habermas (1996) refers to as a social room, enabling participants from different domains to meet and in a simple, rational way have the opportunity to reach consensus. Therefore, the participants not only reach mutual understanding but also accept each other due to "speaking the same language", meaning speaking in the same ethical terms. This in turn

means that everything conducted and communicated through Big Heart becomes rational and is all together perceived as ethical, which simultaneously is the reason for why it could be seen as a protection for the companies.

In conclusion, what this study shows is the fact that, when conducting CSR it is expected by consumers to have some sort of power or in some way be a part of how companies should manage their CSR-activities. So, far it confirms the literature in the sense that in order to achieve greatest CSR-success and to obey ethical standards, companies ought to integrate consumers within their CSR-activities. Where literature and reality contradict each other is within what consumers perceive as integration and what actually is integration. In stakeholder involvement theory dialogue is the most vital component when talking about integration as it creates mutual understanding between the participants (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Big Heart however, as the study suggests, rather eliminates dialogue between the company and the consumer (or the user in this case) than contributes to it, which by logic should result in companies being perceived as less ethical. However, what Big Heart accomplishes is that by using Big Heart, companies can bring about mutual understanding and rational agreement with the consumer. This Habermas (1996) calls the social room and is the reason creating a sense of unity among the consumers when actually there exist a division of labor (Bauman, 1989). Therefore, the consumers (users) only perceive to be involved and integrated within the company activities when they actually are not, explaining why they perceive this way of conducting CSR to be ethical rather than unethical.

In addition, CSR in this sense contributes more to the worlds division of labor than it helps uniting and integrating consumers and companies. Furthermore, it makes it easier for companies to be perceived as companies' with good values simultaneously as it removes some complexities concerning CSR as a field.

6.3 Contributions to the field of strategic communication

CSR is most commonly studied from an integration perspective, meaning how companies use CSR in order to integrate society's ambient demands of everything to be conducted morally in accordance with norms, values etcetera. Therefore, this study's main contribution lies in CSR seen from a differentiation perspective,

(which has never been done before) meaning how CSR contributes to division of labor and as a consequence, a differentiation of the morality of society. Furthermore, it sheds light on CSRs cross-boarder character, covering multiple domains and actors ranging from company to consumer, where the study finds out how it affects the role of the strategic communicator working as a mediator between the domains. It also contributes to the field of strategic communication as it also sheds light on how CSR-communication can be managed when CSR-responsibility is divided and how it can be outsourced to a medium instead of being created originally from within the company. In addition, the study reveals how moral views are affected when CSR-responsibility is divided among several actors.

6.4 Future research

Future research ought to bring more clarity to CSR and its cross-boarder character, preferably in another context and in a different type of business in order to broaden our knowledge about it and to gain more knowledge about what it means for the field of strategic communication. In addition, future research ought to touch more upon how a division of labor, where more responsibility is given to the consumer, affects brand images. Meaning, shedding more light on how important democratic preferences are within CSR-activities from a brand perspective.

In relation, future research should also shed more light on the development of how CSR contributes to division of labor, and the challenges for companies to withhold an ethical image when parts of their CSR-activities are outsourced to a disentangled platform or medium. Further research should also try to bring more clarity to more reasons why a division of labor within CSR-activities is perceived to be ethically correct when general theories within the literature suggest the opposite. Finally, there is need for a broader understanding of the ethical implications CSR has when working as merely a protection for companies.

References

- Allhoff, F., & Vaidya, A. (2005). *Business ethics* (1st ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Alter, K., 2000. *Managing the Double Bottom Line: a Business Planning Reference Guide for Social Enterprises*. PACT Publications, Washington D.C.
- Alvehus, J. (2013). *Skriva uppsats med kvalitativ metod: En handbok*. Stockholm: Liber AB.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2008). *Tolkning och reflektion*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Barkman, H. (2014). *Barriärer och broar för hållbar konsumtion*. 1st ed. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet: Statsvetenskapliga institutionen.
- Bauman, Z. (1989). *Auschwitz och det moderna samhället*. 1st ed. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Baumane-Vitolina, I., Cals, I., & Sumilo, E. (2016). *Is Ethics Rational? Teleological, Deontological and Virtue Ethics Theories Reconciled in the Context of Traditional Economic Decision Making*. *Procedia Economics And Finance*, 39, 108-114.
- Becker, H. S. (1998). *Tricks of the trade: how to think about your research while you're doing it*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BIGHEART – En app för dig med stort hjärta. (2017). BIGHEART. Retrieved 29 March 2017, from <http://bghrt.se>
- BIGHEART – Mobile advertising with a charitable twist. (2017). *FundedByMe*. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from <https://www.fundedbyme.com/sv/campaign/8020/big-heart-sweden-ab/?type=e>
- Boesso, G., Kumar, K., & Michelon, G. (2013). *Descriptive, instrumental and strategic approaches to corporate social responsibility*. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 26(3), 399-422.

- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews – learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles: SAGE publications.
- Bullen, A. and Whitehead, M., (2005). *Negotiating the networks of space, time and substance: a geographical perspective on the sustainable citizen*. *Citizenship studies*, 9(5), 499-516.
- Carroll, A. (2000). *Ethical Challenges for Business in the New Millennium: Corporate Social Responsibility and Models of Management Morality*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10(1), 33.
- Carroll, A. B. (2015). *Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(2), 87-96.
- Cochran, P. (2007). *The evolution of corporate social responsibility*. *Business Horizons*, 50(6), 449-454.
- Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative (2008). *The initiative defining corporate social responsibility*. Retrieved on 31 August 2012 from: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/CSRI/init_define.html
- Dabholkar, P.A. (1990). *How to improve perceived service quality by improving customer participation*. *Developments in Marketing Science*, (Ed.) B.J. Dunlap. Cullowhee, NC: Academy of Marketing Science, 483–487.
- Davis, K. (1960). *Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities*. *California Management Review*, 2, 70–76.
- Daymon, C. & Holloway, I. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods in Public Relations and Marketing Communications*. New York: Routledge
- Eksell, J., & Magnusson, S. (2014). Att kombinera intervju med observation. I Eksell, J., & Thelander, Å. (Ed). (2014). *Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation (p. 93-109)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2014.
- Eksell, J., & Thelander, Å. (2014). Kvalitativ analys inom strategisk kommunikation. I Eksell, J., & Thelander, Å. (Ed). (2014). *Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation (p. 197-213)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2014.
- European Commission (2011). *A renewed EU strategy 2011–14 for corporate social responsibility*. Retrieved on 31 August 2012 from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0681:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Falck, O. and Heblich, S. (2006). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing well by doing good*. *Business Horizons*, 50(3), 247-254.

- Fryer, M. (2015). *A Role for Ethics Theory in Speculative Business Ethics Teaching*. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 138(1), 79-90.
- Gawell, M. (2014). Soci(et)al Entrepreneurship and Different Forms of Social Enterprise. In: Lundström, A., Zhou, C., von Friedrichs, Y., Sundin, E. ed., *Social Entrepreneurship*, 1st ed. Springer, Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 23-41.
- Gustafsson, N. (2014). Traditionella och virtuella fokusgrupper. I Eksell, J. & Glaser, B. G., and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Kommunikativt handlande*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heide, M., & Simonsson, C. (2014). Kvalitet och kunskap i fallstudier. In Eksell, J., & Thelander, Å. (Ed). (2014). *Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation (p. 93-109)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2014.
- Hoover, K., & Pepper, M. (2014). *How did They Say That? Ethics Statements and Normative Frameworks at Best Companies to Work For*. *Journal Of Business Ethics*, 131(3), 605-617.
- Mattila, A. and Hanks, L. (2012). *Antecedents to participation in corporate social responsibility programs*. *Journal of Service Management*, 23(5), 664-676.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. S. (2001). *Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective*. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 117-127.
- Merriam. S. B. (1994). *Fallstudien som forskningsmetod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.
- Morsing, M., & Schultz, M. (2006). *Corporate social responsibility communication: stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies*. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(4), 323-338.
- Narveson, J. (2016). *Social Contract: The Only Game in Town*. *Dialogue*, 55(04), 695-711.
- Rahdari, A., Sepasi, S., & Moradi, M. (2016). *Achieving sustainability through Schumpeterian social entrepreneurship: The role of social enterprises*. *Journal Of Cleaner Production*, 137, 347-360.

- Ruiz de Maya, S., Lardín-Zambudio, R. and López-López, I. (2016). *I Will Do It If I Enjoy It! The Moderating Effect of Seeking Sensory Pleasure When Exposed to Participatory CSR Campaigns*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.
- Sahu, H. (2016). *A descriptive study on business ethics*. *CLEAR International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, 7(9).
- Schwartz, M., & Carroll, A. (2003). *Corporate Social Responsibility: A Three-Domain Approach*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(04), 503-530.
- Skarmeas, D. and Leonidou, C. (2013). *When consumers doubt, Watch out! The role of CSR skepticism*. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1831-1838.
- Spencer, G. (1973) *Methodological issues in the study of bureaucratic elites: a case study of West Point*. *Social Problems*, 21, 90-102.
- Sutcliffe, A., Gonzalez, V., Binder, J., & Nevarez, G. (2011). *Social Mediating Technologies: Social Affordances and Functionalities*. *International Journal Of Human-Computer Interaction*, 27(11), 1037-1065.
- Perks, K., Farache, F., Shukla, P. and Berry, A. (2013). *Communicating responsibility-practicing irresponsibility in CSR advertisements*. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1881-1888.
- Pierre, A., von Friedrichs, Y. and Wincent, J. (2014). *A Review of Social Entrepreneurship Research*. In: A. Lundström, C. Zhou, Y. von Friedrichs and E. Sundin, ed., *Social Entrepreneurship*, 1st ed. Springer, Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 43-69.
- Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: working in the post-positivist traditions*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe.
- Prasad, A. and Holzinger, I. (2013). *Seeing through smoke and mirrors: A critical analysis of marketing CSR*. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1915-1921.
- Prothero, A., Dobscha, S., Freund, J., Kilbourne, W., Luchs, M., Ozanne, L. and Thøgersen, J. (2011). *Sustainable Consumption: Opportunities for Consumer Research and Public Policy*. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 30(1), 31-38.
- Thelander, Å. (Ed). (2014). *Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation (p. 43-57)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.
- sk kommunikation (p. 43-57)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.

- Yin, R. (1998). The abridged version of case study research. In Bickman, L., & Rog, D. (Ed). *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods* (p. 229-259). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Åkerström, M. (2014). Olika vetenskapsteoretiska perspektiv ger olika kunskap: Leave the gun - take the cannoli. I Eksell, J. & Thelander, Å. (Ed). *Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation* (p. 249-268). Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.
- Öberseder, M., Schlegelmilch, B. and Murphy, P. (2013). *CSR practices and consumer perceptions*. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1839-1851.

Appendix

Appendix A: Interview guide – Users of Big Heart

Om intervjupersonen

1. Berätta kortfattat om dig själv och vad du gör.

Allmänt

2. Varför tror du att företagen har valt att samarbeta med Big Heart?
3. Varför har du laddat ner appen?
4. Vilket behov har du i att använda appen?
5. Vad är ditt mål med att använda appen? Vad vill du uppnå?
6. Vad utstrålar företagen till dig som konsument?
7. Hur har bilden av företagen förändrats sen du laddade ner och började använda appen?

Om svaret är i riktning av CSR:

8. Har du varit i kontakt med CSR-frågor innan?
9. Vad är CSR för dig?
10. Hur ser du på CSR?
11. Vad tror du är målet med företags CSR-arbete?
12. Upplever du något problematiskt med företags CSR-arbete?
13. Enligt dig, vad är det största ansvar företag har gentemot deras konsumenter vad gäller CSR-arbetet?
14. Vad förväntar du dig från företags CSR-arbete? Förväntar du dig mer?

Om svaret är i riktning av marknadsföring:

15. Hur tror du att detta kan förbättra företagets varumärke?
16. Vad är detta för typ av marknadsföring för dig?
17. Vad tror du att företagen har för mål med detta?
18. Hur reagerar du på denna typ av marknadsföring?

Involvering

19. Hur känner du för att bli involverad i företags välgörenhetsjobb?
20. Hur nära känner du dig i relation till företaget? Känner du dig integrerad i CSR-arbetet?
21. Vad är viktigt för dig när du ska involveras i företags CSR-arbete?
22. Vad betyder det för dig att företaget vill samarbeta med dig?

Hållbart medborgarskap

23. Hur har du bidragit, pengamässigt, till välgörenhet innan?
24. Hur ska CSR-arbetet vara utformat för att tillfredsställa dina behov?
25. Hur vill du kunna göra välgörenhet?
26. I vilka kontexter ska man ha möjlighet att bidra till välgörenhet? (Privat, publikt)

Ansvarsfördelning

27. Hur fungerar kommunikationen mellan dig, appen och företagen?
28. Hur tycker du att samarbetet mellan alla parter fungerar?
29. Upplever du det som problematiskt att det är många parter inblandade i ett CSR-arbete?
 - På vilket sätt?
 - Varför inte det?
30. Hur känner du med att ha ansvar över vart företagets pengar går när det gäller välgörenhet?
31. Hur känner du inför att företagen ger pengar till kunder för att kunna synas och för att göra gott?
32. Varför tror du att företag har valt att ge pengar till kunder för att utöva sitt CSR-arbete?
33. Enligt dig, vem ska bära det största ansvaret i CSR-arbete?

Moral och etik

34. Vad är moral för dig?
35. Är detta moraliskt rätt?
36. Enligt dig, hur ska ett företag utöva CSR korrekt?

Appendix B: Interview guide – Employee at Big Heart

Om intervjupersonen

1. Berätta kortfattat om ditt jobb.
2. Vad finns det för utmaningar i ditt jobb?

Allmänt

3. Varför har ni skapat appen?
4. Vilket behov ser ni hos företag?
5. Vilket behov ser ni hos konsumenten?
6. Varför tror du människor använder appen?
7. Varför tror du att företag har valt att samarbeta med Big Heart?
8. Vad tror du att företag vinner på att samarbeta med er?

Om svaret är i riktning av CSR:

9. Vad är CSR för dig?
10. Hur arbetar ni gentemot företagen?
11. Hur arbetar ni gentemot era användare?
12. Upplever du något problematiskt med företags CSR-arbete?
13. Enligt dig, vad är ert största kommunikativa ansvar gentemot era konsumenter vad gäller CSR-arbetet?
14. Enligt dig, vad är ert största kommunikativa ansvar gentemot företagen vad gäller CSR-arbetet?
15. Gör ni någon sorts återkoppling till företaget i anknytning till hur konsumenter använder appen?
 - Varför?
 - Varför inte?
16. Visar ni upp resultatet internt?
 - Varför?
 - Varför inte?

17. Tror du det blivit svårare för företag att utöva CSR-arbete?
- Varför?
 - Varför inte?
18. Vad tror du har förändrats inom CSR som gör att företag idag förlitar sig på exempelvis Big Heart för att legitimera sitt CSR-arbete?

Om svaret är i riktning av marknadsföring:

19. Hur tror du att detta kan förbättra företagets varumärke?
20. Varför väljer företag att marknadsföra sig på detta sätt?
21. Varför ser företagen detta som ett bra sätt att marknadsföra sig på?
22. Hur tror du att kunder kommer att reagera på denna typ av marknadsföring?

Ansvarsfördelning

23. Beskriv alla parterna inblandade.
24. Vilka ansvarsområden har alla parter?
25. Beskriv hur kommunikationen fungerar mellan alla parter.
26. Hur tycker du att samarbetet mellan alla parter fungerar?
27. Upplever du det som problematiskt att det är många parter inblandade i ett CSR-arbete?
- På vilket sätt?
 - Varför inte det?
28. Hur känner användarna med att ha ansvar över vart pengarna går när det gäller välgörenhet?
29. Hur tror du att företagen känner inför att ge pengar till kunder för att kunna synas och för att göra gott?
30. Varför tror du att företag vill ge kunder ansvar över deras pengar för att utöva deras CSR-arbete?
31. Finns det ett behov från användarna att ha kontroll över pengarna som ska distribueras som CSR?
- Varför?
32. Enligt dig, vem ska bära det största ansvaret i CSR-arbete?

Moral och etik

33. Vad är moral för dig?

34. Enligt dig, hur ska ett företag utöva CSR korrekt?

Appendix C: Interview guide – Employee at company providing ads to Big Heart

Om intervjupersonen

1. Berätta kortfattat om ditt jobb.
2. Vad är typiska arbetsuppgifter för dig?
3. Vad finns det för utmaningar i ditt jobb?

Allmänt

4. Varför har ni valt att samarbeta med Big Heart?
5. Vad tror du att ni utvinner av att samarbeta med Big Heart?
6. Vad tror du att konsumenterna utvinner?
7. Vad kan Big Heart ge er?
8. Vad vill ni utstråla?

Om svaret är i riktning av CSR:

9. Vad är CSR för dig?
10. Hur arbetar ni med CSR?
11. Vad är ert mål med ert CSR-arbete?
12. Upplever du något problematiskt med ert CSR-arbete?
13. Enligt dig, vad är ert största kommunikativa ansvar gentemot era konsumenter vad gäller ert CSR-arbete?
14. Vad betyder det för ert CSR-arbete att ni samarbetar med konsumenterna?
15. Gör ni någon sorts återkoppling inom företaget i anknytning till hur konsument-
er använder appen?
 - Varför?
 - Varför inte?
16. Visar ni upp resultatet internt?
 - Varför?
 - Varför inte?

17. Har det blivit svårare att utöva CSR-arbete?

Om svaret är i riktning av marknadsföring:

18. Hur tror ni att detta kan förbättra ert varumärke?

19. Varför väljer ni att marknadsföra er på detta sätt?

20. Varför ser ni detta som ett bra sätt att marknadsföra sig på?

21. Hur tror du att kunder kommer att reagera på denna typ av marknadsföring?

Ansvarsfördelning

22. Beskriv alla parterna inblandade.

23. Vilka ansvarsområden har ni?

24. Beskriv hur kommunikationen fungerar mellan er och Big Heart/konsumenterna.

25. Hur tycker du att samarbetet mellan alla parter fungerar?

26. Upplever du det som problematiskt att det är många parter inblandade i ett CSR-arbete?

- På vilket sätt?

- Varför inte det?

27. Hur känner era kunder med att ha ansvar över vart era pengar går när det gäller välgörenhet?

28. Hur känner ni inför att ge kunder ansvar över era pengar för att kunna synas och för att göra gott?

29. Varför har ni valt att ge pengar till kunder för att utöva ert CSR-arbete?

30. Vad har konsumenterna använt pengarna till?

31. Finns det ett behov från användarna att ha kontroll över pengarna som ska distribueras som CSR?

- Varför?

32. Enligt dig, vem ska bära det största ansvaret i CSR-arbete?

Moral och etik

33. Vad är moral för dig?

34. Är detta moraliskt rätt?

35. Enligt dig, hur ska ett företag utöva CSR korrekt?