

Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry

Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry

An Empirical Survey

Ulrike Gelbmann

ISIS – Institute of Systems Sciences, Innovation, and Sustainability Research

University of Graz, Austria

Merangasse 18/1

A-8010 Graz

Phone: ++43(0)316/380-7333

Fax: ++43(0)316/380-9585

Mobile: ++43(0)676/9506169

Mail: [ulrike.gelbmann@uni-graz.at](mailto:ulrike.gelbmann@uni-graz.at)]

## Abstract

Waste industry seems to be predestined for mainstreaming sustainability: The object of waste management is dealing with waste and, more than in other industries, doing so in a sustainable way thus contributing to an environment worth living. Actually the contributions of a well-working, *sustainable* waste disposal system can be measured best by looking at regions where systems fail (e.g. Southern Italy).

This article presents the results of a 2007 ISIS-survey in co-operation with “VOEB” (the Association of Austrian Waste Management Enterprises). It explores attitudes and activities of Austrian waste industry in order to ascertain their state and requirements as to sustainability and CSR.

Sustainable management is one of the core competences of Austrian waste industry so far as environment protection is concerned, but all the same, most of the enterprises lack explicit dedication to CSR: They have not yet realized let alone put into action the economic benefits of CSR. This discloses the necessity of further research activities in order to elaborate CSR instruments that meet the special requirements of this sector

Waste Management, Sustainability, Doing CSR, Mainstreaming CSR

## Introduction

Austrian waste industry had its origin some 50 years ago and has been undergoing a heterogeneous historical and regional development. It has been subject to structural shifts from municipality-driven to private structures, from a rapidly growing to a mature market, and from waste disposal to integrated resource management. As a consequence, it has been making efforts towards sustainable management for quite a long time, at least in ecological respects.

All the same, the concept of CSR, integrating ecological, economic, and social aspects of responsibility, has not yet won much recognition in Austrian waste industry, although CSR has become quite popular in Austria lately. Amongst other things, CSR is based on the insight that, due to their rising creative power and their growing influence, enterprises are bound to assume responsibility far beyond economic aspects (Bowen 1953, Wood & Logsdon 2002, Matten, Crane & Chapple 2003, Garriga & Mele 2004, Matten & Crane 2005). Responsibility is not just a question of economic soundness, but also of commitment to staff, society, and the environment. Thus the concept can add to long-term prosperity of the enterprise and to fulfilling the stakeholders' needs (Cragg 2002, Burke & Logsdon 1996)

This article presents the results of a 2007 ISIS-survey by Ulrike Gelbmann and Karin Kulhanek, which was carried out in co-operation with the "VOEB" (the Association of Austrian Waste Management Enterprises). It explores attitudes and activities of Austrian waste industry in order to ascertain their state and requirements as to sustainability and CSR (Gelbmann & Kulhanek 2008).

Analysis starts from the following questions

- To which extent do Austrian waste management enterprises engage in sustainable management topics today?

- What are the reasons for paying attention to sustainability aspects in Austrian waste management enterprises?
- Which benefits do Austrian waste management enterprises expect from sustainable management?
- How do Austrian waste management enterprises prove their sustainability/responsibility behavior?
- Which do Austrian waste management enterprises think are the main obstacles to socially responsible management?
- How familiar are Austrian waste management enterprises with the concept of CSR?
- Do Austrian waste management enterprises practise social responsibility without even knowing that they are „doing CSR“?

To answer these questions, it will be necessary to describe the status quo of CSR in Austria very briefly. It will be also be helpful to learn a bit about the structure and goals of the Austrian waste industry. Furthermore the special situation of waste industry will have to be pointed out. Finally the design, the implications and the results of our study will be portrayed in detail.

#### Historical Development of CSR in Austria

Whereas in America CSR has had a fifty years' tradition and also in the United Kingdom has been established for quite a long time, in Austria it is quite a new issue that has actually emerged only since the European Commission launched its Green Paper in 2001 (EC 2001).

Unlike America or the United Kingdom Austria has never really pursued a libertarian policy (Porter & Phillips 2002), but most areas of life and also of economy have rather been

well-regulated by a vast body of laws for a long time. Labor Law has been developing rapidly since the End of World Wars I and even more World War II (Ziegelmayr 2001), and up to now a welfare state has been established, regulating most of relations between the firm and its employees quite strictly by law or collective bargaining. Hence, special commitment to social affairs did not seem to be necessary over a long period of time.

*Development of Environmental regulations, and Environmental Management*

Environmental regulations were at first integrated into other regulations (e.g. industrial plant law), but since the end of the 1970s there has been a massive increase of environmental regulations having the tendency to become stricter. Since the 1980s many authors have pointed out the advantages of a proactive corporate environmental policy that anticipates subsequent legal regulations (Strebel 1980, Strebel 1990, Wicke 1993). This was the go-ahead for *Environmental Management* all throughout Europe, which gained more and more momentum by the end of the 1990s. But then the speed decelerated considerably, due to the remarkable standards that had already been reached and also due to the fact that comprehensive bodies of legal regulations and standards had been established leaving little space for active commitment. So enterprises and academic researchers were looking for a new approach, stressing the social aspects of sustainability more than ecological ones (Hansen & Schrader 2005).

At the same time the Global Compact (Global Compact 2007) brought about sort of globalization of social responsibility. Social and environmental commitment became trendy again, which started up lots of CSR driven projects and was the kickoff for the *age of sustainability reports* (for Austria cf. various reports on [www.nachhaltigkeitsbericht.at](http://www.nachhaltigkeitsbericht.at)). The 2001 EC Green Paper triggered CSR activities in Austria, e.g. the CSR Austria Initiative (as from 2005 “respAct”, [www.respect.at](http://www.respect.at)) or TRIGOS, the Austrian CSR Award ([www.trigos.at](http://www.trigos.at)).

### *Characteristics of the “Austrian” CSR Approach*

There is one major difference between the Anglo-American and the *Austrian* approach to CSR: Anglo-American literature rarely discusses whether CSR altogether should be voluntary (as the Green Paper states). Yet, voluntary action (Carroll prefers calling it *philanthropy*, Carroll 1991), including most CSR projects, is an important part of CSR, but not the main point. According to Carroll’s pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility (Carroll 1979, Carroll 1999), the Concentric Circle approach (Carroll 1991) or also Frederick’s CSR 1 to CSR 4+ (Frederick 1994, Frederick 1998, Waddock 2006), first of all CSR is not a question of voluntariness, but of reasonable economic action in accordance with existing law, linked to the firm’s value chain (Porter & Kramer 2003, Porter & Kramer 2006). Like in *Gender Mainstreaming* (Rees 1998, Squires 2005) CSR must be *mainstreamed*, that is “fully embedded in the day-to-day culture, processes, and activities of a firm” (Berger, Cunningham & Drumwright 2007, Ketola 2008). Or even more like in the well-established notion of *doing gender* (West & Zimmerman 1987) CSR has to be *done* and to be integrated into the firm’s strategy and every-day conduct (Gelbmann 2007).

Yet, many of the Austrian CSR initiatives that gain official support tend to concentrate on voluntary, philanthropic actions or projects (e.g. the TRIGOS). All-embracing, *mainstreamed* concepts of CSR do exist as well, but are rather poorly promoted.

### Implications of CSR for Waste industry

Waste industry altogether and in Austria in special has some very prominent characteristics making it a prime example for the necessity and the benefits of CSR.

*Social Responsibility as a Challenge for Waste Management*

First of all we have to be aware of the fact that waste industry (including sewage services) has to deal with about half of all the material circulating: Every product will one day go through their hands. So although in Austria their GDP contribution is less than 1 % (Statistik Austria 2007), waste industry takes a very important position in economy that can be illustrated best by looking at regions where waste management does not work. Accordingly, waste industry has a big share in the sustainability performance of a country – and therefore has always had to resume considerable social responsibility.

*Social Responsibility as a Task of Stakeholder Relationship*

All the same, waste industry has a very bad image in public perception: They are blamed for getting rich at the expense of others – which seems to be legitimate in a free market economy, as they produce a good that is of value for others: the service of waste disposal. They are also blamed for not intending to reduce the amount of waste produced. But this seems to create sort of a “wag the dog”-situation: The business purpose of waste industry is to help others dispose of their waste. So actually it ought to be all the other industries’ intention to provide goods that produce as little waste as possible. Anyhow, good stakeholder relations, transparent operations, and taking social responsibility with ostentation have always been vital for the economic performance of waste management enterprises.

*Social Responsibility for Reducing the Complexity of Transaction Designs*

Finally, the activities involved in waste management significantly differ from common product or service management: Usually, the goods that are being dealt with are either services or products. In some cases we have goods coming along with services (a CD with a programme that was designed especially for us) or services coming along with products (installation of a new

PC). But in waste management, we have something (the waste) being delivered from the waste producer to the “waste consumer” (the waste management enterprise), but at the same time the waste producer is provided with a service (waste disposal) by the waste management enterprise. So we can identify reciprocal operations going far beyond the usual *product-against-money-relation*, resembling rather an exchange of goods (Gelbmann 2008).

This does not matter, whenever it is clear, that the waste producers simply want to dispose of their waste: Here we have a waste disposal service being provided. It is of no importance either, when talking about materials having a positive price (like scrap iron): Here waste is actually a product.

However, the complex transaction scheme brings about a lot of implications and complications whenever the situation is not so clear and it is not sure who of the two parties involved is the provider and who the consumer of a service/product, e.g. when plastics are involved. On the one hand, this complicates the application of CSR indices like GRI, which are tailored to the requirements of productive OR service sectors. On the other hand, a CSR driven approach directed at satisfying the stakeholders’ needs can help do away with the complexity of relations in this industry, possibly paving the way for even better and more trustful co-operation in this sector.

## Waste Management in Austria

### *Historical Development*

Austrian waste industry has been developing ever since the 1950s and undergoing a fundamental change since the beginning of the 1990s. This change was due to a shift in the environmental consciousness of the Austrian population and to political efforts directed at passing waste management, which had been a municipal task beforehand, into private hands

(Klampfl-Pernold & Gelbmann 2006). In the beginning, the market of waste management had been heterogeneous and confusing. With the change in waste management, the tasks became more and more complex, which drove some of the competitors out of the market, whereas others grew rapidly. A new branch with exponentially growing markets began to boom, and like in other countries, waste turned out to be a valuable asset.

### *Sustainable Waste Management – Legal Basis of Waste Management*

Nowadays, Austrian waste management is dedicated to sustainability. In the preface of a brochure issued by the Austrian Ministry of the Environment, the Federal Minister Josef Pröll says that

the field of waste management which has developed, starting out from the disposal of generated waste according to the precautionary principle, towards the management of resources, in particular of raw materials, energy, and landfill space. Moreover it includes the repair of damage which occurred in the past (Lebensministerium 2006).

To accomplish this, a vast body of legal regulations has been developed to control waste management activities on EU, federal, and province levels, above all the Austrian Waste Management Act (Abfallwirtschaftsgesetz, AWG) from 1990, which was totally revised and reissued in 2002 as *Federal Act on Sustainable Waste Management – Waste Management Act* (here referred to as AWG 2002; Bachmann et al. 2004). According to the Waste Management Act, Austrian waste industry attempts to protect living beings, to conserve resources, to minimize pollution and climate gas emission, to reuse waste materials without causing further harm, and to treat waste in way that is safe for future generations (§ 1.2 AWG 2002). In doing so, they place emphasis on waste prevention in terms of quantity and quality (of hazardous waste), ecologically, and economically sound waste recovery and controlled waste disposal after appropriate treatment (§ 1.3 AWG 2002).

In 2004 the *Landfill Ordinance* outlawed dumping of waste containing more than 5 w % of organic carbon. Since then there has been a shift in treatment from landfilling to thermal and other types of treatment like mechanical-biological treatment, aerobic and anaerobic biotechnical treatment (Federal Waste Management Plan 2006). Thermal treatment is partly effected by incineration plants, but partly also by *co-incineration* with cement industry or pulp and paper industries using the energy content of especially plastic wastes or tires for generating process heat. (Federal Waste Management Plan 2006)

#### *Facts and Figures on Austrian Waste industry*

In Austria, municipalities take the answer for waste collection and disposal of waste. Few cities like Graz or Vienna have their own collection facilities, others run waste management enterprises of their own. Waste Management Associations consist of several municipalities who provide and/or effect waste treatment facilities. A great deal of the Austrian waste management activities have been given into private hands, which initialized the development of collection and recovery systems. Especially the Altstoff Recycling Austria AG (ARA – the collection and recovery system for packaging), founded in 1993, and its affiliates, have a great stake in Austrian waste management, as they organize the collection and treatment of the better part of all packaging materials (ARA 2008).

The ARA and the municipalities closely co-operate with some 200 private waste management enterprises which carry out the better part of the operative tasks of waste collection and treatment (46 %). There are five or six “big players” who have international presence and employ more than 500 employees, the other enterprises are SMEs. Most of them (80 %) are members of the “VOEB”, the Association of Austrian Waste Management Enterprises (VOEB 2008), which has been lobbying the interests of its members since 1982.

In 2006, waste volume added up to 52 million tons, of which 41 % were excavated materials, 12 % waste from demolition and construction, 9 % waste wood, 6 % waste from households, and 2 to 4 % each municipal sewage sludge, green waste, waste from trade and industry, and ashes and sludge from thermal waste treatment. Hazardous waste is regulated specially and listed in *ÖNORM 2100*. It amounts to 2 % of the total waste volume. (Federal Waste Management Plan 2006).

#### CSR relevant features of Austrian Waste industry

Many of today's waste management enterprises in Austria have developed from small hauliers who had one or two garbage trucks or from small fuel providers who also began to dispose waste oil, the first hazardous waste that was paid special attention to. The first waste management enterprises used to be very small and mainly family businesses. Although this has changed by now, there still some characteristics have been left that are especially important to understand their attitude towards social responsibility and CSR.

Vallejo (Vallejo 2008) identifies several characteristics of family firms: The employees show more loyalty and more commitment to the firm, the working atmosphere and the cohesion among the members of the firm are better, the level of participation is higher, and leadership is considerably different from usual firms: Even if the enterprises have grown considerably, owner-managers tend to a patriarchal leadership.

Another characteristic of small, family-run businesses that have grown is a lack of management know-how. During the initial years intuition and shirt-sleeve approaches of the owner-manager are pushing the firm. When it has reached some size, however, strategies have to be developed and operations have to be designed and implemented. As there is no *one-size-fits-all CSR model* (Mitterbauer 2004), synergetic effects arise when economic and management

strategy (e.g. by the use of a Deming PDCA-circle) is developed in accordance with a CSR model that is tailored to the firm's particular requirements.

#### The 2007 CSR in Austrian Waste industry Survey

In spring 2007 we decided to conduct a survey to examine the attitude and efforts of Austrian waste industry as to sustainability and CSR. The underlying hypothesis was that Austrian waste management enterprises have a strong commitment to sustainability, but have not yet really learned about CSR and as a consequence they have not yet found out about the advantages and benefits CSR can effectuate.

#### *Conceptual Design of the Survey*

On the basis of the theoretical research conducted beforehand, we designed a web-based, standardized survey. In order to find out about our research questions we developed a questionnaire, containing open-ended and closed questions treating both sustainability topics in general and the awareness of CSR and the features linked with the concept in Austrian waste industry.

The survey period spanned July and August 2007. The population comprised 172 members of the Association of Austrian Waste Management Enterprises (VOEB), which equals a comprehensive survey of the Austrian waste industry – only sewage treatment and subsidiary enterprises did not form part of the population.

At first we tried to contact our test persons via phone call, and upon their approval we sent an email containing the link to the questionnaire. Non-responding test persons received an email reminder after three weeks.

### *Representativeness and Significance of the Results*

The rate of return was 30.8 %. Its regional spreading corresponds with the regional structure of the Austrian waste industry. Measured by the size of the enterprises (number of staff and turnover), the return and actual population do not match exactly, as all of the “big players” responded, but very few of the smaller firms. But our return represents the bigger part of the waste industry staff and the bigger part of municipalities and enterprises requiring waste disposal services. So we can assume that the return also comprises the bigger part of the main stakeholders and that the results of the survey are representative and significant for the Austrian waste industry as a whole.

### *Results of the Survey*

In the following section of this paper a short outline of the results of the survey will be given. Due to the small number of respondents we could only apply descriptive methods of evaluation.

### *Importance of Sustainability Integration*

Beforehand we had assumed that unlike CSR sustainability would be well-established. This assumption proved to be right: 91.8 % of the waste management enterprises practice sustainable management regularly and have, hence, realized the opportunities for markets and innovation.

An important prerequisite for implementing social responsibility in an enterprise is to assign essential virtues and codes of conduct to the top management (Vogel 2005). 74.4 % of the enterprises have accomplished that, and 68.6 % have even set their code of conduct out in writing.

But although the respondents agree on the importance of a codified definition of virtues, they do not think that these are the main drivers of corporate behaviour, but regard the economic variables as most influencing, followed by ecological and staff driven factors.

### *Certifications as an Indicator for Sustainability*

The paramount importance of economic factors also arises from the question concerning the number and type of certifications. We offered a comprehensive list of certifications and asked the respondents to tick those they have obtained. The results show that economic standards are much more common than ecological and social ones. Barely 50 % of the waste management enterprises hold a certificate in accordance with quality management standard ISO 9000:2000, which shows that economic/organisational performance is most important. Some 38 % are certified with environmental standard ISO 14 000, and at least 16 % hold the certificate *specialised waste disposal operation* (Entsorgungsfachbetrieb – EFB, <http://www.vefb.at/>) in compliance with industry-specific rules that have been provided for demonstrating good practices in waste collection, recovery or disposal. Certified enterprises strive for a high degree of environmental protection and ensure reliability through company audits conducted by independent external auditors (Federal Waste Management Plan 2006).

Most interestingly, the European environmental management regulation EMAS does not seem to play a major role, as none of the responding enterprises stated to be certified in accordance with the EMAS regulation. Yet, the homepage of the Umweltbundesamt, the expert authority of the federal government in Austria for environmental protection and environmental control, displays EMAS certification for some of the enterprises that responded to our survey. Actually this discrepancy is astonishing, and we have not yet found any plausible explication.

Anyway, as to certification standards providing information as to CSR performance or about social performance in special, none of the respondents claimed to have implemented standards like Social Accountability (SA) 8000 or the AA100 Assurance Standard. One of the responding enterprises has a “investors-in-People” label which was designed to help organisations improve performance and realise objectives through the management and development of their people (Investors in People 2008).

#### *Consideration of different CSR-relevant Benefits*

A separate set of questions split the view of sustainable and socially responsive conduct as to organisational, staff related, economic, organizational and ecological benefits that might accrue. Each of the five categories was described by a set of statements featuring the characteristics of the particular category. We developed the statements on the basis of literature (Burke & Logsdon 1996, Graves & Waddock 2000, Laszlo 2003, Cherunilam 2004, Vogel 2005, Chandler & Werther 2006, Cetindamar & Husoy 2007). According to the number of statements provided per category, the respondents were asked to select those three to five features which they personally considered the most important as to the particular category.

The statistical evaluation per category shows the main reasons for the integration of sustainability topics into corporate conduct per category. Due to the method applied in investigating this set of motives for sustainable conduct, the categories cannot be compared among each other. In fact, the rate of approval within a category displays the respondents’ opinion on whether only one or few factors have an impact on the relative category of benefits (high approval of one very few factors) or whether a wider range of factors influences the category (medium approval to several of the factors).

88 % of the respondents think long-term enterprise survival is the most important organisational reason for dealing with sustainability topics, followed by improvement of the value chain (still 71 % approval). For 64 % of the respondents the higher staff empathy with the firm is the most important staff related reason, for 55 % it is the higher motivation of the staff. Where economic reasons for socially responsible behaviour are concerned, more than half of the respondents each choose winning new customers and customer loyalty, intensified focusing on the future, and ensuring product and service qualities. From the social point of view, for 72 % of the respondents the main driver for corporate sustainability is the hope for a positive impact on long-term corporate performance, whereas other drivers do not really meet with major approval. Finally, as to ecological motives for sustainable management efforts, environment protection and safeguarding of resources balance each other, with more than 60 % votes each. Table 1 shows the most important results in detail

Table 1

*Relevance of differing CSR-relevant benefits*

<b>Relevance of staff related factors</b>	
Stronger empathy of staff with the company	63,8 %
Rise of staff motivation	55,3 %
Amelioration of internal communication	51,1 %
<b>Relevance of social factors</b>	
Contribution to company's long-term success	71,7 %
Encouragement of dialogue with external environment	45,7 %
Establishing relationships with local policy makers	43,5 %
<b>Relevance of ecological factors</b>	
Environmental protection	64,4 %
Safeguarding of resources	62,2 %
Compliance with standards and codes	44,4 %
<b>Relevance of organisational factors</b>	
Long-term enterprise survival	87,5 %
Improvement of value chain	70,8 %

Adaptation to challenges in the future	58,3 %
<b>Relevance of economic factors</b>	
Winning new customers and customer loyalty	63,8 %
Focusing on the future	55,3 %
Quality control	51,1 %

Our next step was to contrast these results, which refer to separately classified benefits, to the results of another question which asked the respondents to agree or disagree generally to statements on the benefits that might accrue from sustainable management. 96 % of the respondents agree or highly agree to the statement that sustainable management enhances the corporate image. 91% of the respondents see particular benefits in each of rising staff motivation and the innovative stimuli that result from socially responsible behaviour. Increasing health and safety of the staff and establishing good relationships with the external environment are ranked fourth (88 % of the respondents agree or highly agree). Enterprise survival, which met the highest approval when measured separately (87 %), is only ranked sixth now. From this we can conclude, that enterprise survival is most outstanding among the organisational variables of sustainable management, but not altogether the main driver of social sustainability. The main driver of sustainability efforts seems to be a rise in corporate image. This is exactly in line with the notice that waste industry has a bad image in public perception. So there is one reason more for integrating CSR into the waste management enterprises' strategy and action. The following results will show that this has not been accomplished yet.

#### *Publicity of the CSR-Concept within the Population*

Only half of the respondents knew the notion of CSR, which shows the low degree of awareness of the concept. Less than 20 % of the respondents were able to identify the conduct of their own enterprise as a CSR-activity. Even fewer of the respondents were familiar with

Austrian CSR-initiatives: In an unaided recall only one respondent each was able to name initiatives like respAct, the most prominent CSR initiative in Austria, or Trigos, the Austrian CSR-project award. As to Trigos this may have changed by now after a big Austrian waste management firm was awarded a 2008 Trigos.

How little the respondents relate to CSR becomes apparent from the low number of sustainability tools they are familiar with: In an aided recall more than 90 % state to be familiar with environmental management systems and environmental reports, some 80 % know sustainable development and certification, 70 % have heard about sustainability reports. The degree of awareness of the other notions listed in the questionnaire declines rapidly, and less than 15 % of the respondents are familiar with specific tools like the GRI or Corporate Citizenship. Again this result indicates that essentially the concept of sustainability is well-known, but CSR does not really attract special interest yet.

The respondents who were familiar with CSR quite agree upon the reasons for the poor interest in the concept: 89 % found the benefits (too) hard to measure, and at least two thirds of the respondents give high expenditure of time and a lack of skills as reasons against CSR. Both reasons are quite easy to understand – quite unlike two other points:

78 % of the respondents criticise the sizable bureaucratic efforts that go along with socially responsible conduct, and 69 % criticise the lack of public support as to initiation and coordination of CSR measures. These answers both support the assumption that waste management enterprises are familiar neither with the concept nor with the official Austrian initiatives of CSR: For on the one hand it is part of the nature of CSR to be NON-bureaucratic, but to simply form part of corporate behaviour. On the other hand, in Austria comprehensive public and semi-public support is available (e.g. guidelines, model concepts, government aid for CSR checks, training

programmes) for putting into action CSR initiatives as well as for co-ordinating and measuring CSR performance, but obviously these measures are little known and / or poorly communicated.

### *Communicating CSR*

Communication, however, plays a major role not only in the relationship between the enterprise and public / semi-public institutions, but also between the enterprise and its stakeholders. Thus in our survey we also asked the respondents who were familiar with CSR which tools of communication they make use of as to CSR. 75 % of the responding enterprises use the internet to inform their external stakeholders about their sustainability activities. They also use flyers, emails and publications in local and / or regional print media in order to inform the public about their social responsibility efforts and achievements.

71 % of the respondents use personal face-to-face conversation in order to communicate with the staff, but they also make use of email memos, circulars and the intranet for internal communication on sustainability topics (40 % each).

### *Conclusion and Outlook*

Austrian waste management enterprises have obviously got quite far ahead in putting into action sustainable conduct. They mention manifold motives for dealing with sustainability topics. This shows that sustainable management and social responsibility are closely connected, but involve different prerequisites and varying expectations. The low popularity and poor spreading CSR bears in Austrian waste industry are not up to the enterprises' poor commitment to sustainability, but to the fact that they have not yet fully realized the market relevance of their sustainability activities. Actually it is not relevant whether socially responsible conduct is referred to as CSR, but the CSR approach has already generated a lot of initiatives and tools which can be useful. By regarding and addressing their stakeholders – especially municipalities,

the local environment, and local authorities – not only as to ecological, but also as to social matters - the enterprises will be able to establish a climate of confidence that will add to the long-term survival of the firm.

The respondents' point of view that CSR is too bureaucratic and that there is too little public support is mirrored in their answers. This shows that there is still a big deal to be done to establish the CSR concept in waste industry. On the one hand politicians and interest groups will have to make a considerable effort in order to promote and push the CSR development, on the other hand scientific inputs will be necessary for increasing the awareness of CSR, for mainstreaming CSR in the waste management enterprises everyday-conduct towards stakeholders, for adapting CSR instruments according to the needs of waste industry and finally for measuring CSR benefits and outcome.

Actually, our survey was a first step in this direction: Apart from investigating the extent to which CSR has already been implemented in Austrian waste industry, our survey also had the ambitious intention to make a contribution to enhancing their awareness of CSR. By presenting the benefits of CSR, we also intended to motivate waste management enterprises to find out more about the topic and get involved with CSR. Furthermore we want to encourage firms who have already started *doing CSR* to intensify their efforts.

## References

- Altstoff Recycling Austria AG (2008). Die Leistungen des ARA Systems. Nachhaltigkeitsbericht und Report 2007 (Sustainability report). Vienna.
- Austrian Waste Management Act. Bundesgesetz über eine nachhaltige Abfallwirtschaft (Abfallwirtschaftsgesetz 2002 – AWG 2002), BGBl. I Nr. 102 geändert durch BGBl. I Nr. 43/2004, BGBl. I Nr. 151/2004, BGBl. I Nr. 155/2004, BGBl. I Nr. 181/2004, BGBl. I Nr. 34/2006, BGBl. I Nr. 16/2007, BGBl. I Nr. 43/2007, last changed through Bundesgesetz BGBl. I Nr. 54/2008.
- Bachmann, S. et al.(2004). Besonderes Verwaltungsrecht. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Wien: Springer 2004.
- Bassen, A., Jastram, S. & Meyer, K. (2005). Corporate Social Responsibility. Eine Begriffsklärung. Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik., 6, 231-26.
- Berger I.E., Cunningham P.H. & Drumwright M.E. (2007). Mainstreaming Corporate Social Responsibility. Developing markets for virtue. California Management Review, 49, 132-157.
- Bowen, H.R. (1953): Social responsibilities of the businessman, New York: Harper and Row.
- Burke, L. & Logsdon, J. M. (1996). How Corporate Social Responsibility pays off. Long Range Planning, 29, 495-502.
- Carroll A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of Corporate Performance. The Academy of Management Review, 4, 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility. Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. Business Horizons, 34, 39-48.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility. Evolution of a definitional construct. Business & Society, 28, 268-295.
- Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry

- Cetindamar, D. & Husoy K. (2007). Corporate Social Responsibility practices and environmentally responsible behavior. The case of the United Nations Global Compact. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76, 163–176.
- Chandler, D. & Werther W. B. (2006). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility. Stakeholders in a global environment*. London-New Delhi: Sage.
- Cherunilam, F. (2004). *International Business. Text and Cases*. 3rd edition. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Cragg, W. (2002). Business ethics and stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12, 113-142.
- EU Regulation No. 761/2001 of the European Parliament and Council of 19 March 2001 allowing voluntary participation of organisations in a community eco-management and audit scheme.
- European Commission (2001). *Promoting a European framework for Corporate Social Responsibility. Green Paper*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Environment and Water Management (eds.) (2006). *Federal Waste Management Plan 2006*. Vienna.
- Frederick, W. C. (1994). From CSR1 to CSR2. *Business and Society*, 33, 150-164.
- Frederick, W. C. (1998). Moving to CSR4. What to pack for the trip. *Business and Society*, 37, 40-59.
- Freeman, R. E. & Phillips R.A. (2002). Stakeholder theory. A libertarian defense. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12, 331-349.

- Garriga E. & Mele D. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 51–71.
- Gelbmann, U. & Kulhanek, K. (2008). Was kann CSR für die Abfallwirtschaft leisten? *VOEB Magazin*, 14, 10-11.
- Gelbmann, U. (2007): Entwicklung und Implementierung eines österreichischen Gütezeichens für Corporate Social Responsibility. In Martinuzzi, A. & Tiroch, M. (Eds.) *Umweltwirtschaft. International, interdisziplinär und innovativ*. Vienna: Schriftenreihe des Research Institute for Managing Sustainability der Wirtschaftsuniversität, 151-158.
- Gelbmann, U. (2008): Müll ist Materie am falschen Ort – Zu den Implikationen des Verwertungsparadoxons in der Abfallwirtschaft. In Wagner, A., Eberlein, J. K. & Schwarz, U. (Eds.) *Abfallmoderne. - ein Symposium zu den Schmutzrändern der Gegenwartskultur* Münster et al. 2008 (in print).
- Graves, S. B. & Waddock, S. A. (2000). Beyond built to last... Stakeholder relations in „built-to-last“ companies. *Business and Society Review*, 105, 393-418.
- Gütezeichenfachausschuss der Österreichischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Förderung der Qualität ÖQA (ed.) (2007). *Güterichtlinie Corporate Social Responsibility*, Wien: ÖQA.
- Hansen, U. & Schrader, U. (2005). Corporate Social Responsibility als aktuelles Thema der Betriebswirtschaftslehre. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 65. 373-395.
- Ketola. T. (2008). A holistic Corporate Responsibility model. Integrating values, discourses and actions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 419–435.
- Klampfl-Pernold, H. & Gelbmann, U. (2006). *Quantensprünge in der Abfallwirtschaft. Entwicklung eines innovationsorientierten Phasenmodells der europäischen Abfallwirtschaft*. Aachen: Shaker.
- Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry

Landfill Ordinance (2004). Verordnung über die Ablagerung von Abfällen (Deponieverordnung)

BGBI. Nr. 164/1996 as published in BGBI. II Nr. 49/2004

Laszlo, C. (2003). *The sustainable company. How to create value through social and environmental Performance.* Washington: Island Press.

Lebensministerium, ed. (2006): *Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft: Sustainable waste management in Austria.* Vienna.

Loew, T. & Braun, S. (2006). *Organisatorische Umsetzung von CSR. Vom Umweltmanagement zur Sustainable Corporate Governance.* Berlin: Institute 4 Sustainability.

Matten, D. & Crane A. (2005). *Corporate Citizenship. Towards an extended theoretical conceptualization,* *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 166-179.

Matten, D., Crane, A. & Chapple, W. (2003), *Behind the mask. Revealing the true face of Corporate Citizenship.* *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45, 109-120.

Mitterbauer, P (2004). *Mit Verantwortung wachsen.* In Köppl, P.& Neureiter, M. (Eds.) *Corporate Social Responsibility. Leitlinien und Konzepte im Management der gesellschaftlichen Verantwortung von Unternehmen.* Vienna: Linde, 97-104.

Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M. R. (2002). *The competitive advantage of Corporate Philanthropy.* *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 56-68.

Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M. R. (2006). *Strategy and society. The link between competitive advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility.* *Harvard Business Review*, 84, 78-92.

Rees, T. (1998). *Mainstreaming equality in the European Union. Education, training and labour market policies.* London: Routledge.

Riess, B. (2006). *Verantwortung für die Gesellschaft. Verantwortlich für das Geschäft.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry

- Ruggie, J. G. (2002). The theory and practice of learning networks. *Corporate Social Responsibility and the Global Compact. Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 5, 27-36
- Seebacher U., Friesenbichler M., Gelbmann U. & Suschek-Berger J. (2005). Making Corporate Social Responsibility operational. In Oehme, I. & Seebacher, U. (Eds.): *Corporate Sustainability. Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches*. Munich, Vienna: Profil, 147-169.
- Squires, J. (2005) Is mainstreaming transformative? Theorising mainstreaming in the context of diversity and deliberation. *Social Politics*, 12, 366–388.
- Strebel, H. (1980). *Umwelt und Betriebswirtschaft. Die natürliche Umwelt als Gegenstand der Unternehmenspolitik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.
- Strebel, H. (1990). *Industrie und Umwelt*. In Schweitzer, M. et al (Eds.). *Industriebetriebslehre* (pp 697-779). Munich: Vahlen (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1994 pp. 747-848).
- Vallejo, M. C. (2008). Is the culture of family firms really different? A value-based model for its survival through generations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 261–279.
- Vogel, D. (2005). Is there a market for virtue? The business case for Corporate Social Responsibility. *California Management Review*, 47, 18-45.
- West, C. & Zimmerman D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125-151
- Wicke, L. (1993). *Umweltökonomie. Eine praxisorientierte Einführung*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Munich: Vahlen
- Wood, D. J. & Logsdon J. M (2002). Business Citizenship. From individuals to organizations. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12. 3, 59–94.
- Yoder, T.S. (2001). Corporate responsibility and the environment. *Business and Society Review*, 106, 255-272.

Zakheim, A. (2008). Stakeholder Management Capability. A discourse–theoretical approach.  
Journal of Business Ethics, 79, 395–405.

Ziegelmayr, V. (2001). Sozialstaat in Deutschland. Ein Systemwechsel? In K. Kraus, K., T.  
Geisen (eds.): Sozialstaat in Europa. Geschichte, Entwicklung, Perspektiven (pp. 63-88).  
Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weblinks:

ARA 2008: Homepage of the collection and recovery system for packaging URL

<http://www.ara.at>, Aug. 14<sup>th</sup> 2008

Global Compact Office (ed.) (2007). Corporate Citizenship in the world economy. New York:  
United Nations 50761

[http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/about\\_the\\_gc/gc\\_brochure\\_final.pdf](http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/about_the_gc/gc_brochure_final.pdf), Aug. 14<sup>th</sup>  
2008

Investors in People 2008: Homepage of Investors in People UK, URL

<http://www.investorsinpeople.co.uk>, Aug. 14<sup>th</sup> 2008

V.EFB 2008: Homepage of the Association to Award the Certification to Specialized Waste  
Management Companies URL <http://www.vefb.at>, Aug. 14<sup>th</sup> 2008

VOEB 2008: Homepage of the Association of Austrian Waste Management Enterprises URL

<http://www.voeb.at>, Aug. 14<sup>th</sup> 2008

Umweltbundesamt 2008: Homepage of the expert authority of the federal government in Austria  
for environmental protection and environmental control, URL

<http://www.umweltbundesamt.at>, Aug. 14<sup>th</sup> 2008

Sustainability and CSR in Austrian Waste Industry