

A Study on the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Art

Sezgin SAVAŞ*

Abstract

The Purpose of the Study: This study explores the relationship between corporate social responsibility and art as well as the consideration of art as a topic of interest in terms of corporate social responsibility. Corporations devise various corporate social responsibility projects.

Literature Review/Background: Art is an essential part of these projects. Art forms the basis of society, constitutes reality, and plays a significant role in the upbringing of the individuals who adopt a sensitive, solution-oriented, consistent, conscious, and critical approach to social issues. Art is an instrument of transformation which has a positive impact on the society.

Method: The study provides the relevant literature review on the topic and establishes a connection between corporate social responsibility and art. The tendency of corporations to be involved in the activities of art as part of corporate social responsibility is discussed through the exploration of the inclinations of corporations at a macro scale.

Results: The study examines the emergence and the importance of the concept of social responsibility in order to discuss the present-day scope of corporate social responsibility in more detail. The study puts art under scrutiny as a wide area of responsibility attributed to corporations as well as the tendency of corporations to support art because of its social role.

Conclusion: The study shows that corporate social responsibility and art are closely related. It also lays bare that corporations are indeed interested in the involvement in the activities of art and this is caused by the factors such as personal views, needs and expectations of the society.

Keywords: Social Responsibility, Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporation and Society, Art and Society, Social Impact

Derleme Makale (Review Article)

Geliş / Received: 08.12.2021 **Kabul / Accepted:** 10.02.2022

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İktisadi İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi, Yeni Medya ve İletişim Bölümü, İstanbul, Türkiye, E-posta: ssavas@gelisim.edu.tr ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2141-1055>

Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk ve Sanat Bağlantısı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

Öz

Giriş ve Çalışmanın Amacı: Bu çalışma, kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk ile sanat arasında bağlantı ve sanatın kurumlar tarafından bir kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk konusu olarak benimsenmesinin önemi üzerinde durulmasına odaklanmaktadır.

Kavramsal/Kurumsal Çerçeve: Kurumlar pek çok farklı konuda kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk projeleri üretmektedir. İlgili projeler kapsamında öne çıkan konulardan biri de sanat olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Sanat bir toplumun temelini oluşturmakta, gerçekliği inşa etmekte, toplumsal sorunlara daha yüksek oranda duyarlı, çözüm odaklı, tutarlı, bilinçli ve eleştirel bireylerin yetişmesinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Sanat toplumu ve geleceği olumlu anlamda dönüştürmenin/şekillendirmenin bir aracı olarak konumlanmaktadır.

Yöntem: Çalışmada konu ile ilgili literatür taranmış ve kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk ile sanat arasında bağlantı kurulmuştur. Kurumların sahip oldukları eğilimler makro düzlemde ele alınarak kurumların kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk konusunda sanat uygulamalarına yönelme eğilimleri tartışılmıştır.

Bulgular: Çalışmada, sosyal sorumluluk anlayışının ortaya çıkış temelleri ve önemi irdelenmiş, ilgili kavramın kurumlar üzerinden sorgulanması gerçekleştirilmiş ve kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk anlayışının günümüzdeki kapsamı tartışılmıştır. Günümüzde kurumlara geniş çerçevede atfedilen sorumluluk alanlarından biri olan sanat değerlendirmeye tabi tutulmuş, sanatın toplumsal rolü kapsamında kurumlar tarafından desteklenme eğiliminin temelleri irdelenmiştir.

Sonuç: Çalışmada kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk ile sanat arasında yakın bir ilişki bulunduğu görülmüştür. Kurumların sanat ile ilgilenme eğilimlerinin varlığı ortaya koyularak bu eğilimin nedenleri arasında toplumsal beklenti, toplumların ihtiyaçları ve kişisel görüşlerin olduğu belirtilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Sorumluluk, Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, Kurum ve Toplum, Sanat ve Toplum, Toplumsal Etki

1. Introduction

Today, corporations are defined as living organisms. Corporations as living organisms, akin to humans, exist in society in the form of active agents. Corporations influence the social milieu and are, at the same time, influenced by it. Therefore, they should be thought of within the context of the society and the environment in which they are located. Accordingly, the sense of responsibility that the corporations feel towards the society and the social milieu becomes a sort of obligation.

Concept of social responsibility comes to the fore when one thinks about the sense of responsibility. Corporate social responsibility ascribes a wide area of responsibility, which the corporations should take upon themselves (towards internal and external stakeholders) in the first place, to the corporations. In doing so, it contributes to the corporations' code of ethics. Corporations make profit through the business they conduct within the social milieu. Thus, it is necessary that some of the profit that the corporations make should be shared with the society.

Art is one of the main things to be discussed in terms of corporate social responsibility. Art is of interest to corporations as much as it is to individuals and governments. It is a known fact that art is now sponsored by many corporations. Since art is vital for the advancement of the society, investments made in art are indeed crucial for humanity.

This study, accordingly, explores the connexion between the sense of social responsibility and art. The study first puts under scrutiny the concept of social responsibility, followed by a reconsideration of the concept in terms of corporations in order to lay bare the foundation and the structure of the sense of corporate social responsibility. Last but not least, the study examines the relationship between art and corporate social responsibility as well as the significance of regarding art as an aspect of corporate social responsibility.

2. The Sense of Being Responsible for the Other: On the Concept of Social Responsibility

Although there are various definitions of the concept of social responsibility, the concept itself is thought to be as old as the human history. In order to understand the concept of social responsibility, one must first define responsibility.

Responsibility has to do with the consequences of one's behaviour. According to the Turkish Language Association (TDK), responsibility is "taking full accountability of the consequences of one's own actions or of an incident occurring within one's bailiwick; liability" (TDK, t.y). Responsibility can also be defined as "the whole of the responsibilities expected to be taken by the person who takes on something" (Korkmaz, 2009, pp. 19). Responsibility is, then, doing what one needs to do for his/her relatives, country, and the entire humanity without violating someone else's rights (Korkmaz, 2009, pp. 20). In other words, it can be described as a response to a call or something that appears to us as call (Spivak, 1994, pp. 22). Responsibility is closely related to philosophy and law and thus can be viewed as an issue of ethics. Therefore, the topics such as the relationship of behaviour and punishment with moral cause also gain importance (Korkmaz, 2009, pp. 20).

One of the first philosophers who suggests that one should feel responsible to the society is Plato (Bayraktaroğlu et al., 2009, pp. 33). Similarly, Socrates and Aristotle also discuss the issue

of responsibility (Korkmaz, 2009, pp. 26). Furthermore, it has been proved that there exist on the Sumerian cuneiforms and in the code of Hammurabi writings about mutual responsibility (Yamak, 2007, pp. 10). The texts written in the Ancient Greece show that the behaviours of human beings and superhumans were subject to both praise and blame. Aristotle, too, talks about moral responsibility with regard to (praising or criticising) human agency. Whether the act is committed voluntarily or not is also something to be taken into consideration when assessing the morality of the act. In other words, the person committing the act should be held accountable if the act was committed willingly. In the Middle Ages, responsibility was approached from a theological vantage point and the idea of free will was questioned. Accordingly, two different approaches were developed in terms of causal determinism and moral responsibility in the medieval era. First of which argues that questioning free will does not make one to be held morally responsible for anything, whereas the second asserts that although everything (i.e. who the person is and what s/he does) is predetermined, individuals can still be held accountable for what they do (Eshleman, 2014). Thus, it would be safe to say that the anxiety of moral responsibility being at the core of the discussions on free will is a historical fact (Strawson, 1994, pp. 8).

Frederick Strawson's approach to responsibility is different from these two result-oriented approaches that focus on virtue and merit. Frederick Strawson emphasises that the attitudes in personal relationships vary; therefore, can be changed and temporarily suspended. According to him, one can tolerate a behaviour based on good will and thinking that it was an accident. Correspondingly, behaviours can be justified for the greater good. Moreover, he argues that a more objective attitude can be adopted for the people who lack moral maturity. Strawson, in brief, underlines that both the result-oriented approach and the approach that focuses on virtue and merit considerably intellectualise moral responsibility. Therefore, it is safe to say that the concept of responsibility, namely the practice of accountability, is based not only on an external rationalisation but also on internal principles. The roles that reactive attitudes and interpersonal relations play within this context is also something to be taken into consideration. Some of the agents are condemned while the others are praised because some of them take advantage of our goodwill, whereas the others either meet or exceed our expectations (Eshleman, 2014). This is indicative of the fact that how one views responsibility can also be influenced by personal opinions. In addition, personal attitudes can take various forms depending on time and culture (Strawson, 2008, pp. 26).

When we tell someone that s/he is responsible for the damage caused, we intend to attribute sensitive attitudes, judgments, and actions unto them (Feinburg, 1968, pp. 674). This implies that certain circumstances should come into play for someone to be held accountable

for something. First of these is that the individual must do something himself/herself or take part in doing something. Second is that the thing which has been done must be wrongful, harmful or evil. Third is that if the individual is really responsible for the harmful consequences, then a cause-and-effect relationship must be identified between the behaviour and the outcome. If the fault has nothing to do with the cause, then this causes an ambiguity. Accordingly, "contributory fault" can be considered important in terms of responsibility. To be more specific, in order for an individual to be held responsible, one needs to show more than just the behaviour of the particular individual. Here, accordingly, complete and incomplete actions come into play.

Being morally accountable for an action means to receive praise or blame in return (Eshleman, 2014). This condition of receiving a response provides a basis for the future behaviours. When we regulate the behaviours in the desired way or when our beliefs in the efficiency of the behaviours are proven to be wrong, this gives us a good reason either to get rid of that particular attitude or to change it for the better (Strawson, 2008, pp. 27). This is also essential in order to be able to live in a society with others.

Humans are social species and thus are dependent on each other (Žižek & Mulej, 2013, pp. 325). Therefore no one can live without being part of a society (Arendt, 1987, pp. 45). The sense of responsibility is a necessity for people to co-exist in a society (Korkmaz, 2009, pp. 20). Responsibility is a sort of emotion that people feel for each other and for the social milieu that they are a part of. In other words, it refers to one's obligations to others and it "comes to the fore when a person is assigned certain duties" (Korkmaz, 2009, pp.20).

Responsibility is usually discussed within the context of the individuals' incomplete and complete actions but this personal approach to responsibility should be left behind. Since humans are gregarious species, responsibility should not be thought of as something which only refers to an individual's own behaviours. In some cases, people might be held accountable for the actions that they themselves did not commit but only because they are part of a certain community (Arendt, 1987, pp. 48). People do not always feel responsible for others only due to their own behaviours and actions. They can also feel responsible for others if they go through something due to external factors (which are beyond themselves).

This shows how the people in a society are dependent upon each other. This demonstrates that people feel responsible for others in a social order and that they have a sense of social responsibility. Socialisation gives people certain responsibilities, but at the same time strengthens their bond. People get closer to each other through the feeling of responsibility that they have for one another. Moreover, they also get motivated to make the society that

they are a part of and the social environment that they live in better. Very much like people, corporations today are considered as social actors. This leads us to the concept of corporate social responsibility, which is an extension of social responsibility.

3. Corporation as Social Citizen: A Consideration of the Concept of Social Responsibility

Today, corporations are defined as living organisms. This tendency makes attributing humane aspects to corporations possible. Similar to people, corporations are discussed in terms of personality, culture, identity, and image and thus located within a certain social milieu as an actor. This circumstance of operating within a certain social milieu has certain implications in terms of responsibility, generating the concept of corporate social responsibility.

Corporate social responsibility stands for the liability of a corporation for being accountable to all of its stakeholders (Nicolau, 2008, pp. 991). "Corporate social responsibility is a liability to improve public welfare via voluntary business practices and corporate resources" (Kotler & Lee, 2008, pp. 2-3). The concept of corporate social responsibility, in broad terms, can be defined as follows: (1) the activities that are located outside the legal obligations; (2) the activities that are required to be taken into consideration from a social, economic, ecological, and ethical perspective; (3) the activities that also give weight to profitability when aiming for a high stakeholder satisfaction; (4) the activities that are devised to carry the corporation, along with its social milieu, into the future (Çeritoğlu, 2011, pp. 23).

Although the importance given to social responsibility, as pointed out above, is as old as the human history, the concept of corporate social responsibility came to the fore in 1950s. The modern age of corporate social responsibility began with Howard Bowen's *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. Following the relatively uneventful 1950s, the social movements for civil rights, women's rights, and consumer rights as well as the conservation movement gained importance in the 1960s, giving way to the emergence of an activist spirit, which pioneered the movement of the modern corporate social responsibility. The idea that a corporation had responsibilities not only to its own shareholders but also to the other stakeholders was beginning to emerge. In 1970s, the social transformation of the business world became even more significant and the responses given to the social and the public issues by the corporations became more official and institutionalised in tone. In 1980s, corporate social responsibility gained more legitimacy. Within those 10 years corporate social responsibility achieved stability and people's attention focused on the reason for the illegal corporate behaviours and its possible solutions rather than charity and public relations. In 1990s, globalisation became a significant factor. Due to the enhancing of corporations' global

competitive capacity, corporations' international images became more visible as well as vulnerable. The risk that this development posed were widely discussed. This situation that the corporations found themselves in encouraged them to devise the enterprises that will help them carry out their responsibilities more carefully. Also became important was the idea that a balance needed to be maintained between the groups of stakeholders (Caroll, 2015, pp. 87-88).

As the public awareness raises, what is expected of the corporations also increases. In other words, the scope of the area of responsibility attributed to corporations widens (Ilıcak Aydınalp, 2013, pp. 7). Today, this tendency is on the rise and thus what is expected of the corporations is also increased. Now the corporations are expected to be involved in everything related to the society and the environment. Corporate social responsibility encompasses the topics that include both people and environment (Kotler & Lee, 2008, pp. 3). Although in recent history the corporations were attributed certain financial responsibilities, nowadays the idea that corporations need to respond to the society's social, economic, and political needs prevails (Ilıcak Aydınalp, 2013, pp. 6). Accordingly, corporate social responsibility contributes to the business world in terms of ethical behaviour and economic development. It is also regarded as a guarantor for the improvement of the labour force and the quality of life as well as of the local community and the society (Moir, 2001, pp. 18).

At the core of the idea of social responsibility lies the liability of corporations in social development. Corporations should see themselves as citizens and act as a member of the society (Tak, 2009, pp. 3-4). A corporation must consider the possible effects of its actions on the society and the environment beforehand (Ilıcak Aydınalp, 2013, pp. 6). Each corporate activity has certain effects on people and environment. These effects are the main focal points of social responsibility. Corporations need to think about the possible effects of their actions and produce solutions if necessary. Hence 'accountability'. Corporations need to accept responsibility for their actions that effect people and environment (Ilıcak Aydınalp, 2013, pp. 6). In order for a corporation to prove that it has embodied the understanding of corporate social responsibility, it needs to take responsibility for its actions and be held accountable to the public.

The main idea of corporate social responsibility is that business and society are not separate entities but are interwoven (as cited in Moir, 2001, pp. 16). Therefore, it is safe to say that corporate social responsibility is inseparable from the corporation and its environment. In order for a corporation to possess social responsibility, the sense of responsibility should be on a voluntary basis rather than being imposed upon by the law (Kotler & Lee, 2008, pp. 3).

Corporate social responsibility can only be practised ideally through the internalisation of this understanding.

The existence of corporate social responsibility depends on the contract between the corporation and the society (Cadbury, 2006, pp. 12). Within the context of this contract, corporate social responsibility can be regarded as a form of self-regulation which contributes to the social (as well as the environmental) welfare (Moon, 2007, pp. 299). Corporate social responsibility means pushing profit into the background for the sake of social interests (Benabou & Tirole, 2010, pp. 2). Corporations make contributions to the society only when there is profit in it and when they are socially responsible to do so (Moir, 2001, pp. 17). Even though the first goal of any corporation is to gain profit, some part of the profit gained through the society and the environment should be given back to the society and the environment (Özgen, 2006, pp. 25). The aforementioned contract also characterises the relationship between the society and the corporation. There exists a mutual understanding between the society and the corporation; therefore, corporations must operate within the boundaries of this framework. Society sets the rules and corporations must follow these rules. Corporations can also be considered as moral agents as they should reflect and reinforce the values of the society in which they operate (Tak, 2009, pp. 4).

But why corporations put emphasis on corporate social responsibility? Because they want to distinguish themselves from the other corporations (Ilıcak Aydıralp, 2013, pp. 3). Moreover, although there are various variables that influence the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability, it would not be wrong to say that there is positive correlation between corporate social responsibility and profitability. It is commonly argued that the corporations which focus on corporate social responsibility are financially rewarded by the market (Carroll, 2015, pp. 89). Conversely, it is argued that the corporations which do not give importance to corporate social responsibility are intentionally punished by the customers. Therefore, it is safe to assert that corporate social responsibility is vital for a corporation's survival and success (Kanji & Chopra, 2010, pp. 123).

Corporate social responsibility can be said to enforce a corporation's legitimacy and reputation, reduce expenditure and risks, give competitive advantage, and benefit everyone through synergy. In other words, the corporate social responsibility policy allows a corporation to establish new lines of business, maintain its customers, develop relationships with customers and suppliers, attract potential employees, reduce risks, distinguish itself from other corporations, gain access to investment and financing activities, mold public opinion, and create opportunities in terms of media (Carroll, 2015, pp. 89). Ergo, corporate social

responsibility is useful not only for profitability but also for employees, customers, stakeholders, society, and environment (Kanji & Chopra, 2010, pp. 119).

Who do the corporations feel responsible to? Stakeholders. The stakeholder theory argues that corporations have responsibilities to both internal and external stakeholders (Galbreath, 2009, pp. 111). Corporate social responsibility is closely related to creating value for the stakeholders. Although corporate social responsibility is generally thought to be related only to the external stakeholders, it also focuses on the internal stakeholders and the employees. Though corporate social responsibility projects are usually for the external environment, the significance of the internal stakeholders should always be taken into consideration.

The concepts of corporate social responsibility and charity need to be distinguished carefully. Charity can be defined as initiatives that are undertaken without expecting anything in return and that serve someone else's interests (Campa & Zijlmans, 2019, pp. 819). Corporate social responsibility does not stand for charity. It distinguishes itself from charity in its ability to create a competitive advantage. The corporations that engage in corporate social responsibility get incentives such as tax reduction and exemption (Ilicak Aydinalp, 2013, pp. 7). It can also be pointed out that corporate social responsibility generates indirect financial gain by influencing potential customers through creating an image.

Corporate social responsibility activities can focus on public health, safety, crime prevention, employment, environment, social and economic development, and human needs (Kotler & Lee, 2008, pp. 4). The scope of the tasks undertaken within the context of corporate social responsibility go beyond the corporation's immediate environment and support sports, arts, and education (Benabou & Tirole, 2010, pp. 2). The arts, accordingly, is one of the main categories of corporate social responsibility.

4. The Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Art

The tendency to support the arts dates back at least to 14th century. In 1300s, bankers supported the arts in order to atone for being rich. The Medici family's patronage and supporting the arts was for the sake of public reputation and nobility. Accordingly, it would not be wrong to consider art as a tool for social status (Campa & Zijlmans, 2019, pp. 818). This approach has changed in today's world and the corporate approach to art is now discussed in terms of sponsorship and corporate social responsibility.

There are thousands of accumulated years in the human history and this whole body of the moments/experiences constitute collective memory. Art, accordingly, reflects the existence of humankind as a preserver and conveyor of these moments and experiences

(Tuna, 2020, pp. 21). Art stands for something that has aesthetic value and consistency, and a work that is displayed in appropriate places (Alexander, 2021, pp. 2). Art is subjective beauty turned into an object; personal description of beauty and aesthetic turned into physical representation (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 312). Art, in broad terms, is a human activity which discovers and creates the new reality in a visionary fashion and presents this new reality symbolically and metaphorically (Dickie, 1969, pp. 256).

Art, at present times, is seen as an instrument which provides people with certain skills as well as an instrument for entertainment and escapism (Aslan, 2016, pp. 292). As the aforementioned definitions illustrate, art means so much more than all of these. Art is a form of mechanism which helps people make sense of their reality (Altıntaş & Eliri, 2012, pp. 63). Therefore, art is much more than a simple leisure activity. Art is something true; an object of knowledge. The changes in one's cognitive perception cause certain changes in one's behaviour. This leads one to question the cultural milieu in which s/he is located and thus gain a new perspective on life (Aslan, 2016, pp. 293). Ernst Fisher states the following in his *The Necessity of Art*:

"(...) Art can transform one from a fragmented state into a state of wholeness. It allows one to understand the truth. It not only helps one make reality bearable but also makes reality more humane, worthy of humanity. Art itself is a social reality." (as cited in Aslan, 2016, pp. 293).

Art makes the cultivation of individuals who can adopt a critical approach towards the social problems and create value possible. This critical approach is not confined only to art. It spreads through all phenomena (Ünver, 2016, pp. 871). This means that art is a part of the society and thus cannot be isolated. The overall rate of inclusion of the works of art into life determines how civilised a society is (Ünver, 2016, pp. 875). Art enables people to be sensitive to social issues and to take part in solving these issues, to create values, and to be consistent. Art also cherishes mutual respect and encourages people to be respectful to one another. Art is foundational to the development of a society.

"What is art for?" is a complex question whose answer varies. Art can be for the individual, society, country, humanity, and for its own sake. Notwithstanding this debate, art is a productive activity that makes considerable contributions to society. A society's ways of living and thinking are related to education and art. Giving importance to education, science, and art means giving importance to the future of the society. This encourages the members of the society to go beyond the limits and expand their horizons (Aslan, 2016, pp. 292-295). Art and culture are a society's living, evolving, and changing living organisms. Therefore, sustaining

cultural and art activities means sustaining the society (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 311). Art, accordingly, is the principal element of cognitive enlightenment.

The social impact of art is of great importance here. Art should have a certain impact on society. The term impact presumes a cause-and-effect relationship. The social impact of art refers to a mechanism which directly and constantly affects people's lives (Galloway, 2009, pp. 126). In today's atmosphere of fast-moving consumer goods, changes need to occur quickly. Therefore, supporting arts and culture has become an obligation (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 311).

Arts and culture can be supported by individuals, governments, and private corporations (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 312-313). Corporations expect certain things in return for their support. Gaining things like tax reduction, which contributes to productivity and profitability, in return encourages corporations to make investments or donations (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 313). Engaging in the activities of art and supporting the arts, in addition, helps a corporation to build a corporate image and to have a positive impact on the employee attitude and productivity (Campa & Zijlmans, 2019, pp. 818). Therefore, corporations put emphasis on the issue of impact. The term impact can be discussed in terms of two vantage points: a positive impact (1) on the development of society and (2) on the corporation's profitability and image. This binary state, which is inherent in corporate social responsibility, can also be located in the practices of art. Corporations are involved in the projects regarding education, arts and culture, environment, social issues, civil rights, and sports based on their goals or interests (Iamandi & Constantin, 2021, pp. 1123). Social demands are significant here. Social demands constitute the basis for what the corporations will focus on. If the society's expectations are centred upon the arts, then the chances for the corporations to be involved in the activities related to arts and culture raise dramatically. Also important in terms of supporting the arts are the former experiences of the founders and executives concerning the activities of arts (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 316).

Corporate social responsibility projects on arts, therefore, stand for much more than mere charities. As mentioned above, corporate social responsibility initiatives and charity are different things. Charity, for corporations, can be defined as initiatives that support corporate goals (Bulut & Yumrukaya, 2009, pp. 313-314). Corporate social responsibility, on the other hand, is a form of practice which incorporates the idea of charity to a certain extent and aims to have a certain impact as well as to fulfil certain objectives. Since arts have the potential to have a considerable impact on the society, corporations tend to focus on art as part of corporate social responsibility. Supporting the arts, accordingly, is a win-win for the corporations and the society.

5. Conclusion

Art is an inseparable part of the society. Throughout the human history, art has always been important. Although the reasons behind the importance given to art has varied occasionally, its importance has always been permanent. Likewise, in modern society art is given significance and held in high regard.

Investments made in art contributes to the development of society. As such, art is a symbol of advancement and civilisation. The societies that are underdeveloped in terms of art are doomed to be underdeveloped in the other areas as well. The critical perspective and awareness that art promotes extend into all of the social practices. In broad terms, art nourishes individualization.

Many social actors such as individuals, governments, and private corporations play a role in supporting the arts. The formerly dominant idea that social issues are so important that they need to be taken care of by governments instead of private corporations has undergone a change. Social issues are now considered collective problems and the private corporations which make profit over the society should be involved in these just like the members of the society and the government. In the modern approach to management, the aforementioned forms of involvement give way to the emergence of such concepts as charity, sponsorship, and corporate social responsibility.

Corporations as social agents are interested in various social issues such as education, health, sports, environment, civil rights and animal rights, equality, and art. Which of these the corporations will be more interested in depends on many factors like personal views, needs and expectations of the society. Corporations are involved in the projects of corporate social responsibility to make up for the damage that they have caused. The former experiences of the founders and executives concerning corporate social responsibility play an important role in terms of decision-making. The needs of society are also considerably significant in terms of corporate social responsibility. One of the main reasons why corporations are involved in corporate social responsibility is to build a corporate image. That is why they are susceptible to the views of the 'other'. In order for corporations to leave a better impression in the eyes of the stakeholders, they need to meet their needs. Therefore, social demands are the key determinant of a corporation's direction in terms of corporate social responsibility.

Corporate social responsibility projects are usually about the things that would benefit society. If one of the goals of corporate social responsibility is to make a contribution to the

development of society, supporting the arts is one of the best ways to do it. Investing in arts means investing in humanity and in the future.

REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER, V. D. (2021). *Sociology of the arts*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- ARENDRT, H. (1987). Collective responsibility. S. J. James W. Bernauer (ed.) In *Amor mundi* (pp. 43-50). Springer, Dordrecht.
- ASLAN, E. (2016). Üretici bir etkinlik alanı olarak sanat eğitiminin toplumsal gerekliliği, *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5 (3), 290-296.
- ALTINTAŞ, O., ELİRİ, İ. (2012). Birey toplum ilişkisinde kent kültürü, kamusal alan ve onda şekillenen sanat olgusu. *İDİL Sanat ve Dil Dergisi*, 1 (5), 61-74.
- BÉNABOU, R., TIROLE, J. (2010). Individual and corporate social responsibility. *Economica*, 77 (305), 1-19.
- BAYRAKTAROĞLU, G., İLTER, B. & TANYERİ, M. (2009). *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk: pazarlamada yeni bir paradigmaya doğru*. İstanbul: Literatürk.
- BULUT, D., YUMRUKAYA, C. B. (2009). Corporate social responsibility in culture and art. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 20 (3), 311-320.
- CADBURY, A. (2006). Corporate social responsibility. *Twenty-First Century Society*, 1 (1), 5-21.
- CAMPA, D., ZIJLMANS, E. W. A. (2019). Corporate social responsibility recognition and support for the arts: Evidence from European financial institutions. *European Management Journal*, 37 (6), 818-827.
- CARROLL, A. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44 (2), 87-96.
- CERİTOĞLU, A. B. (2011). *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk*. İstanbul: Yalın Yayıncılık.
- DICKIE, G. (1969). Defining art. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 6 (3), 253-256.
- ESHLEMAN, A. (2014). "Moral Responsibility". Philosophy Faculty Publications and Presentations. http://pilotscholars.up.edu/phl_facpubs/1
- FEINBERG, J. (1968). Collective responsibility. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 65 (21), 674-688.

GALBREATH, J. (2009). Building corporate social responsibility into strategy. *European Business Review*, 21 (2), 109-127.

GALLOWAY, S. (2009). Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts. *Cultural Trends*, 18 (2), 125-148.

IAMANDI, I. E., CONSTANTIN, L. G. (2012). Quantifying corporate social responsibility involvement in art and culture projects in Romania and Bulgaria. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 3, 1122-1127.

ILICAK AYDINALP, G. (2013). *Halkla ilişkiler ekseninde kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk*. Ankara: Nobel.

KANJI, G. K., CHOPRA, P. K. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in a global economy. *Total Quality Management*, 21 (2), 119-143.

KORKMAZ, S. (2009). *İşletmelerin sosyal sorumlulukları*. Kocaeli: Umuttepe Yayınları.

KOTLER, P., LEE, N. (2008). *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk*. İstanbul: MediaCat.

MOIR, L. (2001). What do we mean by corporate social responsibility? *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business In Society*, 1 (2), 16-22.

MOON, J. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, 15 (5), 296-306.

NICOLAU, J. L. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: Worth-creating ctivities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (4), 990-1006.

ÖZGEN, E. (2006). *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk projeleri*. İstanbul: Maviağaç

SPIVAK, G. C. (1994). Responsibility. *Boundary 2*, 21 (3), 19-64.

STRAWSON, G. (1994). The impossibility of moral responsibility. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 75 (1/2), 5-24.

STRAWSON, P. F. (2008). *Freedom and resentment and other essays*, London and New York: Routledge.

TAK, B. (2009). *İşletmelerin sosyal sorumlulukları ve paydaş grupları ile ilişkilerinin yönetimi*. İstanbul: BETA.

TDK (t.y). *Sorumluluk*, Erişim Tarihi: 23.11.2021, <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>

TUNA, S. (2020). Şenlik ve festivalden kültürel mirasa: sinemasal bir bakış açısı. Sinem Tuna (Ed.) Kültürel Miras ve Sinema içinde (ss.1-25). İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları.

TUNA, S. (2021). Kùltürlerin kesişim noktasında minyatür sanatının sinemasal bağlamda yorumlanması: Murat Palta minyatürleri. *ART/icle: Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 1 (1), 139-168.

ÜNVER, E. (2016). Neden ve nasıl sanat eğitimi. *İdil Sanat ve Dil Dergisi*, 5 (23), 865-878.

YAMAK, S. (2007). *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk kavramının gelişimi*. İstanbul: BETA.

ŽIŽEK, S. Š., MULEJ, M. (2013). Social responsibility: a way of requisite holism of humans and their well-being. *Kybernetes*, 42 (2), 318-335.