

## **EDITORIAL: Combining CSR, public-private policies, inclusiveness and complex challenges for integral well-being by reciprocity relations — An agenda for global governance**

*Dear readers!*

The survival of the human being, understood in Aristotelian terms as a “social animal”, is not only closely connected to the action he/she exercises on the planet, but above all in the social and economic actions he/she exercises towards his fellows. This properly human dimension is transmitted in every context in which man carries out his activity, which in relation to the socio-economic dimension places world governance before great challenges. The economy, specifically finance, organization (both public and private), set demarcation lines, boundaries that go beyond the sole sphere of attribution and invest the entire social sphere with repercussions and consequences. The logic of balanced reciprocity (Rainero & Modarelli, 2021), in terms of internal/external social responsibility and inclusiveness, should be capable of guiding human actions, making a fair and sustainable measure of development and governance. All of this, on a general level, would be preparatory to promoting inclusion and well-being-oriented progress. The term well-being means something complex and integral, not being well in purely material and economic terms, but in a generalized and generalizable sense (at all levels, mental, physical and social) (ICF provisions — International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health). This means feeling good, being at ease and enjoying a favorable context in every area in which a person’s life takes place. Therefore, not only is it necessary to maintain a constant work-life balance, standard of living and welfare, but also to guarantee the possibility of carrying out interpersonal and intra-social relations adequately and with respect for diversity value. Often, the contexts in which the main human activities take place, especially the workplace, become obstacles and structure barriers to the aforementioned well-being. With reference to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), linked to the United Nations Agenda 2030, a large number of scholars around the world (Moallemi et al., 2019; Colglazier, 2015; Orlandini & Amelio, 2022; Freistein & Mahler, 2016; Fukuda-Parr, 2019) propose alternative solutions in each area outlined by the agenda itself to guarantee and favor the achievement of a holistically oriented preparatory sustainability. According to the point of view that guides the editorial of this issue of the “*Corporate and Business Strategy Review*”, it is crucial to highlight the prospects inherent in the economic, financial and organizational vision, also and above all in emerging and often neglected markets, which influences that are scarcely considered at an international level, but which reflect important ideas for research and reflection, in any case having an incisive and decisive impact on social communities. With reference to the depersonalization that came about with the industrial revolutions it is necessary to reflect on an increasingly latent and endemic deconstruction of the self. This case and this critical dimension cannot leave social sciences scholars indifferent, and in this case, those sciences are connected to the dimension of strategic governance. Precisely in this area and in the sphere of economic attribution, society as a whole favors the emergence of new and more stratified inequalities (O’Keeffe, 1993; Hunt et al., 2015; Beckenbach & Bellman, 2012; Lorber, 2001; Triandis et al., 1994; Reskin, 2000; Lumby & Coleman, 2007; Kawachi et al., 2002).

Technology, technological advancement, digital transition, Industry 4.0 and 5.0, change in itself, the advent of artificial intelligence and humanoids, progress in general, understood positivistically, are all bricks capable of producing benefits but just as many risks. Sometimes this helps man to ensure the well-being that was previously mentioned; sometimes this becomes a cage harbinger of risks to be governed. The benefits that can derive from the use and application of technologies in different contexts, such as the emergence and evolution of smart cities, must be able to involve human beings in their own progress. The vector guideline of social responsibility is moving in this direction or should be moving. As highlighted, it is necessary to consider, not only the output of this dimension in expository and demonstrative terms such as social and sustainability reports, an often self-celebratory representation (Goffman, 1956; Rainero & Modarelli, 2020), but the analyses of the real pre-existing and existing conditions with reference to the relationships where man is the protagonist also and above all in the light of exogenous shocks, such as wars, earthquakes, pandemics, crises, etc. These relationships then must be increasingly oriented towards balanced reciprocity between individuals (Sahlins, 2020). The perspective exposed must necessarily consider the “gift” as a metaphor, both for government action in the public sphere, and for government action in the private sphere, and in inter-intra-

personal relationships in every context in which the human activity runs. This teaching derives precisely from the lesson learned in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic and must be considered deeply for the future. At this juncture, the “gift”, understood in the cases of governance and relationship as expressed above, would be related to all those actions aimed at incorporating and proactively perpetrating mechanisms for the generation of individual, collective, work, social and economic well-being, drawing from the value of active and *ad hoc* structured government policies. Therefore, with reference to the countertrend perspective, relating to the literature, that considers major challenges as cosmetic activities, the current issue of the magazine opens a prospective scenario on investors’ prejudices and psychological influences, green intellectual capital capacity and predisposition to sustainable development, construction and transformation of the city into a smart city, labor market and commitment — engagement as a determinant of company performance, organizational strengthening in relation to the learning organization. From this point of view, the emphasis is placed on the self-generating value that social organizations and social organizations economically relevant, can bring to society in a tangible way, if there is a mentality oriented towards guaranteeing lasting well-being, attachment to work, reduction of inequalities.

In this sense, transversally, the current edition of the journal traces definite lines towards the great challenges posed for the near future in relation to the SDGs. In this way, the promotion of an inclusive, proactive, self-generating and regenerative society starts from the organizations (public and private) in relation to the head of governance, which must promote an intellectual capital oriented towards the sustainability of internal and external actions, as key dimensions of a social aggregation to be considered not in contrast with modernity, but in line with the sustainable vision of the future.

Starting precisely from the combination of corporate social responsibility interventions (public and private), inclusion policies, organizational improvement strategies and organizational strengthening aimed at the formation and structuring of an integrated and integral well-being, the dimension of the “gift” and the one of balanced reciprocity, would find their *raison d’être* in relation to the great current and near-future challenges.

If on the one hand, the corporate governance perspective traditionally took account explicitly and exclusively of an internally oriented vision, over the past few decades the paradigm has changed and the vision of corporate governance from an internal programmatic level has become strategically integrated and interacting, inherent in a decisive internal-external binomial. Furthermore, most of the time large and emblematic case studies grafted into large markets and companies or international policies of great importance were taken into account. This issue aims to provide light to perspectives of lesser impact, but not of less interest. Therefore, emerging markets and small-scale realities can and indeed must be considered by the scientific community, precisely in order not to overlook possible best practices, references and guide applications which, shifting the perspective from the macrosystem, can be identified with a meso structure for groups of interacting microsystems.

Giuseppe Modarelli,  
Department of Management, University of Turin, Italy,  
Editorial Board Member, Corporate and Business Strategy Review

---

## REFERENCES

1. Beckenbach, E. F., & Bellman, R. (2012). *Inequalities* (Vol. 30). Springer.
2. Colglazier, W. (2015). Sustainable development agenda: 2030. *Science*, 349(6252), 1048-1050. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2333>
3. Freistein, K., & Mahler, B. (2016). The potential for tackling inequality in the Sustainable Development Goals. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(12), 2139-2155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1166945>
4. Fukuda-Parr, S. (2019). Keeping out extreme inequality from the SDG agenda — The politics of indicators. *Global Policy*, 10(S1), 61-69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12602>
5. Goffman, E. (1956). *The presentation of self in everyday life* [Monograph No. 2, University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Centre]. [https://monoskop.org/images/1/19/Goffman\\_Erving\\_The\\_Presentation\\_of\\_Self\\_in\\_Everyday\\_Life.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/1/19/Goffman_Erving_The_Presentation_of_Self_in_Everyday_Life.pdf)
6. Hunt, V., Layton, D., & Prince, S. (2015). *Diversity matters*. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/business%20functions/people%20and%20organizational%20performance/our%20insights/why%20diversity%20matters/diversity%20matters.pdf>

7. Kawachi, I., Subramanian, S. V., & Almeida-Filho, N. (2002). A glossary for health inequalities. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 56(9), 647-652. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.56.9.647>
8. Lorber, J. (2001). *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics* (2nd ed.). Roxbury.
9. Lumby, J., & Coleman, M. (2007). *Leadership and diversity: Challenging theory and practice in education*. Sage.
10. Moallemi, E. A., Malekpour, S., Hadjidakou, M., Raven, R., Szetey, K., Moghadam, M. M., Bandari, R., Lester, R., & Bryan, B. A. (2019). Local agenda 2030 for sustainable development. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 3(6), e240-e241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(19\)30087-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(19)30087-7)
11. O'Keeffe, J. (1993). Disability, discrimination & the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 45(2), 3-9. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.45.2.3>
12. Orlandini, P., & Amelio, S. (2022). *Un percorso aziendale verso la sostenibilità*. Giappichelli.
13. Rainero, C., & Modarelli, G. (2020). CSR for emergencies: The two concepts of accountability. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 18(1), 78-95. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv18i1art7>
14. Rainero, C., & Modarelli, G. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and reciprocity relations during Covid-19. *Symphonya: Emerging Issues in Management*, 2, 118-141. <https://doi.org/10.4468/2021.2.10rainero.modarelli>
15. Reskin, B. F. (2000). Getting it right: Sex and race inequality in work organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 707-709. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.707>
16. Sahlins, M. (2020). *L'economia dell'età della pietra*. Elèuthera.
17. Triandis, H. C., Kurowski, L. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (1994). Workplace diversity. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 769-827). Consulting Psychologists Press.