

## FASTABIQUL KHAIRAT DRIVEN CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY AS SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS PRACTICES FOR ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

Suhaimi Mhd Sarif

Kulliyyah of Economics and Management Sciences

International Islamic University Malaysia, 53100 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia

Email: albanjari@yahoo.com

### ABSTRACT

*Most businesses used short term business practices to gain long term profitability and competitive advantage. In reality, businesses are facing dynamic challenges and uncertainties. The sustainable business practices enable business continuity and resilience. This paper argues fastabiqul khairat driven corporate philanthropy helps businesses to be more resilient. Fastabiqul khairat is to be competitive and unstoppable in giving charity with the motivation, drive, energy and reinforcement to do good deeds for the sake of stakeholders. Fastabiqul khairat promotes long term practices for long term benefits. The existing short-term corporate philanthropy justifies the reputation of socially responsible businesses but lack of organizational resilience. Businesses with good reputation and ability to deliver superior value gain better performance and competitive advantage. The study used personal interview with 10 social entrepreneurs to obtain feedback on the practices of fastabiqul khairat in the corporate philanthropy for social enterprises. The results of the study suggest that the practice of fastabiqul khairat is operationalized under the infaq (judicious spending) through the payment of zakat, corporate donation, and sponsorship on various social activities that linked with business activities. Business owners, strategists and decision makers should introduce fastabiqul khairat corporate philanthropy in business processes and strategies. Nevertheless, the results of the study cannot be generalized due to the specific contexts of the respondents which may be different from other contexts. The future study should consider more social entrepreneurs as respondents of the study for more robust and comprehensive results.*

**Keywords:** Organizational resilience, Business practices, Corporate philanthropy, *Fastabiqul khairat*.

### Introduction

In a competitive business world, businesses are working very hard dynamically to offer superior value as an attempt to outcompete their rivals. Business owners and managers have to work very hard to keep their competitive positions for survival and growth (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Porter, 2008). In other words, the Board of Directors and managers keep formulating and evaluating business strategies as a mean to offer super value so that they can keep pace with the dynamism of the competitive business world (Barney, 1991; Porter, 2008). There are many options for managers to ensure their companies are competitive in responding to the counter attack by rivals (Grant, 1991; Porter, 2008). Some may modify and revamp value chain activities for better efficiency and cost effective (Gouillart, 2014). The stiff competition landscape has changed from competing and beating among the competing businesses to collaborating and establishing alliances among the competing businesses (Jin, & Edmunds, 2015). Likewise, the concerns of the businesses are changing from shareholders' to stakeholders' concern (Ali, 2015; André, 2015). Businesses are changing their strategies and methods in the competition for the sake of survival, business continuity, growth and profitability of businesses (McGee & Shook, 2015; Velu, 2015; Chaganti, Brush, Haksever & Cook, 2015).

The ability to create, maintain and sustain businesses is about having the organizational resilience. Business resilience refers to the organizations or firms' ability to continue with the business by responding, adopting and modifying business strategies. Ortiz-de-Mandojana & Bansal (2015) argued that organizational resilience refers to the firms' ability to respond, make sense, correct and cope with the negative situations in achieving the goals of firms. Some of changes are predictable and sensible. But, most of the changes are not predictable and sensible. Winnard, Adcroft, Lee and Skipp (2014) contended that organizational or business resilience implies the ability of the firms to forecast the unpredictable business environment. However, Bharna, Dani and Burnard (2011) pointed that the ability of the firms to bring back the firms from the disruptive and unstable situations to stable situations. As for Hamel and Välikangas (2003), organizational resilience refers to the ability of the firms to revamp or reinvest business models and strategies when the business environment change (Sarif & Ismail, 2006, 2013). Indeed, organizational resilience is not only the ability to respond to change responsibly, but also able to make sense and stabilize the organizations or firms for the next strategic actions.

The creation of organizational resilience is about translating resources and talents into superior value in terms of products and services on sustainability basis. Resources and talents are sustainable where are perceived by the market as valuable, rare, inimitable, and not substitutable (Sarif & Ismail, 2013; Bloodgood, 2014; Lin & Wu, 2014). As for the maintenance and sustainability of business, companies could provide appropriate compensation scheme to maintain the human talents (Velu, 2015; Porter, 2008; Sarif & Ismail, 2006). This could not be the case for profit only driven businesses, managers used short term business practices to gain long term profitability (Winnard *et al*, 2014; Ali, 2015; Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013). Business managers realized that the only responsibility of business is profitability. When businesses decided to allocate some budget for the society, they have decided beyond their basic duty which is to meet economic and legal responsibility (Sarif & Ismail, 2011). The economic responsibility refers to the obligation of managers to be focus, to make effort and to use resources in getting more

profit within the legal framework. However, business managers are not able just to focus on the economic and legal duties, which may slow down the economic productivity and growth (Sarif & Ismail, 2006, 2011, 2013). They have to accept that business sectors cannot assume to be excluded from the society and natural environment and expanded into social, ethical and philanthropic duties.

Giving charity is commendable, not just for individuals and organizations, but also businesses. The spirit of give and take has been in human civilization, but due to profitability concerns, the give and take is just within the business process (Sarif & Ismail, 2011). To give is not just to share the material benefit, but also to share intangible and spiritual gains. Giving charity is important for business continuity (Sarif & Ismail, 2006), gaining trust and confident (Sarif & Ismail, 2011), and superiority (Sarif & Ismail, 2013).

The motivation of this study is to promote Islamic approach competing to make charity as contingency insights to be considered theoretically and practically as sustainable collaboration method for long term business benefits. The discussion in this paper is divided into several parts. Part 1 is the introduction and critical literature review on the basic terms of *fastabiqul khairat* (non-stop and competing in making charity of Islamic approach) that includes corporate philanthropy, *fastabiqul khairat*, and the integration of both terms. Part 2 is on the methodology, findings and discussion. The final part is to highlight the implications for practice, implications for theory, limitations of the study, future research, recommendation and conclusion.

### Literature review

This section reviews the critical concepts of the key terms of the paper into its philosophy epistemology, paradigm and application. The key terms are the *fastabiqul khairat*, corporate philanthropy, sustainable business practices and organizational resilience. While majority of the terms are used in the conventional business literature, *fastabiqul khairat* is one of Islamic theological terms to be integrated with the conventional terms.

### Corporate philanthropy

Corporations are established to make profit. The owners of corporations are investing money in the corporations for higher return of investments. They expected the managers of the corporations to focus on economic an obligation that is to be efficient in managing the corporations for better profitability. Therefore, corporate sectors have no social obligations towards the society. Clarkson (1995) contended that stakeholders' perspectives may be used to balance between economic interests of the corporations and the social justice of the society. Nevertheless, Friedman (2007) argued if managers used resources and spent money owned by the corporations not to add profit, such managers are longer doing the best for the corporations. Needless to say, while taking care of the business with diligent, prudent and high enthusiasm, business owners must also uphold social justice.

Some corporations did contribute to the society in donation and sponsorship. Mescon & Tilson (1987) argued that corporate contribution to the society has been reoriented as corporate philanthropy. The desire to help the welfare of others through charity, donation and sponsorship is known as philanthropy. These corporations are convinced and realized that the survival and performance of the corporations are depending on the patronage of the society, as end users as well as. Indeed, the same argument made by Clarkson (1995) that business owners must uphold social justice by being socially responsible.

Corporate philanthropy reflects their ethical consideration and relationship between business and society (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2014). Many companies considered doing charity can give good reputation and image too (Javalgi, Traylor, Gross & Lampman, 1994). Businesses are meant for providing services with superior value (Sarif & Ismail, 2006), within the expectation of the society (Sarif & Ismail, 2011), and for the benefit of the humanity (Sarif & Ismail, 2013)

### *Fastabiqul khairat*

The teaching of Islam can be explained from the essence of the creed declaration or Tawhidic statement "there is no God but Allah, and Prophet Muhammad as messenger of Allah." From this statement, it manifests *Tawhidic* paradigm. Tawhidic paradigm manifests Islamic monotheism statement that emphasized on the obligations of man as servant and vicegerent of Allah. Servants of Allah are required to adhere to the commandment of Allah religiously and spiritually. Likewise, as vicegerent of Allah is required to live in this world according to the guidelines of Islam. Therefore, Tawhidic paradigm can be practiced in three aspects, namely conviction (*aqidah*), practices (*ibadah*), and morality (*akhlaq*) (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013).

The conviction is the key pillar to validate the rest of activities in life. The meaning and essence of any action is determined by the intention, whether it is for the sake of Allah or otherwise, which leads to different consequences in life (physically, religiously and spiritually). The obedience and religiosity aspects are with the practices (*ibadah*). Under this aspect, the practices must follow the regulations (*shari'ah*), standards (*istiqamah*) and procedures (*nizam*) (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013). The validity of practices must conform with the regulations, which can be categorised as acceptable/missible (*halal*), prohibited (*haram*), commendable (*mubah*), discouraged (*makhruh*). To have impact, the practices must be done consistently regardless of time. Any deficiency in the practice can be improved with various supplementary practices. In other words, there are core practices and peripheral practices that are practiced simultaneously. For instance, zakat is core practice, which is compulsory, but at the same time, *sadaqah* or charity as secondary or peripheral practice is encouraged.

## Corporate philanthropy and *fastabiqul khairat*

This section is demonstrating the integration of corporate philanthropy with *fastabiqul khairat* concepts. Conventional themes on corporate philanthropy include “investing money in the corporations for higher return of investments” (Clarkson, 1995), “taking care of the business with diligent, prudent and high enthusiasm, business owners must also uphold social justice” (Friedman, 2007), “donation and sponsorship” (Mescron & Tilson, 1987), “ethical consideration and relationship between business and society” (Carroll & Buchholtz, 1994), and “good reputation and image” (Javalgi *et al*, 1994). The *fastabiqul khairat* themes include “conviction (*aqidah*), practices (*ibadah*), and morality (*akhlaq*)” (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013), “the regulations (*shari’ah*), standards (*istiqamah*) and procedures (*nizam*)” (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013), “acceptable/permissible (*halal*), prohibited (*haram*), commendable (*mubah*), discouraged (*makhruh*)” (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013) and “*sadaqah* or charity” (Sarif & Ismail, 2011, 2013). Table 1 summarizes the themes from corporate philanthropy and *fastabiqul khairat* derived from the previous studies.

Table 1: A Summary of the themes from corporate philanthropy and *fastabiqul khairat*

Conventional themes of corporate philanthropy	<i>Fastabiqul khairat</i> themes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “<b>investing</b> money in the corporations for higher return of investments” (Clarkson, 1995) [investing]</li> <li>• “<b>taking care</b> of the business with diligent, prudent and high enthusiasm, business owners must also uphold social justice” (Friedman, 2007) [regulations]</li> <li>• “<b>donation</b> and sponsorship” (Mescron &amp; Tilson, 1987) [procedures]</li> <li>• “ethical consideration and <b>relationship</b> between business and society” (Carroll &amp; Buchholtz, 1994) [acceptability]</li> <li>• “good <b>reputation</b> and <b>image</b>” (Javalgi <i>et al</i>, 1994) [charity]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>conviction</b> (<i>aqidah</i>), practices (<i>ibadah</i>), and morality (<i>akhlaq</i>). (Sarif &amp; Ismail, 2011, 2013)</li> <li>• the <b>regulations</b> (<i>shari’ah</i>), standards (<i>istiqamah</i>) and <b>procedures</b> (<i>nizam</i>). (Sarif &amp; Ismail, 2011, 2013)</li> <li>• <b>acceptable</b>/permissible (<i>halal</i>), prohibited (<i>haram</i>), commendable (<i>mubah</i>), discouraged (<i>makhruh</i>). (Sarif &amp; Ismail, 2011, 2013)</li> <li>• <i>sadaqah</i> or <b>charity</b>. (Sarif &amp; Ismail, 2011, 2013)</li> </ul>

From Table 1, there are five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* namely, conviction, regulations, procedures, acceptability, and charity are identified as drivers for corporate philanthropy in six areas, namely investing, taking care, donation, relationship, reputation and image, as sustainable business practices for organizations to be resilient.

## Methodology

The study used personal interview with 10 social entrepreneurs to obtain feedback on the practices of *fastabiqul khairat* in the corporate philanthropy for social enterprises. There five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* namely, conviction, regulations, procedures, acceptability, and charity are identified as drivers for corporate philanthropy in six areas, namely investing, taking care, donation, relationship, reputation and image, as sustainable business practices for organizations to be resilient. The results of the study suggest that the practice of *fastabiqul khairat* or non stoppable and competitive in giving charity is operationalized under the *infaq* (judicious spending) through the payment of zakat, corporate donation, and sponsorship on various social activities that linked with business activities. Business owners, strategists and decision makers should introduce *fastabiqul khairat* driven corporate philanthropy in business processes and strategies that are non stoppable and competitive.

The study aims to explore the influence of *fastabiqul khairat* on corporate philanthropy of social enterprises for the organizational resilience. The exploratory studies require the paradigm, philosophy, ontology and methodology to reflect the views and opinions of the informants. The truth of the study is based on the reality and contexts experienced, perceived, and comprehended by informants. The appropriate methodology is through personal interview. The study employed qualitative method through open-ended personal interview with social entrepreneurs and managers of social enterprises in Klang Valley, Malaysia. Indeed, personal interview allows the researchers to obtain the informants’ own feedback (Bourne & Jenkis, 2005) that cannot be done through questionnaire. Most of the time, open-ended personal interview allows for rich data (Schultze & Avital, 2011) that includes telephone interview (Carr & Worth, 2001). The rich findings of the interview would be more narrative (Fraser, 2004).

The use of qualitative allows researchers to get rich data (Birkinshaw, Brannen, & Tung, 2011) and to probe deeply into the process of organizations (Yeung, 1995). Personal interview with small business managers and owners allow researchers to understand the social interactions, networking, and dynamism of the small business world (Bygrave, 1989). Due to small size yet facing the dynamism, their developed unique behaviour and thinking along with the small business and socialisation that they belong to (Bryman, 1988; Bygrave, 1989; Gill & Johnson, 1991).

## Findings and Discussion

This section reports the findings of personal interview with 10 social entrepreneurs who have been generous; non stoppable and consistent in giving charity while creating, maintaining and sustaining business resilience for continuous organizational strategic and financial high performance. The study asked a few open-ended questions as avenue to obtain the informants' opinion. Firstly, "could you please share with us the objectives and reasons for giving charity on continuous basis?" The purpose of asking this question is to obtain the feedback of informants on the motivation and factors for the informants to be generous and at the same time they enjoyed continuous prosperity in business performance.

The study asked a few open-ended questions, namely:

- How do you make a balance between making profit and giving charity simultaneously?
- What are the steps that you used in ensuring both profit making and giving charity for your enterprises?
- What are the factors contribute to your motivation to do business and to give charity?

Social Entrepreneur 1 argued that making profit and giving charity cannot be separated since both actions are about giving and taking. Profit is a result of the willingness of buyers to give up their dollars for the offer made by the sellers. In return, the sellers should give back the buyers quality products and services to the buyers and others. SE 1 said: *"Business is not just one way traffic flow, sellers and buyers and vice versa, but also involves other parties as well. This is the basic economic concept. We have household and business sectors, both are offering and accepting kinds and services."* Regarding the steps taken by SE 1 to strike a balance between both actions, SE argued that the first step is to have clear purpose and direction in mind. SE 1 said: *"Intention is very important. If my intention to make money, then I will be spending the whole life to serve my intention, which is very selfish. When my intention is to serve others, I feel great about it. Serving others is a charity, an act of giving."*

The main reason for emphasising on intention to give and to give is due to the ethical responsibility. It is the right thing to do in life. Table 2 summarizes the feedback of SE 1 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 1 are convictions (F1), acceptability (F4), taking care (C2), and relationships (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 1.

Table 2: Feedback of SE 1 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 1 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> <li>F2 Regulations</li> <li>F3 Procedures</li> <li>F4 Acceptability</li> <li>F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> <li>C2 taking care</li> <li>C3 donation</li> <li>C4 relationship</li> <li>C5 reputation</li> <li>C6 image</li> </ul>	<p><i>"both actions are about <b>giving</b> and <b>taking</b>" (F1, F4, C2, C3, C4)</i></p> <p><i>"willingness of <b>buyers</b>" (F1, F4, F5, C2, C4, C5, C6)</i></p> <p><i>"clear <b>purpose</b> and direction in mind" (F1, C4)</i></p>

For Social Entrepreneur 2, giving and taking in business is not just about making profit, but it is about making relationships. SE2 argued: *"In any relationship, there must be give and take. The balance is in the scale of giving and taking. Some people said it is better to give and to give more rather than taking back. You must have this intention. You do business is about giving services and goods to those who need them. You must keep giving them, and taking a bit from them to continue your business. Some people are not able to comprehend the whole episodes. Believe me, you ought to try it, then you will taste the outcome."* SE 2 also contended that in giving charity without stopping is to assume the action as daily routine. Once it becomes a routine, it will be done easily and continuously. SE 2 said that there are many reasons for business people to keep giving charity, which includes social responsibility, big agenda in the community, back to basic lifestyle, and the-more-prosperous agenda.

Table 3 summarizes the feedback of SE 2 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 2 are convictions (F1) and relationships (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 2.

Table 3: Feedback of SE 2 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 2 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> <li>F2 Regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> <li>C2 taking care</li> </ul>	<p><i>"any relationship, there must be give and take" (F1, F5, C2, C4)</i></p> <p><i>"scale of giving and taking must have this intention" (F1, C1, C4)</i></p>

- |                    |                   |  |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|
| • F3 Procedures    | • C3 donation     | “you ought to try it” (F1, F4, C1, C4) |
| • F4 Acceptability | • C4 relationship |  |
| • F5 charity       | • C5 reputation   |  |
|                    | • C6 image        |  |

Social Entrepreneur 3 commented that doing business is not about to get more profit, but to share the fortune with many people. SE 3 uttered: “When I started this business, my concern is to provide services that people needed. There is a need for transportation of kids from home to school safely and vice versa. There is a need to assist the kids to go through childhood life apart from their busy parents. There is a need to giving day care to the kids. Helping kids is our priority. We do not our kids who will be our future leaders deprived from their needs.” The intention of SE3 is to serve the need of others as the main priority when SE3 decided to be a social entrepreneur.

Table 4 summarizes the feedback of SE 3 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 3 are convictions (F1), taking care (C2) and relationships (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 3.

Table 4: Feedback of SE 3 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 3 feedback
• F1 Conviction	• C1 Investing	“my <b>concern</b> is to provide services that <b>people needed</b> ” (F1, C2, C4, C6) “kids from home to school <b>safely</b> and vice versa” (F1, F4, F5, C2, C4) “assist the kids to go through <b>childhood life</b> ” (F1, F4, C1, C2, C4, C5)
• F2 Regulations	• C2 taking care	
• F3 Procedures	• C3 donation	
• F4 Acceptability	• C4 relationship	
• F5 charity	• C5 reputation	
	• C6 image	

Social Entrepreneur 4 mentioned that the balance between profit making and giving charity is about intention and ambition for long term life. Intention refers to pre-planned action in due consideration for mutual benefit. Ambition is about future undertaking that is potential for benefit. The planning and the prospects are important. SE 4 said: “Our first and foremost thing in business is our purpose of doing business. In our case, we do business because we want to make contribution to others. People first become our main driving force. People here refer to us and others. Our profit is not absolutely ours. It comes from others and it must go back to others.” For SE the purpose of doing business differentiated from ordinary businesses.

Table 5 summarizes the feedback of SE 4 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 4 are convictions (F1), charity (F5), taking care (C2) and relationships (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 4.

Table 5: Feedback of SE 4 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 4 feedback
• F1 Conviction	• C1 Investing	“our purpose of doing business” (F1, F5, C1, C2, C4) “to make contribution to others” (F1, F5, C2, C4) “People first become our main driving force” (F1, F5, C2, C4) “Our profit is not absolutely ours” (F1, F4, F5, C1, C2, C3, C4)
• F2 Regulations	• C2 taking care	
• F3 Procedures	• C3 donation	
• F4 Acceptability	• C4 relationship	
• F5 charity	• C5 reputation	
	• C6 image	

SE 5 argued that when charity and welfare drive the business, the business will be on the right track. SE 5 said: “Doing business without charity and welfare is not a business. We can’t be selfish in the business. It simply the business itself is not alone. The business needs as many customers as possible. The more customers the merrier, the more you serve, the more you feel better.



*The value is required for the products and services; the value is expected for the money, and the value for everything.*” Business and charity are the first step in any business. The main driver for this idea is to reinforce the humanity concern of love and care.

Table 6 summarizes the feedback of SE 5 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 5 are convictions (F1), charity (F5), taking care (C2) and relationships (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 5.

Table 6: Feedback of SE 5 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 5 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> <li>F2 Regulations</li> <li>F3 Procedures</li> <li>F4 Acceptability</li> <li>F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> <li>C2 taking care</li> <li>C3 donation</li> <li>C4 relationship</li> <li>C5 reputation</li> <li>C6 image</li> </ul>	<p><i>“Doing business without charity and welfare is not a business” (F1, F5, C1, C2, C4)</i></p> <p><i>“more customers the merrier, the more you serve” (F1, F5, C2, C4)</i></p> <p><i>“value is required for the products and services” (F1, F5, C2, C4)</i></p>

SE 6 argued the need to review the assumption that businesses are competing for market share and to win as many customers as possible for more profit. The assumption should be serving nonstop and competitive in giving value and welfare to others, to give as much value as possible to others. SE 6 said: *“We have been oriented with the assumption that when we do business, we must compete to get as many customers from the market without realising that we are pressuring ourselves to do something that beyond our rationality. Let’s do something back to basic. We are supposed to serve and to keep serving.”* This statement emphasizes the importance of charity in business as main reason for doing business.

Table 7 summarizes the feedback of SE 6 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 6 are convictions (F1) and taking care (C2). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 6.

Table 7: Feedback of SE 6 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 6 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> <li>F2 Regulations</li> <li>F3 Procedures</li> <li>F4 Acceptability</li> <li>F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> <li>C2 taking care</li> <li>C3 donation</li> <li>C4 relationship</li> <li>C5 reputation</li> <li>C6 image</li> </ul>	<p><i>“when we do business, we must compete to get as many customers” (F1, C1, C2, C5)</i></p> <p><i>“Let’s do something back to basic” (F1, F5, C2, C4)</i></p>

SE 7 said that businesses can be selfish, but they are not meant to stay longer. Some businesses are there meant for a short stay. In lieu of that, SE 7 argued that the charity in business shows that businesses can’t be selfish. If it continues to be selfish, it can’t live longer. SE 7 said: *“There are many ways people make for living. Before they can do so, they have to give something first before getting what they desired. In business too, there must be an act of giving prior to taking.”* This statement meant that business and charity are two important concepts that cannot be separated.

Table 8 summarizes the feedback of SE 7 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 7 are convictions (F1), charity (F5), investing (C1), taking care (C2) and relationship (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 7.

Table 8: Feedback of SE 7 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 7 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> </ul>	<p><i>“many ways people make for living” (F1, C1, C2, C4)</i></p> <p><i>“give something first before getting” (F1,</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F2 Regulations</li> <li>• F3 Procedures</li> <li>• F4 Acceptability</li> <li>• F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C2 taking care</li> <li>• C3 donation</li> <li>• C4 relationship</li> <li>• C5 reputation</li> <li>• C6 image</li> </ul>	<b>F5, C1, C2, C4)</b> <i>"there must be an act of giving prior to taking" (F1, F5, C1, C2, C3, C4)</i>
---	---	--

SE 8 mentioned that corporate charity is a new concept. Giving and taking have been there in business although businesses are claimed to be greedy and motivated to maximize profit. This is not to deny the need for profit, but to emphasize on the need to give charity first before getting profit. SE said: *"They are many ways to give and keep giving. One of the ways is to give charity and welfare. Charity is about giving something without expecting a return. It is just kindness."* The emphasis of SE 8 is very clear, that is to be part of the charity circle.

Table 9 summarizes the feedback of SE 8 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 8 are convictions (F1), charity (F5), taking care (C2) and donation (C3). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 8.

Table 9: Feedback of SE 8 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 8 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F1 Conviction</li> <li>• F2 Regulations</li> <li>• F3 Procedures</li> <li>• F4 Acceptability</li> <li>• F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C1 Investing</li> <li>• C2 taking care</li> <li>• C3 donation</li> <li>• C4 relationship</li> <li>• C5 reputation</li> <li>• C6 image</li> </ul>	<i>"give charity and welfare" (F1, F5, C2, C3)</i> <i>"Charity is about giving something" (F1, F5, C2, C3, C4)</i>

SE 9 argued that businesses are established to make the economy grow. They helped the household with income so that they can purchase goods for consumption. The household provides employees to the business so that business can produce goods and provide services. The circular flow between household and businesses is the sign for them to give and take in the long term to result in productivity and economic growth. SE 9 said: *"We have the freedom to charge more to our customers. But, that will reduce their ability to buy more. When they can't buy more, they can't consume more. Then, there will be less income for the business to keep running the business."* The main motivation is liberalization and freedom financially.

Table 10 summarizes the feedback of SE 9 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 9 are regulations (F2), procedures (F3), investing (C1) and reputation (C5). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 9.

Table 10: Feedback of SE 9 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 10 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• F1 Conviction</li> <li>• F2 Regulations</li> <li>• F3 Procedures</li> <li>• F4 Acceptability</li> <li>• F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C1 Investing</li> <li>• C2 taking care</li> <li>• C3 donation</li> <li>• C4 relationship</li> <li>• C5 reputation</li> <li>• C6 image</li> </ul>	<i>"freedom to charge more to our customers" (F2, F3, C1, C5)</i> <i>"they can't buy more, they can't consume more" (F2, F3, C1, C5)</i>

SE 10 confirmed that being competitive and non stoppable in giving charity is actually about businesses. SE 10 said: *"being competitive in business, it means being able to offer better value to the customers. Customers are reasonable. They wanted value*

for their money. Basically, they desire for quality products with cheaper price, as always the mantra. Let's change it on relationship with the customers. Customization is the idea, not mass production, as always the case. There are laws to adhere to; there are customs to be respected; there are reputation and goodwill to deserve an honour." This statement emphasises the ethical, social, legal and economic responsibilities.

Table 11 summarizes the feedback of SE 10 with the five key drivers of *fastabiqul khairat* and six sustainable practices for organizational resilience. The dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience at SE 10 are regulations (F2), acceptability (F4), and relationship (C4). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at Social Enterprise 10.

Table 11: Feedback of SE 10 on *Fastabiqul Khairat* driven Corporate Philanthropy

Five key drivers of <i>fastabiqul khairat</i>	corporate philanthropy in six areas as sustainable business practices	SE 10 feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F1 Conviction</li> <li>F2 Regulations</li> <li>F3 Procedures</li> <li>F4 Acceptability</li> <li>F5 charity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1 Investing</li> <li>C2 taking care</li> <li>C3 donation</li> <li>C4 relationship</li> <li>C5 reputation</li> <li>C6 image</li> </ul>	<p>"being competitive in business, it means being able to offer better value to the customers" (F1, <b>F2</b>, F3, <b>F4</b>, C1, <b>C4</b>, C5)</p> <p>"quality products with cheaper price" (<b>F2</b>, <b>F4</b>, <b>C4</b>, C6)</p> <p>"relationship with the customers" (<b>F2</b>, <b>C4</b>)</p>

In summary, the feedback of 10 social entrepreneurs suggest that the dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience are conviction (F1), regulations (F2), acceptability (F4), charity (F5), investing (C1), taking care (C2), donation (C3), relationship (C4), and reputations (C5). These are the sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience at 10 social enterprises.

#### Implications for research

This study contributes to the contingency view of dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience through the concept of *fastabiqul khairat*. The Divine commandment of *fastabiqul khairat* is for the goodness of humanity as it promotes sustainable and valuable practices for long term and mutual benefits of humanity. The existing short-term corporate philanthropy justifies the reputation of socially responsible businesses but lack of organizational resilience. Businesses with good reputation and ability to deliver superior value gain better performance and competitive advantage.

#### Implications for practice

In terms of practice, *fastabiqul khairat* promotes sustainable and valuable practices for long term and mutual benefits of humanity and for organizational resilience. There is a need for more horizontal integration for enterprises that emphasized on offering goodness, charity and welfare.

#### Limitations

This study is based on qualitative study, with the aim to explore the influence of *fastabiqul khairat* in promoting goodness, sustainable business practices, and mutual cooperation among enterprises as a mean to create, maintain and sustain competitive advantage. Since the feedback is based on 10 social enterprises, the results of the study is unable to be generalized, but useful to provide insights of 10 social entrepreneurs on the important concept of *fastabiqul khairat* to be considered as value system and business practice..

#### Recommendation

The study recommends case study method for future research for more comprehensive, robust, and generalisable findings. The current findings are useful for an early insight in policy making, but are too far to be operationalized in the contexts of organizational practices and policy encouragement.

#### Conclusion

Businesses can apply, use or practice *fastabiqul khairat* driven corporate philanthropy business practices to gain long term profitability and competitive advantage through (a) organizational values and systems, (b) organizational philanthropic systems, and (c) organizational managerial practices. The systems and practices need to be internalized with *fastabiqul khairat* spirit through (a) routines, (b) organizational hierarchy, (c) high performance team, that enables businesses to gain more stamina, endurance, and resilience in facing dynamic challenges and uncertainties. Social entrepreneurs are suggested to practice the dominant sustainable practices for organizational resilience, through the rationalisation of regulations, acceptability, charity, investing, taking care, donation, relationship, and reputations. These sustainable practices contribute to organizational resilience.



The study recommends social enterprises to subscribe to this approach for sustainable competitive advantage and organizational resilience. Theoretically, *fastabiqul khairat* driven corporate philanthropy contributes contemporary and contingency insights for organizational development and strategic management theories.

## References

- Ali, T. (2015). Beyond shareholders versus stakeholders: Towards a Rawlsian concept of the firm. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 34, 126-141.
- André, R. (2015). Benefit corporations at a crossroads: As lawyers weigh in, companies weigh their options. *Business Horizons*, 58(3), 243-252.
- Bhamra, R., Dani, S. & Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: the concept, a literature review and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49 (18,) 5375-5393.
- Birkinshaw, J., Brannen, M. Y., & Tung, R. L. (2011). From a distance and generalizable to up close and grounded: Reclaiming a place for qualitative methods in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 573-581.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bloodgood, J. (2014). Enhancing the resource-based view of the firm: Increasing the role of awareness. *Strategic Management Review*, 8(1), 61-75.
- Bourne, H., & Jenkins, M. (2005). Eliciting managers' personal values: an adaptation of the laddering interview method. *Organizational Research Methods*, 8(4), 410-428.
- Bygrave, W. (1989). The entrepreneurship paradigm (I): a philosophical look at its research methodologies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14 (1), 7-26.
- Bryman, A. (Ed.) (1988). *Doing Research in Organisations*. London: Routledge.
- Carr, E. C., & Worth, A. (2001). The use of the telephone interview for research. *Nursing Times Research*, 6(1), 511-524.
- Campbell, J. L. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of management Review*, 32(3), 946-967.
- Carroll, A., & Buchholtz, A. (2014). *Business and society: Ethics, sustainability, and stakeholder management*. Cengage Learning.
- Chaganti, R., Brush, C. G., Haksever, C., & Cook, R. G. (2015). Stakeholder influence strategies and value creation by new ventures. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 13(2), 1-15.
- Clarkson, M. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of management review*, 20(1), 92-117.
- Dhar, P. (2013). Zakat as a Measure of Social Justice in Islamic Finance: An Accountant's Overview. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research (JEEIR)*, 1(1).
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strategic management journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121.
- Fraser, H. (2004). Doing narrative research analysing personal stories line by line. *Qualitative Social Work*, 3(2), 179-201.
- Friedman, M. (2007). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits (pp. 173-178). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gill, J. & Johnson, P. (1991), *Research Methods for Managers*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Gouillart, F.J. (2014). The race to implement co-creation of value with stakeholders: five approaches to competitive advantage. *Strategy & Leadership*, 42(1), 2-8.
- Grant, R. M. (1991). The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implications for strategy formulation. *Knowledge and strategy*, 33(3), 3-23.
- Hamel, G. & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9), 52-63.
- Javalgi, R. G., Traylor, M. B., Gross, A. C., & Lampman, E. (1994). Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Advertising*, 23(4), 47-58.
- Jin, Y., & Edmunds, P. (2015). Achieving a competitive supply chain network for a manufacturer: a resource-based approach. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 26(5).744-762.
- Lin, Y., & Wu, L. Y. (2014). Exploring the role of dynamic capabilities in firm performance under the resource-based view framework. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(3), 407-413.
- Margolis, J. D., Elfenbein, H. A., & Walsh, J. P. (2007). Does it pay to be good? A meta-analysis and redirection of research on the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Ann Arbor*, 1001, 48109-1234.
- McGee, J. E., & Shook, C. L. (2015). Responding to industry consolidation in fragmented industries: the role of capabilities in small business survival. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 11(2), 21-32.
- Mescon, T. & Tilson, D. (1987). Corporate philanthropy: A strategic approach to the bottom-line. *California Management Review*, 29(2).
- Navarro, P. (1988). Why do corporations give to charity?. *Journal of Business*, 65-93.
- Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., & Bansal, P. (2015). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. *Strategic Management Journal*, in press.
- Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., & Bansal, P. (2015). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. *Strategic Management Journal*. In press.
- Porter, M. E. (2008). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Simon and Schuster.
- Sarif, S. & Ismail, Y. (2006). Technology parks, knowledge transfer and innovation: the case of Malaysia's information and communication technology (ICT) small and medium enterprises. *International Journal of the Information Systems*

*for Logistics and Management*, 1 (2), 133-142

- Sarif, S. & Ismail, Y. (2011) Spirituality in business ethics from Islamic perspectives. In: Spirituality in management from Islamic perspectives. IIUM Press, Kuala Lumpur, pp. 119-154
- Sarif, S. & Ismail, Y. (2013). Developing the *ulū al-albāb* model for sustainable value and wealth creation through social entrepreneurship, *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law* (IJBEL), 2 (1), 28 – 34.
- Schultze, U., & Avital, M. (2011). Designing interviews to generate rich data for information systems research. *Information and Organization*, 21(1), 1-16
- Velu, C. (2015). Business model innovation and third-party alliance on the survival of new firms. *Technovation*, 35, 1-11.
- Winnard, J., Adcroft, A., Lee, J., & Skipp, D. (2014). Surviving or flourishing? Integrating business resilience and sustainability. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 7(3), 303-315.
- Yeung, H. W. C. (1995). Qualitative personal interviews in international business research: some lessons from a study of Hong Kong transnational corporations. *International Business Review*, 4(3), 313-339.