



## **A Critical Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility Index: A Systematic Literature Review**

Names **Muhammad Rashid<sup>1</sup>** **Azhar Iqbal<sup>2</sup>** **Waseem Sajid<sup>3</sup>**

**Designation** MS Research Scholar Management Science Agriculture University Peshawar<sup>1</sup> MS Research Scholar Management Science Iqra University Peshawar<sup>2</sup> MS Research Scholar Management Science IMs Peshawar<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** This research study gives a comprehensive literature analysis on the topic of corporate social responsibility (CSR), examining its evolution, utilisation, and impact across various nations. Due to the presence of competitive marketplaces, several businesses are compelled to portray themselves as highly socially responsible firms. The surge in scholarly and professional attention towards "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has resulted in the formulation of various definitions pertaining to the concept and its implementation" (Jamali and Mirshak 2007). The phrase in question is not a novel notion, as evidenced by previous scholarly work (Taneja, Taneja, & Gupta, 2011). Its origins may be traced back to the 1950s. In contemporary times, several scholarly works provide compelling evidence that corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives may have a big impact on augmenting the value of a company (Mahfuja, 2013). In this particular context, the present study explores the overall advancement of the concepts underlying the notion via its historical roots and subsequent development, adopting a country-specific perspective. The investigation encompasses the practical execution of these ideas and the existing body of literature contributed by various writers during the course of time. In addition, we present a comprehensive framework consisting of fundamental components that several academics often identify with this concept. Moreover, we specifically emphasize the stakeholder's approach, which has significant relevance among the various theories pertaining to this subject matter.

**Keywords:** Corporate Social Responsibility, Stakeholder Approach, Corporate Social Performance, Corporate Citizenship



## **Introduction**

The term "corporate social responsibility" (CSR) is widely recognized and has gained significant significance within the global economic context. Moreover, in recent times, the topic has gained significant attention inside the business sphere (Gross & Roberts, 2011). Despite extensive study conducted over several decades, the precise definition and optimal practices of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the context of multinational enterprises continue to be subjects of ongoing dispute within several academic disciplines. The subject matter under consideration has generated extensive discourse, analysis, theoretical advancement, and scholarly investigation across various academic disciplines such as economics, political science, sociology, and management (including strategic management, organizational behavior, environmental management, psychology, marketing, risk, and finance) (McWilliams, Siegel, & Wright, 2006). It is crucial to have in mind

that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has seen significant growth and transformation on a worldwide scale, as observed by both practitioners and researchers (Carroll & Shabana, 2010). In recent years, the phenomenon of globalization and the expansion of international commerce have been identified as key factors that have fostered a heightened emphasis on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The global developments discussed have led to a heightened level of complexity within corporate environments, necessitating organizations to adopt a more transparent and socially responsible approach in their operations (Jamali & Mirshak, 2007).

According to Garcia (2012), an alternative perspective on corporate social responsibility (CSR) posits it as a philosophy and attitude that guides organizations, motivating them to voluntarily incorporate stakeholder expectations and concerns into their



management strategies, with a particular focus on long-term objectives.

business social responsibility (CSR) has emerged as an essential element of business strategy within the contemporary global economy. As a result of instances of financial misconduct, monetary deficits, and the subsequent decline in the reputation of the publicly traded firms involved.

According to Becchetti, Ciciretti, and Hasan (2009), the utilization of this technology to mitigate conflicts among stakeholders is becoming imperative. Given the prevailing consensus among numerous scholars that organizations are increasingly cognizant of the environmental and social impact of their operations (Sprinkle and Maines, 2010), it is imperative to possess a comprehensive understanding of stakeholder viewpoints and their specific inclinations concerning corporate social responsibility initiatives and endeavors aimed at enhancing societal well-being and community welfare (8).

Certain organizations opt to adopt corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities that prioritize social problems as their primary

focus. In addition to large corporations, certain medium-sized and smaller enterprises, commonly referred to as SMEs, also have this inclination. These enterprises often engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, allocate resources or establish dedicated departments for CSR activities, and publish CSR reports. Consequently, corporate social responsibility (CSR) is increasingly recognized as a fundamental domain within the field of management, alongside finance, marketing, and accounting. According to Munro (2013), there is a growing consumer inclination towards acquiring knowledge about the origins of products and the level of transparency in the supply chain.

Moreover, from an economic standpoint, it is anticipated that corporations will partake in corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives if the governing body concludes that the advantages, regardless of their measurability, surpass the corresponding expenses<sup>10</sup>.

According to Shubham and Shruti (2014), the primary objective of corporate social



responsibility (CSR) is to assume accountability for a company's conduct and generate favorable impacts on the environment, customers, workforce, local communities, stakeholders, and the broader public through its business activities. Moreover, organizations that prioritize corporate social responsibility (CSR) will actively strive to promote the overall well-being of society by providing financial support for community development and progress. Additionally, they will voluntarily discontinue any activities that have a negative impact on the public sphere, irrespective of their legality.

This part starts by providing a comprehensive overview of the many conceptualizations of corporate social responsibility as documented in the existing literature. Subsequently, we examine the historical roots of this term. Finally, our focus is directed towards the examination of Korschun and Sen's analysis of the stakeholder model approach as presented in their work from 2009.

### **Ethics in business and the idea of CSR**

The notion that corporations bear responsibilities towards society that extend beyond the mere pursuit of profit for shareholders has been a longstanding concept spanning several generations. The genesis of a structure for corporate social responsibility (CSR) may be traced back to the United States in the 1900s. It is noteworthy to mention that academic inquiries about this subject were previously undertaken during the 1920s, spurred by deliberations around the need for corporate administrators to acknowledge the concerns of stakeholders beyond only shareholders. Due to the economic recession often referred to as the Great Depression during the 1930s and the ensuing worldwide battle of the Second World War, this specific discourse was demoted to a subordinate position. Therefore, it was not until the 1990s that the discussion around Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) gained substantial recognition and became the subject of several academic inquiries. The emergence of many definitions for Corporate Social



Responsibility (CSR) gained momentum throughout the 1970s, with a prevailing inclination towards emphasizing social performance, as highlighted by Carroll (1999) and Sethi (1971)<sup>12</sup>.

Carroll and Shabana (2010) argue that throughout the 1980s, there was a notable decline in the emergence of novel conceptualizations of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Nevertheless, a surge in empirical research was observed during this particular timeframe. Furthermore, there has been an increased recognition and interest in alternative subjects that are connected to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The notion of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the 1990s was predominantly linked to corporate philanthropy (Tripathi & Bains, 2013). During the 2000s, there was a significant rise in the level of scholarly focus on corporate social responsibility (CSR). This was primarily motivated by the acknowledgement of several worldwide voluntary policies, codes, guidelines, and initiatives. Some notable examples of

initiatives in the field of corporate sustainability reporting include the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the United Nations Global Compact, the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI), the Dow Jones Sustainability Index, and the founding of the International Integrated Reporting Committee (IIRC) in 2010, among other initiatives.

The objective of this study is to present a comprehensive analysis of corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives conducted in different nations globally. It is essential to acknowledge that the concepts of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) may exhibit variations owing to historical and socioeconomic variances among nations. Certain definitions place emphasis on a certain issue as a result of its heightened significance within a particular setting. In certain cases, the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) serves as an indicator of a nation's level of economic and social progress.

The concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has undergone



substantial development over its history, transitioning from a primary emphasis on social issues and collective action to incorporating broader values such as transparency, responsibility, and corporate citizenship. In accordance with the findings of Sharma and Kiram (2013).

Numerous authors have endeavored to delineate and advance the notion of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Cannon (1992) undertakes an analysis of the evolution of corporate social responsibility by examining the historical progression of corporate engagement. Consequently, there was a reassessment of the interplay of business, society, and government in the aftermath of the war. The number in question is the fourteenth numeral. Carroll (1979) posits that the concept of corporate social responsibility encompasses the whole range of societal demands placed upon businesses, encompassing economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary aspects. The examination and in-depth debate of the notion of corporate social responsibility (CSR) have led to the development of several models and

discussions regarding its management implications. This method also introduced significant concepts pertaining to corporate social responsibility and ethics (Carroll, 1999).

While other interpretations exist, the definition put forward at the 2007 Corporate Social Responsibility Forum in Spain posits that corporate social responsibility extends beyond simply legal compliance. Voluntary inclusion of social, labor, environmental, and human rights considerations emerge from open and sincere dialogues with stakeholders. By incorporating this technique inside the framework of the organization's governance, management, strategy, regulations, and protocols, the firm assumes accountability for the choices it renders and the outcomes stemming from those choices.

In recent years, there has been an increasing demand from the general public for more transparency and integrity in corporate governance and internal operations management. The presence of duty is also evident. Several themes that are relevant to



this discussion include sustainability, responsibility, and transparency (Crowther & Aras, 2008). Comprehending the concept of "activity" is thus vital, and it is our contention that every corporate social responsibility (CSR) endeavor can be encapsulated within a concise set of fundamental principles.

The concept of sustainability encompasses the examination of how current actions might potentially impact future outcomes, whether they result in positive or negative effects. The identification of fundamental principles that provide lucidity and facilitate implementation for enterprises aiming to develop a complete corporate social responsibility (CSR) plan encompass environmental practices, management strategies, long-term financial management, and innovation. The depletion of resources in the present renders them unavailable for future utilization, posing a particular challenge when the resource is scarce.

Accountability refers to the recognition of the potential influence of one's actions on the external environment and assuming

responsibility for the resulting outcomes. The concept of "corporate governance" (CG) is defined by Shleifer and Vishny (1997), Becht et al. (2003), and Bebchuk et al. (2009) as the established structure that establishes the responsibility of corporate directors towards the shareholders of their respective companies. The basic objective of this concept revolves around the quantification of the repercussions resulting from decisions taken within and outside the organizational boundaries.

Transparency refers to the practice of openly disclosing information on the external impact of an organization's actions. This information may be found in the organization's reporting, where pertinent facts are published without any attempt to conceal them. Moreover, as said by Edelman (2011), the reputation of a company is predominantly influenced by significant attributes such as integrity, openness, fair treatment of its workforce, and its commitment to social responsibility.

Engaging in socially responsible business practices encompasses various aspects.



Firstly, an organization can enhance its workplaces and uphold ethical labor and employment practices (Gopal, 2010). Additionally, it can actively contribute to the development of local communities and establish effective communication channels with affected communities to address the impacts of its policies and products. Furthermore, investing in the establishment of social infrastructure and actively participating in the preservation and sustainability of the environment are crucial components of social responsibility. Lastly, the organization's corporate governance plays a pivotal role in supporting overall economic development.

In addition to employees, stakeholders encompass a range of other groups, such as investors, shareholders, clients, consumers, business partners, civil society organizations, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, local communities, the environment, and society as a whole (including both internal and external entities)<sup>19</sup>.

Sharma and Kiram (2013) believe that corporate social responsibility (CSR) entails the voluntary integration of social, environmental, and health concerns into a company's operations, business strategy, and relationships with stakeholders. According to Mortazavi, Pirmouradi, and Soltani (2013), a comprehensive understanding of corporate social responsibility (CSR) entails an organization's acknowledgement of its responsibility for the consequences of its decisions and activities on the natural environment and society. This accountability is demonstrated through the adoption of ethical and transparent conduct that aligns with the principles of sustainable development and the overall well-being of society.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR), sometimes referred to as corporate responsibility, corporate citizenship, sustainable business, and sustainable responsible business, encompasses a range of concepts and practices within the corporate domain. Moreover, it is imperative for a corporation to engage in activities that





enable it to make unrestricted investments in the social, ethical, environmental, and economic dimensions of society. Please make reference to Figure 2.

Following the review, Basu and Guido (2008) conducted an examination of three primary research strands pertaining to corporate social responsibility (CSR) that are commonly observed in academic literature. These strands may be generally classified as:

Stakeholder-driven corporate social responsibility (CSR) pertains to an organization's response to the specific demands of mostly external stakeholders, such as governments and consumer advocacy organizations, with reference to a business's operations or wider societal issues.

The performance-driven approach emphasizes the correlation between a company's concrete corporate social responsibility actions and the external expectations placed upon it. The focus of this study is around assessing the effectiveness and influence of these efforts,

while also identifying the activities that hold the greatest potential for attaining the targeted outcomes (Wood, 1991).

Motivated by various factors, this study examines the influence of extrinsic factors (Parker, 2002) on a company's engagement in corporate social responsibility (CSR). Additionally, it explores the management of risk (Fombrun, Gardberg & Barnett, 2000; Husted, 2000), the establishment of customer loyalty (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2001 and 2004), the enhancement of corporate reputation (Fombrun, 2000), and other pertinent factors that contribute to a company's CSR engagement.

The incorporation of social responsibility within company operations necessitates the consideration of four fundamental components. The essential components of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) include:

#### **Exemptions from the Statute**

One component of corporate social responsibility (CSR) that is widely agreed upon by researchers and authors is the



notion of beyond the limited economic, technological, and legal obligations of a corporation (Davis, 1973, p. 312; Carroll, 1999). According to Mortazavi et al. (2013), the concept of corporate social responsibility pertains to the manner in which a corporation surpasses the prescribed minimum duties towards stakeholders as outlined in regulations and corporate governance. The authors emphasize the significance of this aspect.

### **A Perspective for the Future**

The second characteristic of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is its alignment with a perspective that emphasizes long-term economic advantages, which may not be easily measurable in monetary terms but have the potential to enhance "social power" and future profitability (Davis, 1973; Carroll, 1999). The aforementioned strategy bears resemblance to the concept of sustainability, when firms strive to achieve a multitude of objectives that synergistically contribute to their long-term viability and profitability amidst a dynamic environment,

rather than only focusing on immediate financial gains. According to the study conducted by LeeDavis, Rozuel, and Kakabadse in 200,

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) necessitates strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation in alignment with established standards, so adhering to the same principles and guidelines as any other significant corporate aim. It is important to ensure alignment with the organization's overarching objectives. The diversion of the company's focus from its core business activities should not be regarded as a façade or a mere set of obligations. The value 20 can be expressed as The concept of stakeholder accountability refers to the responsibility and obligation of individuals or entities to be answerable for their actions and decisions to

The concept that enterprises are obligated to be accountable to several identified stakeholders who possess both moral and legal rights to the company's activities that affect them represents a third characteristic of corporate social responsibility (CSR)



(Frederick, 1987; Mitnick, 199; Jones, 1999). The notion that businesses bear responsibilities towards their shareholders is well acknowledged. However, it is important to recognize that firms also bear obligations towards other stakeholders. This is because, for their sustained success, businesses rely on the support and contributions of other groups, including consumers, employees, suppliers, and local communities (Crane, Dirk, & Spencer, 2008).

### **Social consensus**

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is often associated with the concept of the "social contract" or, alternatively, the "license to operate" in relation to stakeholder arguments (Kakabadse, Rozuel, & Lee-Davis, 200). According to this perspective, a corporation is an entity that is formed and endowed with legal personhood by the issuance of a state charter. By obtaining this authorization, the business acquires the capacity to own, acquire, and dispose of real estate, to enter into contractual agreements, to initiate legal

proceedings and be subject to legal action, and to bear legal responsibility for debts and losses up to the extent of the shareholders' investments. This description provides a disconcerting insight into the potential actions that organizations can do when granted unrestricted operational freedom devoid of ethical limitations. Nevertheless, the notion of a license to operate implies that society grants businesses permission to exist with the expectation that they would behave responsibly and assume accountability for their actions beyond legal requirements.

### **The concept of power**

Finally, it is argued by certain corporate social responsibility (CSR) scholars that the accountability of corporations stems from their power and influence, which results in the generation of moral consequences within society, both in a direct and indirect manner (L'Etang, 199). Wilson (2000, p. 13) posits that corporate social responsibility (CSR) encompasses various levels of behavior, ranging from the basic obligation to adhere to widely accepted ethical principles of "good behavior" to the more demanding



expectation that corporations should actively contribute to resolving social issues, including those that may have been caused by their own actions and undoubtedly impact their performance. In his analysis, the author characterizes CSR as a collection of novel regulations that delineate the ethical norms of society and pertain to matters such as ethics, employment, the interplay between the public and private sectors, legitimacy, governance, equity, and the environment (Wilson, 2000). According to Wilson (2000), the principle of legitimacy posits that corporations should articulate their fundamental mission in relation to the societal objective they want to fulfill, rather than only focusing on profit maximization. This approach is crucial for the business to establish and maintain social legitimacy (p. 13).

### **The approach of stakeholders**

Previous studies have indicated that corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives can provide favorable outcomes for organizations by establishing robust and enduring relationships with stakeholders

(Waddock and Smith, 2000). The theory of identification and salience, as proposed by Mitchell et al. (1997), integrates three key concepts from the social sciences - power, legitimacy, and urgency - to delineate the qualities of stakeholders. These traits are referred to as stakeholder characteristics in their study. It is essential to acknowledge that stakeholder salience has been conceptualized as "the degree to which managers prioritize competing stakeholder demands." The year 1997.

According to Maignan and Ferrell (2004), the level of stakeholder identification with a corporation is influenced by the degree to which corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives effectively address the concerns that are important to the specific stakeholder group.

The current body of literature on corporate social responsibility (CSR) has not extensively explored the topic of relationships and the associated benefits. However, the significance of establishing robust and long-lasting relationships with stakeholders through the provision of these



benefits is well-established in both stakeholder theory and relationship marketing. According to Korschun and Sen (2009), relying just on stakeholder theory is inadequate for ensuring the long-term competitiveness of a corporation. According to Ogreaan et al. (2008), the integration of the subject matter should be undertaken within a conceptual framework, together with a strategic operational management strategy. The inclusion of stakeholders and their essential contributions within a corporation is a prominent element found in the diverse definitions and methods to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). In recent years, experts have conducted extensive research on the correlation between stakeholders and corporate social responsibility (CSR). The approach referred to as the stakeholder method was initially introduced by Freeman during the 1970s. In the study conducted by Server and Capó (2011), a perspective on corporate social responsibility (CSR) is presented that emphasizes the need of considering stakeholders. This approach recognizes that businesses exist within

extensive networks of stakeholders, each of whom holds legitimate interests and demands from the organization. The diverse stakeholders inside the organization possess conflicting and interconnected interests, which also intersect with the interests of the organization itself. When companies face pressure from stakeholders to recognize the significance of corporate social responsibility (CSR), they frequently translate these demands into CSR goals and implement CSR policies for the stakeholders<sup>22</sup>. Therefore, it is unsurprising that a forward-thinking organization, equipped with the ability to identify these varied interests, will engage with its stakeholders to obtain the ethical permission to exploit those resources. The number 23 is the subject of discussion.

This approach initiates by scrutinizing several cohorts for whom the company has accountability, often categorized as primary and secondary stakeholders. According to Clarkson (199, p. 106), a primary stakeholder group can be defined as a crucial entity whose ongoing involvement is



indispensable for the corporation to sustain its operations. This primary group encompasses shareholders and investors, employees, customers, and suppliers. Additionally, the public stakeholder group, as defined by Clarkson, includes governments and communities that provide essential infrastructures and markets. Compliance with their laws and regulations is imperative, and they are also recipients of the corporation's actions (p. 106). Secondary groups can be defined as entities that have the ability to exert influence or have an impact on a firm, or are themselves influenced or impacted by the organization. However, these groups do not engage in direct transactions with the corporation and are not essential for its survival.

The importance of stakeholders may be assessed by considering their relative authority, legitimacy, and urgency (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). The underlying rationale for corporate social responsibility (CSR) is rooted in the belief that it enhances a company's credibility and fosters stronger relationships with key stakeholders,

including the improvement of employee satisfaction. This, in turn, reduces transaction costs and yields financial benefits, such as decreased employee turnover, a more enthusiastic talent pool, and the avoidance of labor union involvement. The number 2. According to Freeman (1978), there are two key principles that serve as the basis for the stakeholder approach to management: The major purpose, as indicated by the first source, is to establish extensive global collaboration among all stakeholders in order to effectively achieve the business objectives.

According to the second source, effectively managing stakeholder relationships requires simultaneous attention to other pertinent matters that have implications for several stakeholders.

The examination of ethical consequences for stakeholders resulting from managerial actions has been conducted utilizing the stakeholder approach. According to Freeman (2008), there are four distinct approaches through which scholars have applied the



stakeholder approach to business ethics. These approaches include: the instrumental theory, which posits that managers who prioritize the interests of stakeholders will ultimately enhance firm performance; the descriptive theory, which focuses on observing and describing how managers currently engage with stakeholders; the normative theory, which advocates for managers to consider the interests of all stakeholders; and lastly, the managerial theory, which serves as a practical framework to guide managerial decision-making and actions.

The objective of stakeholder management is to incorporate stakeholders into the commercial decision-making processes of the organization. This approach focuses on stakeholders, who are those that have the ability to influence or are affected by the policies and practices of a corporation, rather than a broad sense of duty, specific concerns, or the concept of public responsibility (Garriga and Melé, 2004). The management is motivated by the stakeholder approach to develop strategies aimed at

identifying and investing in all the relationships that will ensure sustained success in the long run. Freeman and McVea (2001) argue that this phenomenon contributes to the elucidation of the stakeholder concept's triumph and impact in the domains of business ethics and business and society.

Mitchell et al. (1997) have established a stakeholder identification and salience model that is based on the possession of one or more of the traits of power, legitimacy, and urgency. The confirmation and reinforcement of the three traits' contribution to salience has been established by Agle et al. (1999). Consequently, corporations would prioritize their efforts towards engaging with stakeholder groups who wield legitimate power and exhibit a sense of urgency in influencing the impact of their activities. According to Moir (2001), it may be inferred that organizations experiencing challenges with staff retention should prioritize addressing employee concerns, while those operating in consumer markets should give due thought to reputational



concerns. On the other hand, O'Riordan and Fairbrass (2008) argue that the management of stakeholder interactions may potentially be enhanced through the facilitation of stakeholder discussions.

Moreover, the study undertaken by Korschun et al. (2014) may be seen as an analysis of the interrelationship of three corporate constituencies, namely customers (as a form of stakeholder), workers, and society. Through the utilization of this approach, corporations and their associated parties are able to participate in a structured procedure that promotes the productive articulation of their viewpoints and enables them to actively contribute to a dialogue concerning the extent and characteristics of the social responsibilities that these corporations may possess.

Business managers can gain insights into ways for identifying, evaluating, addressing, and reconciling the interests of their stakeholders via engaging in a discourse pertaining to the prospective social, economic, and environmental obligations of pharmaceutical enterprises.

This research has undertaken a thorough examination of national literature pertaining to the topic, in order to get a full understanding of the concept of corporate social responsibility and the motivations and methods behind corporations' involvement in such endeavors. The integration of business Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives into business policies is of paramount importance, considering the increasing societal pressure on firms to assume accountability and enhance their competitiveness.

In the present global economic landscape, firms are increasingly prioritizing the preservation of human rights, social and environmental responsibility, ethical governance, and the advancement of sustainable development throughout their many activities, collaborations, and offerings. In the context of a global economy, it is imperative for a corporation to align its actions with the social, economic, and environmental expectations of its stakeholders. This phenomenon is





commonly referred to as corporate social responsibility.

The Carrol and Agle studies were included as supplementary sources in this study, which focused on adopting a stakeholder approach rooted on Freeman's stakeholder theory. In order to fulfill their corporate social responsibility (CSR) obligations, organizations must cultivate a strong rapport with their stakeholders by implementing a range of projects and engaging in various activities.

To facilitate the acquisition of stakeholders' approval, comprehension, and esteem, which significantly impacts an organization's reputation, our objective is to elucidate the significance of stakeholder perspectives and preferences, as well as the rationale behind their inclusion in business operations across diverse markets and nations.

If each organization endeavors to attain a unique position and cultivates robust connections with stakeholders to fortify their competitive standing, the inclusion of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the

business strategy will provide significant competitive benefits.

#### **Summary:**

It is imperative for enterprises to embrace a socially responsible attitude towards their environment with the aim of enhancing public perception. Moreover, it is imperative for businesses to perceive social responsibility as a strategic investment rather than a mere expenditure.



### References:

- Agle, B.R., Mitchell, R.K. and Sonnenfeld, J.A. (1999), "What matters to CEOs? An investigation of stakeholder attributes and salience, corporate performance, and CEO values", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, pp. 07-2.
- Agüero, A., & Martínez, J. (200, January 17). The Why, When, and How of Corporate Social Responsibility. (I. d. School, Ed.) Working Paper No. WP0-04. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=10189> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.10189>
- Barnett, M. (200). Stakeholder Influence Capacity and the Variability of Financial Returns to Corporate Social Responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=83086>
- 4. Basu, K., & Guido, P. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Process Model of Sensemaking. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1). Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=130373>
- Bebchuk, L., Cohen, A., & Ferrell, A. (2009). What matters in corporate governance? *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(2), 783.
- Becchetti, L., Ciciretti, R., & Hasan, I. (2009, January 22). Corporate Social Responsibility and Shareholder's Value: An Event Study Analysis. Bank of Finland Research Discussion Paper No. 1/2009. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=9287> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.9287>
- Becht, M., Bolton, P., & Röell, A. (2003). Corporate governance and control. *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, 1, 1–109. Cannon, T. (1992) *Corporate Responsibility*, First edn. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Carroll, A. B.: 1991, the Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders", *Business Horizons* 34, 39–48.
- Carroll, A.B. (1999) 'Corporate social responsibility', *Business and Society*, Vol. 38, Iss. No. 3, pp.268–29.



- Clarkson, M.B.E. (199), "A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 92-117.
- Cheng, B., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and access to finance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(1), 1-23.
- Crane, A., Dirk, M., & Spencer, L. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: readings and cases in a global context. In *Global context*, 3-20. Retrieved from SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1667081>
- Crowther, D., & Aras, G. (2008). *Corporate social responsibility*. Bookboon.
- Davis, K. (1973) 'The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16, Issu. No. 2, pp.312– 322.
- Freeman, R. Edward, and John McVea. "A stakeholder approach to strategic management." (2001).
- Freeman, E., & Velamuri, R. (2008). A New Approach to CSR: Company Stakeholder Responsibility1. Obtenido de Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1186223> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1186223>
- García, F. N. (2012). *Responsabilidad social corporativa: teoría y práctica*. EsiC Editorial.
- Garriga, E. & Mele, D. (2004): "Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory", *Journal of Business Ethics*, n. 3, p. 1-71.
- Goss, A., & Roberts, G. S. (2011). The impact of corporate social responsibility on the cost of bank loans. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 3(7), 1794- 1810.x|
- Jamali, D., & Mirshak, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility (CSR): Theory and practice in a developing country context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72(3), 243–262.
- Kakabadse, N., Rozuel, C., & Lee-Davis, L. (200). Corporate social responsibility and stakeholder approach: a conceptual review. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 1(4), 277-302.



- Korschun, D., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Swain, S. D. (2014). Corporate social responsibility, customer orientation, and the job performance of frontline employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(3), 20-37.
- Korschun, D., & Sen, S. (2009). Strengthening Stakeholder-Company Relationships Through Mutually Beneficial Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives . *Journal of business ethics*, 8, 27-272. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2333439>.
- L'Etang, J. (199) 'Ethical corporate social responsibility: a framework for managers', *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 14, Iss. No. 2
- Mahfuja, M. (2013). Value-Enhancing Capabilities of CSR: A Brief Review of Contemporary Literature.
- Maignan, I., O. C. Ferrell and L. Ferrell: 200, 'A Stakeholder Model for Implementing Social Responsibility in Marketing', *European Journal of Marketing* 39(9/10), 96–977.
- Melsa Ararat, (2008),"A development perspective for "corporate social responsibility": case of Turkey",*Corporate Governance*, Vol. 8 Iss: 3 pp. 271 - 28
- Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. and Wood, D.J. (1997), ``Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 83-86.
- Moir, L. (2001). What do we mean by corporate social responsibility? *Corporate governance*, 16-22.
- Morrison, C., & Seagel, D. (2006, January). Corporate Social Responsibility and Economic Performance. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=900838> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.900838>
- Morimoto, R., Chris, H., & Jhon, A. Corporate social responsibility audit: from theory to practice. (J. I.-C. University, Ed.)



- Mortazavi, H., Pirmouradi, N., & Soltani, A. (2013, August). Corporate social responsibility. Journal of behavioral sciences in asia(4), 63-77. Retrieved from <http://www.joursa.com/majaleh/40.pdf>
- Munro, V. (2013, September). Stakeholder preferences for particular corporate social responsibility and social initiatives. Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 72-10.
- Claudia Ogreaan , Mihaela Herciu & Lucian Belaşcu (2008) Searching for new paradigms in a globalized 3. world: Business ethics as a management strategy, Journal of Business Economics and Management, 9:2, 161-16
- O' Riordan, L., & Fairbrass, J. (2008). CSR: Models and Theories in Stakeholder Dialogue. Journal of Business Ethics, 74-78. doi:DOI 10.1007/s101- 008-9662-y
- Server, R., & Capó , J. (2011). The interrelationship between the demands of Corporate Social Responsibility and cooperative principles and values. (C. -R. España, Ed.) (73).
- Sethi, S.P. (197). Dimensions of corporate social performance: an analytic framework. California Management Review, Spring, pp. 8–64.
- Sharma, A., & Kiram, R. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility: Driving Forces and Challenges. International Journal of Business Research and Development, 2(1), 18-27.
- Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. Journal of Finance, 2(2), 737– 783. 41. Shubham, J., & Shruti, J. (2014, January 22). Corporate social responsibility: a need of a present and future. OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, 6(7), 21-28. Retrieved from Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2383421>
- Sprinkle, G. and Maines, L. (2010) “The benefits and costs of corporate social responsibility”, Business Horizons, 3, pp. 44-43
- Sustainable development through the global impact. (2007). International instruments and corporate social responsibility. Retrieved from



[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp/groups/public/@ed\\_emp/](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp/groups/public/@ed_emp/)

[@emp\\_ent/@multi/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms\\_101247.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/@multi/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_101247.pdf)

- Taneja, S. S., Taneja, P. K., & Gupta, R. K. (2011). Researches in corporate social responsibility: A review of shifting focus, paradigms, and methodologies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101(3), 343-364.
- Tanguy Jacopin, Joan Fontrodona, (2009),"Questioning the corporate responsibility (CR) department alignment with the business model of the company", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 9 Iss: 4 pp. 28 - 36
- Tripathi, A., & Bains, A. (2013). *Evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility: A journey from 1700 BC till 21st century* (8 ed., Vol. 1). (I. J. Research, Ed.)
- Uddin, S., & Shigeru, U. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance linkage: A preliminary study for the conceptual framework. 0, 43-1.
- Uzoma, B. (2012). CSR stakeholder engagement and Nigerian tobacco manufacturing sub - sector. *African Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 3(1), 42-63. doi:10.1108/20400701211197276
- Vergalli, S., & Poddi, L. ( de August de 2009). Does Corporate Social Responsibility Affect The Performance of Firms? Obtenido de <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1444333> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1444333>
- Vergalli, S., & Poddi, L. (2009, August ). Does Corporate Social Responsibility Affect The Performance of Firms? Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1444333> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1444333>
- 1. Verma, A. (2014, January 8). The next level. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2376466> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2376466>