

Chapter 2

Corporate Social Responsibility Around the World—An Overview of Theoretical Framework, and Evolution

2.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to highlight the evolution of the concept of the corporate social responsibility around the world. Specifically, we focus on theoretical framework underpinning the corporate social responsibility. We also review various definitions highlighting some of the most widely used definitions which are exhaustive in nature. We conclude the chapter by providing a summary of various surveys conducted across the world by various agencies to understand the nature of CSR spending from differing perspectives of employees, consumers and management.

Corporate social responsibility has changed the role of doing business in the society, from simple exhortation of no social duties for business to the understanding of being socially responsible. Around the globe, various scholars, reporting agencies and institutions have already started to explore the multiple aspects of this concept both theoretically and empirically. Formalising corporate social responsibility for a corporation builds on the perspective of multi-faceted stakeholders. The basic understanding of widening the responsibility of corporate from shareholder perspective to its all stakeholder approach leads business to play different roles for its different players. However, the challenge is of providing a universally accepted definition of activities to be described as socially responsible behaviour.

In simple terms CSR can be understood from the three words the phrase contains: “Corporate” which covers the large spectrum of businesses, “Social” refers to the local community with which they interact and finally by incorporating “Responsibilities” that are intrinsic on both sides of these relationships. Hence, CSR is nothing but corporate in its widest sense and on many levels, to include all stakeholders and constituent groups that maintain an ongoing interest in the organization’s operations along with the society within which it operates.

2.2 Origin and Evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility

Though the roots of the concept of corporate social responsibility have a long and evolving history, it is mostly a product of the twentieth century, especially from the early 1920s up to the present time. In spite of its recent growth and popularity, one can trace for centuries evidence of the business community's concern for society. Over past six decades it has been discussed in the literature (Bowen 1953) that corporate do have a social responsibility, in the context of widening the accountability of firms performance.

In recent decades, CSR as a concept, has been the focus of many deliberations and research. It has grown in importance both academically as well as in the business sense. It captures a spectrum of values and criteria for measuring a company's contribution to social development.

The central theme of the concept of corporate social responsibility is that the social responsibilities are the social forces operating in every society making corporates to act in a certain way. This is true regardless of whether it is a capitalist or a socialist society as the social forces are always there. These may not allow the business to deviate from the course of social responsibility. These forces may wipe out all such enterprises which prove contrary to social interests. The activities of a corporation impact upon the external environment and that therefore such an organization should be accountable to a wider audience than simply its shareholders.

The core perception of business has some social responsibilities has emerged for the past three hundred years ago from a renowned Scottish philosopher and economist, Adam Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations*. He describes the support for market interactions that are freely participated in by individuals and organizations, saying that they could serve the needs of the society. Further, people engage in commerce or business out of selfish (Invisible Hand) reasons, or for their personal benefits, but in one way or other this would also benefit the society as a whole with positive or negative externalities. This implies that the corporations should also enhance the welfare of the society by protecting and nurturing the interests of the society. Recently, scholars like Brown and Forster (2013) have further substantiated the Smith's idea of corporate social responsibility.

The concept of business ethics or corporate philanthropy has its roots way back in 1920s through concepts of public service (Smith 1759) and trusteeship (Clark 1939). Bowen (1953) has further formally introduced the concept of Businessmen's social responsibilities which provided the much needed foundation for the development of the modern concept of CSR. By bringing in the concept of "stewardship", Friedman (1970) has further enhanced the Smith's view on CSR.

Carroll (1979, 1999a, b) further formalized Bowen's arguments to build models on the escalating concept of CSR. In 1980s the concept of CSR further transcends to a broader concept of corporate social responsiveness and corporate citizenship which further translates to Corporate Social Performance (CSP), which has been




Fig. 2.1 Escalating concept of corporate social responsibility. *Source* Adopted from Mohan (2003) and Gond and Moon (2011)

widely studied by many authors. The interrelationship between the CSP and firm performance and profitability was also extensively explored by many authors such as Cochran and Wood (1984), Aupperle et al. (1985), Waddock and Graves (1997).

Since 1980s the concept of the CSR has evolved in terms of the Stakeholder theory (Freeman 1984) which formed the base for understanding the relationship between CSR and Sustainable Development during 1990s. Around this time, nations around the world started framing guidelines, regulations and principles for adopting CSR as a best practice by corporations. This, further brought a new dimension called the Triple Bottom Line during 2000s which has initiated the modern concepts of CSR as Corporate Citizenship, Corporate Stakeholder Responsibility and Political CSR. Mohan (2003) and Gond and Moon (2011) have summarized the escalating concept of CSR since 1920s, which depicts the road-map of the evolution of the concept of the CSR till date. Figure 2.1 graphically presents the escalating concept of CSR following the works of Mohan (2003) and Gond and Moon (2011).

2.3 Concept of Corporate Social Responsibility: Timeline

Following section summarizes the historical evolution of the concept CSR into six phases from 1950s to after 2000 respectively. We also elaborate on origin and development of the concept of CSR in each of these phases.

The aforementioned six phases are as follows:

1950–1960s—Period of Introduction of CSR in the academic arena and corporate philanthropy as CSR

1970s—Period of rapid growth in the concept of CSR

1980s—Period of Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics

1990s—Period of CSR Practicing by Corporate

2000 onwards—Period of empirical works to investigate the determinants and consequences of CSR on corporate strategy

2.3.1 Corporate Social Responsibility in—1950s

Howard Bowen in his seminal work in 1953 titled as “Social Responsibilities of the Businessman” introduced for the first time the concept of Social Responsibility in the academic research. Specifically, Bowen enquired “What responsibilities to society may businessmen reasonably be expected to assume?” and provided the initial definition of the social responsibility as “... it refers to the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society”. Bowen’s (1953) work proceeded from the belief that the several hundred largest businesses at the time were vital centers of power and decision making and that the actions of these firms touched the lives of citizens in many ways as observed by Carroll (2006).

Subsequently, another influential contribution to the early definitions of social responsibility was made by Frederick (1960). Frederick (1960) specifies that “social responsibility [in the final analysis] implies a public posture toward society’s economic and human resources and a willingness to see that those resources are utilized for broad social ends and not simply for the narrowly circumscribed interests of private persons and firm”. Frederick (1950) points out three core ideas of trusteeship and corporate philanthropy:

1. Corporate managers as public trustees,
2. Balance of competing claims to corporate resources and,
3. The acceptance of philanthropy as a manifestation of business support of good causes.

Murphy (1978) has also classified the growth of CSR in four eras in which he has described the 1950s as the ‘philanthropic’ era during which companies primarily donated to charities.

2.3.2 Corporate Social Responsibility as Philanthropy in 1960s

The decade of the 1960s marked as a period of momentous growth in the attempts to formalize the definition of Corporate Social Responsibility. However, philanthropy continued as the most noticeable manifestation of CSR during the 1960s.

Davis (1960) defined corporate social responsibility as: “Businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest”. Walton (1967) has also addressed many facets of CSR, and proposed a new concept of social responsibility recognizing the interaction between the corporation and society. He has further emphasized that these interactions need to be considered by all the stakeholders while pursuing their respective goals.

Further, Friedman (1962) conceptualized CSR as a social responsibility of business to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is particularly to engage in open and free competition without deception or fraud.

The term “corporate social responsibility” came into common use in the late 1960s and early 1970s after many multinational corporations formed the term stakeholder, meaning those on whom an organization’s activities have an impact. It was used to describe corporate owners beyond shareholders (Freeman 1984).

2.3.3 Period of Rapid Growth in the Concept of CSR During 1970s

The decade of 1970s witnessed a significant growth in the concept of CSR by bringing new concepts such as corporate social responsiveness (Ackerman 1973; Ackerman and Bauer 1976), corporate social performance (CSP), and social responsibility.

In the beginning of 1970s, Friedman (1970) argued that the social responsibility of business is to increase its profits meeting the shareholder value maximisation approach which is referred to as capitalism. He further extends the capitalism argument to account for social responsibility as “there is one and only one social responsibility of business—to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud.” The scholars from psychology and philosophy continued to provide refined concepts of CSR. For example, Johnson (1971) describes CSR as conventional wisdom where “a socially responsible firm is one whose managerial staffs balance a multiplicity of interests. Instead of striving only for larger profits for its stockholders, a responsible enterprise also takes into account employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities, and the nation.” Later, Sethi (1975) distinguishes between CSP, CSR and

corporate behaviours by conceptualising the ‘dimensions of corporate social performance’, ‘social obligation’, ‘social responsibility’, and ‘social responsiveness’ respectively. He further argues that the social responsibility implies synchronising the corporate behaviour with prevailing social norms, values, and expectations of performance.

Using a sample of major U.S. corporations who were engaged into some form of the activities that can be described in the area of social responsibility Eilbirt and Parket (1973), Parket and Eilbirt (1975) found that company size is positively related to the social responsibility efforts and the usual activities undertaken by most of the firms were related to contribution to education and arts. The corporations involved in activities which they consider socially responsible, were interested in making these activities widely known as well.

Hay and Gray (1974) conceptually divided the notion of social responsibility into three historical phases—“Phase I, the profit maximizer style; Phase II, the trusteeship style; and Phase III, the quality of life style. Phase III values will become more accepted by business managers of the future.”

Carroll (1979) made a landmark contribution in the development of CSR concept as he proposed a four-part definition of corporate social responsibility which was embedded in a conceptual model of corporate social performance (CSP). The definition of CSR as proposed by Carroll can be stated as: “the social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time.”

The four part framework of CSR as proposed by Carroll (1979) was widely accepted during this period and fully addresses the entire range of obligations business has to society: economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary. These four basic expectations categorize the social responsibilities of businesses in a more exhaustive manner. He further emphasises each responsibility is one part of the total social responsibility of business, giving a definition that completely reflects the societal expectation from the business.

The first and foremost social responsibility, the “economic responsibility”, of business is to produce goods and services that society wants and to sell these at a profit. While pursuing the economic responsibilities, the society expects businesses to fulfil its legal responsibilities i.e. operating its activities within the framework of legal requirements. Although the economic and legal responsibilities involve certain ethical formal norms, there are additional behaviors and activities that are not necessarily imposed by law but nonetheless are expected of business by the members of society. These voluntary actions are guided only by a business’ desire to engage in social roles and not necessarily governed by the law. Finally, “discretionary responsibilities” are the most convoluted ones and are left to individual judgment and choices.

However, Carroll (1991) revisited his 1979 framework to provide a more specific definition of discretionary component as philanthropic and suggesting that it embraced “corporate citizenship.” He had succinctly put his argument as: “For CSR to be accepted by the conscientious business person, it should be framed in such a way that the entire range of business responsibilities is embraced. It is



Fig. 2.2 Pyramid model of CSR. *Source* Adapted from Carroll (1991)

suggested here that four kinds of social responsibilities constitute total CSR: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. Furthermore, these four categories or components of CSR might be depicted as a pyramid with economic responsibility being the foundation of the pyramid as shown in Fig. 2.2. To be sure, all of these kinds of responsibilities have always existed to some extent, but it has only been in recent years that ethical and philanthropic functions have taken a significant place.”

Friedman (1970) attempted to find how a company is established and for what goal it operates and found that the main objective is profit. As profit is the most important thing, then the objective of business is merely to be responsible for the increasing of shareholders’ wealth.

2.3.4 Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics as CSR in 1980s

In the 1980s, the focus on developing new or refined definitions of CSR dominated the academic research on CSR. The concepts and themes such as corporate social responsiveness, corporate social performance, public policy, business ethics, and stakeholder theory and management were brought into recast the core concern of the CSR.

Summarizing the existing CSR debate, Jones (1980) argued that it is very difficult to reach consensus as to what constitutes socially responsible behaviour and therefore CSR ought to be seen as a process but not as a set of outcomes. Later, Muirhead (1999) categorized the period from the mid-1950s to mid-1980s as a period of ‘growth and expansion’ of corporate contributions. Further, Tuzzolino and Armandi (1981) proposed a microanalytic foundation for organizational analysis, using a paradigm taken from need theory. They presented a taxonomic

construct to assess corporate performance proposing a yardstick to monitor its social responsibility. They further argued that the CSR can be easily motivated and operationalized in the context of an organizational-need hierarchy.

Two very important ‘alternative themes’ of CSR that developed during the 1980s’ were stakeholder theory and business ethics mostly from the contributions of Freeman (1984) and Wartick and Cochran (1985).

As observed by Freeman (1984): “Our current theories are inconsistent with both the quantity and kinds of change that are occurring in the business environment of the 1980s...A new conceptual framework is needed.” It was further developed by Freeman and Velamuri (2005) as a stakeholder approach to CSR to broaden the concept of business beyond its traditional economic roots, by defining stakeholders as—any group or individual who is affected by or can affect the achievement of an organization’s objectives. Based on the stakeholder approach they proposed CSR as Company Stakeholder Responsibility which involves four levels of commitment to this new CSR, and have suggested ten principles that can help executives and business thinkers begin to apply this approach.¹

Wartick and Cochran (1985) examined social issues management as a dimension of corporate social performance and concluded that the corporate social performance model is valuable for business and society study. Studies analysing the relationship between corporate social responsibility and firm profitability were also undertaken during this period. Epstein (1987) provided a definition of CSR relating social responsibility, responsiveness, and business ethics. He argued that these three concepts dealt with closely related, even overlapping, themes and concerns and defined CSR as the following: “Corporate social responsibility relates primarily to achieving outcomes from organizational decisions concerning specific issues or problems which (by some normative standard) have beneficial rather than adverse effects on pertinent corporate stakeholders. The normative correctness of the products of corporate action have been the main focus of corporate social responsibility.”

1980s was mainly marked by the stakeholder theory which was further developed into a more holistic approach in 2000s to describe the concepts of CSR. March and Simon (1958), while developing the stakeholder theory further argued that the relationship between a company and its stakeholders is reciprocal as the stakeholders deliver contributions for the company to meet their interests and the company reward them benefits in return.

The main contributions are from Freeman (1984, 1994), Evan and Freeman (1988), Donaldson and Preston (1995), Freeman and Phillips (2002), Phillips et al. (2003) considers fiduciary duties towards stakeholders of the firm. Further its application requires reference to some moral theory (Kantian, Utilitarianism, theories of justice, etc.). For certain organizations frameworks like The Global Sullivan Principles and UN Global Compact universal rights are considered as

¹For details see Freeman and Velamuri (2005) Annexure I and II.

CSR as they view CSR as to be framed as human rights, labour rights and respect for the environment that a company should possess. Achieving human development considering present and future generations as sustainable development are mainly highlighted as CSR by the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Report; Gladwin et al. 1995). Finally, orientation towards the common good of society is described as CSR by Alford and Naughton (2002); Garriga and Mele (2004); and Kaku (1997).

Several authors then referred this stakeholder theory and created some new CSR models. These are Sustainable Development, Stewardship Theory, Triple Bottom Line, DNA of CSR2.0 Model, Practitioner-based model of societal responsibilities, value creation model of CSR and consumer drive corporate responsibility respectively.

In order to have a long-term perspective, Stakeholder Theory is further developed as Sustainable Development Theory which is defined by World Commission on Economic and Development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. This definition emphasizes the concept in the balance between present and future dimensions. Hawken (1993) aligns this theory with his argument that business can harm the environment, but on the other hand, business is also crucial to solve sustainability problem of environment.

Nearly after two decades, Gechev (2005) observed that this concept consider both of short-term and long-term developments. Further Maples defines Sustainable Development as a combination between innovation and conservation. It is about doing innovation to respond the recent prompt changes while conserving socio-economical systems to get the balance of ecosystem. Sustainability is an important indicator of a company’s performance in a long-term dimension (Maples 2005). The notion of important relationship between business and environment was then started to play in the Sustainable Development Theory. This theory then further developed into some new models, i.e. Triple Bottom Line, Sustainable Development Model and The DNA of CSR 2.0 Model.

2.3.5 CSR in Business Practice During 1990s

During the late 1980s and into the 1990s, corporate philanthropy expanded considerably starting from the pyramid model depicted by Carroll (1991) which further inspires some new novel models, such as Triple Bottom Line, Value Creation Model of CSR and The Model of Consumer Driven Corporate Responsibility. Muirhead (1999) characterized this period of corporate contributions as ‘diversification and globalization’.

Around this time Davis, Schoorman and Donaldson (1997) integrated agency theory to define the concept stewardship which further influenced the evolution of

the concepts of CSR in future. The stewardship theory view managers as “stewards” of corporate assets, satisfying shareholders, and stakeholders. In contrast to the agency theory that argue that maximisation of shareholders interest require separation of board chair and CEO, stewardship theory argues shareholder value maximisation is achieved by shared positions of board chair and CEO (Donaldson and Davis 1991). Stewardship Theory further led to some new CSR models in the 21st century such as Sustainable Development Model and The Model of Consumer Driven Corporate Responsibility.²

Elkington (1998) formulated a concept of “triple bottom line” (TBL) using stakeholder theory to measure and manage the impact of CSR that reflects economic, social and environmental performance. More global companies appeared in the world economy, and management positions dedicated to corporate giving began proliferating on the organization charts of major companies and corporate social performance emerged as more encompassing measure of performance.³ Most of the research in 1990s evolved around the themes of: CSP, stakeholder theory, business ethics, sustainability and corporate citizenship.

The most significant advances to CSR in the 1990s came in the realm of business practice. The concept of CSR broadened from community involvement to an eventual and abiding concern for socially responsible products, processes, and employee relations. In 1992, a non-profit organisation called Business for Social Responsibility (BSR) was established to represent the initiatives and professionals having responsibility for CSR in their companies. BSR expanded the definition of CSR by encompassing various topics such as business ethics, community investment, environment, governance and accountability, human rights, marketplace and workplace. Further, BSR has also argued that terms such as corporate citizenship, business ethics, corporate accountability and sustainability can be used interchangeably to indicate CSR.

The 1990s was also characterized by the emergence of many different companies which have excellent reputations for their CSR practices. To name a few large companies like Nike, Merck, Coca-Cola, UPS, IBM, Prudential Insurance, Levi Strauss & Co., McDonald’s, and Herman Miller, have developed significant CSR related reputations.

The 1990s also witnessed a similar trend in India wherein companies like Tata group, Nirma and Hindustan Unilever had created new business systems and products to meet the needs of under-served consumers, mostly from poor, rural areas.

²Other works based on integrated theories ranges from Sethi (1975), Ackerman (1973), Jones (1980), Vogel (2005) , Wartick and Mahon (1994). Preston and Post (1975, 1981) describe law and the existing public policy process as a reference for social performance. Wartick and Cochran (1985), Wood (1991) and Swanson (1995) propose role of social issues into assessment of corporate social performance. More recently the act of balancing the interests of the stakeholders of the firm as integrative theories as described by Mitchell et al. (1997), Agle et al. (1999), Rowley (1997).

³For example, Griffin and Mahon (1997) examined the relationship between corporate social performance and financial performance.

For example, Tata Steels introduced Lifeline express or Jeevan Rekha Express Train during 1990s which has reached out to more than 67,800 persons offering medical treatment. The company's entire range of healthcare services has been reaching out annually to 400,000 people in the interior villages of India through five hospitals and mobile health clinics.

2.3.6 Research on CSR in 21st Century

Twenty-first century has witnessed a shift in focus from theoretical construct towards the empirical research on the topics such as stakeholder theory, business ethics, sustainability, and corporate citizenship.

Husted (2000) presented a contingency theory of CSP in which he argued that CSP is a function of the nature of the social issue and its corresponding strategies and structures. This further leads to an integration of elements such as corporate social responsiveness, issues management, and stakeholder management. Further, Griffin (2000) argued that the existing research in related disciplines like marketing, human relations, psychology etc., can help to broaden our understanding of Corporate Social Performance. A different but relevant strand of literature described CSR as a signalling instrument to understand corporate commitment to social cases as a communication instrument within the framework of signalling models.

These frameworks essentially argue that CSR activities could possibly communicate relevant information over an enterprise to an uninformed actor, because they are afflicted with cost and hence can be deployed as a signal to reduce the asymmetric information premium (Jones and Murrell 2001; Fisman 2006).

Schwartz and Carroll (2003) refined the three-domain approach to CSR defined by Carroll (1979) by reducing the four categories of CSR into three as economic, legal, and ethical. Stormer (2003) suggested moving beyond the stakeholder model of the firm to an inter-systems model of business which requires modifying the view of corporations as autonomous or independent entities toward a view of firms as part of the communities that created them (Solomon 2004). This is further characterized as a shift from the 'egoic' view of the self as alienated towards the 'post-egoic' view of the organization self as interdependent (Driver 2006).

The twenty-first century also witnessed attention of global organisations to articulate best practices in CSR. For example, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) released the guidelines in corporate social responsibilities (OECD 2001). OECD released its first guidelines on CSR in 2001 for its member countries with voluntary initiatives. The report notes that there are significant divergences of commitment and management practices, even in narrow areas of application such as labor standards, environment, human rights, and fighting bribery. In addition to, research works such as Greenfield (2004), Maignan and Ralston (2002), McWilliams et al. (2006), Pearce and Doh (2005) provided theoretical and managerial discussions that argue "not only is doing good

the right thing to do, but it also leads to doing better” (Bhattacharya and Sen 2004; Dunphy et al. 2003; Kotler and Lee 2005). Perrini (2005) analysed non-financial disclosure on CSR from corporate social, environmental and sustainability reports for ninety European companies and find that firms’ disclosure is related to operational efficiency, maximum safety, environmental protection, quality & innovation, open dialogue, skill development, and responsible citizenship respectively.

Further, Habisch et al. (2005) documented the perspectives of CSR developments across Europe and argue that CSR is one of the most important topics for discussion for business people, politicians, trade unionists, consumers, NGOs, and researchers. In a specific study for UK, Moon (2004) presented how CSR evolved as a part of societal governance in the country which influenced the overall development of CSR in the European Union. Compared to the US, the notion of CSR in Europe is closely related to stakeholder responsibility. For example, Lyndenberg (2005) observes that the development of CSR in Europe was described as driven by “a long-term re-evaluation of the role of corporations in society”.

Figure 2.3 describes the evolution of CSR in a chronological order from 1950s to 2000s. The figure also highlights the key researchers whose works have been highly cited regarding the progress of CSR from philanthropic interpretation to the business practices which accounts for the stakeholder approach.

The theories and concepts until the 21st century can be integrated as Sustainable Development theory which further augmented the existing concepts of CSR and TBL. For example, Aras and Crowther (2009) integrated the concept of Stewardship Theory into Triple Bottom Line to develop sustainable development model demonstrating the synergy and stewardship of financial, social and environmental resources to ensure sustainability. More specifically, the authors focus on internal and external interests of a company by asserting four aspects of CSR as follows:

- Economic aspect, to be the reason of the company’s existence;
- Social aspect, to eradicate poverty and safeguard human rights;
- Environment, to preserve the nature for future generations;
- Organizational culture, to align the corporate and social values with individual values.

The integration of Stewardship Theory with TBL is further evolved into new models such as the DNA of CSR 2.0 Model, A Practitioner-Based Model of Societal Responsibilities and Consumer Driven Corporate Responsibilities Model.

The concept of DNA of CSR 2.0 is an integration of Stakeholder Theory and Sustainable Development by Visser et al. (2010a, b) conceiving this model as “spiralling, interconnected, non-hierarchical levels, representing economic, human, social and environmental systems, each with a twinned sustainability/responsibility manifestation: economic sustainability and financial responsibility; human sustainability and labour responsibility; social sustainability and community responsibility; and environmental sustainability and moral responsibility.”

DNA of CSR 2.0 model combines the concepts of Connectedness “C”, Scalability “S”, and Responsiveness “R”, along with Duality “2” and Circularity




Fig. 2.3 Historical development of CSR in timeline. Source Authors’ compilation from various literature surveys

for “0”. Connectedness is about expressing multi-stakeholders relationships; Scalability indicates that CSR programs must be carried out by a company on a big scale and for a long-term duration; Responsiveness represents that a company must be responsive to deliver the needs of the community; Duality captures company’s responsibility not only to economic aspect but to economic and social aspects as well. Finally, Circularity confirms the concept of sustainability.

A Practitioner-Based Model of Societal Responsibilities describes managers’ perceptions where CSR is viewed in a relatively narrow sense. Pedersen (2010) describes that it is the focus on the TBL that brings out a more practitioner based model of social responsibilities. This further captures the differences in managers’ view of CSR. For example, some of them view CSR in a reactive approach that CSR is carried out merely to comply with responsibility and avoid risk, while the others take the proactive approach to perceive CSR as an effort to make wider changes in society. Overall, managers view CSR as about producing good-quality products without doing harm to environment while creating value for the company and community. In such an approach the responsibilities of a company for products, people and environment are not only taken as its internal operations, but are also meant for creating value for the stakeholders rather than only for shareholders. While Practitioner-Based model builds on Stakeholder Theory, it does not take all stakeholders’ interests as equally important and views CSR as

a part of core business activities of a company where the managers perceive that employees and customers are more important than the other stakeholders. Further, Gholami (2011) develops Value Creation Model from the Stakeholder theory that describes the value creation for an organization and society that results from the mutual dependence between them due to the linkage between CSR and corporate performance including financial and non-financial performance. Gholami (2011) further builds on Carroll's (1991) Pyramid Model in which economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities must be delivered by a company to create value for organization and society. In addition to the concept measurable indicators for each of the theme of the pyramid is explained under the Value Creation Model proposed by Gholami (2011). Specifically, personal saving rate, business saving rate, inflation rate and manufacturing lead time are the indicators of economic dimension according to Value Creation Model. Indicators of legal aspect proposed by Gholami (2011) are anti-trust law, labor training law, taxation law and human rights. Ethical aspect deals with codes of conduct, corruption and money laundering matters. Gholami (2011) further suggests donor acquisition, donor attrition, stewardship calls and gift processing time as key indicators for philanthropic aspect. In the Value Creation Model, economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic aspects are considered as independent variables; organizational dimensions of culture, technology, centralization and training are considered as control variables; and traditional measures of corporate performance such as return on investment (ROI), return on equity (ROE), Return on Asset (ROA), Operating Income (OI) and non-financial corporate performance including access of capital, business value, business savings, social value are considered as dependent variables respectively.

Finally, the Model of Consumer Driven Corporate Responsibility is coined by Claydon (2011). Similar to Value Creation Model, this model is also influenced by Carroll's Pyramid Model as economic approach is inevitably the main aspect of a company. The model further amalgamates concept of sustainability from the Sustainable Development Theory arguing that a company must remain profitable to be sustainable. Considering consumers as the most important stakeholders, this model argues that sustainable profitability can be achieved by ethical and responsible behaviour to its consumers. This model corroborates that CSR can be adopted to achieve competitive advantage by a company where customer base is not well established as well as to maintain profitable situation where the customer base is already established as the existing customers will continue demanding CSR from the company. Therefore, the company must respond to meet the CSR demand in order to remain reputable and profitable. This model shows a cycle that CSR adopted by a company will lead to the increased customer base which in turn means profitability. The profitability from CSR further leads to a greater reputation which can increase customer base. The increased customer base leads to the increased consumer demand for CSR, then it increases CSR adopted by the company.

2.4 Comprehensive Review of Surveys on Corporate Social Responsibility Around the World

In this section we capture the different aspects of CSR from the perspectives of various key stakeholders such as consumers, employees, and management decision makers like CEO's, along with the impact it creates on the society and environment in which the business operations are carried out. Further, in the emerging scenario, reporting of CSR activities are critical for all corporate across countries, we also bring out the status of CSR reporting and the way of communicating CSR to the public by corporate around the world.

This section is organised in a way to provide a clear picture of status of CSR from the perspective of consumers, employees, top management decision makers, and how companies started reporting their CSR. All these aspects are analysed across regions and various countries.

2.4.1 Consumers Perspective on CSR

In the corporate world, consumers are treated as most priority person and satisfying their needs and fulfilling their requirements would be the core objective any business entity. As corporate are loaded with an additional responsibility to take part in the social activities, this would trigger the expectation of consumers to yet another spectrum of understanding their priorities on CSR activities for the companies, their willingness towards CSR, and further their role in CSR emerge as an interesting areas to research both for the corporate and in academics.

A lot of surveys and studies have been conducted on assessing the consumer behaviour towards CSR. Researchers have established that the companies CSR programs indeed have a strong influence on consumers' attitudes and behaviour towards products and companies (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001). Customers use corporate reputation to assess products, with positive reputation resulting in higher perceptions of product or service quality (Jacoby et al. 1971; Shapiro 1983).

Consumers expectation on the corporate social responsibility role of companies have been surveyed in the Millennium Poll survey by Environics International in cooperation with the Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum, during the year 1999, with a representative sample of 23,000 citizens across 23 countries. The major findings of the survey is that two out of three consumers want companies to contribute to broader societal goals that go beyond the historical role of making a profit, paying taxes, employing people and obeying the law. Over one in five consumers report that they have acted as ethical consumers, and almost as many again have considered doing so. It also highlighted that a higher amount of interest among the citizens in understanding the social and environmental impact of companies from all countries.

Social consciousnesses of the consumers about the product they buy are surveyed by Nielsen covering 28,000 online respondents from 56 countries around the world during 2012. The survey findings revealed that two thirds (66 %) of consumers around the world say they prefer to buy products and services from companies that have implemented programs to give back to society. That preference extends to other matters, too: they prefer to work for these companies (62 %), and invest in these companies (59 %). A smaller share, but still nearly half (46 %) say they are willing to pay extra for products and services from these companies, the “socially-conscious consumers,” as defined and focused upon in the report. According to this survey, global, socially-conscious consumers tend to be younger: 63 % are under the age of 40, compared to 55 % of all respondents. In general, Nielsen’s survey shows that younger consumers are more likely to spend extra for products and services from socially-responsible companies. Fifty-one percent of all respondents aged 15–39 are willing to pay extra for such products and services compared to 37 % of all respondents over age 40.

Further Nielsen conducted the second global survey on “Consumers Who Care And Say They’ll Reward Companies with Their Wallets” during August 2013 around 58 countries. The survey results indicate that socially-conscious consumers care most about environmental sustainability. Around 66 % of socially conscious consumers identified environmental sustainability as a cause companies should support. More than 50 % of socially conscious consumers may be less obvious: improvements to science, technology and math education. Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger is also a priority for this segment, with 53 % of socially-conscious consumers believing brands should play a role in the cause.

Consumers willingness towards buying the products and services from a socially responsible company was surveyed by TNS Opinion and Social network among 27 Member States of the European Union and in Croatia, Israel, Turkey, Brazil, the United States, China and India during 2012 on citizen’s view on how company influence society. Over 32,000 respondents have been covered under the survey. The findings of the survey showed that half of respondents said they would be willing to reward companies that give back to society by paying more for their goods and services. European respondents are much more likely to say that small and medium sized companies (71 %), rather than large companies (48 %), make efforts to behave in socially responsible ways. Respondents living in the EU and the US are the only ones who are more likely to think that small and medium companies are making efforts to behave responsibly towards society compared to large companies. In Brazil, India and Turkey the situation is reversed, with respondents more likely to say that large companies are making these efforts.

Europeans think that citizens themselves should take the lead role in influencing the actions of companies through their decisions about what they buy (49 %), followed by company management (40 %) and public authorities (36 %). Where as this decision was much higher among the respondents in India (70 %). Across the European Union, 40 % of Europeans think that companies pay more attention to their influence on society than they did 10 years ago. However, respondents in

non-European countries like India resulted in 62 % a much higher compared with European and Non-European countries.

Similarly Cone Communications 2013 survey revealed that Just as consumers want companies to change, they also feel personally accountable for making responsible purchasing decisions. A mere 13 % feels they do not play any role in addressing social and environmental issues through their purchases, while one-in-five (21 %) consumers not only proactively seek out products and services they feel are responsible every time they shop, but also encourage others to do the same.

Priorities of the customers on the role of companies to do on CSR activities have been surveyed was carried out by IPSOS CSR Global Advisory among 24 countries with an international sample of 18,150 during 2013. On a global average it was found that customers mostly prioritize workplace safety, respect and adhere to local laws & rights and Contribute to the socioeconomic development of the countries where it operates. Whereas the least prioritized factor is fulfilling their financial and commercial targets to increase shareholder value, leave behind conditions for sustainable development after operations are closed and Maintain sustainable environmental practices. Indian Consumers also reflect the similar trend of priorities as of overall global average score.

Research suggests that companies may receive external benefits from implementing CSR policies. Field based and laboratory studies have found that CSR is linked to more favourable corporate evaluations, increased purchase behaviour (Lichtenstein et al. 2004), higher customer satisfaction and market value of a firm (Luo and Bhattacharya 2006) all of which is believed to translate into increased profitability for the corporation.

Cone Communications partnered with Echo Research to field out second comprehensive survey of global attitudes, perceptions and behaviours around CSR after 2011. They conducted an online survey of 10,287 consumers in 10 of the largest countries in the world. The survey broadly described “corporate social responsibility” to respondents in each country as “companies changing their business practices and giving their support to help address the social and environmental issues the world faces today.” The survey findings reveal that globally 22 % opinioned that companies create impact on CSR whereas, 27 % believed that Consumers drive CSR, which shows that Consumers are more keen in bringing CSR. Similarly in India also showed the same trend with a higher percentage of 37 % believed that of company and 52 % believed that consumers drive CSR.

2.4.2 Employee Perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility

There is also some evidence that CSR is beneficial because as with customer’s willingness and acceptance of CSR activity also improves employees’ perceptions of the company. When a company has CSR initiatives, employees are more

proud of and committed to that organization. A study conducted by Brammer et al. (2007) also support this finding: employees' perceptions of their organizations' concern for community and environment is linked to their level of organizational commitment. Even after controlling for a whole host of relevant variable, perceptions of CSR make a unique and positive contribution to overall commitment. That is, the higher an employee rates their organization's corporate citizenship, the more committed they are to the organization.

Society for Human Resource Management conducted a pilot study on Corporate Social Responsibility Survey among Human Resource professionals employed by organizations operating in the United States, Australia, India, China, Canada, Mexico and Brazil during 2007. The survey findings revealed that Brazil reported the highest rate of organization participation in corporate social responsibility practices and where as in contrast China reported the lowest rate of participation in corporate social responsibility practices. Human Resource professionals from India who were employed by large or medium organizations reported that their organizations participated in donating/collecting money for natural disasters than those from small organizations.

2.4.3 CEO's Perspective on CSR

According to the survey of 766 United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) member CEOs, Accenture CEO Study Project Lead 2010, CEOs around the world are starting to see the shape of a new era of sustainability coming into view. In the face of rising global competition, technological change and the most serious economic downturn in nearly a century, corporate commitment to the principles of sustainability remains strong throughout the world. The major highlights of the survey are: Nearly one third of the respondents cited brand, trust and reputation as the top three factors followed by revenue growth and cost reduction as driving force for them to take action on sustainability issues. Among the development issues, education issues dominate climate change as crucial factor considered as the most important issue to address for the success of their business. And further all most all the respondents believe in integrating sustainability issues through their supply chain and also in the strategy and operation of their company.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) had made a global survey on CEOs in its 16th annual global survey during 2013 with 1330 CEOs interviews in 68 countries. The survey reported highest confidence in CSR reputation amongst North American CEOs, with 64 % feeling strongly that the public perceives their company as a positive social performer and 30 % feeling somewhat guarded confidence. Asia-Pacific CEOs have the lowest confidence in public perception of their companies as positive social performers, with only 28 % feeling strongly confident and 54 % feeling more cautiously confident.

The PwC survey results highlighted that about 75 % of CEOs in India are planning to strengthen their engagement with local communities, 72 % with the media

and 59 % with NGOs. Forty-eight percent of CEOs in India (31 % globally) are also increasing their focus on volunteering and community work. Their attention to reducing the environmental footprint is almost on par with the global number; 44 % in India as opposed to 48 % globally. More than half of the CEOs interviewed in India are encouraging a framework to support a culture of ethical behaviour.

The United States based Conference Board carried out a global survey during 2002 on the attitudes of CEOs to developments in corporate citizenship. The highlights of survey results were: Company traditions and values to act ethically and be a force for economic development are by far the most important drivers for corporate social investment throughout the world. CEOs in the United States, Brazil and Europe say that their efforts to create future success through citizenship initiatives have only been ‘somewhat’ effective to date. In other regions, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, CEOs see their results as ‘not very’ effective.

2.5 Conclusion

The objective of this chapter is to highlight the evolution of the concepts of the corporate social responsibility around the world. Specifically, we focus on theoretical framework underpinning the corporate social responsibility. We also review various definitions highlighting some of the most widely used definitions which are exhaustive in nature. We conclude the chapter by providing a summary of various surveys conducted across the world by various agencies to understand the nature of CSR spending from differing perspectives of employees, consumers and management.

This chapter highlights the evolution of the concept of the corporate social responsibility around the world into phases of development of the concepts. There is no “one definition fits all” concept for CSR and therefore, specific definitions have evolved based on the institutional development, awareness about social issues and organizational behaviour. CSR is embedded in the management sciences with new constructs and linkages with organisational behaviour are evolving. The chapter also provides the comprehensive summary of some recent surveys on CSR activities to capture the perspectives of consumers, employees and management.

Against this backdrop the following chapter provides a detailed discussion on the relevant guidelines and best practices across the globe.

References

- Ackerman RW (1973) How companies respond to social demands. *Harvard Bus Rev* 51(4):88–98
- Ackerman RW, Bauer RA (1976) *Corporate social responsiveness*. Reston, Reston, VA
- Agle BR, Mitchell RK, Sonnenfeld JA (1999) Who Matters To CEOs? An Investigation of Stakeholder Attributes and Salience, Corporate Performance and CEO Values. *Acad Manage J* 42(5):507–525

- Alford H, Naughton M (2002) Beyond the shareholder model of the firm: working toward the common good of a business. In: Cortright SA, Naughton MJ (eds) *Rethinking the purpose of business*, University of Notre Dame Press, IN: Notre Dame, pp 27–47
- Aras G, Crowther D (2009) *The durable corporation: strategies for sustainable development* (Gower Publishing Ltd)
- Aupperle KE, Carroll AB, Hatfield JD (1985) An empirical investigation of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Acad Manage J* 28:446–463
- Bhattacharya CB, Sen S (2004) Doing better at doing good: when, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *Calif Manage Rev* 47(1):9–24
- Bowen HR (1953) *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. Harper & Brothers, New York
- Brammer S, Millington A, Rayton B (2007) The Contribution of corporate social responsibility to organisational commitment. *Int J Hum Resource Manage* 18(10):1701–1719
- Brown JA, Forster WR (2013) CSR and stakeholder theory: a tale of Adam Smith. *J Bus Ethics* 112(2):301–312
- Carroll AB (1979) A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Acad Manage Rev* 4:497–505
- Carroll A (1991) The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Bus Horiz* 34:39–48
- Carroll AB (1999a) Corporate social responsibility evolution of a definitional construct. *Bus Soc* 38(3):268–295
- Carroll AB (1999b) Corporate social responsibility: evolution of a definitional construct. *Bus Soc* 38(3):268–295
- Carroll A (2006) Corporate social responsibility: a historical perspective. In: Epstein MJ, Hanson KO (eds) *The accountable corporation*, vol 3. Praeger Publishers, Westport, pp 3–30.
- Buchholtz, 2006. *Business and society: ethics and stakeholder management*, 6th edn. South-Western College Publishing/International Thompson Publishing, Cincinnati
- Clark JM (1939) *Social control of business*. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Claydon J (2011) A new direction for CSR: the shortcomings of previous CSR models and the rationale for a new model. *Soc Responsib J* 7(3):405–420
- Cochran PL, Wood RA (1984) Corporate social responsibility and financial performance. *Acad Manage J* 27(1):42–56
- Davis K (1960) Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *Calif Manage Rev* II:70–76
- Davis JH, Schoorman FD, Donaldson L (1997) Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Acad Manage Rev* 22(1): 20–47
- Donaldson T, Preston LE (1995) The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of management review* 20(1):71
- Driver M (2006) Beyond the stalemate of economics versus ethics: corporate social responsibility and the discourse of the organizational self. *J Bus Ethics* 66:337–356
- Dunphy D, Griffiths A, Benn S (2003) *Organizational change for corporate sustainability*. Routledge, London
- Eilbert H, Parket IR (1973) The current status of corporate social responsibility. *Bus Horiz* 16:5–14
- Elkington J (1998) *Cannibals with forks: the triple bottom line of 21st century business* (New Society Publishers)
- Epstein EM (1987) The corporate social policy process: beyond business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social responsiveness. *Calif Manage Rev* 29:99–114
- Evan WM, Freeman RE (1988) A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation: kantian capitalism. In: Beauchamp TL, Bowie NE (eds) *Ethical theory and business*, 3rd edition (Englewood Cliffs). pp 97–106
- Frederick WC (1960) The growing concern over business responsibility. *Calif Manage Rev* 2:54–61
- Frederick WC (2006) *Corporation be good: the story of corporate social responsibility*. Dog Ear Publishing, Indianapolis
- Freeman RE (1984) *Strategic management: a stakeholder approach*. Pitman, Boston

- Freeman RE (1994) The politics of stakeholder theory: some future directions. *Business ethics quarterly* 4:409–421
- Freeman RE, Phillips RA (2002) Stakeholder theory: a libertarian defense. *Business ethics quarterly* 12(3):331–350
- Freeman RE, Velamuri SR (2005): A new approach to CSR: company stakeholder responsibility. In: Kakabadse A, Morsing M (eds) *Corporate Responsibility*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK
- Friedman M (1962) *Capitalism and freedom*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Friedman M (1970) The social responsibility of business is to increase profits. *N Y Times Mag* 32–33, 122–126, Sept 2013
- Garriga E, Mele D (2004) Corporate social responsibility theories: mapping and territory. *J Bus Ethics* 53:51–74
- Gechev R (2005). *Sustainable development. Economic aspect*, University Press
- Gholami S (2011) Value creation model through corporate social responsibility (CSR). *Int J Bus Manag* 6(9)
- Gladwin TN, Kennelly JJ, Tara-Shelomith K (1995) Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: implications for management theory and research. *Acad Manage Rev* 20(4):874–907
- Gond J-P, Moon J (2011) Corporate social responsibility in retrospect and prospect: exploring the life-cycle of an essentially contested concept, No. 59-2011 ICCSR research paper series—Routledge major work on corporate social responsibility
- Greenfield WM (2004) In the name of corporate social responsibility. *Bus Horizons* 47(1):19–28
- Griffin JJ (2000) Corporate social performance: research directions for the 21st century. *Bus Soc* 39(4):479–491
- Griffin JJ, Mahon JF (1997) The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: twenty-five years of incomparable research. *Bus Soc* 36:5–31
- Habisch A, Jonker J, Wegner M, Schmidpeter R (eds) (2005) *Corporate social responsibility across Europe*. Springer, Berlin
- Hawken P (1993) *The ecology of commerce*. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London
- Hay R, Gray E (1974) Social responsibilities of business managers. *Acad Manage J* 17:1
- Husted BW (2000) A contingency theory of corporate social performance. *Bus Soc* 39(1):24–48
- Jacoby J, Olson JC, Haddock RA (1971) Price, Brand Name, and Product Composition Characteristics as Determinants of Perceived Quality. *J Appl Psychol* 55:570–579
- Johnson HL (1971) *Business in contemporary society: framework and issues*. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., Belmont
- Jones TM (1980) Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. *Calif Manage Rev* 59–67 (Spring)
- Jones R, Murrell AJ (2001) Signaling positive corporate social performance: an event study of family-friendly firms. *Bus Soc* 40(1):59–78
- Kaku R (1997) The path of kyosei'. *Harvard Bus Rev* 75(4):55–62
- Kotler P, Lee N (2005) *Corporate social responsibility: doing the most good for your company and your cause*. Wiley, Hoboken
- Lichtenstein DR, Drumwright ME, Braig BM (2004) The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *J Marketing* 68(10):16–33
- Luo X, Bhattacharya CB (2006) Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *J Marketing* 70(4): 1–18
- Lydenberg SD (2005) *Corporations and the public interest: guiding the invisible hand*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., San Francisco
- Maignan I, Ralston D (2002) Corporate social responsibility in Europe and the U.S.: insights from businesses' self-presentations. *J Int Bus Stud* 33(3):497–514
- Maples AD (2005) Sustainable development. *New Appl Sci J* 27:1083–1086
- March JG, Simon HA (1958) *Organizations*. New-York: John Wiley and sons
- McWilliams A, Siegel DS, Wright PM (2006) Corporate social responsibility: strategic implications. *J Manage Stud* 43(1):1–18
- Mitchell RK, Agle BR, Wood DJ (1997) Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Acad Manage Rev* 22(4):853–886

- Mohan A (2003) Strategies for the management of complex practices in complex organizations: a study of the transnational management of corporate responsibility. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, United Kingdom
- Moon, J. (2004). CSR in the UK: an explicit model of business – society relations. In: Habisch A, Jonker J, Wegner M, Schmidpeter R (eds) CSR across Europe. Springer, Berlin, pp 51–65
- Muirhead SA (1999) Corporate contributions: the view from 50 years. The Conference Board, New York
- Murphy PE (1978) An evolution: corporate social responsiveness. *Univ Mich Bus Rev*
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2001) Corporate responsibility: private initiatives and public goals. OECD, Paris
- Parket IR, Eilbirt H (1975) Social responsibility: the underlying factors. *Bus Horiz XVIII*:5–10
- Pearce JA, Doh JP (2005) High-impact collaborative social initiatives. *MIT Sloan Manage Rev* 46(3):30–39
- Pedersen ER (2010) Modelling CSR: how managers understand the responsibilities of business towards society. *J Bus Ethics* 91(2):155–166
- Perrini F (2005) Book review of corporate social responsibility: doing the most good for your company and your cause. *Acad Manage Perspect* 90–93 (May)
- Phillips RA, Freeman RE, Wicks AC (2003) What stakeholder theory is not. *Bus ethics quart* 13(4):479–502
- Preston LE, Post JE (1975) Private management and public policy: the principle of public responsibility. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs
- Preston LE, Post JE (1981) Private management and public policy. In: *california management review*. 23(3):56–63
- Rowley TJ (1997) Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. *Acad Manage Rev* 22:887–910
- Schwartz MS, Carroll AB (2003) Corporate social responsibility: a three domain approach. *Bus Ethics Q* 13(4):503–530
- Sen S, Bhattacharya CB (2001) Does doing good always lead to doing better? consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *J Mark Res* 38(5):43–62
- Sethi SP (1975) Dimensions of corporate social performance: an analytic framework. *Calif Manage Rev* 17:58–64 (Spring)
- Shapiro C (1983) Premium for high quality products as returns to reputations. *Quart J Econ* 98(4):659–679
- Stormer F (2003) Making the shift: moving from “ethics pays” to an inter-systems model of business. *J Bus Ethics* 44(4):279–288
- Swanson DL (1995) Addressing a theoretical problem by reorienting the corporate social performance model. *Acad Manage Rev* 20:43–64
- Tuzzolino F, Armandi BR (1981) A Need-hierarchy framework for assessing corporate social responsibility. *Acad Manage Rev* 6:21–28
- Visser W (2010a) CSR 2.0: From the age of greed to the age of responsibility. In: Sun W et al (eds) *Reframing corporate social responsibility, Lessons from the global financial crisis*, Emerald, Bingley
- Visser W (2010b) The age of responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the new DNA of business. *J Bus Systems, Govern Ethics* 5(2):7–22
- Vogel DJ (2005) Is there a market for virtue? the business case for corporate social responsibility. *Cal manage rev* 47(4):19–45
- Waddock SA, Graves SB (1997) The corporate social performance–financial performance link. *Strat Mgmt J* 18: 303–319
- Walton CC (1967) *Corporate social responsibilities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Wartick SL, Cochran PL (1985) The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Acad Manage Rev* 10:758–769
- Wartick SL, Mahon JF (1994) Toward a substantive definition of the corporate issue construct a review and synthesis of the literature. *Bus Soc* 33(3):293–311
- Wood DJ (1991) Corporate social performance revisited. *Acad Manage Rev* 16:691–718



<http://www.springer.com/978-981-10-0924-2>

Corporate Governance and Corporate Social
Responsibility of Indian Companies

Bhaduri, S.N.; Selarka, E.

2016, XV, 134 p. 19 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-0924-2