LEADER: International Journal of Business Management

Review Article

Corporate Social Responsibility: A review and future research agenda

Palwinder Kumar[1] & Sukhdeep Kaur[2]

[1]Chandigarh School of Business, Jhanjeri, Punjab, India
[2]Gursewa Institute of Science and Technology, Hoshiarpur, Punjab, India

ABSTRACT:

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has become an essential area of research, capturing the multifaceted interface between companies and their wider social responsibilities. With corporations in an increasingly interdependent and open-world economy, CSR has become a core element of corporate strategy, influencing stakeholder engagement, regulatory affairs, and sustainability over the long term. It serves as a bridge between corporate objectives and societal well-being, reinforcing the notion that businesses have responsibilities beyond profit maximization. The review emphasizes the multidimensional character of CSR, highlighting its institutional, organizational, and individual-level dynamics. At the institutional level, CSR is shaped by legal and regulatory environments, international sustainability agendas, and socio-political forces that condition corporate actions. At the organizational level, CSR strategies are inscribed in corporate governance arrangements, business models, and leadership styles that define how companies address ethical and sustainability issues. At the micro level, CSR influences employee motivation, consumer conduct, and executive decision-making, showing the micro-level influence of corporate responsibility on stakeholders. By considering these three levels of analysis, this research gives a complete picture of how CSR acts as a strategic and moral imperative for firms globally.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility (CSR), literature review

Correspondence: Palwinder Kumar, Associate Professor, Chandigarh School of Business, Jhanjeri, Punjab, India**,** India, Pin – 140307 (email - drpalwinder3@gmail.com)

1. Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) includes organizational policies and actions that serve to meet the expectations of stakeholders and balance economic, social, and environmental necessities (Aguinis, 2011). With businesses expanding their operations into complex global landscapes, the functions of CSR have extended beyond simple philanthropy. Companies are now tasked with mainstreaming CSR in business strategies, where corporate operations align with sustainable development while supporting financial performance. This transition has necessitated researchers and professionals to investigate the multi-faceted characteristics of CSR and its impact on business and society.

CSR has become an integral element of corporate governance, shaping organizational policies, stakeholder relationships, and competitive strategy. Organizations that focus on ethical responsibility and sustainability are likely to secure consumer confidence, investor trust, and employee loyalty. The increasing focus on CSR is also evident in regulation and reporting systems, including the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), that promote corporations to be more accountable and transparent about their social and environmental behaviors (Rasche et al., 2013).

Scholarly debates over CSR have been influenced by multiple theoretical approaches, such as stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and institutional theory. These frameworks give an insight into why and how businesses get involved in CSR. Although some academics contend that CSR contributes to improved corporate reputation and bottom line, others underscore its function of ensuring long-term sustainability and moral leadership. Due to the escalating sophistication of CSR, interdisciplinary studies that investigate its effects on various industries and socio-economic settings are required (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016).

In spite of the increasing number of studies on CSR, there are still some gaps in the knowledge of its implementation and impact. Researchers still argue about the degree to which CSR activities affect firm performance, stakeholder involvement, and social welfare. Moreover, the emergence of digital technologies has added new aspects to CSR, including online transparency, corporate activism, and consumer-driven accountability. These new patterns require more inquiry to establish ways in which enterprises can utilize CSR effectively for a competitive edge, while also doing their greater societal duties (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019).

This report examines the developmental history of CSR, tracing its initial roots, contemporary evolution, and current application. The arguments also touch upon some of the major theoretical constructs, research paradigms, and empirical literature in CSR study. Through the identification of empirical and theoretical gaps, this review establishes a research map for the future, focusing on the importance of integrative approaches and methodological development. The knowledge of CSR's historic development and practical implications can inform companies, policymakers, and scholars on how to promote responsible corporate conduct in accordance with changing societal expectations.

2. History of the Evolution of CSR

2.1. Early Foundations (Pre-1950s)

The history of CSR dates back to the early 20th century when companies first realized their extended responsibilities other than profit maximization. CSR initiatives in the initial stages were mainly philanthropic in nature and were steered by religious and moral beliefs. At the time of the industrial revolution, business tycoons like Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller indulged in philanthropic acts, sponsoring educational centers, hospitals, and social welfare schemes (Carroll, 2008). These activities, though commendable, were for the most part discretionary and were not under formal regulatory auspices.

The beginning of corporate accountability debates during the 1930s and 1940s provided a foundation for contemporary CSR. Academic authors such as Barnard (1938) and Clark (1939) were focusing on interdependence between companies and society and advocated for corporations giving back to society for its privileges enjoyed by the company. In this time, ideas like managerial responsibility and corporate citizenship began to be popularized, emphasizing the moral imperative of corporations to keep stakeholder concerns in line with financial goals (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019).

World War II subsequently also cemented the importance of corporate responsibility, with businesses having a key role to play in economic rebuilding and national progress. Governments and international bodies started calling for equitable labor practices, ethical supply chains, and environmental protection. The initial roots of CSR, while largely voluntary, paved the way for its slow institutionalization in the next few decades.

2.2. The Modern Era (1950s-1980s)

The 1950s were a turning point in the development of CSR thinking. Howard Bowen's (1953) book, Social Responsibilities of the Businessman, is commonly accepted as the pioneering work that established CSR as an academic field. According to Bowen, businesses had moral responsibilities to society and ought to align their policies with the public good. His work set the stage for the incorporation of social expectations into corporate decision-making, shaping later CSR theories and practices.

In the 1960s and 1970s, CSR picked up pace as companies were subjected to greater scrutiny by civil rights movements, environmentalists, and trade unions. Researchers like Davis (1960) and McGuire (1963) broadened the CSR agenda by focusing on corporate responsibility in social and environmental areas (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016). The era also witnessed the emergence of Corporate Social Performance (CSP), a model that evaluated the success of CSR efforts in delivering concrete social impacts (Wood, 1991).

By the 1980s, CSR was already a part of mainstream corporate plans, with corporations setting up standalone CSR departments and issuing sustainability reports. International advancements, including the enactment of environmental protection legislation and the emergence of socially responsible investing, further validated the importance of CSR. Firms realized that CSR could also be used as a risk management tool, as a means to differentiate themselves through branding, and as a vehicle for stakeholder engagement (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). The contemporary period of CSR thus laid the groundwork for its institutionalization within corporate governance.

2.3. Contemporary Developments (1990s-Present)

The 1990s began an age of formal CSR schemes and international accountability norms. Bodies like the United Nations and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) promulgated CSR best practices, persuading companies to incorporate ethical reasoning into their management. The United Nations Global Compact, initiated in 2000, set forth principles concerning human rights, labour standards, environmental responsibility, and anti-corruption practices (Rasche et al., 2013).

An important advancement within modern CSR was the advent of Porter and Kramer's (2011) Creating Shared Value (CSV) idea, which focused on linking business success with societal advancement. In contrast to mainstream CSR, which was generally perceived as an add-on initiative, CSV advocated for the possibility of companies generating economic value by resolving social problems. This view supported the notion that CSR must be integrated into corporate strategies and not viewed as an independent philanthropic effort (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016).

The revolution in the digital sector has also transformed CSR practices in the 21st century. Firms today utilize digital platforms to make their operations more transparent, report on sustainability, and interact with stakeholders in real-time. Social media has given consumers the power to hold companies accountable for their actions, and companies have been forced to become more responsible in their practices. Moreover, advances in technology like blockchain and artificial intelligence have made ethical supply chain management possible, with increased corporate accountability (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019). Modern CSR continues to change, with the growing incorporation of ethical factors into corporate decision-making and governance systems.

3. Theoretical Perspectives

3.1. Institutional-Level Analysis

It is based on institutional theory that CSR practices are framed by regulatory, normative, and cultural-cognitive pressures (Scott, 1995).

Companies do not exist independently; instead, they exist in a network of expectations of society, regulatory systems, and cultural standards that permeate their decision-making processes. CSR adoption frequently occurs as a result of responses to external pressures from governments, industry associations, NGOs, and society as a whole. Organizations adhere to CSR norms in order to acquire legitimacy, improve their image, and avoid risks of non-compliance (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

One of the most important elements of institutional theory in CSR studies is stakeholder theory, which focuses on the importance of stakeholders in influencing corporate actions. Frynas and Yamahaki (2016) contend that stakeholder expectations generate external pressures that compel CSR efforts. For instance, those firms that specialize in industries that are particularly scrutinized, for example, manufacturing or energy, tend to be more scrutinized in terms of their environmental and labor policies. Those companies that do not address these issues risk losing reputation, regulatory fines, and consumer confidence. Therefore, companies actively undertake CSR initiatives to ensure legitimacy and competitive position.

Most important contributions at the institutional-level analysis are:

Stakeholder Salience: Mitchell et al. (1997) introduced a model of identifying and ranking stakeholders according to their power, legitimacy, and urgency. Companies have to measure the influence of stakeholders to know who needs most of their attention in their CSR initiatives.

Institutional Pressures: DiMaggio and Powell (1983) differentiated institutional pressures as coercive (compliance with laws and regulations), mimetic (mimicking successful organizations), and normative (professional and industry expectations). These forces influence corporate practices and CSR initiatives.

Legitimacy Theory: Suchman (1995) emphasized that companies embrace CSR practices to attain social legitimacy and approval, thus sustaining stakeholder backing and market acceptability.

Institutional-level analyses also highlight the imperative of global standards and frameworks to influence CSR practices. International CSR guidelines, including the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), United Nations Global Compact, and ISO 26000, have made sustainability reporting standard, allowing stakeholders to assess corporate performance in the same way consistently (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Firms that follow these frameworks raise their credibility and reinforce their long-term sustainability strategies.

3.2. Organizational-Level Analysis

At the organisational level, CSR is shaped by strategic management theories such as the Resource-Based View (RBV) and agency theory. These views accentuate how CSR fosters competitive advantage, risk control, and long-term profitability. Those organisations that embed CSR in their business core strategies reap improved stakeholder relationships, stronger employee commitment, and better financial performance (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016).

The Resource-Based View (RBV) also posits that CSR can act as a distinctive and imitable resource that grants firms a long-term competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Firms that integrate CSR into their business strategy can distinguish themselves from rivals by building brand loyalty, drawing consumers who are conscious of societal issues, and generating high employee satisfaction. For example, companies that focus on sustainable supply sources or ethical hiring processes tend to attain positive brand image, which can drive market share and profitability.

Major takeaways from CSR analysis at the organizational level are:

RBV and CSR: Barney (1991) contended that CSR can be a determinant of lasting competitive advantage when it is embedded in distinctive organizational resources. Organizations that engage in CSR-focused innovation, like green technology or moral supply chains, are able to achieve long-term profitability and market dominance (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012).

Agency Theory: Jensen and Meckling (1976) discussed how CSR is in line with managerial and shareholder interests. CSR programs can minimize

agency costs by bringing corporate goals in line with stakeholder expectations, reducing risks from unethical business conduct.

Dynamic Capabilities: Teece et al. (1997) stressed the need for flexibility and the reconfiguration of resources in order to introduce successful CSR strategies. Organisations need to constantly revise CSR strategies to accommodate shifting market conditions and stakeholder issues.

Interactions between CSR and the organisational culture are also underscored in organisational-level analyses. Ethical organisational culture promotes employee commitment to CSR goals, improving the success of CSR initiatives (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019). Employees are more likely to participate in CSR initiatives if they feel that their company values ethical conduct and social responsibility. Firms that make CSR a part of their internal culture have a more motivated and committed set of employees, which results in greater job satisfaction and less employee turnover.

In addition, organizations that integrate CSR into supply chain management show adherence to ethical purchasing and sustainability. Organizations like Unilever and Patagonia have become leaders in their prudent supply chain policies, which correspond with consumers' demands for green products. Organizations that integrate CSR into their organizational strategies not only contribute to well-being in society but also guarantee long-term financial gains.

3.3. Individual-Level Analysis

The micro-level CSR research has also picked momentum with a shift to psychological and behavioral aspects. Stakeholders like employees, customers, and management at the individual level are at the center of the success and acceptance of CSR initiatives. The study of CSR at this level discusses how company responsibility efforts are shaped by values, leadership behaviors, and societal norms (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012).

Employee engagement is a central element of individual-level CSR research. Employee morale, loyalty, and productivity are improved by CSR activities through creating a sense of meaning and adherence to ethical principles (Glavas &

Piderit, 2009). Organizations with robust CSR commitments tend to witness greater employee satisfaction, low turnover rates, and strong organizational citizenship behavior. Those employees who are convinced of their company's CSR vision will be more inclined to speak on behalf of their employer and play a positive role within corporate culture.

Leadership impact is another imperative determinant of CSR adoption. Transformational leaders have a central role in instilling CSR values in organizational culture (Waldman et al., 2006). Ethical decision-making, stakeholder participation, and sustainability-oriented leadership styles propel CSR achievement. Leaders focusing on corporate ethics establish a setting where CSR becomes part of the business strategy as opposed to being an add-on function.

Consumer behavior is also largely driven by CSR. Research has shown that consumers prefer socially responsible brands and are willing to pay a premium for products from ethically committed companies (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Brands that communicate CSR in an open manner gain consumer trust and loyalty. Socially responsible marketing campaigns, like fair trade certifications and carbon-neutral initiatives, appeal to consumers who make sustainability-driven purchasing decisions.

Major findings of individual-level CSR research are:

Employee Engagement: CSR promotes a healthy work culture, resulting in greater job satisfaction and greater employee retention (Glavas & Piderit, 2009).

Leadership Influence: Transformational leaders influence CSR-focused corporate cultures, instilling ethical values into business practices (Waldman et al., 2006).

Consumer Behavior: CSR affects buying behavior, with research showing high demand for brands that adopt ethical and sustainable business practices (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001).

Besides that, individual-level studies investigate personal values and ethics as drivers for CSR perceptions. Ethically strongly convinced

employees and customers are willing to support and become involved with CSR activities more than others (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019). Firms whose CSR agendas reflect stakeholder values can bolster brand loyalty, establish long-term relationships, and advance social reform.

Broadening CSR studies to recognize institutional, organizational, and individual-level factors enables a richer understanding of corporate responsibility. Considering CSR from these various perspectives, firms and scholars can create more effective approaches that are in harmony with stakeholder expectations, regulatory requirements, and sustainability objectives. Future study must continue to examine how these levels interact and to what extent CSR programs can be improved to produce the greatest social and economic benefits.

4. Methodological Approaches

CSR studies utilize various methodologies, from qualitative case studies to extensive quantitative studies. These methods enable researchers to examine the multifaceted nature of CSR, measuring its effects on financial performance, employee commitment, stakeholder trust, and societal consequences. Aguinis and Glavas (2012) highlight the necessity of multilevel and multidisciplinary methods to capture the complexity of CSR phenomena. By combining institutional, organizational, and individual levels of analysis, researchers are able to create a richer understanding of the ways in which CSR affects stakeholders.

Quantitative methods such as surveys, econometric modeling, and meta-analyses are commonly employed to quantify the effectiveness of CSR initiatives. These methodologies allow scholars to analyze large data sets, evaluate statistical correlations, and determine temporal trends. Longitudinal surveys are especially useful in CSR research because they monitor changes in corporate behavior and stakeholder attitudes over long periods. Through examining long-term CSR investments, researchers can find out whether social responsibility programs translate to long-term business success or continue as short-term PR campaigns (Orlitzky et al., 2003).

Qualitative research methods, including case studies, interviews, and ethnographic studies,

offer deeper understandings of motivations, issues, and strategies involved in CSR implementation. Case studies of major corporations enable researchers to investigate best practices in CSR and determine what factors lead to effective social responsibility programs. Qualitative research also reveals contextual subtleties, demonstrating how CSR is influenced by cultural, political, and industry-specific considerations. This method is especially valuable in the examination of CSR in emerging markets, where institutional environments and stakeholder expectations might vary considerably from those in Western economies.

4.1. Strengths of CSR Methodologies

Holistic Data Gathering: The synthesis of institutional, organizational, and individual lenses makes it possible to understand CSR from a holistic point of view. Scholars can study CSR's macro-level factors, firm-level strategies, and micro-level behavioural impacts to have a three-dimensional picture of corporate responsibility.

New Methods: Experimental designs and longitudinal studies offer an understanding of the dynamic nature of CSR effects. Measuring CSR effects over time allows researchers to establish causal effects and evaluate the efficacy of certain CSR policies and programs.

Interdisciplinary Insights: The application of mixed methodologies adds depth to CSR studies. Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods ensures that CSR results are statistically sound as well as contextually relevant.

4.2. Limitations of CSR Methodologies

Despite these strengths, CSR research faces several methodological challenges:

Fragmentation: Theoretical and methodological fragmentation limits the generalizability of findings. CSR is a broad and evolving concept, leading to inconsistencies in how it is measured, defined, and interpreted across different studies.

Data Sources Bias: Heavy dependence on Western-centric data might ignore context-based CSR practices in emerging markets. The absence of diverse geographical coverage in CSR research restricts the generalizability of results to

international business settings.

Subjectivity in Qualitative Research: Although qualitative research provides deep insights, it can be subject to researcher bias and low external validity. Corporate cultures, leadership styles, and stakeholder expectations vary, making it difficult to make universal generalizations from qualitative CSR research.

4.3. Empirical Insights

Empirical research shows that CSR has a positive impact on financial performance, employee engagement, and stakeholder trust. The extent of these positive impacts, though, depends on contextual factors such as industry, geography, and organizational culture (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Some of the most important empirical findings are:

Financial Performance: Meta-analyses prove a positive relationship between CSR and financial performance, especially in stakeholder-visible industries (Orlitzky et al., 2003). Firms that invest in environmentally friendly business operations tend to enjoy better brand reputation, customer loyalty, and investor confidence.

Stakeholder Trust: CSR activities boost corporate reputation and stakeholder relations (Peloza & Shang, 2011). Trust-building initiatives, including community involvement, ethical labor practices, and open reporting, lead to increased consumer and employee loyalty.

Environmental Sustainability: CSR activities concerned with environmental sustainability lower the risk of operations and improve long-term resilience (Hart & Dowell, 2011). Organizations that embrace green supply chain practices, use renewable energy, and reduce waste generation enjoy cost savings and regulatory benefits.

5. Future Research Agenda

5.1. Theoretical Integration

In order to further develop CSR scholarship, future research must concentrate on integrating several theoretical lenses in order to formulate more holistic CSR frameworks.

Important research avenues include:

Cross-Level Frameworks: Formulating frameworks that link institutional, organizational, and individual-level studies. For instance, combining stakeholder theory with insights from behavior can offer a more nuanced understanding of the role of CSR in driving employee commitment, consumer trust, and firm performance.

Emerging Theories: Drawing on insights from behavioral economics, political science, and cultural studies to further develop CSR scholarship. By leveraging psychology and sociology insights, scholars can find it easier to explain the drivers of corporate social responsibility.

5.2. Methodological Innovations

In order to increase the methodological rigor of CSR studies, researchers ought to employ the following methods:

Mixed Methods: Qualitative and quantitative methods, when combined, may provide more informative understandings of CSR phenomena. Case studies complemented with statistical analyses are able to reveal subtle relationships, offering both depth as well as generalizability.

Global Perspectives: Expanding research to underrepresented regions and industries is critical for understanding context-specific CSR practices. Comparative studies can highlight cultural and institutional differences, allowing for more tailored CSR strategies in diverse markets.

Big Data and AI Applications: New opportunities in measuring CSR impact are presented through advances in data analytics and artificial intelligence (AI). Sentiment analysis using AI, machine learning algorithms, and real-time sustainability monitoring can make CSR assessments more accurate.

5.3. Practical Implications

Policy Alignment: There is a need to explore the relationship between CSR and regulatory regimes. Policymakers can use CSR findings to craft effective governance frameworks that

facilitate responsible business behavior.

Technological Impact: Evaluating the contribution of digital transformation to CSR practice. Blockchain and AI, for example, provide new means of transparency, ethical supply chain management, and stakeholder interaction.

Crisis Management: Examining the contribution of CSR to crisis risk mitigation. Companies with strong CSR commitments, for example, tend to be more resilient in managing public relations issues and sustaining consumer confidence during economic recessions or corporate scandals.

6. Conclusion

CSR is a dynamic and multilateral field that is indicative of changing societal expectations and corporate interests. Its function in filling the gap between the corporate agenda and social requirements has positioned it at the heart of contemporary business practice. Through the decades, CSR has evolved from an ancillary activity to a core component of corporate administration, spurred on by stakeholder demands, legislative requirements, and calls for sustainable development. The development of CSR portrays its resilience to evolving societal environments, stressing its timeliness in the mitigation of universal problems like climate change, disparities, and ethical leadership.

Through filling theoretical and methodological loopholes, prospective research can strengthen the strategic incorporation of CSR into enterprise practice, leading to sustainable and equitable results. Scholars and practitioners need to come together to create innovative paradigms and methodologies that reflect the multidimensionality of CSR in varied contexts. Furthermore, with businesses making more and more use of technology and data analytics, CSR processes also need to keep pace, using these advances for greater transparency, accountability, and measurability. With these initiatives, CSR can continue to be an engine of positive change, ensuring that corporate prosperity works for societal benefit.

By linking theoretical models with empirical understanding, the paper adds to the body of literature on CSR as a catalyst for ethical business practices. The findings underscore the importance of integrating CSR into business

decision-making, policy making, and stakeholder communication plans. As firms contend with the pressures of globalization, corporate accountability, and moral leadership, CSR will continue to define the future of corporate governance and its role in fostering sustainable economic and social development.

References

Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 932-968.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99-120.

Bowen, H. R. (1953). Social responsibilities of the businessman. New York: Harper & Row.

Carroll, A. B. (2008). A history of corporate social responsibility: Concepts and practices. In A. Crane et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 19-46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Frynas, J. G., & Yamahaki, C. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: Review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 25*(3), 258-285.

Glavas, A., & Piderit, S. K. (2009). How does doing good matter? Effects of corporate citizenship on employees. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 36*, 51-70.

Hart, S. L., & Dowell, G. (2011). Invited editorial: A natural-resource-based view of the firm: Fifteen years after. *Journal of Management, 37*(5), 1464-1479.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305-360.

Latapí Agudelo, M. A., Johannsdottir, L., & Davidsdottir, B. (2019). A literature review of the history and evolution of corporate social

responsibility. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 4*(1), 1-23.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & 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, 22*(4), 853-886.

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies, 24*(3), 403-441.

Peloza, J., & Shang, J. (2011). How can corporate social responsibility activities create value for stakeholders? A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*(1), 117-135.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review, 89*(1/2), 62-77.

Scott, W. R. (1995). Institutions and organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(2), 225-243.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571-610.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

Waldman, D. A., Siegel, D. S., & Javidan, M. (2006). Components of CEO transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(8), 1703-1725.

Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(4), 691-718.