

# Review on Corporate Social Responsibility

**Bui Thi Nga, Nguyen Van Phuong**

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has formally entered the agenda of the European Union since the Lisbon European Council in March 2000 and was considered as one of the strategic tools to make companies more competitive, socially cohesive, and to modernize and strengthen the European social model. The CSR goes beyond compliance with legal requirements and identifies practices and behaviors that a company adopts voluntarily, to get results that can bring benefits and advantages to itself and to the context in which it operates.

Particular attention is paid to relations with its stakeholders: employees, suppliers, customers, partners, communities and local institutions, implementing concrete actions between them. This results in the adoption of a corporate policy that reconciles economic objectives with social and environmental aspects of the territory, in view for future sustainability of agricultural supply chains.

On the other hand, corporate social responsibility (CSR) covers the broad range of market-mediated approaches, which aim to improve the social and environmental impacts of international production and trade by concentrating on global supply chains. Alongside the traditional technical, quality, safety and price demands of pivotal buyers in the supply chain, suppliers are increasingly being asked to meet social or environmental standards through supplier codes of conduct, fair trade and eco-labeling schemes

A strong growth of research on corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been witnessed in the past decades. Pisani et al. (2017) reviewed 494 articles in prestigious journals over 31 years systematically looking at development of international CSR research. 47.8% of the articles were published from 2012 to 2017; this indicates that the CSR concept is receiving increasing attention. The CSR concept is criticized for a lack of coherent theory (Jones et al., 2018) and for insufficient theory development to explain practices. Matten and Moon (2008) note CSR to be an “ambiguous and complex umbrella”. This position is supported by Sarkar and Searcy's (2016) work which identifies 110 definitions of the CSR construct in the period 1953 - 2014. Among the definitions of CSR, the European Commission defines CSR as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in the interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (European Commission, 2002). Meanwhile, ILO defines CSR as: “a way in which enterprises give consideration to the impact of their operations on society and affirm their principles and values both in their own internal methods and processes and in their interaction with other actors. CSR is a voluntary, enterprises –driven initiative and refers to activities that are considered to exceed compliance with the law”.

The idea that business has a social role can be traced back for centuries (Carroll 1999). CSR can potentially decrease production inefficiencies, reduce cost and risk and at the same time allow companies to increase sales. As a result of lower costs, lower risk and increase in sales, companies become more profitable. According to Carroll (1991), CSR could be modeled as a pyramid of 04 factors: economic responsibilities; legal responsibilities; ethical responsibilities and philanthropic responsibilities. However, there is a need of extension of Carroll's (1991) CSR pyramid model to the context of local firms in a developing country since Carroll's (1991) CSR pyramid was framed upon his study of American firms.

Matten and Moon (2008) distinguish explicit CSR in the USA and implicit CSR in European countries based on their analysis of differences in the regulations on CSR practices between the two regions. They claim that CSR reporting in the USA is featured by more voluntary, whereas CSR reporting in Europe is characterized by more mandatory. Kang and Moon (2012) offer a comparative analysis of CSR practices in three types of capitalism countries. They contend that CSR appears to be more instrumental in the liberal market economies (i.e. the US, the UK) and more cohesive in the coordinated market economies (i.e. Germany, Japan) while more developmental in state-led market economies (i.e. France, South Korea).

Jamali and Karam (2018) point out the contextual dynamic as the key feature of CSR insights in developing countries within the historical, socio-political and geographical context of a nation. Using a dataset of 14,490 CSR-related studies in Web of Knowledge between 2000 and 2016, Lin et al. (2020), argue that CSR researchers from developing countries simply focus on limited issues of CSR, due to the fact that researchers had difficulties in accessing CSR data, which led to the assumption of a gap between CSR thinking and CSR doing (Jamali and Karam, 2018) in developing countries. This concern has been raised by Matten and Moon (2008) in the term implicit CSR, requiring firms to address relevant issues in their particular environments, stemming from cultural norms of the local communities. The context-based CSR noted by Kong et al. (2020) has been ignored when studying global supply chains of key products to human being, such as agricultural product.

Previous research has examined motivators behind CSR practices of firms rather than of a wide range of stakeholders in global supply chains. Firms' motivators of CSR strategy adoption have been investigated through the lens of two groups (employees and managers of firms) with a focus on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the previous research (e.g., Mankelov, 2006; Mankelov and Quazi, 2007; Nejati and Amran, 2009; Roy et al., 2013; Chehimi et al., 2019). Unfortunately, CSR motivators perceived by various stakeholders in a global agricultural product supply chain have largely been ignored while the role of CSR is to harmonize conflict of interests among constituencies. Little is known about local firms' motivations, and there is a lack of in-

depth understanding about this topical issue with the local firms in developing countries. Localities have their own characteristics that shape the way they engage with stakeholders.

Survey-based papers constitute the majority of CSR research. Using quantitative methodology, these studies quantify data and make general conclusions but lack ‘contextual richness’ (Andromachi, 2012). As such, more qualitative CSR research is needed to take into account social contexts that quantitative studies have overlooked. Pisani et al. (2017) called for further studies in ‘unexplored geographical contexts, especially in emerging and developing countries.’

Most recently, a qualitative proposes a model adapted from Carroll (1991) CSR pyramid. In this study, in-depth interviews were conducted with 27 middle managers from Quang Ninh province in Vietnam. Using Carroll’s (1991) CSR pyramid model as the framework for qualitative data analysis, they find that firms are motivated to engage with CSR for necessity and sufficiency. The necessity components are profitability, competitive advantage, law compliance and anti-bureaucracy achievements, which are the maintenance factors; and the sufficient components include employee retention, and ethical image and reputation, which are the encouraging factors. However, how these CSR motivators are translated into CSR actions by local players and international participants in a global supply chain remains little known. Therefore, there is a need to research into CSR in global supply chain to give a light to understanding of motivators and behaviors of a wide range of stakeholders in the chain. Understanding these motivators is importance for policy makers and practitioners.

## References

- Carroll AB. (1999) Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & society* 38: 268-295.
- European\_Commission. (2008) European Competitiveness Report 2008. (COM(2008/774). In: EC (ed).
- Jamali D and Karam C. (2018) Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 20: 32-61.
- Johnson ME. (2001) Learning from toys: Lessons in managing supply chain risk from the toy industry. *California management review* 43: 106-124.
- Kong Y, Antwi - Adjei A and Bawuah J. (2020) A systematic review of the business case for corporate social responsibility and firm performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 27: 444-454.
- Lin Y-C, Padliansyah R and Lin T-C. (2020) The relationship and development trend of corporate social responsibility (CSR) literature. *Management Decision* 58: 601-624.
- Matten D and Moon J. (2008) “Implicit” and “explicit” CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review* 33: 404-424.

Pisani N, Kourula A, Kolk A, et al. (2017) How global is international CSR research? Insights and recommendations from a systematic review. *Journal of World Business* 52: 591-614.

Smit L, Bright C, McCorquodale R, et al. (2020) Study on due diligence requirements through the supply chain: FINAL REPORT [Country Reports were authored by Lia Heasman (Denmark, Finland and Sweden)].