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1.1 Background

Globalisation is the process that has come to dominate the world since the nineties of the last century with the end of the cold war and the break-up of the former Soviet Union. Globalisation opened up economies world over and offered scope for investment in any part of the world and also brought the new opportunities to developing countries to participate globally in socio-economic and cultural affairs. Greater access to markets of developed countries and technology transfer hold out promise of improved productivity and higher living standards. The process of globalisation has thrown up new challenges like growing inequality across and within nations, volatility in financial market, environmental degradation and competition among the corporations, to overcome these challenges the globalisation has given rise to the practice and concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is commitment by organizations to balance financial performance with contributions to the quality of life of their employees, the local community and society at large is gaining worldwide value as a business tool and social effort. Organizations are increasingly called upon to evolve beyond focusing on the financial bottom line and consider the social and environmental impact of their business decisions, particularly as globalization continues. Corporate social responsibility includes a broad range of practices and activities, from charitable donations to cause branding to business strategies addressing human rights and labor issues. How organizations demonstrate corporate social responsibility and the rationale behind such practices may vary according to the industry, sector and country in which organizations operate.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is defined as a strategy in which operating a business in a manner that meets or exceeds the ethical, legal, commercial and public expectations that society has of business. In the last twenty years, there has been a sea change in the nature of the triangular relationship between companies, the state and the society (Edenkamp, 2002). CSR has become increasingly prominent in the Indian corporate scenario because organisations have realised that besides growing their businesses it is also vital to build trustworthy and sustainable relationships with the community at large. This is one of the key drivers of CSR
programs (Ramya Sathish, 2010). CSR is coming out of the purview of ‘doing social good’ and is fast becoming a ‘business necessity’. Corporate houses are realising that what is good for community, environment and workers health is also good for the business (Indu Jain, 2010). CSR also refers to the relationship of corporation with society as a whole. CSR is therefore a dramatically expanding area of activity for management and academics. The standard code for CSR is to contribute to protect and promote the interest of community and society at large and the operations at the global level have helped to increase the importance of CSR world over. Now the CSR activities will not remain limited to the company itself, but also touch upon their economic partners and communities too.

The corporate sector has a pivotal role to play in ensuring private investment flows to those rural areas that have been left out of the development process so far and also to work for sustainable development of rural areas in general. Over the past few years, as a consequence of rising globalization and pressing ecological issues, the perception of the role of corporates in the border social context within which it operates, has been altered. Corporates considers themselves as an integral part of society and accordingly act in a social responsible way that goes beyond economic performance (KPMG and ASSOCHAM, 2008). As a result of this shift from purely profit to profit with social responsibility.

1.2: Origin and History of Corporate Social Responsibility

1.2.1 Origin of CSR Concept

Although the concept of CSR has become increasingly recognized in the latest decades its core idea can be traced through history. Already in the 18th century employers realized the value of having an efficient workforce and that a lack of food, housing and healthcare had a negative effect on the workforce. Medical facilities, housing and subsidized food that might have been seen as philanthropic improvements was actually created out of self-interest (Brown 2005). Thus in the 18th century people saw positive economic consequences of CSR actions. The history of CSR highlights the ways in which business leaders and scholars have struggled to define and conceptualize CSR. As America and Europe emerged from World War II and confronted the emerging Cold War tensions, thinking about business and the
future course of the economic system in the West intensified. The preliminary research for the envisioned project revealed a range of opinion and ongoing efforts to articulate business responsibilities, to provide a philosophical foundation for those responsibilities, and to develop effective ways of responding to or implementing those responsibilities. A few selected examples of this evolution are offered below:

**Dempsey and David:** Although the term corporate social responsibility was not used, Bernard Dempsey, in his 1949 Harvard Business Review (HBR) article – “The Roots of Business Responsibility,” laid out a rationale for responsible business practice. Dempsey provided a philosophical foundation for arguments in an HBR article two months prior by Donald K. David, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, titled “Business Responsibilities in an Uncertain World.” David called upon business leaders to become engaged in public affairs beyond the immediate economic functions of business which they regarded as its fundamental contribution to society.

Dempsey provided philosophical foundations arguing the responsibilities of businessmen arose from four concepts of justice: exchange justice – the trust underlying exchanges in the market; distributive justice – the just relation between the government and individuals; general justice – acceptance of legal frameworks but beyond this to acceptance of ethical obligations; and especially social or contributive justice – the obligation to contribute to the well-being and progress of individuals and society. Dempsey and David asserted two reasons why businessmen must respond to the obligations of contributive justice. (1) They essentially argued that no man, and no business, is an island. All are in need of a community, a well-functioning community, in order to operate and thrive. (2) They argued that business controls substantial resources and has great capacity to contribute to the progress of society and the well-being of individuals within society. This echoes other arguments that business power brings with it business responsibility.

David noted a priority in business obligations: first to make the business effective, second to make the business organization itself a good and just society (a healthy organization if you will), and third to operate in ways that respect and
contribute to external communities and organizations – in other words to be constructive. Included in their concept was a responsibility to ensure that competition was fair, that the economic framework was functioning with an eye toward justice, and that broader communities were healthy.

Dempsey added that “contributive justice is the first principle of economic organization; it imposes a positive obligation upon every economic agent not only to contribute positively to every community of which he is a member but to contribute positively to the formation of necessary communities which do not exist.” Both Dempsey and David argued that the broad spectrum of business leaders, regardless of how they might articulate it, believed in a fundamental obligation to create a just society beyond the immediate boundaries of the business and within which business could operate effectively. They built on a rich dialogue that preceded their writing by many years, and they foreshadowed future debates about business responsibility.

**Morrell Heald:** He wrote the only comprehensive history on this topic “The Social Responsibilities of Business: Company and Community 1900 - 1960” (published in 1970). Heald focused not on the theory of social responsibility but on “how businessmen themselves have defined and experienced it.” In particular, he looked to their policies and practices to tell the story. Heald notes that the “trusteeship concept” of business leadership and responsibility was enunciated nearly a quarter century before World War II. Indeed, Andrew Carnegie offered an even earlier statement of the trustee or stewardship concept in June 1889 in his North American Review article titled “Wealth.” In 1906, Yale president Arthur Hadley advised business leaders to remember that they are also trustees of the public interest and to align their sense of ethics and obligation accordingly. In the 1920s, the trusteeship concept emerged boldly in the words and practices of Owen D. Young, chairman, and Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Company. In their eyes, shareholders were only one constituency to whom business leaders were responsible, and as Young put it in 1926, the public and employees ranked ahead of shareholders. Young and Swope envisioned and sought to build partnerships and cooperation between business, labor, government and community – not open hostilities. Well before World War II, the practices of giving (philanthropy) and of community involvement were well established in
community chest drives of the 1920s and in dealing with labor and community issues associated with neighboring plants and in company towns – although certainly not embraced by all business leaders. As the 1950s unfolded Heald describes business leaders moving beyond philanthropy to substantive cooperation and outright leadership on a range of community initiatives. He developed extensive profiles of business initiatives with higher education, working to become a good neighbor, and business support for the arts.

**Archie Carroll:** He provided the most comprehensive overview of the evolving definition of corporate social responsibility in the post World War II period. Carroll examines and compares all of the main contributions from scholars from 1950 through the mid-1990s including: Howard Bowen, Keith Davis, Clarence Walton, William Frederick, the Committee for Economic Development, Prakash Sethi, Donna Wood, and many others. Carroll credits Howard R. Bowen, 1953 author of the book Social Responsibilities of the Businessman, as the “Father of corporate Social Responsibility” because his book dealt directly with the concept of social responsibility. Bowen asserted that social responsibility “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.”

The past sixty years have been notable for the increasing attention given to the concept, for its continuing evolution, and for the lack of consensus on what it means – and even whether it is legitimate. At one extreme, Carroll notes Milton Friedman’s often cited 1970 New York Times Magazine article arguing that CSR, as a matter of principle, is “fundamentally subversive” of the true responsibilities of business which are enhancing profitability and shareholder value. This point of view arises from the economic theory, articulated first by Adam Smith, that a free market and pursuit of self-interest (later shareholder value) will result in the greatest benefit for society overall. Other scholars have debated whether basic economic and legal obligations fall within the concept of CSR or whether the domain for CSR is “over and beyond” economic and legal obligations. In effect, what is the scope and boundary of such responsibility? Still others bring differing views about what issues merit the attention of business.
Carroll noted that business leaders themselves, under the auspices of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) in 1971, articulated a definition, perhaps emerging in part from the political, social and urban turmoil of the late 1960s. Essentially – “business functions by public consent and its basic purpose is to serve constructively the needs of society to the satisfaction of society.”

The CED report speaks to three overlapping levels of responsibility ranging from core economic functions to anticipating emerging non-economic issues. Carroll’s own definition of CSR embraced a full range of responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary. Note that in Carroll’s framework economic functions are at the heart of the “corporate social responsibilities” of business. He later changed discretionary to philanthropic, but in either case discretionary or philanthropic – these responsibilities were seen as voluntary. Carroll did not see these responsibility categories as mutually exclusive but rather as something of a continuum, often pursued simultaneously. In his overview of the evolution of the CSR concept, Carroll noted increasing attention among scholars and among business practitioners to how the business responds to or acts on these responsibilities.

It is one thing to talk about responsibility; it is another to talk about what to do and how to do it. The terms of preference for this framework became corporate social responsiveness or corporate social performance (CSP), what Carroll called the “action phase of management responding in the social sphere.” Social auditing and social issues management (SIM) are other concepts that developed in the 1970s and 1980s. The decade 1980s saw efforts to connect corporate social responsibility (as principles), corporate social responsiveness (as processes), and social issues management (as policies) or to link responsibility, responsiveness and business ethics. Stakeholder theory was formalized as a corporate decision-making framework through the work of R. Edward Freeman in the 1980s. During the same period the concept of corporate conscience was developed by Kenneth E. Goodpaster at the Harvard Business School.

William Frederick: In the midst of these developments, William Frederick, writing in 1986, challenged CSR scholars for failing to dig deeply into the underlying value
conflicts between business and changing societal expectations. Frederick described two waves. One he called CSR and noted its focus on responsibility, the second he called CSR and noted its focus on responsiveness (or how a business could respond to and manage issues with all the tools and strategies that might entail). Neither was sufficient for Frederick. He urged business leaders and CSR scholars to look deeper and deal with normative foundations and conflicts. He was a strong proponent of connecting the field of business ethics with CSR. Anchoring consideration of CSR in the moral foundations of business ethics led to a third approach or CSR3 what he called corporate social rectitude. Indeed, Business ethics grew substantially as a field from the 1980s through the 1990s. In the 1990s the term corporate citizenship gained currency – although the idea of the corporation as a good citizen reaches back many decades. Most recently, corporate accountability has gained some visibility as think tanks, NGOs and companies have focused on what processes are needed to assure companies are accountable to stakeholders.

While scholars from the 1970s into the 1990s wrestled with CSR concepts and developed stakeholder theory, numerous business leaders had independently articulated similar views on the purpose of business. As noted earlier, there are many examples of 20th century business leaders who shaped their companies’ business practices accordingly. A noteworthy example is J. Irwin Miller, Chairman and CEO of Cummins Engine Company, who laid out a comprehensive view of CSR in a 1975 interview in Organizational Dynamics. Although the interview was conducted in 1975, he began putting his philosophy of business into practice in the 1930s. The Dayton Family, founders in 1906 and leaders well into the 1990s of the company that today is the Target Corporation, provides another exemplar of a business philosophy intimately connecting business success with service to society. Throughout this period scholars attempted to define, redefine, and clarify the concept of corporate social responsibility that they saw being assumed by, imposed upon, and played out by business. In addition, scholars sought to connect and integrate disparate principles and activities into a more comprehensive conceptual model.
1.2.2 History of CSR

**Universal History of CSR:** The history of social and environmental concern about business is as old as trade and business itself. Commercial logging operations for example, together with laws to protect forests, can both be traced back almost 5,000 years. In Ancient Mesopotamia around 1700 BC, King Hammurabi introduced a code in which builders, innkeepers or farmers were put to death if their negligence caused the deaths of others, or major inconvenience to local citizens. In Ancient Rome senators grumbled about the failure of businesses to contribute sufficient taxes to fund their military campaigns, while in 1622 disgruntled shareholders in the Dutch East India Company started issuing pamphlets complaining about management secrecy and “self enrichment”. With industrialisation, the impacts of business on society and the environment assumed an entirely new dimension. The “corporate paternalists” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries used some of their wealth to support philanthropic ventures. By the 1920s discussions about the social responsibilities of business had evolved into what we can recognise as the beginnings of the “modern” CSR movement. In 1929, the Dean of Harvard Business School, Wallace B. Donham, commented within an address delivered at North-Western University: 'Business started long centuries before the dawn of history, but business as we now know it is new - new in its broadening scope, new in its social significance. Business has not learned how to handle these changes, nor does it recognise the magnitude of its responsibilities for the future of civilisation.'

Almost seventy five years later, these words ring just as true. Although today we face some novel concerns about the role of business in society, from internet “spam” to genetically modified foods, many of the issues under discussion are not very different to those being raised in the 1920s. There is a danger that social and environmental concern about business is an issue which, like sex, every new generation thinks that it has discovered. The interactive timelines below provide details of the evolution of the history of our environment, the history of business corporations, the evolution of the concept of sustainable development and the history of business law and socially responsible investment as forces seeking to shape the social and environmental impact of business.
According to Archie B. Carroll the roots of the concept that we know today as corporate social responsibility have a long and wide-ranging history, it is mostly a product of the twentieth century, especially from the early 1950s 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. To help appreciate the context in which corporate social responsibility (CSR) grew and flourished, we will consider the late 1800s, or the Industrial Revolution, as a reasonable beginning point for purposes of discussion. The purpose of this chapter on corporate social responsibility concepts and practices, referred to as just ‘social responsibility’ (SR) in the period before the rise and dominance of the corporate form of business organization, is to provide an overview of how the concept and practice of SR or CSR has grown, manifested itself, and flourished. In addition to considering how the concept has changed and grown in terms of its meaning, we will consider its practice as well. That is, we will consider how the concept has, in practice, expanded from its focus on a few stakeholders, close at hand, to be more far reaching and inclusive, eventually becoming global in scope.

In addition, we will briefly consider what organizational activities and changes have taken place to accommodate these new initiatives, to the point at which it has become fully institutionalized today. It will become apparent that today, well into the first decade of the 2000s, CSR in many firms is moving towards full integration with strategic management and corporate governance. This has included firms developing management and organizational mechanisms for reporting and control on business’s socially conscious policies and practices. It will also become apparent that the range of stakeholders and issues defining CSR has broadened, especially in the past several decades.

Formal writings on social responsibility are largely a product of the twentieth century, especially the past 50 years or so. Though it is possible to see evidence of CSR throughout the world, mostly in the developed countries, most early writings have been most obvious in the United States where a sizable body of literature has accumulated (Cavrou, 1999). In the past decade, however, Europe has become captivated with CSR and there is considerable evidence that scholars and practitioners in Europe are taking seriously this social concern, often manifested in the form of
formal writings, research, conferences, and consultancies. More recently, countries in Asia have begun increasing their attention to CSR policies and practices. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that CSR and related notions have been developed in practice and thought in a number of other countries and at different times. With this background in mind, this review of CSR’s history will focus primarily on developments in the United States and Europe.

**History of CSR in India:** India had a very well developed commerce and industrial sector since ancient times. The concept of helping the poor and disadvantaged was cited in much of the ancient literature. The idea was also supported by several religions where it has been intertwined with religious laws. “Zakaat”, followed by Islam, is two percent donation from one’s earnings which is specifically given to the poor and disadvantaged. Similarly Hinduism follows the principle of “Dhramada” and Sikhs the “Daashaant”. In the global context, the recent history goes back to the seventeenth century when in 1790s, England witnessed the first large scale consumer boycott over the issue of slave harvested sugar which finally forced importer to have free-labor sourcing. All the philosophical, religious and spiritual literature available of that period is testimony to this fact. The great Indian philosopher Kautilya (in 4th Century BC) in his book Arthashastra has described in detail the trade and crafts, manufacturing, agricultural, mining and forestry sector present during the time of Maurya Empire. Reference to presence of trade and craft is also found in Vedic literature, the Jataka tales and in Mahabharata one of the greatest Indian epics of all times

In recent times, many business houses believe that the role of business in society should not be limited to creation of wealth for its owners and promoters but also for the larger society. The early pioneers of Indian Industry, whether TATAs, Birlas, or Bajajs, firmly believed in the concept of social responsibility of business. The founder of TATA Steel, Jamshedji Nusserwanji Tata expressed in his speak in 1903: *“We generate wealth for the Nation. What comes from the people must, to the extent possible, therefore, get back to the people”*. Gandhiji went on to elaborate this

---

1. L.N. Rangarajan, Kautilya, The Arthashastra, Penguin Books India
concept further by emphasizing the moral responsibility of business through his idea of Trusteeship. He viewed owners of capital, as Trustees holding resources on behalf of the society, which to produce goods and services, will benefit society, at large. The founder of Bajaj group, Shri Jamnalal Bajaj said: “Our wealth should be utilised for improving the quality of the society and the nation. We should never fail to spend at least a portion of our incomes on the social, economic and educational development of the province where we live.”

**Development of CSR in four stages:** Given India’s long tradition in this field, its CSR agenda continues to be characterized mainly by philanthropic and community development activities. On the other hand, the survey also revealed that Indian companies and stakeholders are beginning to adopt some aspects of the mainstream agenda, such as the integration of CSR into their business processes and engagement in multi stakeholder dialogues. To understand the current state and future prospects of CSR and the role of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) in India, the country’s political and economic history must be taken into account. Against this background, the development of CSR in India can be divided into four main phases. According to Sundar (2000), the following four phases of CSR development can be identified. These phases parallel to India’s historical development and resulted in different CSR practices must be regarded as an analytical tool. However, it is not static; rather features of one phase can also be observed in the others, as is particularly evident from the last phase.

**Figure 1.1: Four Phases of CSR Development in India**
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Source: Tatjana Chahoud et.al, (2007)
First phase: CSR motivated by charity and philanthropy: The first phase of CSR is predominantly determined by culture, religion, family tradition, and industrialization. Business operations and CSR engagement were based mainly on corporate self-regulation. Being the oldest form of CSR, charity and philanthropy still influence CSR practices today, especially in community development. In the pre-industrial period up to the 1850s, merchants committed themselves to society for religious reasons, sharing their wealth, for instance, by building religious places like Majids, church and religious places like Masjids, Church and temples. Moreover, “the business community occupied a significant place in ancient Indian society and the merchants provided relief in times of crisis such as famine or epidemics throwing open go downs of food and treasure chests (Arora 2004).

Under colonial rule, Western types of industrialization reached India and changed CSR from the 1850s onwards. The pioneers of industrialization in the 19th century in India were a few families such as the Tata, Birla, Bajaj, Lalbhai, Sarabhai, Godrej, Shiram, Singhania, Modi, Naidu, Mahindra and Annamali, who were strongly devoted to philanthropically motivated CSR (Mohan 2001). The early pioneers of industry in India were leaders in the economic, as also in the social fields. Nevertheless, it has been pointed out that their engagement was not only altruistic and stimulated by religious motives: It had business considerations in supporting efforts towards industrial and social development of the nation and was influenced by caste groups and political objectives (Mohan 2001). The underlying pattern of charity and philanthropy means that entrepreneurs sporadically donate money (e.g. to schools or hospitals) without any concrete or long-term engagement. Charitable and philanthropic CSR is practised outside the company, focusing on such external stakeholders as communities and general social welfare bodies.

Second phase: CSR for India’s social development: The second phase of Indian CSR (1914-1960) was dominated by the country’s struggle for independence and influenced fundamentally by Gandhi’s theory of trusteeship, the aim of which was to consolidate and amplify social development. During the struggle for independence, Indian businesses actively engaged in the reform process. Not only did companies see the country’s economic development as a protest against colonial rule; they also
participated in its institutional and social development (India Partnership Forum 2002). The corporate sector’s involvement was stimulated by the vision of a modern and free India. Gandhi introduced the notion of trusteeship in order to make companies the “temples of modern India”: businesses (especially well established family businesses) set up trusts for schools and colleges; they also established training and scientific institutes (Mohan 2001). The heads of the companies largely aligned the activities of their trusts with Gandhi’s reform programmes. These programmes included activities that sought in particular the abolition of un-touchability, women’s empowerment and rural development.

**Third phase: CSR under the paradigm of mixed economy:** The paradigm of the “mixed economy,” with the emergence of Public Sector Units it and ample legislation on labour and environmental standards, affected the third phase of Indian CSR (1960-1980). This phase is also characterized by a shift from corporate self-regulation to strict legal and public regulation of business activities. Under the paradigm of the “mixed economy”, the role of the private sector in advancing India receded. During the Cold War, India decided to take a third course between capitalism and communism. In this scenario, the public sector was seen as the prime mover of development. The 1960s have been described as an “era of command and control”, because strict legal regulations determined the activities of the private sector (Arora 2004). The introduction of a regime of high taxes, quota and licence system imposed tight restrictions on the private sector and indirectly triggered corporate malpractices. As a result, corporate governance, labour and environmental issues rose on the political agenda and quickly became the subject of legislation. Furthermore, state authorities established PSUs with the intention of guaranteeing the appropriate distribution of wealth to the needy (Arora 2004). However, the assumption and anticipation that the public sector could tackle developmental challenges effectively materialized to only a limited extent. Consequently, what was expected of the private sector grew, and the need for its involvement in socio-economic development became indispensable. An initial and cautious attempt at reconciliation was made by Indian academics, politicians and businessmen at a national workshop on CSR in 1965 (Mohan 2001). According to this agenda, businesses were to play their part as respectable corporate citizens, and the call went out for regular stakeholder dialogues,
Fourth phase: CSR at the interface between business and society: In the fourth phase from 1980 until the present) Indian companies and stakeholders began abandoning traditional philanthropic engagement and, to some extent, integrated CSR into a coherent and sustainable business strategy, partly adopting the multi-stakeholder approach. In the 1990s, the Indian government initiated reforms to liberalize and deregulate the Indian economy by tackling the shortcomings of the “mixed economy” and tried to integrate India into the global market. Consequently, controls and license systems were partly abolished, and the Indian economy experienced a pronounced boom, which has persisted until today (Arora and Puranik 2004). This rapid growth did not lead to a reduction in philanthropic donations; on the contrary, the increased profitability also increased business willingness as well as ability to give, along with a surge in public and government expectations of businesses” (Arora 2004). Against this background, India has meanwhile become an important economic and political actor in the process of globalization. This new situation has also affected the Indian CSR agenda, with more Transnational Corporations (TNCs) resorting to global sourcing, India has become an attractive and important production and manufacturing site. As Western consumer markets are becoming more responsive to labour and environmental standards in developing countries, Indian companies producing for the global market need to comply with international standards.

1.3 Meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is viewed as a comprehensive set of policies, practices and programs that are integrated into business operations, supply chains, and decision-making processes throughout the organization wherever the organization does business and includes responsibility for current and past actions as well as future impacts. CSR involves addressing the legal, ethical, commercial and other expectations society has for business, and making decisions that fairly balance the claims of all key stakeholders. Effective CSR aims at “achieving commercial success in ways that honor ethical values and respect people, communities, and the
natural environment.” Simply put it means “what you do, how you do it, and when and what you say.” Several terms have been used interchangeably with CSR. They include business ethics, corporate citizenship, corporate accountability, sustainability and corporate responsibility. The issues that represent an organization’s CSR focus vary by size (small, medium and large), sector for example, financial institutions, infrastructure providers, textile manufacturers, agri-producers, supermarket retailers, and even by geographic region. In its broadest categories, CSR typically includes issues related to business ethics, community investment, environment, governance, human rights, the marketplace and the workplace.

1.4 Defining Corporate Social Responsibility

One of the factors responsible for limited conceptual understanding of CSR is the complexity and absence of consensual definitions of the concept. Although the concept of CSR is widely discussed in theory and practice a universally accepted definition of CSR is yet to emerge. CSR can be conceptualised differently by individuals. Indeed Amaeshi and Adi (2005) argue that there are as many definitions of CSR as there are writers on the topic.

Though there is no universal definition for CSR, but it is necessary to mention some of the important definitions those are accepted by many researchers, academicians and CSR practitioners and those are as following:

World Bank Committee for Sustainable Development (WBCSD, 1998): “The continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large”.

International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2007): “Corporate social responsibility is 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, enterprise-driven initiative and refers to activities that are considered to exceed compliance with the law”.
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Carroll (2003): "The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary expectations that a society has of organizations at a given point in time."

Mallenbaker (2004): "CSR is about how companies manage the business processes to produce an overall positive impact on society"

European Commission (2011): "A concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis."

Bowen (1953); “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.”

Committee for Economic Development (CED) (1971); In Social Responsibilities of Business Corporations report: “...business functions by public consent and its basic purpose is to serve constructively the needs of society – to the satisfaction of society.” Further that – “Business is being asked to assume broader responsibilities to society than ever before and to serve a wider range of human values. Business enterprises, in effect, are being asked to contribute more to the quality of American life than just supplying quantities of goods and services. Inasmuch as business exists to serve society, its future will depend on the quality of management’s response to the changing expectations of the public.”

Eilbert and Parket (1973); “Perhaps the best way to understand social responsibility is to think of it as ‘good neighborliness.’ The concept involves two phases. On one hand, it means not doing things that spoil the neighborhood. On the other, it may be expressed as the voluntary assumption of the obligation to help solve neighborhood problems.” Or...”...the commitment of a business or business, in general, to an active role in the solution of broad social problems...”
Prakash Sethi (1975); Distinguishing social obligation, social responsibility, and social responsiveness: “Thus social responsibility implies bringing corporae behavior up to a level where it is congruent with the prevailing social norms, values, and expectations of performance.”

Jones (1980); “Corporate social responsibility is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract. Two facets of this definition are critical. First, the obligation must be voluntarily adopted; behavior influenced by coercive forces of law or union contract is not voluntary. Second, the obligation is a broad one, extending beyond the traditional duty to shareholders to other societal groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, and neighboring communities.”

In Simple term: Corporate social responsibility is the corporate belief that a company needs to be responsible for its actions socially, ethically and environmentally. It is the integration of business operations and values whereby the interests of all stakeholders including customers, employees, investors, the community, and the environment are reflected in the company’s policies and actions.

1.5 Motives of Corporate Social Responsibility

A number of factors are driving the increased adoption of CSR practices in the corporate India. Regulation obviously provides the baseline for corporate action, notably for employment practices and the environment. Beyond this, for many companies, being a good corporate citizen is a vital aspect of their identity, values, and vision. Far-sighted business leaders recognize that it is unsustainable for their companies to exist as ‘islands of prosperity’ in a sea of poverty. ‘We must do something for the community from whose land we generate our wealth’, says one leading chief executive officers. Market forces are also propelling many firms to go ‘beyond compliance’, notably for those selling into international supply chains. No longer a legal necessity and a nice thing to do, corporate social responsibility is emerging as a ‘hard’ commercial factor, linked directly to profits and brand value.
In the recent years corporate business houses have substantially involved towards societal responsibilities. Companies have started to realise the importance of corporate social responsibility and initiating the steps towards it. Today, the objectives of the companies are not limited to profit maximisation, economic gains or enhancing competencies but at the same time ensure environmental protection, promotion of social responsibility including consumer interest. It will lead to good public image which in turn have positive impact on the wealth of the organisation. The reasons that motivate organisations to involve in corporate social responsibility activities are discussed as follows:

**Globalization and market forces:** As corporations pursue growth through globalization, they have encountered new challenges that impose limits to their growth and potential profits. Government regulations, tariffs, environmental restrictions and varying standards of what constitutes labour exploitation are problems that can cost organizations millions of dollars. Some view ethical issues as simply a costly hindrance. Some companies use CSR methodologies as a strategic tactic to gain public support for their presence in global markets, helping them sustain a competitive advantage by using their social contributions to provide a subconscious level of advertising. (Fry, Keim, Meiners 1986) Global competition places particular pressure on multinational corporations to examine not only their own labour practices, but those of their entire supply chain, from a CSR perspective.

**Laws and regulation:** Another driver of CSR is the role of independent mediators, particularly the government, in ensuring that corporations are prevented from harming the broader social good, including people and the environment. CSR critics such as Robert Reich argue that governments should set the agenda for social responsibility by the way of laws and regulation that will allow a business to conduct themselves responsibly. The issues surrounding government regulation pose several problems. Regulation in itself is unable to cover every aspect in detail of a corporation's operations. This leads to burdensome legal processes bogged down in interpretations of the law and debatable grey areas (Sacconi 2004).
Social awareness: The role among corporate stakeholders to work collectively to pressure corporations is changing. Shareholders and investors themselves, through socially responsible investing are exerting pressure on corporations to behave responsibly. Non-governmental organizations are also taking an increasing role, leveraging the power of the media and the Internet to increase their scrutiny and collective activism around corporate behavior. Through education and dialogue, the development of community in holding businesses responsible for their actions is growing (Roux 2007).

Ethical Consumerism: The rise in popularity of ethical consumerism over the last two decades can be linked to the rise of CSR. As global population increases, so does the pressure on limited natural resources required to meet rising consumer demand (Grace and Cohen 2005). Industrialization in many developing countries is booming as a result of technology and globalization. Consumers are becoming more aware of the environmental and social implications of their day-to-day consumer decisions and are beginning to make purchasing decisions related to their environmental and ethical concerns. However, this practice is far from consistent or universal.

Stakeholder priorities: Increasingly, corporations are motivated to become more socially responsible because their most important stakeholders expect them to understand and address the social and community issues that are relevant to them. Understanding what causes are important to employees is usually the first priority because of the many interrelated business benefits that can be derived from increased employee engagement (i.e. more loyalty, improved recruitment, increased retention, higher productivity, and so on). Key external stakeholders include customers, consumers, investors (particularly institutional investors, regulators, academics, and the media). There is a wide consensus among public and private institutions that the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is based on a company attaining a balance between the interests of all its stakeholders within its strategic planning and operations.

Consumers Satisfaction: Responsible companies give greater priority to their customers. With diminishing business boundaries across the world consumers have
become aware and more demanding in terms of information regarding conditions in which the products and services are produced along with the sustainability impact thereof. CSR is about values and accountability which includes the behaviour of the people. Many potential clients who themselves operate CSR activities expect their suppliers to do similar kind of programmes. Sometimes the selection is on the basis of social responsiveness of the supplier.

**Employees Satisfaction**: Young blood in the organisation wants more than the financial benefit. They feel sense of pride to be connected with the organisation which is socially responsible. Strong CSR practices can help in attracting, recruiting and retaining the best young talent.

**Image Building**: Globalisation and universal expansion of the economies enhances the consideration of image and reputation among organisations. An organisations image and reputation can be ruined in days through unregulated and unethical practices. So, imbibing CSR practices becomes the strong foundation in image building. CSR practices can help the organisation to avoid the risk of corruption scandals, environment disasters, child labour violations and dangerous work environment. These incidents also draw unwanted attention from regulators, courts, governments and media. A genuine effort in playing straight and having good CSR record with the right check insulates the companies from such risks.

**Risk Management**: Managing risk is a central part of many corporate strategies. Reputations that take decades to build up can be ruined in hours through incidents such as corruption scandals or environmental accidents. These events can also draw unwanted attention from regulators, courts, governments and media. Building a genuine culture of ’doing the right thing’ within a corporation can offset these risks.

**License to operate**: Corporations are keen to avoid interference in their business through taxation or regulations. By taking substantive voluntary steps, they can persuade governments and the wider public that they are taking issues such as health and safety, diversity or the environment good corporate citizens with respect to labour standards and impacts on the environment.
Environment protection: Environment protection becomes an area of concern these days. A CSR programme that aims to conserve earth's natural resources, avoiding pollution, water conservation and minimising global warming effects are the areas in which the companies take initiative.

1.6 Approaches of CSR

Some commentators have identified a difference between the Canadian (Montreal school of CSR), the Continental European and the Anglo-Saxon approaches to CSR. It is said that for Chinese consumers, a socially responsible company makes safe, high-quality products; for Germans it provides secure employment; in South Africa it makes a positive contribution to social needs such as health care and education. And even within Europe the discussion about CSR is very heterogeneous.

A more common approach to CSR is corporate philanthropy. This includes monetary donations and aid given to local and non-local nonprofit organizations and communities, including donations in areas such as the arts, education, housing, health, social welfare, and the environment, among others, but excluding political contributions and commercial sponsorship of events. Some organizations[who?] do not like a philanthropy-based approach as it might not help build on the skills of local populations, whereas community-based development generally leads to more sustainable development.

Another approach to CSR is to incorporate the CSR strategy directly into the business strategy of an organization. For instance, procurement of Fair Trade tea and coffee has been adopted by various businesses including KPMG. Its CSR manager commented, "Fairtrade fits very strongly into our commitment to our communities." Another approach is garnering increasing corporate responsibility interest. This is called Creating Shared Value, or CSV. The shared value model is based on the idea that corporate success and social welfare are interdependent. A business needs a healthy, educated workforce, sustainable resources and adept government to compete effectively. For society to thrive, profitable and competitive businesses must be
developed and supported to create income, wealth, tax revenues, and opportunities for philanthropy. CSV received global attention in the Harvard Business Review article Strategy & Society: The Link between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility by Michael E. Porter, a leading authority on competitive strategy and head of the Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness at Harvard Business School; and Mark R. Kramer, Senior Fellow at the Kennedy School at Harvard University and co-founder of FSG Social Impact Advisors. The article provides insights and relevant examples of companies that have developed deep linkages between their business strategies and corporate social responsibility. Many approaches to CSR pit businesses against society, emphasizing the costs and limitations of compliance with externally imposed social and environmental standards. CSV acknowledges trade-offs between short-term profitability and social or environmental goals, but focuses more on the opportunities for competitive advantage from building a social value proposition into corporate strategy. CSV has a limitation in that it gives the impression that only two stakeholders are important shareholders and consumers and belies the multi-stakeholder approach of most CSR advocates.

Many companies use the strategy of benchmarking to compete within their respective industries in CSR policy, implementation, and effectiveness. Benchmarking involves reviewing competitor CSR initiatives, as well as measuring and evaluating the impact that those policies have on society and the environment, and how customers perceive competitor CSR strategy. After a comprehensive study of competitor strategy and an internal policy review performed, a comparison can be drawn and a strategy developed for competition with CSR initiatives.

1.7 The Benefits of CSR

Every concept has got two faces naturally the advantage as well as disadvantage, here the research try to highlight the first face of corporate social responsibility in terms of its practical benefits and those as mentioned below.

**Building Reputation** by increasing environmental efficiency and improving environmental responsibility, an enhanced reputation is often manifested in awards and recognition from governments, rating agencies, and public surveys.
**Developing human** capital through better human resource management, a high quality work force is essential for competitiveness since it improves productivity, product quality, and innovation. A study in India covering 52000 employees in 200 companies found a positive correlation between employment practices and financial returns.

**Improving access** to capital through high standards of corporate governance that reassure investors on issues relating to shareholder and stakeholder rights, transparency and disclosure, and proper governance structures. Another interesting illustration of the business case for CSR is provided by Bob Willard (2002) in his book, The Sustainability Advantage: seven business case benefits of a triple bottom line.

**Easier hiring of the best talent** Researchers estimate that the most important corporate resource over the next 20 years will be talented employees, many of which pay attention to corporate social and environmental behaviour. Willard shows how recruiting costs for South Dakota Inc. could be reduced by 5% through a positive South Dakota branding.

**Higher retention of top talent** Studies show that talented employees tend to stay with a company when they have meaningful work. Willard shows how South Dakota Inc., in embracing a sustainable framework, could avoid 38 million dollars in costs.

**Increasing employee productivity** Willard discusses the connection between meaningful work and productivity, and shows that engaging the entire organization in sustainable development goals like zero emissions, self-sufficient energy production, zero waste, helping restore the planet’s health, ensures that the company gets more output from its employees. Small and medium enterprise (SMEs) productivity benefit translates into 756 million dollars, the equivalent of 12,600 extra employees.

**Reduced expenses in manufacturing** Willard demonstrates savings opportunities through eliminating or recycling waste and redesigning processes to use less energy,
water, and materials in manufacturing, which are the low hanging fruits of eco-efficiency.

**Reduced expenses at commercial sites** A lot of unnecessary waste takes place at non-manufacturing sites. Through more judicious waste handling, energy efficiency, water conservation, and naturalized landscaping, SD Inc. can add 26 million dollars of pure profit.

**Improved financial performance** As stated above a corporations’ priority is to maximize profits and therefore it is interesting to discuss the relationship between social responsibility actions and economic performance. There different opinions on this matter and they can be structured into three different viewpoints. The first viewpoint believes that there is a trade off between social responsibilities and financial performance. Engaging in CSR will get in the way of profit maximization and it is therefore irresponsible of a corporation towards its shareholders to engage in CSR operations. The second viewpoint believes that the costs occurring when the corporations embrace their social responsibilities are marginal and outweighed by benefits such as improved employee moral and productivity. The third viewpoint believes that CSR is important in itself and its costs are offset by a reduction of other costs (Mcguire et al. 1988).

**1.8 Scope for Corporate Social Responsibility in India**

The scope for corporate social responsibility can be classified into two major areas such as internal scope and external scope, those are discussed in detailed as following:

**Internal Scope for CSR**

**Risk Management:** organizational health and safety, product safety, regulatory compliance, reputation management, responsible business practices, stakeholder engagement

**Value Chain:** responsible procurement, supplier management, externalisation of costs, supplier screening, supplier feedback, fair trade
Employees: Turnover, morale, satisfaction, work-life balance, internal culture (transparency), labour practices, job security, remuneration, diversity, equal opportunity, training

Environment: Environmental footprint, waste and pollution avoidance, eco-efficiency, product recycling, sustainability, greenhouse gas emissions, resource reduction, precautionary principle with in the organisation.

Measurement: Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) reporting, internal and external audits, verification statements, management targets

External Scope for CSR

Education: Support to technical or vocational institutions for their self-development, academic education by way of financial assistance to primary, middle and higher secondary schools, adult literacy especially amongst those belonging to BPL, awareness programmes on girl education, counseling of parents. special attention on education, training and rehabilitation of mentally and physically challenged persons, spreading legal awareness amongst people and disadvantageous sections of the society about their rights and remedies available, promotion of professional education by setting up educational institutions offering courses in engineering, nursing, management, medicine and in technical subjects.

Water Supply including Drinking Water: Installation repair of hand pumps tube wells, digging or renovation of wells, gainful utilization of waste water from underground mines for cultivation or any other purpose, development construction of water tank ponds, rain water-harvesting scheme, formation of a task force of volunteers to educate people regarding proper use of drinking water, empowerment to the villagers for maintenance of the above facilities for availability of water.

Health Care: Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS), awareness and care, tuberculosis (TB) and leprosy, social evils like alcohol, smoking, drug abuse child and mother care, diet
and nutrition, operation Jyoti—vision to help the people of the peripheral area for necessary assistance, blood donation camps, diabetics detection and hypertension camps, family welfare, senior citizen health care, wellness clinics, fully equipped mobile medical vans, Tele medicine, to supplement the different programme of local or state authorities, eyes and heart care, collaboration with govt. health institution.

**Environment:** organizing sensitizing programmes on environment management and pollution control, green belt development forestation, social forestry, check dams, park, restoration of mined out lands, development of jobs related to agro product i.e dairy, poultry, farming and others, plantation of saplings producing fruit, animal care.

**Social Empowerment:** Priority for local youth in employment, Self Gainful Employment Opportunities Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) on welding, fabrication, and other electronic appliances, to provide assistance to villagers having small of land to develop mushroom farming, medicinal plants, farming and other cash crops to make them economically dependent on their available land resources, training may be provided by agricultural experts for above farming, organizing training programmes for women on tailoring, embroidery designs, home foods/fast foods, pickles, painting and interior decoration and other vocational courses.

**Village Infrastructure Development:** To develop infrastructural facilities for providing electricity through Solar Lights or alternative renewal energy to the nearby villages, Pawan Chakki as alternative for providing electricity in villages, construction of road, drainage, bus stand, community hall, toilets water supply pipe line, water storage tank, check dam.

**Sports and Culture:** Promotion of sports and cultural activities for participation in state and national level, by conducting tournaments like football, cricket, Kabaddi and Khokho, providing sports materials for football, volleyball, hockey to the young and talented village youths. Promoting and sponsoring of national level teams, national sports events in coalfield areas and supporting local players, and extending sponsorship for cultural event to restore Indian cultural, traditions and values,
last but not the least providing sports facilities for physically handicapped persons may be explored, development of park so on and so forth.

1.9 Measuring Methods of CSR

The concept CSR is not easy to measure, though many researchers have developed lots of methods. Generally, there are two accepted methods of measuring CSR, one is reputation index, and the other is content analysis (Ahmed and Uchida, 2009). The former measurement is a method that is based on the view of the knowledgeable observers who rate firms on the basis of one or more dimensions of social performance. The advantages of their method are: it summarizes the responses of a key. Constituency of various firms and it tends to be internally consistent because one evaluator is applying the same criteria to each firm (Karake, 1998).

Content analysis is a way of codifying text and content of written narratives into groups or categories based on selected criteria, with the end goal of transforming the material into quantitative scales that permit further analysis (Weber, 1998; Holder-Webb et al., 2007). Both methods have their limitations. The reputation index heavily relies on the observers subjective judgments; instead, the content analysis relies on information provided by the company itself (Karake, 1998).

Comparing the CSR progress of India with the other emerging economies is difficult to achieve, because there are no global benchmarks. However, some proxy indicators are available. In September 2004, the International Organisation of Standardisation published its latest survey of the adoption of the International Organisation for Standard (ISO) 14001 environmental management system. At the end of 2003, over 66000 certificates had been issued worldwide, up 16 percent on the year before. Of these, India had 879 certificates, a substantial growth from the 600 certificates in 2002. Yet, India lagged far behind China, which had over 5000 ISO 14001 certificates in 2003, making it the country with the third highest number of ISO 14001 registrations after Japan and the United Kingdom.

The United Nation Global Compact Ten Principles

Another broader measure of corporate commitment to social responsibility is the United Nation Global Compact, a set of 10 principles launched by UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. Currently, 95 Indian companies have backed the Global
Compact, slightly less than in Brazil, but on this occasion, considerably more than in China. The UN Global Compact's ten principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption enjoy universal consensus and are derived from: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Labour Organization's declaration on fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The UN Global Compact asks companies to embrace, support and enact, within their sphere of influence, a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labour standards, the environment and anti-corruption:

**Human Rights**
*Principle 1:* Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
*Principle 2:* make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.

**Labour**
*Principle 3:* Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
*Principle 4:* the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour
*Principle 5:* the effective abolition of child labour; and
*Principle 6:* the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

**Environment**
*Principle 7:* Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
*Principle 8:* undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
*Principle 9:* encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

**Anti-Corruption**
*Principle 10:* Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.
1.10 Indian Leading organisations’ CSR Practices

Corporate social responsibility is not a new concept in India. Corporates like the Tata Group, the Aditya Birla Group, and Indian Oil Corporation, to name a few, have been involved in serving the community ever since their inception. Many other organizations have been doing their part for the society through donations and charity events. Today, CSR in India has gone beyond merely charity and donations, and is approached in a more organized fashion. It has become an integral part of the corporate strategy. Companies have corporate social responsibility teams that devise specific policies, strategies and goals for their corporate social responsibility programs and set aside budgets to support them. These programs, in many cases, are based on a clearly defined social philosophy or are closely aligned with the company’s business expertise. Employees become the backbone of these initiatives and volunteer their time and contribute their skills, to implement them. Corporate social responsibility programs could range from overall development of a community to supporting specific causes like education, environment and health care. Best practices followed by many Indian companies related to CSR are as follows:

**Ashok Leyland** Operates a FunBus in Chennai and New Delhi. This bus, equipped with a hydraulic lift, takes differently abled children and those from orphanages and corporation primary schools on a day’s picnic. The company also runs AIDS awareness and prevention programmes in its Hosur factories for about 3.5 lakh drivers

**Axis Bank** The Axis Bank Foundation runs Balwadis which are learning places for children living in large urban slum clusters. It also conducts skill development programmes (PREMA and Yuva Parivartan) in motor driving, welding, mobile repairing, tailoring etc, for the youth in backward districts.

**Bharat Petroleum Corporation** Its rain water harvesting project Boond, in association with the Oil Industries Development Board, selects draught stricken villages to turn them from „water scarce to water positive“. Some of BPCL’s other social programmes include adoption of villages, prevention and care for HIV/AIDS and rural health care.
**Hindalco Industries** Its CSR activities are concentrated in 692 villages and 12 urban slums, where it reaches out to about 26 lakh people. It has constructed check dams, ponds and bore wells to provide safe drinking water. In education, it awards scholarships to students from the rural schools it support. Its other interests include women’s empowerment and health care, in which it treats patients in hospitals, runs medical camps and operates rural mobile medical van services.

**Infosys** The Infosys Science Foundation, set up in 2009, gives away the annual Infosys Prize to honour outstanding achievements in the fields of science and engineering. The company supports causes in health care, culture and rural development. In an interesting initiative undertaken by it, 100 school teachers in Karnataka, who were suffering from arthritis, underwent free surgery as a part of a week long programme.

**Mahindra & Mahindra** Nanhi Kali, a programme run by the KC Mahindra Education Trust, supports education of over 75,000 underprivileged girls. The trust has awarded grants and scholarships to 83,245 students so far. In vocational training, the Mahindra Pride School provides livelihood training to youth from socially and economically disadvantaged communities. M&M also works for causes related to environment, health care, sports and culture.

**Tata Consultancy Services** Its Computer Based Functional Literacy (CBFL) initiative for providing adult literacy has already benefitted 1.2 lakh people. The programme is available in nine Indian languages. Besides adult education, TCS also works in the areas of skill development, health care and agriculture.

**Tata Steel** It comes out with the Human Development Index (HDI), a composite index of health, education and income levels, to assess the impact of its work in rural areas. Health care is one of its main concerns. The Tata Steel Rural Development Society aims to improve agricultural productivity and raise farmers’ standard of living.
ONGC and Indian Oil Corporation has been spending 0.75-1 percent of their net profits on CSR activities. In 2007-08 Rs. 246.70 crores was spent by oil PSUs on CSR activities. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation’s (ONGC) CSR projects focus on higher education, grant of scholarship and aid to deserving young pupils of less privileged sections of society, facilities for constructing schools etc.

Reliance Industries: Reliance Industries initiated a project named as “Project Drishti” to bring back the eyesight of visually challenged Indians from the economically weaker sections of the society. This project has brightened up the lives of over 5000 people so far.

SAIL has taken successful actions in environment conservation, health and medical care, education, women up-liftment providing drinking water.

BHEL and Indian Airlines have been acclaimed for disaster management efforts. Bharat Heavy Electronic Limited (BHEL) has also adopted 56 villages having nearly 80,000 inhabitants.

Glaxo Smith Kline Pharmaceuticals CSR programs primarily focus on health and healthy living. They work in tribal villages where they provide medical check-up and treatment, health camps and health awareness programs. They also provide money, medicines and equipment to non-profit organizations that work towards improving health and education in under-served communities.

Bajaj Electricals Ltd corporate social responsibility activities include Education, Rural Development and Environment. And IBM has joined hands with the Tribal Development Department of Gujarat for a development project aimed at upliftment of tribals in the Sasan area of Gir forest.

Navratna Company, Coal India Ltd (CIL) invest US$ 67.5 million in 2010-11 on social and environmental causes and National Aluminium Company Ltd (NALCO) has contributed US$ 3.23 million for development work in Orissa's Koraput district as part of its Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).
HSBC India, Max New York Life The financial services sector is going green in a steady manner. With an eye on preserving energy, companies have started easing the carbon footprint in their offices. The year 2009 witnessed initiatives including application of renewable energy technologies, moving to paperless operations and recognition of environmental standards. Efforts by companies such as Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC) India, Max New York Life and Standard Chartered Bank have ensured that the green movement has kept its momentum by asking their customers to shift to e-statements and e-receipts.

1.11 Recognizing the limitations of CSR

Over the past 15 years, CSR has become a more and more familiar term although, as discussed above, it can be defined in different ways. And, we see more and more companies issuing reports and engaging in programs under the banner of CSR. The assertion of corporate social responsibility may seem fairly uncontentious who could object to businesses being “socially responsible?” Isn’t everyone supposed to be “responsible?” There is, in fact, cause to be wary of “strategic” CSR, however, and a number of reasons to reject “radical” CSR. Let us now turn to discuss the major problems with CSR.

The Problems of Strategic CSR

First, one of the main questions about this view of CSR is whether companies will be able to maintain the balance called for between benefits to the company and benefits to the environment or stakeholders. Some of the supposed benefits such as building a better image or attracting better employees are very difficult to measure. Will these factors be used to justify environmental or social programs that really do not provide adequate benefits to the company? In the CSR debate, sometimes discussions of these general types of benefits seem to take on such importance that any program or contribution could be justified if only the company devotes enough time to studying it and approaches it with creativity. Many social and environmental programs, however, are very expensive, and it is doubtful that technological “know how,” business acumen, global reach and human resources goes as far as some CSR advocates think in allowing companies to address social and environmental issues in a way that simultaneously yields benefits for the company. Perhaps Jonathan Charkham
best characterizes the concern here: “When CSR is promoted, one should bear in mind that giving away other people’s money is easy!”

Second, to what degree can even strategic CSR programs be called discretionary? As noted above, Kotler and Lee explicitly include discretion in their definition of CSR. After setting forth this definition, however, they immediately state that a commitment to CSR “must be demonstrated” and that a CSR plan “will be fulfilled through the adoption of new business practices and/or contributions. . . .” If CSR must be demonstrated as a result of the expectation that companies will, in fact, be socially responsible, it would seem that discretion only comes in what type of CSR program the company initiates. Another important question is raised concerning the “discretionary” nature of strategic CSR. The more that companies talk about their commitment to programs to benefit the environment and stakeholder, are companies, in fact, conditioning society to believe that companies are equally responsible to the “triple bottom line” of radical CSR? That is, the company may have strategic CSR in mind (with either proven or at least arguable benefits to the company for its CSR initiatives), but this is hardly communicated to society. Are companies, therefore, reinforcing the message of radical CSR even as they carefully define their programs as strategic CSR? A final note about the “discretionary” nature of strategic CSR is in order. As notions of CSR have spread, so too have various codes of conduct to define, in either positive or negative commands, what companies have the “responsibility” to do or not to do. These codes have become more and more influential in recent years, often promulgated by industry associations or international organizations. For example, the United Nations has its “Global Compact” principles. Again, however, the question of discretion arises. The danger is that the proliferation of codes of conduct will result in mandatory CSR and reinforce the idea that the “triple bottom line” is actually the true goal of all business.

**Businesses Make Valuable Contributions to Society**

Second problem with CSR is that discussions regarding CSR almost fail to recognize the many inherently “socially responsible” aspects of business and the markets in which they operate. Many CSR proponents start from the premise that there is nothing socially responsible about business itself. It is only with CSR that businesses become socially responsible. one picture after another, it seems, of
corporate executives in suits, ties, and handcuffs. Too bad there’s another side of the business world. Of course, the other “side of the business world” is the decision of Macy’s to carry the new basket line. It was as if nothing else Macy’s (and of course business in general) was doing was in any way responsible; it is either crime or CSR. Of course, in this case we can put the distinction down to good journalistic device, capturing the attention of the listener. But perhaps it is also more characteristic of how CSR is, in fact, normally presented. Discussions of CSR ought to begin with the recognition that companies play a very important social role. For example, as John Meadowcroft notes in his recent book The Ethics of the Market, most companies depend on relationships developed both inside and outside the company. Outside the company, the business develops relationships often of long duration, including ties with suppliers and customers. Inside the company, the business depends on networks of relationships between employees for the successful coordination and operation of the business. Meadowcroft makes the important point that the market is characterized as “a vast web of cooperative and mutually beneficial relationships between employers and employees, colleagues and clients, suppliers and contractors, producers and consumers.” Meadowcroft notes that such relationships “will very often be akin to a partnership based upon mutual dependency, cooperation and trust, where short-term gain will often be sacrificed for the benefits of long term collaboration.” In this way, businesses certainly play an important role in promoting social networks.

Obviously, businesses also play an important role in society in supplying products and services to society and providing employment. As Jonathan Charkham summarizes in the introduction to his important work on corporations, “They provide employment and are, therefore, an important element in social cohesion. They produce taxes, and therefore, the sinews of civilization law and order, defense, and welfare of many kinds. Above all, they produce the goods and services people want or need.” Many companies also provide important social benefits such as pension plans for their employees. Again, the positive impacts of business should not be overlooked in the broader debate about CSR.

**Existing Legal and Ethical Principles Establish Duties for Business in Society**

Another problem in the CSR debate is that CSR proponents tend to downplay the importance of the existing legal obligations which control company conduct as
well as the observance of important ethical principles by companies. The CSR mindset sometimes seems to start with the assumption that companies have no obligations to the environment or employees, so CSR will provide them. But many legal and ethical standards are already in place. Indeed, businesses readily accept that a legal and ethical framework is crucial for the existence of a well-functioning market system. Companies in modern market economies are already subject to regulation in many areas. Comprehensive laws regulate how businesses operate with respect to issues including environment, employment, labor unions, consumer protection, competition (antitrust) and bribery. Not only do these laws threaten punishment of the company with fines and other “civil” penalties for violations, but in jurisdictions like the US prosecutors have the power to bring criminal charges under these laws and press for prison sentences for the company employees and managers involved in the violation. In these ways, companies have significant existing obligations to be socially responsible. Not only does current law place substantial limitations on business, but legal and regulatory obligations are expanding internationally, not contracting.

**CSR Will Lead to More Government Control**

Another reason to reject the radical view of CSR is that it will ultimately lead to more government regulation. A good example of the likely outcome of the principles of CSR is provided in a recent book on CSR by David Vogel entitled The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility. Vogel begins by using the term “virtue” to describe voluntary CSR initiatives undertaken by companies, business associations or private bodies to further environmental or social ends. But later in his book Vogel comes to the conclusion that voluntary action is not effective. Vogel notes that CSR often imposes costs that would raise the price of products and services, and consumers often won’t want to pay these higher prices if there is also the choice of buying a lower-priced product from a company which did not undertake “voluntary” CSR. And so, by the end of his book, Vogel argues that “virtue” must be replaced by government regulation: “Consequently, the definition of corporate social responsibility needs to be redefined to include the responsibilities of business to strengthen civil society and the capacity of governments to require that all firms act more responsibly.” So the end result of CSR is not voluntary compliance but a new layer of government regulation. Companies will be forced to be virtuous. Not
only will CSR ultimately lead to more regulation, but to more onerous and intrusive regulation than ever before in markets like the US. Indeed, the types of CSR programs which companies are being urged to adopt reveal the inherently radical nature of CSR.

**CSR Undermines Good Company Governance**

CSR is problematic because it undermines the responsibility of company managers to company owners. CSR redefines the very purpose of business so that, in addition to the traditional business purpose of maximizing the long-term interest of the shareholders (in the context of abiding by laws and ethical principles), businesses also have obligations to the environment and to stakeholder interests. Because CSR says that managers are accountable to all of these, however, managers, in fact, will be accountable to none, and could justify just about any decision on the basis that it benefits at least one aspect of the “triple” bottom line. According to Jonathan Charkham, “There is a real danger with CSR of competing, contradictory, and incompatible objectives.” So the traditional problem of making sure managers are serving the interests of the company (and its owners) – and not themselves – is made worse. Furthermore, CSR does not indicate how a “fair” allocation of resources can be achieved among the so-called “triple bottom line.” Employees typically would be very happy if the company increased the wages paid to employees. But shareholders would like more consistent dividend payments, and perhaps the community would like more money spent on pollution control equipment whereas suppliers want faster payment for goods sold to the corporation. Which group is to get priority if each group has an equal claim to be served by the company? Finally, conflicts will arise even within one group such as employees. A number of factors can cause employees to have very different interests for example, whether the employee is full time or part time, salaried or an hourly wage earner, or young or very experienced. Part time workers may not receive a pension, and therefore, may be much more interested in increases in hourly wages than increases in company pension payments. Younger workers may be much more interested in benefits such as time off for the birth of a child than older workers. How are conflicts to be resolved where one group of employees has very different interests than other groups of employees? CSR does not offer a clear answer.
CSR Diminishes the Crucial Focus on Good Public Governance

While CSR places the focus on business in addressing environmental and social issues, the fact is that in many developing countries the bigger issue is effective public governance. Local, regional and national governments must ensure accountability especially through transparent decision making. Public governance must be improved by fighting corruption, and in particular, bribery of government officials. Finally, conditions for the “rule of law” must be improved. It is only with improvements in public governance that major environmental and social problems can be effectively addressed. So the focus of CSR deflects attention to the crucial issue of ineffective public governance. The proper response is rather to make sure that governments themselves are acting effectively on those issues of importance in society. With better public governance, business activity itself will prove the best way to speed development in many countries. The World Bank’s 2005 World Development Report 2005, for example, focuses on the necessity to extend the activity of companies in open markets as the best way to speed the development of those countries which most need it. The Report 2005 asserts also that “private firms from farmers and micro entrepreneurs to local manufacturing companies and multinational enterprises are at the heart of the development process. Driven by the quest for profits, they invest in new ideas and new facilities that strengthen the foundation of economic growth and prosperity.” The World Bank is not alone in this regard. Rabbi Jonathan Sacks has noted that “the free market is the best means we have yet discovered for alleviating poverty . . .” and for “creating a human environment of independence, dignity and creativity.” The contributions of business, without the addition of CSR baggage, are already apparent.

Why “Corporate” Social Responsibility?

CSR proponents obviously focus on the role of business in society. Corporations, and more generally businesses of all types, are certainly one of the important organizations in society. But, of course, there are many other actors in society beyond businesses. Perhaps first we would think of individuals and local, regional and national governments. Then we would think of the many branches of “civil society”: family; religious organizations; political parties; non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including aid and many “cause”-oriented groups; clubs and
associations of many kinds, including sports and interest groups; media; labor unions; community and neighbourhood organizations; and schools. Why does CSR focus on just businesses in raising the question of social responsibility? If social responsibility exists, why should it be limited to the role of business in society? What about individuals for example? Should we have a “social responsibility board” to monitor the actions of individuals to ensure that each person is contributing in a balanced way to the environment and social issues in addition to the hours they devote to earning compensation in one form or another? Should that board have the power to levy a “CSR tax” on those who do not demonstrate a sufficient personal contribution and to make sure that everyone is contributing a fair share toward environmental and community needs?

It is true, especially for larger businesses, that they may employ many citizens, possess technical and management expertise, possess significant financial resources and have global “reach.” But is this a sufficient basis to set them apart from other actors in society on this issue? If we took the individuals who make up any urban area in the US, we could certainly find great technical and management expertise, significant financial resources and global reach, but do we impose upon them a “social responsibility” test? Businesses are certainly not the only, and not the dominant, actor which shapes society and culture. Should businesses especially those organized as a “corporation” or some other entity created only under law be subject to “social responsibility” since they are only created by use of law established by society? Should obtaining a corporate or other business “charter” be made subject to the condition that the business provides “social” benefits? First, remember that businesses do provide many social benefits. Why at this point in history we should expect any additional “social responsibility” from businesses is not clear. Second, any additional forced “virtue” in terms of environmental or other social spending is in reality nothing more than a tax on doing business. The consequences of taxing business activity are well known those societies which place too much of a burden on business and discourage the entrepreneurial business spirit experience lower economic growth and lower standards of living.
Do We Want Businesses to Assume the Powers of Government?

CSR should also be rejected since it leads to the inappropriate assumption of government powers by businesses. We should not look to businesses to take the lead to establish schools, provide environmental protection and organize medical care. Can corporations identify the most pressing social and environmental needs? And can they address these needs for the good of all of society rather than just one location or group of people? Do we want unelected corporations delivering basic services normally provided by government? Of course, governments may have some incentive not to object to business involvement in CSR programs insofar as company-funded programs may address public issues without the government having to raise taxes. Surely broader action on the part of governments and civil society organizations knowledgeable about these issues are in a better position to address public needs than businesses. It is also important to note that increasing involvement by corporations in the general needs and affairs of society will certainly result in more calls for governments to regulate company affairs. If a company voluntarily undertakes environmental or social programs, which are typical functions of government, society will begin to view the corporation as a type of government entity, subject to society’s control. The likely result of CSR will actually be further government control.

CSR Violates Fundamental Rights of Owners of the Company

A final limitation of CSR is that it undermines the fundamental rights of the owners of the company. First, private property, which is crucial to economic prosperity as well as to political liberty, is accorded a high degree of protection. As Elaine Sternberg asserts, just because some limits to the ownership of private property exist, all limits on property are not acceptable. Second, John Meadowcroft also makes the important point that imposing CSR on individuals who happen to be shareholders in a company “constitutes an infringement of their right to pursue their own ends.” Radical CSR, therefore, also implicates some fundamental rights of owners of companies. Deregulation of economic activity, corporate scandals and the fact that in many countries social and environmental issues have been prominent for many years. The debate over the social responsibility of business in the US and in Europe is still developing and important differences exist in how “corporate social responsibility” is defined. Discussions of a company’s social responsibility can serve
to remind companies of the importance of complying with legal and ethical standards as well as ensuring that the firm is fully incorporating stakeholder and environmental interests in ways that truly benefit the company. The concept of CSR, however, threatens to evolve in a much more radical manner and to create significant problems for the future.

1.12 Corporate Social Responsibility Guidelines of Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India

Since the present study is to understand the trend, issues and strategies of CSR in India, it becomes important to understand the country law or guidelines to implement the CSR, because most of the activities of the organisations are based on the guidelines provided by the Govt. The guidelines also helps researcher as bench mark in study. So it becomes mandatory to mention as given by the Govt. of India, Ministry of Corporate Affairs.

Fundamental Principle: Each business entity should formulate a CSR policy to guide its strategic planning and provide a roadmap for its CSR initiatives, which should be an integral part of overall business policy and aligned with its business goals. The policy should be framed with the participation of various level executives and should be approved by the board and the CSR Policy should normally cover following core elements:

Care for all Stakeholders: The companies should respect the interests of, and be responsive towards all stakeholders, including shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, project affected people, society at large etc. and create value for all of them. They should develop mechanism to actively engage with all stakeholders, inform them of inherent risks and mitigate them where they occur.

Ethical functioning: Their governance systems should be underpinned by Ethics, Transparency and Accountability. They should not engage in business practices that are abusive, unfair, corrupt or anti-competitive.

3 Corporate Social Responsibility Voluntary Guidelines 2009, Published by Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi for more details visit: http://www.mca.gov.in
**Respect for Workers’ Rights and Welfare:** Companies should provide a workplace environment that is safe, hygienic and humane and which upholds the dignity of employees. They should provide all employees with access to training and development of necessary skills for career advancement, on an equal and non-discriminatory basis. They should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining of labour, have an effective grievance redressal system, should not employ child or forced labour and provide and maintain equality of opportunities without any discrimination on any grounds in recruitment and during employment.

**Respect for Human Rights:** Companies should respect human rights for all and avoid complicity with human rights abuses by them or by third party.

**Respect for Environment:** Companies should take measures to check and prevent pollution; recycle, manage and reduce waste, should manage natural resources in a sustainable manner and ensure optimal use of resources like land and water, should proactively respond to the challenges of climate change by adopting cleaner production methods, promoting efficient use of energy and environment friendly technologies.

**Activities for Social and Inclusive Development:** Depending upon their core competency and business interest, companies should undertake activities for economic and social development of communities and geographical areas, particularly in the vicinity of their operations. These could include: education, skill building for livelihood of people, health, cultural and social welfare etc., particularly targeting at disadvantaged sections of society.

**Additional Instructions**
- The CSR policy of the business entity should provide for an implementation strategy which should include identification of projects activities, setting measurable physical targets with timeframe, organizational mechanism and responsibilities, time schedules and monitoring. Companies may partner with local authorities, business associations and civil society non-government organizations. They may influence the supply chain for CSR initiative and
motivate employees for voluntary effort for social development. They may evolve a system of need assessment and impact assessment while undertaking CSR activities in a particular area. Independent evaluation may also be undertaken for selected projects activities from time to time.

- Companies should allocate specific amount in their budgets for CSR activities. This amount may be related to profits after tax, cost of planned CSR activities or any other suitable parameter.

- To share experiences and network with other organizations the company should engage with well established and recognized programmes/platforms which encourage responsible business practices and CSR activities. This would help companies to improve on their CSR strategies and effectively project the image of being socially responsible.

- The companies should disseminate information on CSR policy, activities and progress in a structured manner to all their stakeholders and the public at large through their website, annual reports, and other communication media.

- The investment in CSR should be project based and for every project time framed periodic milestones should be finalized at the outset.

- Project activities identified under CSR are to be implemented by Specialized Agencies and generally not by staff of the organization. Specialized Agencies could be made to work singly or in tandem with other agencies.

- Such specialized agencies would include: Community based organization whether formal or informal, Elected local bodies such as Panchayats, Voluntary Agencies (NGOs), Institutes, Academic Organizations, Trusts, Mission etc, Self-help groups, Government, Semi Government and autonomous Organizations, Standing Conference of Public Enterprises (SCOPE), Mahila Mondals, Samitis and the like, Contracted agencies for civil works, and Professional Consultancy Organization etc.

1.13 Statement of Research Problem

At the beginning of the new millennium, the world faces various challenges. Global warming is an all too familiar word, global terrorism is a threat to many countries that always felt safe and an ever looming oil crisis just does not want to go away. No longer can it be argued that nature is a never-ending provider of resources.
In order for humanity to co-exist with nature, it is of great importance that we take our responsibility towards nature and other human beings seriously. In the midst of all these, the most prominent institution in the world, the corporation, plays a very significant role. They are the biggest traders in resources and they are also the institutions that affect our lives more than any other. It is because of the influence that corporations have in our lives and on the natural environment they operate in, that they need to take their social and environmental responsibility seriously. For many years companies (foreign as well as domestic) have abused their power in rural and remote areas where they have extracted natural resources. This by emptying these areas of resources and leaving with all the profit with nothing left for the local inhabitants in these areas.

CSR have since then played a major role for some companies in India in order to become accepted and secured from its surrounding society. CSR is a relatively new but well known concept among companies in India; nevertheless difficulties lie within interpreting what the term CSR really means. CSR is a widely interpreted term with almost as many meanings as interpreters. Furthermore, as a strategic tool for companies to use in order to satisfy its stakeholders as well as create a healthier environment for the surrounding society. Over the past twenty years, globalisation, deregulation, privatisation and a redrawing of the roles between state and market have radically changed the basis on which private enterprise is expected to operate. Meanwhile, discussions around concepts such as Corporate Social responsibility (CSR), Good Corporate Citizenship or Corporate Accountability, indicate the growing vacuum between strictly nation-bound governmental control and increasingly global efforts in areas such as protection of the environment and social cohesion. It is now recognised that socially and environmentally sustainable poverty reduction depends on the emergence of a growing number of responsible entrepreneurs and small and medium enterprises (SMEs), since that it leads to increasing productivity and economic opportunity in developing countries that is socially and environmentally protective.

We believe that a company making billions of dollars of revenue through processes and products, which are harmful to humans, other forms of life and environment and spending millions of dollars of that income on philanthropy is a
billion dollar problem. Instead, the world should welcome corporates which are sensible and sensitive, work on their business processes which take care of multiple stakeholders and environment but not spending a single dollar on community initiatives every company during its operations and activities degrades the environment. Thus, it becomes the duty of every company to give back and replenish, first the environment, and thereafter undertake various community development initiatives, infrastructure projects, and other innovative projects that benefit society, (Karmayog, 2007). Conducting business in a responsible way has always been a priority.

The company should recognise that every action and the implementation of that action affect people, communities and the environment. From buying tea from estates around the world to the point where its many tea products are sold, understanding and addressing the impact of its business activities is central to the way the company works. Many of the CSR practitioner, researcher and academicians express their opinion that there are number of survey studies were carried out based secondary information and organisational reports but very few studies conducted to understand the practice of CSR in India in a true sense. Community is one of the important stakeholders in CSR but the existing review of literature shows that the studies to understand CSR from community prospective is lacking at present literature. Therefore an attempt is made in the present study to understand the interface between the company and community pertaining to the concept of CSR as a societal motto of CSR initiatives and sustainable development.

1.14 Objectives

In view of the statement of the research problem made above, the present study try to address itself to the objectives stated below:

1. To study the awareness and knowledge of community about CSR and implementing organisations.
2. To identify the emerging trends of CSR programmes carried out by the organisations in India and study sites.
3. To observe the different strategies adopted by the organisations and its effectiveness.
4. To throw a light on the issues rose in implementation of CSR activities in community.
5. To understand the impact of CSR activities carried by the organisation in enhancing the community development.

1.15 Hypothesis

In pursuance of the objectives stated above, few hypotheses were deduced to be tested and those are as follows:
1. Still common man (Community) is unaware of the concept of CSR.
2. There is no observable change in CSR trend from past five and six years
3. No specific strategies difference was observed in implementation of CSR across organisations.
4. Most of the CSR initiatives of organizations were biased towards community infrastructure development rather than environment protection.
5. Corporate bodies operating CSR in India lack professional approach and committed human resources to execute CSR activities in more appropriate manner.
6. Directly or indirectly communities surrounding to organisations few of were got benefited through CSR activities while, major chunk of them still remained unsatisfied.

1.16 Significance of the study

Over the last twenty years an increasingly large number of business houses have responded positively to the banner of CSR. This has perhaps been partly due to their aspiration to make their operations more ethical. While for the government, to play the role collaboration with the businesses community can play in the development of society is quite crucial, the activist community might like to take credit for the growing importance of CSR as a clear victory for their efforts in pressurizing the activities of companies. To put the same in other words, companies introduced CSR reports and programs as a response against damage inflicted on their sale and reputation by attacks from activist groups who aided by news media in which corporate wrongdoing has been especially highlighted. Many of the researchers,
experts and the practitioners express their opinion that there are very few studies conducted to understand the practice of CSR from community prospective in India.

Further, the review of literature suggest that there were many studies exist in India to understand CSR as a subject of management but there were few studies undertaken to understand other dimension of CSR that is beneficiaries of CSR. The present study was an attempt to understand the CSR concept from both the dimensions such as CSR implementing organisation and beneficiaries of CSR activities (community). The present study tries to understand the issues covered by the management and their implemented approach in order to executive the same at community level. Moreover, at the same time the researcher tries to study the community requirement in that particular site, in terms of by checking trend and the effectiveness of such different strategies through the community satisfaction. Eventually, this type of attempt was first in kind in Karnataka rather in India to study the community awareness and their knowledge about CSR as well as organisations working in their community as part of CSR. The present study also tries to measure the impact of the CSR activities undertaken by the organization in a way to have the sustainable development at the village community. In this scene the present study got a significant role to play in the field of corporate manage as well as social science especially from the social work prospective.
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