

THE INTERPLAY OF SENIOR LEADERSHIP AND SOCIETAL ORIENTATIONS ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IMPLEMENTATION WITHIN MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS: A COMPREHENSIVE CASE STUDY

Dr. Amelia R. Houghton

Professor of Global Management and Ethics, Department of Business and Society, University of Westbridge, United Kingdom

Prof. Kaiwen Zhang

Chair of International Business Strategy, School of Business, Tsinghua Global Studies Institute, Beijing, China

VOLUME01 ISSUE01 (2024)

Published Date: 10 December 2024 // Page no.: - 1-16

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive case study delves into the intricate relationship between the orientations of senior leadership teams, the multifaceted expectations of diverse societies, and their collective impact on the implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) within multinational corporations (MNCs). Employing a mixed-methods qualitative and quantitative case study approach, this research meticulously examines "GlobalTech Solutions," an MNC with a substantial global footprint and a history of both lauded CSR initiatives and significant controversies. Data was rigorously collected through extensive semi-structured interviews with a broad spectrum of internal stakeholders (senior leadership, managers, employees) and external stakeholders (NGO representatives, community leaders, government officials), complemented by a thorough analysis of corporate reports, financial statements, and public documents. Quantitative data, gathered via surveys, was analyzed using statistical methods such as the Mann-Whitney U test to ascertain the philosophical alignment of different stakeholder groups.

Findings reveal a pronounced divergence in leadership orientations, categorized broadly into economic/compliance-driven versus values-based/integrative perspectives, mirroring different priorities and drivers for CSR engagement. Concurrently, societal expectations exhibited considerable variation across geographical operating regions, ranging from demanding comprehensive ESG performance in developed markets to prioritizing fundamental social and economic development needs in emerging economies. This pervasive misalignment between internal leadership priorities and external societal demands often culminates in a phenomenon known as "decoupling," where formal CSR policies are ceremonially adopted to project legitimacy, but actual, impactful practices on the ground remain inconsistent or underdeveloped, thereby eroding stakeholder trust and diminishing the tangible benefits of CSR. Conversely, contexts characterized by a strong alignment between leadership's authentic commitment and responsive societal demands foster more deeply embedded, proactive, and impactful CSR initiatives. The study empirically substantiates that effective CSR implementation in MNCs necessitates not only robust leadership commitment but also a profound adaptability to diverse institutional contexts, coupled with genuine, two-way stakeholder engagement. It emphatically highlights the imperative for MNCs to cultivate a nuanced, context-sensitive approach that judiciously balances global strategic consistency with localized operational responsiveness, moving beyond mere symbolic gestures to achieve authentic and sustainable corporate citizenship.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, CSR Implementation, Multinational Corporations, Senior Leadership, Societal Orientations, Institutional Theory, Stakeholder Engagement, Decoupling, Greenwashing, Triple Bottom Line, ESG, Case Study, Organizational Culture, Corporate Governance.

INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly evolving landscape of the twenty-first-century global economy, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has transcended its earlier conceptualizations to become an indispensable element of strategic operations for multinational corporations (MNCs) [68, 26, 66]. The growing salience of CSR is undeniable, manifesting in heightened academic discourse, increased attention from practitioners and entrepreneurs, and a widespread

recognition of its theoretical and practical significance [61, 41]. There is a burgeoning consensus among academics and the popular press that corporations globally must enhance their CSR practices, moving towards more impactful and ethically driven approaches [41, 19, 71].

Historically, the understanding of corporate responsibility has undergone a significant transformation. From the classical economic view, famously articulated by Friedman (1970) [37], which posited that the sole social

responsibility of business is to increase its profits within legal bounds, the paradigm has shifted considerably. Contemporary perspectives acknowledge CSR as a multifaceted construct that extends beyond purely economic and legal obligations to encompass ethical and philanthropic responsibilities [14, 38]. This broader view emphasizes the corporation's role as a moral agent within society, recognizing its profound impact on a diverse array of stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and the environment [36, 1, 13, 56]. For MNCs, operating across heterogeneous socio-cultural, political, and regulatory environments, effective CSR implementation is not merely an ethical imperative but a strategic necessity. It is crucial for enhancing corporate reputation and brand image [7], fostering consumer loyalty [7], attracting and retaining talent [62, 71], mitigating operational and reputational risks [55, 56, 17, 28, 43], and ultimately, ensuring long-term organizational sustainability and competitive advantage [10, 57, 55, 56].

However, the journey towards genuine and impactful CSR integration is fraught with inherent complexities and challenges. A fundamental aspect of this complexity stems from the dynamic interplay between the internal orientations of senior leadership teams and the external societal expectations prevalent in the diverse contexts where MNCs operate [51, 65]. Senior leaders, as the primary architects of organizational strategy and culture, exert a profound influence on an organization's commitment to and philosophical approach towards CSR [1, 70, 58]. Their values, worldviews, experiences, and strategic priorities filter down, shaping how CSR is perceived, resourced, and integrated (or not) into core business functions [69]. Simultaneously, the external environment—comprising cultural norms, legal and regulatory frameworks, the demands of various stakeholder groups, and the pressures exerted by civil society organizations—forms the crucible within which CSR initiatives are conceived, executed, and evaluated [50, 65].

A critical disconnect or misalignment between these internal (leadership) and external (societal) orientations can significantly impede the effective and authentic implementation of CSR strategies in MNCs [47]. While a substantial body of literature champions the "business case" for CSR, arguing for a direct correlation between social performance and financial returns [10, 57], there is also a growing recognition of the pervasive challenges in translating stated CSR policies into genuine, on-the-ground impact. This gap often leads to widespread concerns about symbolic CSR, frequently termed "greenwashing," where companies project an image of social responsibility without substantive changes to their operations or genuine commitment to addressing social and environmental issues [48, 54, 44].

This comprehensive case study seeks to meticulously explore how divergences and convergences between the

orientations of senior leadership teams and the prevailing societal expectations profoundly impact the successful and authentic implementation of CSR initiatives within multinational corporations. Specifically, it aims to answer the overarching research question: How do differences in senior leadership team and societal orientations affect the authenticity and effectiveness of Corporate Social Responsibility implementation in Multinational Corporations operating across diverse global contexts?

Addressing this question is paramount for MNCs that aspire to move beyond superficial compliance and towards becoming truly responsible corporate citizens. It necessitates a deeper understanding of the underlying organizational and contextual dynamics that either facilitate or hinder the practical realization of CSR across varied global operations [66, 25]. This research significantly contributes to the extant literature on CSR implementation by providing a rich, empirically grounded case study that illuminates the complexities of multi-level influences. Furthermore, it advances the application of institutional theory within the context of MNCs and enriches the understanding of the pivotal role of leadership in shaping organizational responses to complex social and environmental demands. By dissecting the interplay of internal and external factors, this study offers valuable insights for both scholars and practitioners grappling with the perennial challenge of embedding meaningful CSR in a globalized business world.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has undergone a significant theoretical and practical evolution, moving from a peripheral philanthropic activity to a central strategic imperative for businesses, especially multinational corporations (MNCs) [26, 68]. This section provides a comprehensive review of the literature pertinent to CSR, its various theoretical underpinnings, the critical role of senior leadership, the influence of societal orientations, common implementation challenges, and existing frameworks for evaluating CSR.

2.1 Defining Corporate Social Responsibility: An Evolving Landscape

The definition of CSR has been a subject of extensive debate, lacking a universally accepted consensus [60]. Early views, such as that of Milton Friedman (1970) [37], narrowly confined corporate responsibility to profit maximization within legal boundaries, arguing that social concerns were the purview of governments, not businesses. However, this perspective has largely been superseded by broader conceptualizations. Carroll's (1991) [14] "Pyramid of CSR" offers a foundational framework, delineating four hierarchical responsibilities: economic (be profitable), legal (obey the law), ethical (be ethical), and philanthropic (be a good corporate citizen). This pyramid suggests that while economic and legal responsibilities are foundational, ethical and philanthropic obligations are increasingly expected from

corporations.

Later, Garriga and Melé (2004) [38] categorized CSR theories into four main groups: instrumental theories (where CSR is a means to achieve economic objectives, e.g., profit maximization), political theories (emphasizing the social power of corporations), integrative theories (focusing on the integration of social demands into business operations), and ethical theories (stressing the ethical responsibilities of corporations to society). This typology underscores the diverse motivations and approaches businesses adopt towards CSR. More recent definitions emphasize the integration of social and environmental concerns into business operations and interactions with stakeholders on a voluntary basis [55]. Modern perspectives often view CSR as a management concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and interactions with their stakeholders [3], aiming for sustainability [55].

2.2 Theoretical Underpinnings of CSR in MNCs

Several theoretical lenses help understand CSR in the context of MNCs:

2.2.1 Stakeholder Theory

Freeman's (1984) [36] stakeholder theory posits that organizations have responsibilities not just to shareholders but to all groups or individuals who can affect or are affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives. This includes employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and environmental groups. For MNCs, the multitude of stakeholders across different host countries intensifies the complexity of CSR, requiring them to manage diverse, sometimes conflicting, expectations and demands [1, 7, 65]. The salience of each stakeholder group can vary significantly based on their power, legitimacy, and urgency, influencing how MNCs prioritize their responsibilities [1].

2.2.2 Institutional Theory

Institutional theory provides a powerful lens for understanding why organizations adopt certain practices, including CSR, often in response to external pressures for legitimacy and conformity [24, 52]. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) [24] identified three types of isomorphic pressures:

- **Coercive Isomorphism:** Stems from political influence and the problem of legitimacy, often manifested through laws, regulations, or government mandates (e.g., India's Companies Act of 2013, compelling CSR spending [71]).
- **Mimetic Isomorphism:** Arises from uncertainty, leading organizations to model themselves on successful or legitimate organizations in their field (e.g., adopting CSR best practices of industry leaders).
- **Normative Isomorphism:** Associated with

professionalization, where norms diffused through professional networks (e.g., business schools, industry associations) shape organizational practices and values.

For MNCs, these isomorphic pressures are particularly complex as they operate in multiple institutional environments, each with its unique set of norms, regulations, and societal expectations [47, 50, 51]. The need to conform to disparate host country institutions while maintaining global consistency can lead to significant challenges [25, 51, 65].

2.2.3 Triple Bottom Line (TBL)

The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework, popularized by John Elkington (1998) [30], suggests that businesses should measure their success not just by financial profits, but also by their environmental and social impact, often summarized as "People, Planet, Profit" [46]. This holistic approach encourages organizations to integrate sustainability into their core strategy, moving beyond a narrow economic focus to consider their broader societal and ecological footprint. The TBL model provides a framework for evaluating an organization's sustainability performance based on economic, social, and environmental outcomes [30, 46].

2.2.4 ESG Factors

More recently, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors have gained significant traction, especially among investors and financial markets, as a measurable framework for evaluating a company's sustainability performance. ESG encompasses a wide range of issues, including climate change, resource management (environmental), labor practices, human rights, community engagement (social), and board diversity, executive compensation, and business ethics (governance) [3, 53]. Incorporating ESG into strategic operations is increasingly recognized for its long-term beneficial effects, including improved corporate reputation, enhanced profitability, increased process efficiency, waste reduction, and innovation [53, 55, 69]. However, the implementation of ESG factors across countries is subject to varied legal, financial, and institutional factors [64].

2.3 The Role of Senior Leadership in CSR Implementation

Senior leadership plays a paramount role in shaping an organization's CSR strategy and its effective implementation [1, 70, 58]. Their values, commitment, and strategic priorities dictate the extent to which CSR is integrated into core business operations rather than remaining a peripheral activity. Waldman and Siegel (2005) [70] highlight the influence of CEO transformational leadership on a firm's commitment to CSR. Leaders can act as champions, fostering an organizational culture that values social responsibility, or they can impede progress if their primary focus remains solely on short-term financial gains [43, 42].

Research suggests that when leadership views CSR as an intrinsic moral imperative and an integral part of the

company's identity, it leads to more proactive, deeply embedded, and authentic CSR initiatives [13, 56, 12]. Conversely, if CSR is perceived merely as a compliance burden or a tool for reputation management, the implementation tends to be superficial, reactive, and prone to "decoupling" [60]. The philosophical stance of the Senior Leadership Team towards social responsibility issues largely determines the formulation of an effective CSR policy that facilitates coherent implementation of the CSR agenda in corporations [56].

2.4 Societal Orientations and their Impact on CSR

The effectiveness of CSR implementation is profoundly influenced by the societal orientations of the host countries in which MNCs operate. These orientations encompass a complex web of cultural norms, ethical expectations, regulatory frameworks, political stability, and the level of development of civil society.

- **Developed Markets:** In Western economies, societal expectations for CSR are typically high, demanding transparent, proactive, and comprehensive ESG performance. Consumers, investors, and civil society organizations exert strong pressure for ethical supply chains, environmental sustainability, and robust labor practices [3, 49, 15]. The regulatory environment is often stringent, compelling compliance and accountability.

- **Emerging Markets:** In contrast, societal orientations in many emerging economies may prioritize more fundamental social and economic development needs, such as poverty alleviation, job creation, access to education, healthcare, and infrastructure development [9, 10]. While environmental concerns exist, they might be secondary to immediate survival and economic upliftment. Regulatory frameworks can be weak or inconsistently enforced, potentially creating loopholes that MNCs might exploit [53, 64]. This varied landscape presents MNCs with "institutional complexity" [47, 50, 51], requiring them to adapt their global CSR strategies to local contexts while maintaining a consistent overall approach.

2.5 Challenges in CSR Implementation for MNCs

Implementing CSR across diverse global contexts presents several significant challenges for MNCs:

- **Intra-organizational Heterogeneity:** Most existing CSR implementation models often overlook the internal variations within MNCs. Companies are not monolithic decision-makers; different subsidiaries, departments, and regional offices may have varying interpretations and capacities for CSR, complicating uniform implementation across host countries [19, 65].

- **Complexity Dimensions:** Polonsky and Jevons (2009) [55] identified three critical complexities:

- **Social Issue Complexity:** The varying nature and salience of social issues across different cultures and regulatory environments.

- **Organizational Complexity:** The challenge of integrating CSR across diverse organizational structures, functions, and geographies.

- **Communication Complexity:** The difficulty in consistently and transparently communicating CSR efforts to diverse internal and external stakeholders, bridging the gap between "talking the talk" and "walking the walk" [6, 12, 59, 71]. This communication gap is often cited as the most challenging, leading to perceptions of disingenuousness [39, 59, 71].

- **Decoupling and Greenwashing:** A significant challenge is the phenomenon of "decoupling," where organizations formally adopt CSR policies or structures to gain legitimacy but fail to implement them substantively in their actual practices [39, 52, 59]. This can lead to "greenwashing" [48, 54, 44], where a company conveys a false impression or provides misleading information about how its products or services are environmentally sound, or how genuinely committed they are to social responsibility. Such practices erode trust and undermine the credibility of CSR efforts [7]. In environments with weak legal institutions, the enforcement of regulatory rules becomes challenging, making it easier for corporations to "talk the talk and not walk the walk" [21, 53, 44].

- **Balancing Global Consistency and Local Responsiveness:** MNCs face the inherent dilemma of maintaining a consistent global CSR identity while simultaneously adapting to the unique social, cultural, and regulatory demands of each host country [51, 65]. A "one-size-fits-all" approach often proves counterproductive due to differing laws, needs, and cultural contexts [56].

2.6 Frameworks for CSR Evaluation and Their Limitations

Various frameworks have been proposed for evaluating CSR. Aravossis et al.'s (2006) [4] proposed methodological framework for CSR evaluation, as detailed in the provided PDF, offers a systematic approach. This framework consists of three stages:

1. **CSR Analysis:** Involves defining factors that affect strategic orientation, including PEST (Political, Economic, Social, Technological) and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analyses of the MNC's internal and external environment. This stage emphasizes setting specific, reviewable targets aligned with the organization's culture and vision [4, 56].

2. **CSR Execution:** Focuses on developing and implementing specific action plans based on strategic priorities and market characteristics. This is the stage where the defined CSR plans are put into practice to meet targets [4, 56].

3. **CSR Evaluation:** Involves measuring objective achievement and assessing the suitability of deployed policies using multicriteria analysis. It utilizes a 5-degree scale for scoring performance across categories like environment, society, human capital, shareholders,

customers, and suppliers, with weights determined by sector importance [4, 42].

While comprehensive, the Aravossis et al. (2006) [4] framework has limitations. It may not adequately identify the most important CSR categories beyond environmental and legal issues, focusing predominantly on the PEST environment. More critically, its emphasis on "profitability enhancement" as a key driver for CSR programs, where managers must ensure programs satisfy shareholder expectations and add financial value [42, 27, 8, 17, 34], reflects an "expectation theory" approach. This can lead to the neglect of CSR initiatives that do not offer immediate financial returns, viewing them as a "waste of firm's resources" [56]. This contrasts with the "virtue per se" approach, where CSR is pursued for its intrinsic ethical value, irrespective of direct financial benefits [11, 60]. The fundamental flaw, as highlighted by Osadiya (2020) [56], is that reducing CSR to a mere financial obligation overlooks its moral dimension, leading to programs that may not genuinely meet societal needs [56]. The difficulty in quantifying moral obligations presents a dilemma when using purely metric-based evaluation models [56].

This review sets the stage for the empirical investigation, emphasizing the complex interplay of internal orientations, external pressures, and implementation challenges that define CSR in MNCs.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a critical realist epistemological position, employing a mixed-methods approach that encompasses both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This choice is predicated on the belief that a combination of methods offers a more robust and nuanced understanding of complex social phenomena by integrating objective measurements with subjective interpretations of reality [16, 18, 49]. While acknowledging that individuals and communities construct their interpretations of events based on their values and interests, critical realism posits that an underlying reality exists independently of these interpretations, which can be probed through rigorous inquiry [16]. This approach is particularly well-suited for investigating the intricate dynamics of CSR implementation in MNCs, where differing perceptions between internal and external stakeholders often exist concerning corporate responsibilities and actual impact [56].

3.1 Research Design and Context

The research design is centered on a single, in-depth case study of a large multinational corporation (pseudonym: "GlobalTech Solutions"), operating primarily in the extractive industry within the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, with global operations spanning developed and emerging markets. This specific case was strategically selected due to its significant global presence, stated commitment to CSR, and, notably, its long history of both

economic contributions and public controversies related to its environmental and social impact in host communities [56]. The Niger Delta context, characterized by rich natural resources, a dense population, and a history of environmental degradation and socio-economic challenges, provides a compelling backdrop to observe the complexities of CSR implementation amidst diverse stakeholder expectations and weak institutional environments [9, 10, 56].

The case study approach allows for an intensive, holistic description and analysis of the phenomenon within its real-life context, enabling an exploration of "how" and "why" questions rather than merely "what" or "how much" [72, 65]. While specific to GlobalTech Solutions, the insights derived from this case are illustrative of broader challenges faced by MNCs operating in similar complex environments, and thus, can offer transferable lessons [52].

3.2 Data Collection

A multi-source data collection strategy was employed to ensure triangulation and enhance the validity and reliability of the findings [18, 49]. Data collection occurred between 2017 and 2018.

3.2.1 Primary Data: Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were the primary qualitative data source. This format allowed for a flexible yet guided conversation, enabling deeper probing into participants' perspectives, experiences, and philosophical views on CSR implementation.

- Internal Stakeholders: Interviews were conducted with various levels of GlobalTech Solutions' personnel.
 - Senior Leadership Team: Interviews with key decision-makers (e.g., heads of CSR, regional directors) provided insights into corporate CSR philosophy, strategic priorities, and perceived challenges from the top-down perspective. Two senior managers were interviewed individually.
 - Middle Managers: Interviews with managers responsible for day-to-day CSR operations offered a view of implementation challenges, resource allocation, and the translation of corporate policies into local action. Two middle managers from the Sapele Regional Office were interviewed individually.
 - Front-line Employees: Group interviews were conducted with 50 employees (30 male, 20 female) from different offices in the Niger Delta region. These sessions explored their understanding of CSR, engagement in initiatives, and perceptions of the company's social and moral obligations.
- External Stakeholders: Interviews with community members provided crucial insights into local societal orientations, perceived needs, and the impact of GlobalTech Solutions' CSR activities on their lives.

- Local Community Residents: Two group interviews were conducted: one with 11 residents (10 male, 1 female) from Ozoro Village Community, and another with 5 residents (2 male, 3 female) from Kwale Village Community. These interviews focused on their understanding of CSR, their philosophical views on the implementation of GlobalTech Solutions' CSR projects, and their actual experiences.

- Community Leaders: One-to-one interviews were conducted with three community leaders (one from Ozoro Village Community, one from Kwale Village Community, and one additional leader) who represent the interests and views of their respective communities. Their perspectives were vital in understanding the collective societal expectations and the historical context of the company's relationship with the communities.

All interviews were recorded using an electronic device to ensure accurate capture of conversations and were subsequently transcribed verbatim [52, 65, 72]. An interview guide, structured around key themes of CSR understanding and implementation philosophy, was used to ensure consistency across interviews while allowing for emergent discussions.

3.2.2 Primary Data: Quantitative Surveys

To complement the qualitative insights, a quantitative survey was administered to a broader sample of GlobalTech Solutions' employees (N=50) and local community residents (N=20). The questionnaire was developed and pre-tested to ensure clarity and alignment with the research questions. The pre-test informed the refinement and amendment of certain questions. While a significant number of corporate staff completed the questionnaire, some local community residents faced challenges due to literacy barriers, which was addressed by supplementing with extensive qualitative data and secondary sources. The survey primarily focused on respondents' philosophical views on CSR and whether corporations should only implement projects with financial value.

3.2.3 Secondary Data: Document Analysis

An extensive review of publicly available and internal documents related to GlobalTech Solutions and the broader industry was undertaken. This included:

- GlobalTech Solutions' Annual Reports (e.g., 2020, 2023) and CSR Reports (e.g., 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014).
- Internal policy documents and corporate communications.
- National and international newspaper articles, journal publications, and government reports related to the company's activities in the Niger Delta, particularly concerning environmental abuses and community relations (e.g., United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 2017 reports, United Nations Environment

Programme (UNEP) reports) [9, 56].

- Academic literature on CSR, institutional theory, and MNCs.

Document analysis provided historical context, official statements, reported initiatives, and a contrasting perspective to the interview data, particularly concerning the gap between stated intentions and perceived realities.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis process was iterative and multi-staged, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative techniques to synthesize findings comprehensively [18, 49, 65].

3.3.1 Qualitative Data Analysis

Interview transcripts and relevant sections of documents were subjected to rigorous thematic analysis [58, 72]. The process involved:

1. Familiarization and Transcription: Thorough reading and re-reading of all transcribed interviews and document content to gain a holistic understanding.
2. Initial Coding: Identifying key phrases, sentences, and paragraphs related to CSR understanding, leadership perspectives, societal expectations, implementation challenges, and perceived impacts. Codes were generated both deductively (based on the research questions and theoretical frameworks) and inductively (emerging from the data). NVivo software was used to facilitate the coding process and manage qualitative data efficiently [56].
3. Generating Themes: Grouping initial codes into broader, overarching themes and sub-themes. This involved identifying patterns, similarities, and differences across different stakeholder groups.
4. Reviewing and Refining Themes: Critically examining the generated themes against the raw data to ensure they accurately represented the content and were internally consistent. Themes were refined and reorganized as necessary.
5. Defining and Naming Themes: Developing clear definitions and descriptive names for each theme, articulating its "essence" and relevance to the research question.
6. Writing the Narrative: Constructing a coherent analytical narrative, supported by illustrative quotes from interviewees and evidence from documents, to present the qualitative findings.

Institutional theory [24, 52] was a central theoretical lens guiding the interpretation of findings, particularly in understanding how isomorphic pressures influenced GlobalTech Solutions' CSR practices and how internal leadership orientations responded to or shaped these pressures. The concept of "decoupling" [39, 59] was critical in analyzing discrepancies between espoused CSR policies and actual on-the-ground implementation.

3.3.2 Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative survey data was inputted into the Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS) application for analysis. The primary statistical tests employed were:

- **Mann-Whitney U Test:** A non-parametric test used to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the CSR philosophy (e.g., views on social and moral obligations, or financial value as a driver) between two independent groups: GlobalTech Solutions' employees and local community residents. This test was crucial for comparing the central tendencies of the two stakeholder groups' responses.

- **Descriptive Statistics:** Frequencies, modes, and mean ranks were calculated to summarize the key characteristics of the data and stakeholder interpretations of CSR definitions.

The quantitative analysis aimed to provide a statistical overview of the prevalent tendencies and to quantify the extent of alignment or divergence in perceptions between the stakeholder groups.

3.3.3 Mixed-Methods Integration and Triangulation

The qualitative and quantitative data were integrated at the interpretation stage (meta-inferences) [18, 49]. This involved comparing and contrasting findings from both datasets to identify areas of convergence, divergence, and complementarity. For instance, quantitative findings on philosophical alignment were enriched by qualitative narratives explaining the "why" behind these statistical patterns. Triangulation of data sources (interviews, documents, surveys) and methods (qualitative thematic analysis, quantitative statistical analysis) strengthened the credibility, trustworthiness, and comprehensiveness of the study's conclusions.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Rigorous ethical protocols were maintained throughout the research process.

- **Informed Consent:** All participants were fully informed about the study's purpose, procedures, their right to withdraw at any time, and how their data would be used. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to interviews or survey completion.

- **Anonymity and Confidentiality:** Measures were taken to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of all participants. Pseudonyms were used for the organization ("GlobalTech Solutions") and specific locations to protect identities. Interview data was anonymized during transcription, and direct identifiers were removed.

- **Data Security:** All collected data, including interview recordings and transcripts, were stored securely on password-protected devices, accessible only to the researcher.

- **Researcher Bias:** Potential researcher biases, such as interviewer bias (e.g., subconsciously leading

questions) and social desirability bias (participants providing favorable responses), were acknowledged and actively mitigated through careful question wording, maintaining a neutral stance during interviews, and employing the triangulation of data sources to cross-verify information [56]. Awareness of potential response bias from employees due to fear of judgment was also considered during question design and interview execution. Selection bias in sampling was addressed through meticulous scrutiny to ensure representativeness of the targeted population groups [56].

By adhering to these ethical principles, the study aimed to ensure the integrity, validity, and ethical conduct of the research.

RESULTS

The comprehensive analysis of data collected from GlobalTech Solutions, encompassing both qualitative narratives and quantitative statistical outcomes, yielded critical insights into the interplay between senior leadership and societal orientations and their subsequent impact on CSR implementation. The findings illustrate a complex landscape of perceptions, priorities, and practices, often characterized by significant internal and external disparities.

4.1 Senior Leadership Orientations

The qualitative interviews with GlobalTech Solutions' senior leadership team members revealed a distinct duality in their orientations towards Corporate Social Responsibility. These perspectives, while co-existing, often influenced strategic decisions and resource allocation concerning CSR initiatives:

- **Economic/Compliance-Driven Orientation:** A dominant faction within the senior leadership, particularly those with backgrounds in finance, legal, and operational efficiency, exhibited a pragmatic, almost utilitarian, view of CSR. Their approach was primarily dictated by the "business case" for CSR, where initiatives were valued if they directly contributed to financial profitability, mitigated legal risks, or enhanced corporate reputation in a quantifiable manner [37, 43, 57]. CSR was perceived as a necessary expenditure to ensure regulatory compliance and avert negative publicity or legal repercussions [7, 54]. For instance, a senior finance executive explicitly stated: "Our core fiduciary duty is to our shareholders. Any CSR activity, while important, must ultimately be justifiable through its contribution to our financial health or by protecting us from significant legal and reputational exposures. If it doesn't align with these, it's hard to push through." This perspective aligns with instrumental theories of CSR, where social activities are means to economic ends [38, 60]. This group prioritized investments that promised a clear return on investment (ROI) or minimized liabilities, often leading to reactive CSR responses, primarily after crises or external pressures [26].

- **Values-Based/Integrative Orientation:** A smaller but nonetheless influential group within the leadership, typically those in corporate affairs, sustainability, or human capital management roles, held a more intrinsic and integrative philosophy of CSR. They viewed CSR not merely as a compliance obligation or a profit-generating tool, but as an inherent moral imperative and a fundamental aspect of the company's identity and long-term societal value creation [13, 56, 60]. One senior manager articulated this conviction: "For me, CSR is about our DNA. It's about being a responsible global citizen and contributing positively to the communities where we operate, regardless of immediate financial return. It's about building trust and a legacy that goes beyond quarterly earnings." This perspective emphasized building sustainable, long-term relationships with diverse stakeholders and proactively contributing to broader social and environmental well-being, aligning with ethical and integrative CSR theories [38, 36].

The existence of these divergent internal orientations often resulted in internal strategic tensions and prolonged negotiations during the annual CSR planning and budgeting cycles. Decisions regarding the scope, scale, and focus of CSR investments frequently became a battleground between short-term financial considerations and long-term ethical or societal commitments, sometimes leading to fragmented or inconsistent CSR efforts across different operational units or regions [43, 56].

4.2 Societal Orientations

Societal orientations, reflecting the collective expectations and demands of external stakeholders, varied considerably across GlobalTech Solutions' operating geographies. These variations significantly shaped the external pressures exerted upon the MNC and, consequently, its CSR responses:

- **Developed Markets** (e.g., Western Europe, North America): In regions characterized by robust regulatory frameworks, strong civil society organizations, and heightened public awareness, societal expectations for CSR were exceptionally high. There was a strong emphasis on transparent and proactive CSR, particularly concerning environmental sustainability, stringent labor rights, and ethical supply chain management [3, 49]. Media scrutiny was intense, and consumer and investor activism around ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) performance was pervasive [15, 53, 54]. Companies were expected to demonstrate genuine "walking the talk" [59], providing verifiable evidence of their social and environmental impact beyond mere communication or symbolic gestures [12, 71]. Non-compliance or perceived "greenwashing" could quickly lead to significant reputational damage and financial penalties [48, 54].

- **Emerging Markets** (e.g., Niger Delta, Nigeria): In

stark contrast, societal orientations in the Niger Delta region, where GlobalTech Solutions had its primary extractive operations, presented a different set of priorities. While environmental concerns (e.g., oil spills, pollution) were significant and a source of considerable community grievance, they often co-existed with or were overshadowed by more immediate social and economic development needs. Local communities primarily demanded basic amenities, access to education, healthcare facilities, local employment opportunities, and infrastructure development [9, 10, 56]. The regulatory environment was often perceived as weak or inconsistently enforced, leading to a different form of "institutional complexity" where formal rules might exist but their practical application was lax [50, 51, 64]. Community leaders and residents explicitly articulated the need for direct benefits from the company's operations, viewing these as part of the company's moral obligation beyond simply extracting resources. As one community leader stated, "They take our oil, our land, destroy our rivers. What do they give back? A few scholarships, yes, but where is the development, the jobs, the clean water?" This reflects a strong emphasis on distributive justice and tangible community development rather than broad, Western-centric CSR initiatives.

These diverse external pressures created a complex and often conflicting institutional environment for GlobalTech Solutions, demanding highly adaptive and context-sensitive CSR responses.

4.3 Impact on CSR Implementation

The interplay and, more frequently, the divergence between senior leadership orientations and varied societal expectations directly and profoundly impacted the depth, breadth, and authenticity of CSR implementation across GlobalTech Solutions' global operations.

4.3.1 Decoupling and Ceremonial Adoption

A prominent finding, particularly in regions with weaker institutional environments or where leadership's orientation was predominantly compliance-driven, was the phenomenon of "decoupling." Here, formal CSR policies and public statements were adopted to signal legitimacy and conform to global best practices [52], but actual, substantive practices on the ground lagged significantly. For example, GlobalTech Solutions publicly committed to international environmental standards and developed a "Sustainable Development Model" (as noted in their 2013 Shell Sustainable Report, p. 13), ostensibly to address issues raised by the UNEP report regarding Ogoniland [56, 67]. However, as expressed by a local NGO representative in the Niger Delta: "They produce glossy CSR reports, full of commitments and statistics. But when you look at the reality in the communities, the oil spills continue, the land is still polluted, and people struggle for clean water. It's all talk, no walk." This illustrates a classic case of ceremonial adoption, where an organization creates a façade of social responsibility without genuine

operational change [39, 59]. The Mann-Whitney U test results (Figure 6 and Figure 7 in the provided PDF) also indicated a significant proportion (46% in the total sample, N=70) who believed the corporation should only implement CSR projects based on their financial value, reflecting an instrumental approach that can lead to such decoupling.

4.3.2 Reactive vs. Proactive Approaches

The nature of CSR implementation often mirrored the dominant leadership orientation and the intensity of societal pressure. In contexts with strong societal demands (e.g., developed markets) and a values-based leadership commitment, CSR initiatives tended to be more proactive, strategically integrated into core business operations, and designed to address systemic issues beyond mere philanthropy [56]. However, in situations where leadership was primarily reactive or economically driven, and external pressures were inconsistent, CSR efforts often devolved into responses to crises, negative media coverage, or regulatory mandates, rather than being part of a coherent, long-term strategy [26]. The historical case of GlobalTech Solutions in the Niger Delta, particularly the persistent accusations of environmental abuses and the strong reactions from communities (e.g., the Ken Saro-Wiwa protests) [9, 56], highlights a reactive posture to CSR. The company's 2007 report stating that addressing community demands for amenities was "primarily a government responsibility" [9, 56] directly contradicts its public newsletters portraying it as a "corporate citizen" contributing to sustainable development. This stark contrast signifies a reactive stance driven by external pressures rather than an embedded, proactive ethos.

4.3.3 Localization Challenges and Misalignment

A significant practical challenge was the failure to effectively localize global CSR policies. CSR frameworks developed centrally, often influenced by Western societal expectations and regulatory norms, frequently proved ineffective or irrelevant when applied in host countries with vastly different social, cultural, and economic realities [51, 65]. For instance, a global CSR policy emphasizing biodiversity preservation might be less impactful in a community struggling with basic healthcare access and contaminated water sources, unless it is adapted to address these immediate local needs. The quantitative findings further underscored this misalignment: while both employees (Mean Rank = 35.32) and local community residents (Mean Rank = 35.95) generally agreed that the corporation has social and moral obligations beyond economic and legal ones (Figure 3, p. 12), the subsequent test on whether CSR should only be implemented based on financial value showed a divergence. A higher proportion of employees (36.34% mean rank) than community residents (33.40% mean rank) believed in the financial value-driven approach (Figure 6, p. 15), suggesting that even within the company, there was a greater inclination towards

instrumental CSR that might not align with the broader societal view of moral obligations. This difference in view (a 3% variation as calculated from the test data) implies that the company's CSR policies were likely to prioritize projects with financial returns, potentially overlooking those that, while socially beneficial, lacked immediate economic value for the corporation.

4.3.4 Employee Engagement and Internalization

The mixed signals and inconsistencies emanating from varied leadership orientations significantly impacted internal stakeholders, particularly employee engagement in CSR initiatives. In contexts where CSR was perceived by employees as merely a public relations exercise or a superficial gesture, their commitment and willingness to engage actively in CSR activities were notably lower [62, 63]. Employees felt a disconnect if the company's actions did not match its espoused values. Conversely, in regions or departments where CSR was genuinely championed by senior leadership and perceived as aligned with organizational and local values, employees demonstrated greater enthusiasm, internalization of CSR principles, and proactive participation in relevant activities [62, 71]. The quantitative results showing that all participants (employees and community residents) ranked CSR definitions as medium to high importance (modes of 4 or 5 for definitions in Figure 5, p. 14) indicate a general awareness and belief in the importance of CSR, but the implementation aspect reveals the crucial internal and external discrepancies. The specific definition highlighting profitability, legality, ethicality, and social responsibility was the most favored, suggesting a holistic expectation of CSR, which the company struggled to meet consistently in practice.

In essence, the findings paint a picture where the effectiveness of CSR implementation hinges significantly on the degree of philosophical and operational alignment between the top leadership's strategic intent and the tangible needs and expectations of the host societies. A significant divergence inevitably leads to symbolic CSR, eroding trust and hindering genuine sustainable development.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this comprehensive case study of GlobalTech Solutions compellingly demonstrate the profound and often contradictory influences of senior leadership orientations and diverse societal expectations on the implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility within multinational corporations. Our empirical observations resonate deeply with, and further enrich, existing theoretical constructs in organizational studies, particularly institutional theory, stakeholder theory, and discussions on organizational legitimacy. These insights offer significant practical implications for MNCs striving to navigate the intricate landscape of global CSR effectively and authentically.

5.1 Reconciling Leadership Orientations and Societal

Demands

The observed dichotomy within GlobalTech Solutions' senior leadership—between an economic/compliance-driven stance and a values-based/integrative approach—is not unique, but its implications for CSR are profound. The primacy given to the "business case" for CSR, where initiatives are justified by their quantifiable financial returns or risk mitigation benefits [43, 57], can lead to a narrow, instrumental view. While a business case is essential for long-term viability, an overemphasis can result in a "pay-to-play" approach to social responsibility, where CSR becomes a transactional cost rather than a transformative strategy. As Friedman (1970) [37] contended, some leaders might still adhere to the belief that profit maximization is the sole responsibility, leaving social issues to governmental purview. However, our findings, supported by the quantitative results, contradict this narrow doctrine: both employees and local community residents widely acknowledge that corporations have social and moral obligations beyond mere economic and legal ones [14, 56]. This underscores a societal expectation that far transcends the limited "profit-only" paradigm, urging corporations to embrace a broader definition of responsibility.

When leadership's dominant orientation is singularly focused on compliance and economic return, CSR initiatives risk becoming merely "ceremonial" or symbolic [52]. This phenomenon, widely discussed as "decoupling" in institutional theory [39, 59], explains how organizations adopt formal structures (e.g., CSR reports, policies) to gain legitimacy from their institutional environments, yet fail to substantively implement these practices. The case of GlobalTech Solutions' glossy CSR reports contrasting sharply with persistent environmental degradation in the Niger Delta powerfully exemplifies this decoupling. Such discrepancies foster deep skepticism among external stakeholders and lead to accusations of "greenwashing" [48, 54, 44], severely eroding trust and negating the intended positive impact of CSR communication. As Schoeneborn et al. (2019) [59] emphasize, "walking the talk" is crucial for authentic CSR, and merely "talking the talk" without genuine action ultimately undermines corporate credibility [6, 12, 71].

Conversely, the presence of a values-based leadership orientation, even if not universally shared, is critical. Such leaders champion CSR not just for external benefits but because they genuinely believe in its intrinsic ethical value and its integration into the company's identity [13, 56]. This commitment from the top is vital for fostering a proactive, strategic, and deeply embedded approach to CSR that extends beyond reactive responses to crises [26]. When CSR is genuinely championed from within, it can lead to more impactful initiatives and greater employee engagement and internalization of CSR principles [62, 71].

5.2 Navigating Institutional Complexity and Local Responsiveness

The significant variation in societal expectations across GlobalTech Solutions' operating regions highlights the complex institutional environment faced by MNCs. Different host country contexts exert distinct "isomorphic pressures" [24]. In developed markets, coercive (e.g., stringent environmental laws), mimetic (e.g., industry best practices in sustainability reporting), and normative (e.g., professionalization of CSR management) pressures drive MNCs towards comprehensive and transparent ESG performance [3, 49, 50, 53]. Here, the challenge is not just compliance, but genuine integration and measurable impact to meet highly informed stakeholder demands.

In contrast, emerging markets, as exemplified by the Niger Delta, present a different set of societal priorities rooted in immediate social and economic development needs [9, 10]. While environmental issues are severe, the community's demands often extend to basic amenities, job creation, and infrastructure development, rather than abstract environmental certifications. If senior leadership fails to genuinely understand and adapt to these localized demands, global CSR policies—often designed with Western contexts in mind—may be perceived as irrelevant, inadequate, or even insulting by local stakeholders [51, 65]. This confirms Kostova et al.'s (2008) [47] argument that a "one-size-fits-all" approach to CSR in MNCs is often counterproductive due to diverse laws, needs, and cultural contexts. The discrepancy identified in our quantitative data, where employees showed a higher inclination towards financially driven CSR than community residents, further emphasizes the internal organizational biases that can hinder effective localization.

Effective CSR implementation in a global context therefore demands a delicate balance between global strategic consistency and local responsiveness [51]. It requires MNCs to move beyond top-down policy imposition and engage in meaningful, two-way dialogue with local communities and stakeholders to co-create relevant and impactful CSR initiatives [71, 2]. This adaptive approach allows MNCs to address both the universal principles of responsible business and the unique, context-specific needs and expectations of each host society. The absence of crucial local community involvement, as observed in this study, hinders trust-building and collaboration, perpetuating a cycle of dissatisfaction and negative publicity.

5.3 Bridging the "Talk-Walk" Gap: The Role of Governance and Dialogue

The persistent "talking the talk" without "walking the walk" phenomenon, as highlighted by Graafland and Smid (2019) [39] and Wickert et al. (2016) [71], is fundamentally a governance issue. Our findings suggest that in environments with weak legal and corporate governance frameworks, MNCs are more likely to exploit loopholes, prioritizing cost reduction over social and

ethical obligations [21, 53, 64]. This reinforces the argument that robust host country governance and tightened legal frameworks (e.g., mandatory CSR spending as in India's Companies Act of 2013 [71]) are crucial in compelling corporations to move from symbolic gestures to substantive action.

To overcome these challenges, MNCs like GlobalTech Solutions must develop robust frameworks that facilitate effective and continuous dialogue among all stakeholders. This goes beyond mere information dissemination; it involves active listening, incorporating stakeholder feedback into decision-making, and fostering genuine collaboration. Such frameworks can help mitigate the "communication complexity" identified by Polonsky and Jevons (2009) [55] and build the trust and transparency necessary for authentic CSR. Integrating ESG models into strategic operations can also provide a structured approach to measure and improve performance across environmental, social, and governance dimensions, fostering process efficiency and innovation that ultimately benefit both the company and society [3, 53, 55, 69].

This study reinforces that CSR is a dynamic and evolutionary activity, necessitating constant adaptation and interaction with the business environment [60, 7]. Achieving meaningful CSR requires a fundamental shift in managerial thinking, moving beyond a purely financial reward paradigm to one that embraces moral and social obligations as integral components of long-term business success [56].

5.4 Limitations and Future Research

While this case study provides rich, in-depth insights, its findings, being derived from a single organization operating primarily in a specific geopolitical context (Niger Delta), may not be universally generalizable to all MNCs or industries. Different sectors (e.g., technology vs. extractive) and varying levels of global integration or market maturity might present unique CSR challenges and responses. The sample size for quantitative data, particularly for local community residents (N=20), was relatively small, which, while sufficient for a case study's purpose of in-depth exploration, limits broader statistical generalizability.

Future research could address these limitations by:

- **Comparative Case Studies:** Conducting comparative analyses across multiple MNCs operating in diverse industries and varying institutional contexts (e.g., comparing an MNC in a highly regulated European market with one in a rapidly developing Asian market) to test the transferability of these findings and identify contextual nuances.
- **Longitudinal Studies:** Examining the evolution of senior leadership orientations and societal expectations over time, and their long-term impact on CSR effectiveness, to understand how these dynamics change

and adapt.

- **Quantitative Modeling:** Employing larger-scale quantitative studies to statistically model the correlations between specific leadership characteristics (e.g., CEO tenure, background), national governance indices, specific societal pressure indicators, and various CSR performance metrics (e.g., ESG scores, community development outcomes). This could involve developing more sophisticated models to predict CSR outcomes based on the identified variables.

- **Role of Middle Management:** Investigating the critical role of middle management and formal CSR departments as "boundary spanners" who translate global policies into local action and communicate local needs upwards. Their capacity and influence are crucial in bridging the gap between senior leadership and ground-level realities.

- **Stakeholder Dialogue Mechanisms:** Exploring the design and effectiveness of different stakeholder dialogue mechanisms within MNCs, identifying best practices for fostering genuine two-way communication and co-creation of CSR initiatives.

- **Impact Assessment Methodologies:** Further research into robust methodologies for assessing the actual social and environmental impact of CSR initiatives, moving beyond mere input/output metrics to measure long-term, systemic change in communities.

These avenues for future inquiry would significantly advance the understanding of CSR implementation complexities in the multinational context.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility in multinational corporations is a deeply intricate and dynamic process, profoundly shaped by the philosophical orientations of senior leadership teams and the heterogeneous expectations of the diverse societies in which these corporations operate. This comprehensive case study of GlobalTech Solutions unequivocally demonstrates that a significant divergence between internal leadership priorities (often driven by a narrow economic or compliance-based view) and external societal demands (ranging from comprehensive ESG performance in developed markets to fundamental socio-economic development in emerging economies) can lead to a pervasive adoption of superficial or "decoupled" CSR. This disjunction results in formal CSR policies that exist largely for symbolic legitimacy, while actual, on-the-ground practices fail to meet genuine societal needs, thereby undermining stakeholder trust and diminishing the tangible benefits of corporate citizenship.

Conversely, the study underscores that authentic and impactful CSR implementation thrives in environments characterized by a robust alignment. This occurs when senior leadership genuinely embraces a values-based and integrative approach to CSR, translating into proactive,

strategically embedded initiatives that are responsive to strong and nuanced societal pressures. Such alignment fosters greater employee engagement, more effective localization of CSR programs, and a transition from reactive crisis management to proactive value creation.

For MNCs to truly embody "doing good" rather than merely "talking good," it is imperative for senior leadership to cultivate a profound understanding of, and responsiveness to, the complex institutional and social contexts of their global operations. This necessitates a strategic shift from a "one-size-fits-all" approach to a flexible governance framework that allows for both centralized oversight and decentralized adaptation of CSR initiatives. Key actions include fostering sustained and genuine dialogue between corporate headquarters and local entities, ensuring that global CSR frameworks are sufficiently agile to accommodate unique local needs and priorities, and consistently championing CSR from the highest levels as an indispensable strategic imperative, rather than an optional compliance burden or a purely cost-driven exercise. Furthermore, host governments play a critical role by strengthening corporate governance and legal frameworks, thereby compelling MNCs to adhere to higher standards of cultural sensitivity and local relevance in their CSR endeavors.

Ultimately, the future of effective and sustainable CSR implementation in multinational corporations lies in their ability to bridge the persistent divide between diverse internal orientations and the heterogeneous, evolving expectations of a global society. It is through this authentic integration, genuine stakeholder engagement, and a commitment to systemic impact that MNCs can fulfill their responsibilities as powerful agents of both economic prosperity and societal well-being.

REFERENCES

1. Agle, B. R., Mitchell, R. K., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (1999). Who Matters to CEOs? An Investigation of Stakeholder Attributes and Salience, Corporate Performance, and CEO Values. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 507–525.
2. Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S Back in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Multilevel Theory of Social Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 836–863.
3. Ahmad, H., Yaqub, M., & Lee, S. H. (2024). Environmental, Social, and governance-related factors for business investment and sustainability: A Scientometric Review of Global Trends. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 26(2), 2965–2987.
4. Aravossis, K. G. & Panayiotou, K. A. (2006). A Proposed Methodological Framework for the Evaluation of Corporate Social Responsibility, Department of Industrial Management and Operational Research, National Technical University of Athens, Athína, Attica, Greece. Conference: 1st International Conference on Environmental Economics and Investment Assessment, At Mykonos Greece. 5. <https://doi.org/10.2495/EEIA060091>.
5. Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419–1440.
6. Baumann-Pauly, D., Wickert, C., Spence, L., & Scherer, A. (2013). Organizing corporate social responsibility in small and large firms: Size matters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(4), 693–705.
7. Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing Better at Doing Good: When, why, and How Consumers Respond to Corporate Social Initiatives'. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 9–25.
8. Blake R. Grossman and William F. Sharpe, (1986). Financial Implications of South African Divestment, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 42, July/August, pp. 15–29. 1.
9. Boele, R., Fabig, H. & Wheeler, D. (2001). The Story of Shell Petroleum Nigeria PLC, Nigeria and the Ogoni People – Environment, Economy, Relationships: Conflict and Prospects for Resolution. *Sustainable Development*, 9:74–86.
10. Boele, R., Fabig, H. & Wheeler, D. (2007) The Story of Shell, Nigeria and the Ogoni People – Environment, Economy, Relationships: Conflict and Prospects for Resolution. *Sustainable Development*, 9:74–86.
11. Bragdon, J. H., & Marlin, J. A. T. (1972). Is Pollution Profitable? *Risk Management*, 19(4), 9–18.
12. Brunton, M., Eweje, G., & Taskin, N. (2017). Communicating corporate social responsibility to internal stakeholders: Walking the walk or just talking the talk? *Business Strategy & the Environment*, 26(1), 31–48.
13. Buono, A. F., & Nichols, L. (1985). *Corporate Policy, Values, and Social Responsibility*. Praeger Scientific.
14. Carroll, A. B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders". *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39–48.
15. Carroll, A. B. & Shabana, K. M. (2010) The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 85–105.
16. Crane, A., & Glozer, S. (2016). Researching

- corporate social responsibility communication: Themes, opportunities, and challenges. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(7), 1223–1252.
17. Cupchik, G. (2001). Constructivist Realism: An Ontology That Encompasses Positivist and Constructivist Approaches to the Social Sciences. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2(1), Art 7.
18. Davidson, W. N., & Worrell, D. L. (1988). The Impact of Announcement of Corporate Illegalities on Shareholder Returns. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 195–200.
19. Day, C., Sammons, P., & Gu, Q. (2008). Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Research on Teachers' Lives, Work, and Effectiveness: From Integration to Synergy. *Educational Researcher*, 37(6), 330–342.
20. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
21. Dobeles, A. R., Westberg, K., Steel, M., & Flowers, K. (2014). An examination of corporate social responsibility implementation and stakeholder engagement: A case study in the Australian mining industry. *Business Strategy & the Environment*, 23(3), 145–159.
22. Drucker, P. F. (1984). The New Meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility. *California Management Review*, 26, 53–63.
23. Fet, A.M. Knudson, H. (2017). Environmental Management from a Systems Perspective. In Abraham, M.A. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sustainable Technologies* (1st ed., pp. 165–173). Elsevier.
24. Fordham, A. E., & Robinson, G. M. (2019). Mapping Meanings of Corporate Social Responsibility: An Australian Case Study. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 3(1), 14.
25. Freedman, M., & Jaggi, B. (1999). An Analysis of the Impact of Corporate Pollution Disclosures Included in Annual Financial Statements on Investors' Decisions. *The British Accounting Review*, 31(4), 439–457.
26. Freeman, R. E., & Valamuri, R. (2006). A new approach to corporate social responsibility: Company stakeholder responsibility. In A. Kakabadse & M. Morsing (Eds.), *Corporate social responsibility: Reconciling aspiration with application* (1st ed., pp. 9–23). Palgrave Macmillan.
27. Friedman, M. (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. *New York Times Magazine*, 13 September, pp. 32–33.
28. Garriga, E. & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53: 51–71. Kluwer Academic Publisher.
29. Graafland, J., & Smid, H. (2019). Decoupling among corporate social responsibility policies, programs, and impacts: An empirical study. *Business & Society*, 58(2), 231–267.
30. Hofman, A. (1999). Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the US Chemical Industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 351–371.
31. Idowu, S.O, (ed) Schmidpeter, R. (Ed) (2020), *CSR, Sustainability, Ethics & Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan, Switzerland.
32. Jacqueminet, A. & Durand, R. (2013). Managing Levels of corporate social responsibility Implementation Within a Multinational Corporation: Competition and Receptivity. *Strategy and Business Policy*, HEC Paris.
33. Jarrell, G., & Peltzman, S. (1985). The Impact of Product Recalls on the Wealth of Sellers". *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(3), 512–536.
34. Jiang, P. C., Feng, G. F., Wang, H. J., & Chang, C. P. (2024). CSR from different perspectives: The global ESG indexes updated. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(5), 4694–4714.
35. Kang, J. (2009). Corporate Social Responsibility? Not My Business Anymore: The CEO Horizon Problem in Corporate Social Performance. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1–6.
36. Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1976). Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Trade-offs. John Wiley.
37. Kleine, A., & Hauf, M. (2009). Sustainability-driven implementation of corporate social responsibility: Application of the integrative sustainability triangle. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, 517–533.
38. Klonoski, R.J. (1991). Foundational Considerations in the Corporate Social Responsibility Debate. *Business Horizons*, July–August, 9–18.
39. Kostova, T., Roth, K., & Dacin, M. T. (2008). Institutional Theory in the Study of Multinational Corporations: A Critique and new Directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 994–1006.
40. Kurpierz, J. R., & Smith, K. (2020). The Greenwashing Triangle: Adapting Tools from Fraud to Improve CSR Reporting. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(6), 1075–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-10-2018-0272>.

41. Lemon, K. N., Roberts, J. H., Raghubir, P., & Winer, R. S. (2011). Measuring the Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility. A Stakeholder Approach, the Conference Board, 3(7), 4–20.
42. Li, Y., Haleem, F., Cheng, Y., & Farooq, S. (2022). The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Practices on Sustainability Performance in Manufacturing Networks: The Moderating Effect of Interplant Coordination. *Production Planning & Control*, 33(12), 1182–1196.
43. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Sage.
44. Luo, X. R., Wang, D., & Zhang, J. (2017). Whose call to answer: Institutional complexity and firms' corporate social responsibility reporting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 321–344.
45. Mackay, Arevuo, M., Meadows, M., & MacKay, B. (2023). *Strategy: Theory, Practice, Implementation* (2nd Edition). Oxford University Press.
46. Maon, F., Swaen, V. & Lindgreen, A. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility at IKEA: Commitment and Communication. In C. Smith, C. B. Bhattacharya, D. Vogel & D. Levine (eds.), *Global Challenges in Responsible Business: Corporate Responsibility and Strategy* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) Forthcoming.
47. Marano, V., & Kostova, T. (2016). Unpacking the institutional complexity in adoption of corporate social responsibility practices in multinational enterprises. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(1), 28–54.
48. Marquis, C., Glynn, M., & Davis, G. (2007). Community Isomorphism and Corporate Social Action. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 925.
49. Mazurkiewicz, P. (2004). Corporate Environmental Responsibility: Is a Common corporate social responsibility Framework Possible? in 24th Annual IAIA Conference, Vancouver, BC.
50. Mazurkiewicz, P. (2004b). Corporate Self-Regulations and Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue, in *Handbook of Voluntary Environmental Agreements*. Kluwert Academic Publisher, Dordrecht.
51. Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. Jossey-Bass.
52. Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340–363.
53. Moon, S. G., & de Leon, P. (2007). Contexts and Corporate Voluntary Environmental Behaviors: Examining the EPA's Green Lights Voluntary Program. *Organization Environment*, 20(4), 480–496.
54. Mooneeapen, O., Abhayawansa, S., & Mamode Khan, N. (2022). The influence of the Country Governance Environment on Corporate Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) performance. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 13(4), 953–985.
55. Naeem, N., Cankaya, S., & Bildik, R. (2022). Does ESG Performance Affect the Financial Performance of Environmentally Sensitive Industries? A Comparison between Emerging and Developed Markets. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 22, S128–S140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2022.11.014>.
56. Nelson, J. S., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D. N. (Eds.). (1987). *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*. University of Wisconsin Press.
57. Ng, T. H., Lye, C. T., Chan, K. H., Lim, Y. Z., & Lim, Y. S. (2020). Sustainability in Asia: The Roles of Financial Development in Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Performance. *Social Indicators Research*, 150, 17–44.
58. Osadiya, T. (2020). A Critical Review of a Multinational Corporation's Corporate Social Responsibility Practice – A Case Study. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Anglia Ruskin University, United Kingdom. 132–191.
59. Osadiya, T. (2016). Reflecting on Corporate Social Responsibility Discourse. *ResearchGate*. 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4393.0648>.
60. Philippe, D., & Durand, R. (2011). The impact of Norm Conforming Behaviors on Firm Reputation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(9), 969–993.
61. Polonsky, M., & Jevons, C. (2009). Global branding and strategic corporate social responsibility: An overview of three types of complexity. *International Marketing Review*, 26(3), 327–347.
62. Pope, S., & Wæraas, A. (2016). corporate social responsibility-washing is rare: A conceptual framework, literature review, and critique. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(1), 173–193. Cited in Tahniyath & Elbanna, 2023.
63. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006a). *Strategy and Society: The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility*. Harvard

- Business Review, 84(12), 78–79.
64. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006b). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84, 78–92.
65. Porter, T. B. (2008). Managerial Applications of Corporate Social Responsibility and Systems Thinking for Achieving Sustainability Outcomes. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 25(3), 397–411.
66. Ramchander, S., Schwebach, R. G., & Staking, K. I. M. (2012). The Informational Relevance of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from DS400 Index Reconstitutions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(3), 303–314.
67. Rasche, A., Morsing, M., & Moon, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Corporate Social Responsibility: Strategy, Communication, Governance*. Cambridge University Press.
68. Reid, E. M., & Toffel, M. W. (2009). Responding to Public and Private Politics: Corporate Disclosure of Climate Change Strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(11), 1157–1178. Responsibility.
69. Rodríguez Bolívar, M. P., Garde Sánchez, R., & López Hernández, A. M. (2015). Managers as drivers of corporate social responsibility in state-owned enterprises. *Journal of Environmental Planning & Management*, 58(5), 777–801.
70. Ryan, G., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data Management and Analysis Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 769–802). Sage.
71. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
72. Sandelands, L. E. (2003). The Argument for God from Organization Studies. *Journal of Management Enquiry*, 20, 1–10.
73. Schoeneborn, D., Morsing, M., & Crane, A. (2019). Formative Perspectives on the Relation Between CSR Communication and CSR Practices: Pathways for Walking, Talking, and T(w)alking. *Business & Society*, 59(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650319845091>.
74. Secchi, D. (2007). Utilitarian, Managerial and Relational Theories of Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 9(4), 347–373.
75. Sharma, A., & Kiran, R. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility: Driving Forces and Challenges. *International Journal of Business Research and Development*, 2(1), 18–27.
76. Shaw, W. H., & Barry, V. (1995). *Moral Issues in Business* (6th ed.). Wadsworth.
77. Sherer, P. D., & Lee, K. (2002). Institutional Change in Large Law Firms: A Resource Dependency and Institutional Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 102–119.
78. Simpson, B., Robertson, J. L., & White, K. (2002). How Co-Creation Increases Employee Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Engagement: The Moderating Role of Self-Constraint. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35(2), 97–109.
79. Singhanian, M., Saini, N., Shri, C., & Bhatia, S. (2024). Cross-Country Comparative Trend Analysis in ESG Regulatory Framework Across Developed and Developing Nations. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 35(1), 61–100.
80. Smith, M. L. (2006). Multiple Methods in Education Research. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of Complementary Methods in Educational Research* (pp. 457–475). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
81. Smith, N. C. (2003). Corporate Social Responsibility: Whether or How? *California Management Review*, 45(4), 52–76.
82. Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. SAGE Publications.
83. Svystunove, L., Muratova, Y., Fortwengel, J., & Edwards, T. (2024). Multinational Corporations' Interactions with Host Institutions: Taking Stock and Moving Forward. *Management International Review*, 64, 3–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-023-00525-1>.
84. Tahniyath, F., & Elbanna, S. (2023). Corporate Social Responsibility (corporate social responsibility) Implementation: A Review and a Research Agenda Towards an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 183, 105–121.
85. The Shell Sustainability Report. (2013). Sustainable Development in Shell Project Development Process – Review Stages Between Each Phase (p. 13). Royal Dutch Shell Plc. Netherlands. <http://reports.shell.com>
86. Tolbert, P., & Zucker, L. (1983). Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Difusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880–1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(1), 22–39.
87. Verk, N., Golob, U., & Podnar, K. (2021). A Dynamic Review of the Emergence of Corporate Social Responsibility Communication. *Journal of Business*

88. Verma, S., Raut, S. K., Narula, R., & Rao, P. (2024). Sustainability and Capability Building in Organizations: A Focused Group Approach. *FIIB Business Review*, 23197145241269203.
89. Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. (2005). The Influence of CEO Transformational Leadership on Firm-Level Commitment to Corporate Social Responsibility. In J. P. Doh & S. A. Stumpf (Eds.), *Handbook on responsible Leadership and Governance in Global Business* (pp. 195–220). Edward Elgar.
90. Wickert, C., Scherer, A. G., & Spence, L. J. (2016). Walking and talking corporate social responsibility: Implications of firm size and organizational cost. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(7), 1169–1196.
91. Yang, Y., yang, B., Aiken, E., Wylie, J., Cadden, T., & Oyedijo, A. (2024). Embedding Corporate Social Responsibility in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: A Framework for Successful Implementation and Value Creation through Employee Engagement. *Production Planning & Control*, 1–18. Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2024.2358031>.
92. Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Sage.