

Corporate Social Responsibility: It's dimensions

Mukesh Mahay

Department of Soft Skills, Lovely Professional University, Punjab-144411

Mukesh Mahay is Assistant Professor in Soft Skills- He Holds a degree in Management. Worked in IBM India.

Abstract:

Corporate social responsibility is the most discussed and challenging issue of the business world. To make the wealth earned as revenue by the companies working under corporate structure this framework helps to utilize it for the society. It can be a small corporate company to a big corporate house, the corporate social responsibility helps in helping the society in and around to raise and maintain the balance in terms of earning health, and livelihood. This article will focus on the different dimensions of corporate social responsibility like past and present, recent developments, challenges, impacts.

Keywords: corporate, society, responsibility, business relationship

Introduction:

The point of concern has always been that what percentage needs to be allocated for corporate social responsibility? Corporate social responsibility, there is a certain percentage of the companies either wealth or revenue or earning is shared/ given to society. In today's world when our social dynamics are changing, corporate houses are somehow are also busy deciding the different ways or channels to transfer the share of corporate benefits to society. Some have a continuous focus on the timely allocation of funds for corporate social responsibility directly or indirectly. The role of corporate social responsibility has changed by just not sharing the monetary benefits, but also in uplifting society. A corporate business can't grow to ignore the society as either the resources in the form of material, manpower or other points can be directly linked with society. There are many theories coined to understand the concept of corporate social responsibility. Responsibility can be situational or can be the basis of interests. If we talk about an Individual may be performing as a philanthropist may somehow impact corporate social responsibility. Every company has certain goals and values, some do consider CSR as an important initiative in their work culture (Elisabet Garriga and Dome`nec Mele´ (see van Marrewijk, 2003 and Wood and Lodgson, 2002 for corporate citizenship)

If any organization is working ignoring the sustainable growth of the society shows the companies goals with a narrow path towards society. Continuously using the resources and making the corporate social responsibility deprived of the expected outcome can lead to imbalanced structure around. In the 20th century, the definition of social responsibility was more prevalent than the corporate as a base. Davis (1960) argued that social responsibility should be from the aspect of a manager. He also said that decisions based on social responsibility as a context after having much of the gains should be payback to society. Davis also became famous to bring the relationship of the social responsibility and business power.

Dimensions of the Social Responsibility:

Ethical Dimension: Business models in an organization has the aspect to connect with the social demands. “managers bear a fiduciary relationship to stakeholders” (Ref Freeman, 1984), the management. The management has the direct or indirect connects with the stockholders it can have its employees, suppliers, customers etc.

In a more precise way, Donaldson and Preston (1995, p. 67) the approach was very clear in two ways (a) Stockholders need to be specific to corporate social responsibility. Not just because of certain unnecessary reasons. The clarity was indeed very important. If we take an example of today's scenario where in some countries have cooperative structure for business, the cooperative structure makes the stockholders benefitted. (b) The interest for the stockholders should be considered for the responsibility by the managers not just that they have the power or capabilities to do so.

With these basic approaches it is clear that the interest of the people impacted by the continuous growth of the organization should be considered mutually. One should not confine the growth and revenue to self. Being able to follow ethically serve the purpose. In any case, if managers are not able to build a balance between society and organization will definitely have the impact of making less impact by the organization.

(2) **Sustainable corporate social responsibility:** As corporate social responsibility has been the continuous approach by many not in the 21st century but well before that. But, can it be sustainable when it is regarding

the business running through challenges. In order to understand it (Ref – Duane Windsor- The future of corporate responsibility) more. There were two economists (Manne and Wallich) argued the responsibility (i) As a part of the profit (ii) To consider as an activity by self (iii) Involvement of corporate rather than an individual involved in it. Drucker (1984) tried to do reconciliation by putting the social responsibilities into profitable business opportunities. If we talk about the wealth of any organization it can be reasonable for the contribution towards corporate social responsibility. Jensen (2000) clarified that if performance of measure is not the point of profit maximization but of long-run wealth creation. In case of a continuous approach to get business on go in today's time most of the business forgets or has a weak framework of corporate responsibility. The corporate structure must have to add one core policy for corporate social responsibility. These arguments also highlighted the aspect of business growth. As in certain situations market plays a role if there is a monopoly then it will be impacting the business in a way that will impact the contribution to corporate responsibility. The external impact or market monopoly may have more or less will be in the direction of corporate social responsibilities. Policies related to the public will have the influences by the business. This will help in the corporate social responsibility structure to be strong. There was another economical approach given (Ref – Duane Windsor- The future of corporate responsibility) Mc Williams and Siegel's, 2001a Economic model this was given to formalize the approach "a supply and demand model of corporate social responsibility". But mostly this was demanding clarity. Managers or business stockholders are considered as persons responsible for taking the accountability of corporate responsibility. But they do have the consideration towards business functions, but the morale of the business stockholders must be of importance towards corporate social responsibility. (Ref-Alexander Dahlsrud – How corporate social responsibility is defined) Woodward-Clyde 1999, a contract to allow a company to work and operate also in return to meet certain obligations in a certain matter, though the relation is in business and society. This definition clarifies the responsibility and obligation in the overview. Commission of the European Communities, 2003 it focuses on enterprises that it has to be accountable for the impact on the stakeholders. Society and its elements must be considered and acted in a behaved manner. Life of the workforce and family must be given quality conditions. These

different obligations help in a strong relationship between the business and society. As one cannot substantially grow. Business models should have the strong ethics and roles in contributing towards the society and wellbeing.

(3)**Overall Conduct** : Corporate social responsibility cannot just be for some part of the society or stakeholders in the society. Talking about employment, resources ,andthe environment is also a key part of the society. There should be legalized in terms of the action that becomes one of the responsibilities. **(Ref Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a DefinitionalConstruct , Archie B. Carroll)**In 1982, Dalton and Cosiercame with a model of the matrix with “illegal” and “legal” on one axis and “irresponsible” and “responsible” on the other axis. In this matrix, the most important factor was thelegal factor (p. 27). This highlights the most feasible way of defining the legal and responsible together. As, one cannot just obligate toward the humans as part of society while ignoring the environment, Environment do get impacted by the industries when natural resources are used in production. Business for SocialResponsibility, 2003b, defines corporate social responsibilities as commercial success is achieved by giving considerations to ethical values, respect people, communities and the natural environment. Some companies (firm’s own values and agenda (Brenkert, 1996) do contribute in the research work by giving donations to universities to proper quality in study and research.

Conclusion:In this article my continuous effort was in putting light on how corporate social responsibility has been evolved in recent times also in which dimensions can have an impact. Any business can grow but one has to be sustainable in its approach towards the wellbeing of society giving them the jobs, taking care of their health and environment where the business grows and also continue to use the resources.

References:

- 1) **Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct DOI: 10.1177/000765039903800303 1999; 38; 268 Business Society -Archie B. Carroll**
- 2) **How Corporate Social Responsibility is Defined: an Analysis of 37 Definitions -Alexander Dahlsrud***
- 3) **The Boundaries of Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility -Geoffrey P. Lantos**
- 4) **Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory - Elisabet Garriga, Dome`nec Mel`e**

