International Journal of Advance and Applied Research
www.ijaar.co.in
ISSN – 2347-7075 Impact Factor – 8.141
Peer Reviewed Bi-Monthly
Vol. 7 No. 48 July – Aug - 2026

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in India: A Strategic Shift Towards Sustainable Development

Gollyla Sinduja
Assistant Professor, Department of MBA, Ramnath Guljarilal Kedia College of Commerce
Corresponding Author – Gollyla Sinduja

DOI - 10.5281/zenodo.23590232

Abstract:

As India evolves to become a rising economic force in the world, the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has moved from being an act of generosity to becoming a fundamental component of business strategy. The research focuses on the current practice of CSR in India and looks at the way business leaders try to integrate their corporate goals with social goals. Traditionally, the implementation of policies such as Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization (LPG) meant that profit maximization came first, leading to unintentional discrimination. However, contemporary business leaders understand the importance of having the trust of the people. In essence, CSR plays an important role in sustainable development by achieving a balance between economic growth and minimisation of social inequality. This change in perspective came about due to regulations, such as the 2011 Voluntary Guidelines of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, where CSR has been understood in terms of "responsible business" as opposed to being defined narrowly in an operational manner. Modern accounting practices show the change that has taken place in this respect since companies have become increasingly financially transparent in their annual reports with respect to the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) efforts they undertake. In conclusion, the research proves that stakeholder participation, employee well-being, and environmental sustainability are all crucial factors for strategic growth that are consistent with the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The results prove that strategic CSR not only helps to mitigate social risks but also provides a unique competitive advantage in today's competitive environment.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Sustainable Development, Corporate Governance, LPG Policies, ESG, Stakeholder Participation.

Introduction:

Understandably, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or corporate citizenship, sustainable or responsible business management, organizational responsibility, ethical management, and corporate conscience is the norm that integrates social and environmental aspects into corporate operations by engaging all levels of the company and influencing corporate life at strategic and operational levels. This concept determines that the enterprise must manage its impact on the world around it, and its past and present activities should consider their future effects on the business environment. During this process, the critical function of enterprise management is to ensure a balance between profits and the expectations of society and not undermine the protection of the population and the environment. In addition, CSR defines the company's proper functioning and transparency in its operations and information policy.

While the objective of CSR remains the same—the creation of sustainable profitability via enhanced responsibility—it could be fulfilled differently depending on the size, location, and industry of the company. For example, a farm or textile factory would focus on ensuring good working conditions, ethical sourcing, and water safety, while a bank or big-box store would rather

address issues of governance, anti-monopoly practices, consumer privacy, and community investment. Overall, there are seven main areas in which companies could operate in terms of CSR. These include workplace issues, human rights, environmental friendliness, governance, high standards of ethics, good marketplace practices, and social investments.

Objectives:

1. To assess the current state of corporate social responsibility in Indian industry.
2. To expound on the basic principles and alternative organizational structures of social accountability.
3. To scrutinize the legal provisions and guidelines relating to statutory social responsibility in India.
4. To identify constraints and challenges in social responsibility programs in India.
5. To formulate recommendations for improving and expanding enterprise development programs.

Literature Review:

One of the initial questions that arise when considering corporate responsibility is whether equity capital can be invested in corporate social responsibility programs and whether shareholders have the right to vote or influence the social agenda of the companies they own. According to ACCSR's (2011) State of CSR in Australia Annual Review, getting a comprehensive understanding of the concept is one of the challenges companies face when trying to implement CSR initiatives. The report highlights several barriers to effective corporate social responsibility, most of which are related to the company's inability to develop a financially viable social policy, incorporate it into business processes, and obtain buy-in from senior executives and employees. Other obstacles reported by the organizations were associated with the limited time horizon and budget allocation, which are also the result of the former three issues. If a company cannot find a viable financial justification for implementing its initiatives and struggling to integrate them into existing operations, its management is unlikely to invest resources into CSR programs.

Moreover, these challenges reveal that companies use CSR to address compliance, risk management, and stakeholder concerns rather than drive competitive advantage.

CSR in India:

Jamsetji Tata (1902), the legendary industrialist and visionary who laid the foundations of modern Indian industry, articulated socio-economic principles that remain central to contemporary corporate governance. Long before modern regulatory frameworks emerged, he championed the philosophy that enterprise capital exists fundamentally to serve the public, asserting that "in a free enterprise, the community is not just another stakeholder in business, but is in fact the very purpose of its existence." In today's corporate landscape, modern enterprise strategies are re-embracing this principle by formalizing the broader societal obligations of commercial entities.

India holds a long-standing tradition of corporate involvement in social welfare and national growth. Historically expressed through moral duties and charitable gifts, these practices have continuously transformed into the strategic frameworks recognized today as CSR. Ever since commercial trade began generating capital surpluses, ecological and community concerns have been deeply linked with commercial ventures. Formal industrial welfare programs and corporate philanthropy have functioned across the subcontinent since the late 1800s. Early Indian business philanthropy mirrored Western models through its reliance on spiritual principles. By the mid-1900s, responsible corporate behavior manifested as educational grants, civic welfare projects, employee safety standards, and moral leadership. While some early critics viewed corporate gifts to academic and medical bodies as strategic attempts to purchase local goodwill, these efforts laid essential foundations for organized community support.

In the immediate post-independence era, documentations of corporate community work were relatively sparse. Over subsequent decades, however, awareness expanded globally regarding the necessity of corporate contributions toward localized socio-economic progress. Research confirms that firms exhibiting authentic ethical standards earn stronger consumer trust and market preference. This shift in public sentiment significantly accelerated the adoption of formalized CSR strategies.

Following independence, industrial pioneer J.R.D. Tata argued that ethical companies must look beyond simple statutory compliance. He advocated that in addition to customary monetary donations, corporations should mobilize their managerial expertise, financial resources, and skilled workforce to deploy specialized task forces for crisis relief and infrastructure rebuilding. Over time, commerce broadly accepted the premise that enterprises must absorb a share of society's operational costs. Whereas companies historically fulfilled their duties through isolated contributions to schools and hospitals, a major shift occurred as management integrated social duty directly into core corporate strategy. Notably, the comprehensive community programs established by Tata Iron and Steel Company became an early benchmark for operationalized social responsibility.

The conceptual framework of corporate social performance was originally formulated by Sethi (1975) in the mid-1970s, expanded by Carroll (1979) in the late 1970s, and later refined by Wartick and Cochran (1985) in the mid-1980s. Sethi's model categorized enterprise activity into three tiers: "social obligation" (meeting legal and market criteria), "social responsibility" (aligning with societal standards), and "social responsiveness" (taking proactive, preventive action).

By the close of the twentieth century, corporate strategy moved away from passive charity toward direct participation in sustainable development and targeted support for marginalized groups. This shift was fueled both by internal executive leadership and rising expectations from regulatory authorities and the public. Historical corporate giving data indicates that among funds allocated for social development, the largest share (47%) was executed directly through internal corporate initiatives, 39% was granted to external non-profit partners, and 14% was managed through corporate charitable trusts.

In India and across global markets, a clear consensus has emerged that commercial entities cannot succeed in societies that fail. Authentic corporate responsibility encompasses both ethical and philosophical dimensions—especially in developing economies marked by substantial disparities in income, living standards, and social equity. As Infosys co-founder Narayana Murthy (2010) observed, genuine responsibility requires maximizing long-term shareholder value while maintaining complete fairness toward all constituents: workers, consumers, local communities, government authorities, and the environment. Similarly, landmark European policy frameworks have emphasized that being socially responsible goes beyond legal compliance to include increased investment in human capital, environmental preservation, and stakeholder relations. According to benchmark research on Indian corporate responsibility conducted by the Tata Energy Research Institute (TERI, 2001), the evolution of CSR in India spans four primary analytical frameworks (see Table 1).

Table 1: Evolutionary Paradigms of CSR in India

CSR Paradigm	Strategic Focus & Orientation	Leading Theorist / Proponent
Ethical	Discretionary corporate commitment to public welfare, national growth, and community upliftment	Jamsetji Tata
State-Directed	Statutory enforcement, regulatory compliance, and state-backed legal mandates dictating corporate duty	Dr. B. R. Ambedkar
Shareholder Primacy	Enterprise obligations limited strictly to wealth generation, economic output, and profit optimization	Adam Smith
Multi-Stakeholder Governance	Proactive alignment balancing the economic, environmental, and social interests of workers, buyers, vendors, and local communities	Archie B. Carroll

Strategic Issues and Operational Concerns:

The responsibility of many boards of executives is currently skewed to concentrate on short-range issues such as sales and customer service rather than on issues of broader corporate responsibility. Viewing customers as mere buyers of products and services fails to consider other important trends that are likely to have a growing impact on business. The potential benefits to be gained by considering social issues strategically are enormous, and they stem from several key market forces:

- **Decreasing reliance on regulation:** Cash-strapped governments are promoting more flexible approaches to regulation and are looking to the private sector to take greater responsibility for meeting social and environmental goals.
- **Growing demand for disclosure:** Many stakeholders, including customers, institutional investors, suppliers, employees, and activist groups, are pressing for more openness about corporate activities and practices.
- **Changes in consumer behavior:** By virtue of their purchasing power, consumers are mandating responsible behavior from companies, and polls show that 20 percent or more of consumers are likely to buy or boycott products based on social and environmental criteria.
- **Shifts in capital allocation:** Institutional investors are incorporating social and environmental factors into their decision-making models, and huge amounts of money are being funneled into socially screened investment funds.
- **Changes in labor-market demographics:** Knowledge-driven employees are seeking employment with organizations that share their values, compelling companies to be more responsible in their dealings in order to attract the best talent.
- **Wider supply-chain accountability:** Companies are becoming much more aware of their responsibility to ensure that their suppliers are not undermining their own social-performance goals and are subjecting them to ever-tighter scrutiny.

Issues & Challenges:

While many leadership groups continue to approach social responsibility as a dispensable option, emphasizing short-term customer satisfaction, other companies realize that this factor incorporated into customer satisfaction may have profound implications for current business models. Moreover, engaging social responsibility is considered a substantial strategic opportunity because of the following global trends:

- **Growing need for indirect regulation:** Due to limited budgets and the increasing questioning of their ability to control the economy directly, state regulators are promoting indirect control through encouraging voluntary action.
- **Growing demand for openness:** Intensified by consumers, investors, the

supply chain, and various other stakeholders, the need for transparency is putting increased pressure on companies to report.

- **The role of ethics in buyer behavior:** More and more consumers are making choices based on a company's attitude towards society. According to international marketing research, more than 20% of Indian consumers are ready to praise or condemn a particular company based on social and environmental information.
- **A change in capital supply/demand dynamics:** ESG (environmental, social, governance) criteria are increasingly being used in investment decisions. More than 2,000 billion dollars in assets were invested in screened securities in social portfolios at the beginning of the century, which reflects the overall trend of the emergence of modern investment strategies.
- **Labor market dynamics:** In searching for highly specialized and professional staff, companies increasingly take into account such factors as commitment to the employer's values. Consequently, organizations have begun to develop their social policies in order to meet the growing demand for jobs among socially conscious employees.
- **Socially responsible monitoring of suppliers:** Corporations are developing socially responsible relationships with suppliers, as they recognize that negative reputational consequences can arise from inappropriate actions of business partners.

Primary Constraints Impacting CSR Practices in India:

The results of the survey and analysis of the functioning of dozens of companies (state-owned enterprises, domestic, and multinational corporations) reflect the most critical obstacles in the field of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) that influence the work of businesses. Therefore, the five most common challenges discovered in the study for companies doing CSR in India are the following:

- **Low involvement of locals:** Locals' involvement in CSR activities in India is complicated by a few issues, including insufficient awareness of CSR concepts among local populations and the lack of communication between community members and companies.
- **Lack of transparency:** Company executives note the absence of accountability from local nonprofit organizations for program implementation, financial reports, budgets, evaluations, and auditing.
- **The narrow perception of the corporation by non-governmental organizations:** While corporations spend time and resources on charitable activities, local NGOs perceive these actions as paternalism or indirect control. Consequently, it is complicated to create effective and equal relationships between companies and local social organizations.
- **The inconsistent perception of the concept of responsibility by the authorities:** The lack of standardized guidance from official authorities prevents corporations in India from understanding the optimal scope of CSR projects in relation to the size of the enterprise, as well as choosing specific areas to work on.
- **The uncoordinated use of resources:** The absence of uniform coordination of activities among authorities leads to the duplication of efforts and the competition of charities among local NGOs, which creates significant challenges in monitoring the effectiveness of projects and the allocation of resources.

Suggestions:

In order to achieve success, the enterprise should create networks to meet complex problems of ecology, engaging groups by joint actions and using common platforms to share experiences. Secondly, if a company wants to make its

employees responsible for sustainable development, it is necessary to develop their specialization in this sphere. It means that the enterprise should devote enough time and money to researching the sphere of CSR. In addition, the organization should conduct different conferences, meetings, and trainings for its employees. Moreover, appropriate regulations and laws can contribute to the active participation of different corporations in solving ecological issues. On the other hand, if the company actively works with stakeholders, it can build long-standing relationships with them, promoting the organization's reputation. Furthermore, it is important to keep updating the policies and regulations to make sure that all sides consider the CSR sphere as something that needs to be developed.

Conclusions:

Organizational sustainability is not an end point, but a process. While the Companies Act is indeed a welcome initiative, the definitions relating to permissible CSR expenditure are very ambiguous, thus leaving the onus of decision-making on the company management. The inclusion of social responsibility in the global business strategy is recognized as a necessity for long-term viability and competitiveness in the modern marketplace, as well as achieving broader social goals. For businesses, the main challenge is to devise a winning sustainable strategy that would fulfill its social, environmental, and economic needs and meet the expectations of all its stakeholders.

References:

1. ACCSR. (2011). The state of CSR in Australia: Annual review 2010/11. Australian Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility.
2. Agudelo, M. A. L., Jóhannsdóttir, L., & Davíðsdóttir, B. (2019). A literature review of the history and evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility. International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 4(1), 1–23.
3. Al-Shammari, M. A., & Al-Shammari, H. A. (2024). Stakeholder orientation and ESG disclosure: A comparative analysis across emerging markets. Journal of Business Ethics, 189(2), 315–334.
4. Ambedkar, B. R. (1947). States and minorities: What are their rights and how to secure them in the constitution of free India. Thacker & Co.
5. Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2022). Strategic CSR and corporate reputation in the post-pandemic era: Aligning stakeholder values. Journal of Marketing Research, 59(3), 412–431.
6. BSR. (2008). Issue brief: Overview of corporate social responsibility. Business for Social Responsibility. http://www.bsr.org/CSRResources/IssueBriefDetail.cfm
7. Burke, L. (2012). Executive education and leadership in corporate sustainability. Notre Dame University Press.
8. Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. Academy of Management Review, 4(4), 497–505.
9. Carroll, A. B. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Perspectives on the CSR pyramid and multi-stakeholder governance. Business & Society, 60(6), 1258–1278.
10. Deloitte India. (2024). Impact assessment of statutory CSR in India: A decade of Section 135. Deloitte Insights.
11. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.
12. Gupta, A., & Sharma, R. (2025). Digital transformation in corporate social responsibility: Leveraging AI for monitoring and impact assessment. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 32(1), 112–129.
13. Hindu Business Line. (2010, June 23). Corporate philanthropy and social development in emerging India. The Hindu Group.

14. IBEF. (2023). India Brand Equity Foundation report on corporate spending and socio-economic initiatives. India Brand Equity Foundation. https://www.ibef.org
15. KPMG India. (2023). India's CSR reporting survey 2023: Emerging trends in ESG and statutory compliance. KPMG International.
16. Kumar, V., & Singh, P. (2023). Barriers to effective CSR implementation in Indian MSMEs: An empirical investigation. Journal of Cleaner Production, 385, Article 135720.
17. Mohan, A. (2001). Corporate citizenship: Perspectives from India. Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 2001(2), 107–117.
18. Murthy, N. R. (2010). A better India, a better world. Penguin Books.
19. Patel, M., & Verma, S. (2024). Statutory CSR and corporate governance in India: Evaluating financial performance and social returns. Asian Business & Management, 23(4), 589–612.
20. Rao, K. S., & Mishra, M. (2022). Decoupling in CSR disclosures: Evidence from public and private enterprise sectors in India. Journal of Business Research, 142, 891–904.
21. Sehgal, S. (2009). Rural empowerment and sustainable development in India. Institute of Rural Research & Development (IRRAD).
22. Sethi, S. P. (1975). Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytical framework. California Management Review, 17(3), 58–64.
23. Sharma, E. (2023). Evolution of corporate social responsibility in India: From philanthropy to statutory mandate. Journal of Public Affairs, 23(2), Article e2841.
24. Singla, A., & Sagar, P. (2007). Trust and corporate social responsibility: Lessons from India. Genesis Public Relations.
25. Smith, A. (1776). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. W. Strahan and T. Cadell.
26. Sundar, P. (2022). Every creature has a story: The history of business philanthropy in India. Oxford University Press.
27. Tata, J. N. (1902). On free enterprise and community stewardship. Tata Central Archives. TERI. (2001). State of corporate responsibility in India poll. Tata Energy Research Institute.
28. Times Foundation. (2006). Corporate social responsibility practices in India. EurAsia Bulletin, 10(11-12), 14–22.
29. Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. Academy of Management Review, 10(4), 758–769.