

Bridging Corporate Social Responsibility and Individual Social Responsibility

João M. S. Carvalho^{1,2,3,*} ^a and Maria José Faria⁴ ^b

¹REMIT, Portucalense University, R. António Bernardino de Almeida, 541, 4200-072, Porto, Portugal

²CICS.NOVA, Minho University, Braga, Portugal

³CEG – Centro de Estudos Globais, Open University, Lisboa, Portugal

⁴COMEGI - Centro de Investigação em Organizações, Mercados e Gestão Industrial, Lusíada and Maia University, Largo Tinoco de Sousa 4760-108 Vila Nova de Famalicão, Portugal


Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, Individual Social Responsibility, Personal Social Responsibility, Societal Social Responsibility, Scoping Review.


Abstract: This study aimed to highlight the major trends in the relationships between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and Individual Social Responsibility (ISR). A systematic scoping review was undertaken to interpret and synthesise international research on this issue. The literature is still scarce and dispersed. From the scoping review emerged 11 articles that presented theoretical reflections and quantitative and qualitative approaches to the relationships between CSR and ISR. The main conclusions show that the literature is still scarce and dispersed but evolving into new models that try to explain the antecedents and consequences of the dynamic between CSR and ISR. The first measurement scale of ISR was created, and the research stream has the potential to grow up fast. Based on this review, it is presented a research agenda.

1 INTRODUCTION AND FRAMEWORK

The approach to the concept of social responsibility can be made from its historical evolution and context in social and business life. In historical terms, the first discussions in the academy about social responsibility began in 1899, based on the existence of a slave production mode in the United States of America (USA) since the 19th century. XVI, which only began to be dismantled in 1863 with Abraham Lincoln in the presidency (Faria, 2015). For Fonseca (2017), the first scholar to discuss social responsibility was Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), who, at the end of the 19th century, based his studies on two axioms: the first called the principle of charity and the second principle of assistance, also known as the trustee-benefactor principle. In this line of understanding, Freeman and Stoner (1992) argued that social responsibility was about social charity and corporate

custody, resulting from sharing the richest with the less fortunate, in which corporate prosperity should contribute to society in general. The 1920 decade was marked as a period when companies practised welfare (Ashley, 2005), but there was disagreement among shareholders. For example, Henry Ford, president and majority shareholder of the Ford company, reverted a fraction of the dividends to investments in production, increasing wages and creating a reserve fund. However, he had to fight the other shareholders in court to win this case (Lee, 2008). Another example happened in the American company P. Smith Manufacturing Company, which also had to go to court to defend the fact that it had funds to Princeton University instead of distributing them to its shareholders. These cases demonstrate the vision of social responsibility from an essentially philanthropic point of view (Ashley, 2005). However, Sheldon (1924) wrote that an enterprise should assume economic and legal duties and social

^a  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0683-296X>

^b  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9210-0695>

* This work was supported by the UIDB/05105/2020 Program Contract, funded by national funds through the FCT I.P.

responsibilities beyond these duties. In the 1930s and 1940s, some scholars referred to a concern for social responsibility and the social consciousness of managers (e.g. Barnard, 1938; Clark, 1939; Kreps, 1940). These and other works from that period can be considered theoretical foundations for the first stage of CSR theory with a sufficient critical mass of scientific endeavour (Carvalho et al., 2014).

In 1953, Howard Bowen published a work entitled "Social Responsibilities of the Businessman", contributing to the academic debate on social responsibility. The following year, Drucker included public responsibility as one of the eight critical areas in which business objectives should be set. He maintained that organizations must promote the public good and contribute to society's stability, strength, and harmony. He firmly believed that all institutions, including those in the private sector, have a responsibility to society.

From the 1960s onwards, many authors sought to define what could be considered corporate social responsibility (e.g., Davis, 1960; Davis & Blomstrom, 1966; Fitch, 1976; Frederick, 1960; Johnson, 1971; McGuire, 1963), defending that it aims to help solve social problems that the companies often cause. For Parra (2017), social responsibility began as a social obligation, to become a social reaction. It went through a phase of social sensitivity, later to social action and finally came to be observed as an ethical premise of companies today. For Sebastião (2009), corporate social responsibility was the way companies found to assume, together with the State, some of the obligations that were once strictly attributed to the government.

Although the business world was beginning to understand and practice what it deems to be social responsibility actions, several academics argued against this exercise, advocating that the existence of social responsibility increases costs and reduces the benefit of shareholders. They defended that solving social difficulties is not an obligation for the companies (Friedman, 1970), under penalty of becoming "medieval churches" (Levitt, 1958). However, it was in the late 1970s that Carroll (1979) presented the most accepted and publicized model of CSR, based on four dimensions of responsibility: (1) organizations must be productive and profitable and satisfy the needs of consumers and investors (economic responsibility); (2) organizations must work within existing legal frameworks (legal responsibility); (3) organizations must follow socially established moral standards (ethical responsibility); and (4) the voluntary business activities (philanthropy) of organizations should try to help

other people and contribute to the welfare of society (discretionary responsibility).

Many other authors have been making contributions to the development of CSR theory. For example, the concepts of the social orientation of an organization (Aupperle et al., 1985) and corporate social performance (Epstein, 1987; Wartick & Cochran, 1985).

The 1990s brought concerns about how to measure CSR, namely through the studies by Wood (1991), Maignan et al. (1999), and Maignan and Ralston (2002). These authors introduced stakeholder expectations as the primary target of CSR rather than just talking about a society in general. There were no currents contrary to CSR, as was the case of Jones (1996), who considered that it would only make sense if it contributed to increasing the company's profitability. This relationship between CSR and profitability has been assessed as inconclusive, complex and depending on many other variables (e.g., Arlow & Gannon, 1982; Griffin & Mahon, 1997; Margolis & Walsh, 2001; Roman et al., 1999). More recently, there have been new attempts to measure CSR (e.g., Kanji & Chopra, 2007, 2009, 2010) or the social footprint (e.g., McElroy et al., 2008; Henriques, 2010), as well as to systematise its evolution (e.g., De Bakker et al., 2005; Garriga & Melé, 2004; Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Windsor, 2001; Wood, 2000).

However, we are more interested in the influence of current theories that help explain CSR's existence. For example, in instrumentality theory, organisations are seen as instruments to create wealth, so social responsibility must only be used for that purpose (e.g., Friedman, 1962, 1970; Levitt, 1958; McWilliam & Siegel, 2001), assuring a competitive advantage (Porter & Kramer, 2002). Another current of thought encompasses the so-called political theories, which defend that companies have a political action of intervention in society through CSR (e.g., Altman, 1998; Bowen, 1953; Davis, 1973; Hay et al., 1976; McGuire, 1963). Other authors also relate CSR to ethical values (e.g., Matten et al., 2003; Mulligan, 1986; Wood, 1991; Wood & Logsdon, 2002), arguing that these are an obligation for organisations.

In the 2010 decade, the studies focused on how managers can implement and obtain results from CSR policies (Carvalho et al., 2014), even in countries at the 'bottom of the pyramid' (e.g., Hart and Sharma, 2004; Prahalad, 2010). CSR cannot be based only on charity and altruism; Carroll's approach seems solid in the literature, associating economic, legal and ethical responsibilities with philanthropic

responsibilities if possible (Lantos, 2002). Strategically, it is more important to society for organizational activities to have an increased social responsibility to stakeholders than to expect philanthropic performance.

In short, the interest in studying social responsibility extends to different elements of the business, social, and academic community, among others (Rivera et al., 2019). For Acuña-Moraga et al. (2019), there are multiple definitions of social responsibility resulting from multiple models, concepts, instruments used to measure it, variables and indicators that assess corporate social responsibility actions, etc. Therefore, understanding the concept of social responsibility implies analysing an immense variety of ideologies that judge it in numerous and different ways.

In this context, a new question arises: to what extent do individuals who are CSR agents in organisations relate to it through their individual social responsibility? How have the relationships between CSR and ISR been developed in the literature? We know that individual social responsibility will depend on multiple social, cultural, educational and psychological factors, but to what extent has the scientific literature addressed these interrelationships? To answer this question, we undertake a systematic scoping review as the most appropriate method to interpret and synthesise international research about ISR and its relationships. This extensive coverage of the literature on this topic allows us to clarify concepts and unveil research gaps (Munn et al., 2018).

2 METHODS

We followed the path of Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) methodological framework for scoping reviews, with a five-phase approach: (1) developing a research question; (2) systematically identifying relevant studies; (3) charting the data; and (4) and (5) collating and analysing the results.

This study seeks to ascertain how ISR and CSR have been related in the literature. Thus, the research question is: How have the relationships between CSR and ISR been developed in the literature?

It was systematically identified relevant studies by developing a search protocol that included eleven databases and publishers: Academic Search Complete, Cinahl, Elsevier, Journal Citation Reports, Medline, Psychology & Behavioural Science, Sage, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Web of Science, and Wiley.

The search terms adopted as keywords were: 'corporate social responsibility OR CSR OR social responsibility of business' AND 'individual social responsibility OR personal social responsibility'.

It found 17 articles. However, based on papers referenced by these articles, it was possible to identify six more articles that did not present CSR or ISR in their keywords. Still, they had the potential to enhance our research. After analysing these articles, 12 were set aside due to the exclusion criteria presented below, leaving 11 as the base for this study.

Inclusion Criteria: In scholarly journals, we searched for full-text articles published in English between 2014 and 2022. This range was automatically constructed by the database search software, using the data of the first and last articles in time. Some other earlier peer-reviewed scholarly manuscripts were included when referenced by the papers chosen for this scoping review and presented some issues important to the studied topic. The search was conducted in October 2022.

Exclusion Criteria: Articles were excluded when they aimed at studying issues related to personal social values but without any theoretical or practical relation to CSR.

We used charting to reach a consensus on relevant information to extract from all included studies considering the conceptual framework and research questions. This activity involved coding for descriptive characteristics of studies using a qualitative approach. We analysed the conceptualisations of the relation between CSR and ISR. Each author independently analysed and charted the three studies comparing the results. One discussed discrepancy to reach a consensus concerning the analysis framework.

The review of the selected studies is presented and analysed in terms of their objectives, methodologies, and results. Because this subject is recent in scientific research, there need to be more frameworks to help the analysis. However, in this exploratory approach, one can notice what research questions the researchers propose, starting to see if they studied one- or two-direction relationships between CSR and ISR.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The 11 relevant articles in the scoping review are summarised in Table 1. This table identifies the authors and location of the eleven studies, including objectives, methodology and conclusions. Five articles used quantitative research methods, four

qualitative, and two were only theoretical elaboration. The USA had three studies, India and Pakistan two, and France and Iran one each. The aims of the studies include the analysis of the impact of CSR on ISR using diverse approaches (Abbas & Dogan, 2022; Farid et al., 2019; Glavas, 2016; Lu et al., 2021; Mallory et al., 2021); theoretical and practical development of the concept of ISR in CSR context (Bénédou & Tirole, 2010; Davis et al., 2017, 2021; Olsen et al., 2018); a study of the mutual influence between CSR and ISR (Venkatesh et al., 2021); and a study that relates CSR and ISR with Yoga principles (Dayananda Swamy & Babu, 2021). All the quantitative studies presented scales based on the literature to measure the variables within the proposed models, assuming that many are latent variables. Three of these quantitative studies used structural equation modelling and two regression analysis.

These studies conclude that CSR and ISR are intertwined and could be considered favourable to organisational reputation, positively impacting their performance and results. Moreover, the presence of CSR could help the workers be more satisfied with their activity, and the enhancement of ISR helps organisations be more socially responsible. In summary, organisations are also made of people, and people's needs are the primary motive for their existence. As Bénédou and Tirole concluded, ISR could be based on motives like intrinsic altruism, material incentives (defined by law and taxes) and social- or self-esteem concerns.

This study aims at analysing the mutual impacts between CSR and ISR. It was discovered that ISR is a recent concept in the scope of CSR literature. ISR could be considered a moral notion as an individual responsibility to society (Bénéadou & Tirole, 2010) or CSR at the individual level (Farid et al., 2019). Also, ISR can be seen as the way people perform in their daily life - and not only as consumers - basing their decisions on a desire to maximise the positive impacts on the social, environmental and economic dimensions in the long run (Davis et al., 2017).

In organizational psychology, studies about micro-CSR, i.e., the relationship between individual characteristics (e.g., personality) and employees' engagement in socially responsible behaviours, were reviewed by Gond et al. (2017). However, these authors did not consider the new concept of ISR in management, focusing their revision on the individual drivers, evaluations, and reactions to CSR. Some studies approached the impact of the employees' positive perception of CSR on their actions (e.g., Glavas & Piderit, 2009), showing the importance of

CSR for internal stakeholders (e.g., Aguilera et al., 2010; Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010; Rupp et al., 2013), influencing their job satisfaction (e.g., Glavas & Kelley, 2014; Valentine & Fleischman, 2008) and work engagement (e.g., Caligiuri et al., 2013; Gao et al., 2017). The study of Mallory et al. (2021) is in the same line, linking the findings on employee CSR perceptions with the psychological research of socially responsible behaviours to get closer to modelling the psychology of CSR. Bénédou and Tirole (2010) also reflected on the psychology and economics of prosocial behaviour, linking individual concerns and interests to CSR and debating the benefits, costs and limits of socially responsible behaviour as a means to further societal goals.

Voluntary work engaged in CSR causes and collaborators' stories used as inspiration for social intervention purposes are a mutual example of the inter-relationship between CSR and ISR (Venkatesh et al., 2021). Some organisations grant their collaborators hours to develop their ISR opportunities (Venkatesh et al., 2021).

Organizational culture could be a model for shaping employees' attitudes, behaviours, and moral values (e.g., Abbas & Dogan, 2022; Ansari et al., 2021). Moreover, Peng et al. (2014) found that the four cultural dimensions of Hofstede (1980) could predict the firm's CSR engagement, showing a new attractive stream for research. Another crucial factor for increasing ISR and CSR could be organizational support to motivate employees' participation in socially responsible activities (e.g., Basil et al., 2009; Caligiuri et al., 2013).

Thus, this new concept, ISR or personal social responsibility (PSR), is considered a base for CSR organizational strategies (Davis et al., 2017), comprising total human behaviour beyond consumption (Davis et al., 2021). More, Davis et al. (2021) developed a scale to measure PSR based on the literature related to consumer-responsible behaviour (e.g., Anderson & Cunningham, 1972; Fisk, 1973), ethical consumption (e.g., Barnett et al., 2005; Miller, 1998), and CSR, namely Carroll's (1979, 1999) approach with economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary dimensions. Their previous study in 2017 led them to include, as a distinctive dimension, environmental responsibility, which has also been mentioned in the consumer behaviour literature (e.g., Freestone & McGoldrick, 2008; Straughan & Roberts, 1999). Consequently, the final PSR scale remained with five dimensions measured by 19 items: economic (3), legal (3), ethical (4), environmental (4), and discretionary/philanthropic (5).

Table 1: Descriptive characteristics of the eleven selected studies.

Reference & Country	Objectives	Methods	Sample	Instrument/data analysis	Conclusions
Dayananda Swamy & Babu (2021) India	To relate CSR and ISR with Yoga principles.	Theoretical analysis based on Yoga texts and CSR and ISR definitions.	N/A	Theoretical analysis	Philosophical Yoga principles should be incorporated by ISR, which leads to CSR.
Venkatesh et al. (2021) India	1. To understand the nature of CSR activities that IT companies in India indulge in; 2. To determine if working for responsible companies makes employees happier; 3. To evaluate whether responsible companies motivate employees towards ISR; 4. To assess whether individual employees' ISR behaviour impacts the behaviour of team members; and 5. To assess whether individual employees' ISR behaviour impacts the CSR policies and practices of the firm.	Personal and in-depth interviews conducted with the executives of the six companies chosen for this study.	Six corporate organizations in the new-age category spread across IT and Information Technology Enabled Services (ITES) sector.	A semi-structured interview discussion guide with 14 questions. Information brochures from the participating organizations. Content analysis.	Most companies... - reported a positive outlook towards the mandated CSR policy of the Government of India. - have integrated CSR within their overall corporate policy. - undertake an approach including project-led and event-led CSR activities. - provided unlimited support concerning employee involvement in CSR. Participation in CSR elevates the happiness quotient of volunteering employees.
Farid et al. (2019) Pakistan	To examine the influence of employees' perceptions of CSR related to organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and work engagement through the mediation of distributive and procedural justice (a moral and psychological component).	Survey with a self-administered questionnaire	Convenient sample of 350 employees working in the banking sector of Pakistan	Scales to measure employees' perceptions of CSR, distributive justice and procedural justice, work engagement, and OCB. Regression analysis.	Employees' perceptions of CSR positively predict OCB and work engagement. Both distributive and procedural justice positively mediate the effects of employees' perceptions of CSR on OCB and work engagement.
Glavas (2016) USA	Exploring the relationship between CSR and employee engagement.	Workplace survey.	15,184 employees in a large professional service firm.	Scales to measure employees' perceptions of CSR, employee engagement, authenticity, and extra-role involvement in CSR (single item). Structural equation modelling analysis.	Authenticity (i.e., showing one's whole self at work) positively and significantly mediates the relationship between CSR and employee engagement. However, perceived organizational support did not significantly mediate the relationship. When CSR is extra-role, it weakens the relationship between CSR and employee engagement. A bottom-up approach might reveal that the more employees can give of their whole selves, the more engaged they might be at work.
Lu et al. (2021) Iran	To analyse the influence of CSR on a firms' sales growth and to assess the mediating role of competitive advantage and the moderating role of the employee's individual belief of social responsibility on the relationship between CSR and sales growth of small and medium enterprises.	Survey.	107 small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the consumption and manufacturing industry of a developing country.	Scales to measure the four dimensions of CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary), competitive advantage, employees' beliefs of social responsibility, and sale growth. Structural equation modelling analysis.	The link between CSR and sales growth is mediated through competitive advantage, and the positive impact of CSR on sales growth is moderated by the employee's individual belief in social responsibility.
Abbas & Dogan (2022) Pakistan	To examine the effect of organizational green culture (OGC) and CSR activities on employees' responsible behaviour towards the society (ERBS) outside their organizations.	Survey.	301 employees of public and private manufacturing and services firms	Scales to measure OGC, CSR, and ERBS. Structural equation modelling analysis.	OGC and CSR activities significantly reshape employees' behaviour, and they tend to behave in a socially responsible manner in society. The relationship between OGC and ERBS' is partially mediated by CSR. Female workers tend to behave more socially responsibly than male workers.
Olsen et al. (2018) USA	To investigate tourism professionals' purpose(s) for engaging in tourism-centred volunteer tourism opportunities and compares tourism professional motives with motives of volunteer tourists.	Interviews.	Purposive sampling with 23 interviews with tourism professionals.	A qualitative phenomenological approach, using a constructivist lens, was used to examine tourism professionals' motives to volunteer in a multi-day philanthropic event.	Tourism professionals' motives to volunteer for the tourism industry are linked to the common good approach and the sustaining of the tourism product, which directly affects tourism professionals' livelihood. There are hedonic, utilitarian, and corporate motives.
Davis et al. (2017) Spain	Introducing Personal Social Responsibility as a new concept, based on Corporate and Consumer Social Responsibility, and providing a theoretical framework as a starting point for future empirical research.	Theoretical analysis.	In-depth interviews to four researchers and a focus group interview with six consumers selected by convenience.	Qualitative research (in-depth interviews and a focus group).	Definition and justification of the concept of Personal Social Responsibility (PSR).
Davis et al. (2021) Spain	Development and validation of a scale to measure Personal Social Responsibility (PSR), a concept that comprises individual behaviours from the perspective of the individual as a citizen.	The items were generated based on the literature review and qualitative research (in-depth interviews with four researchers, a focus group with six consumers, and a panel of three experts.	138 participants.	Qualitative research (in-depth interviews, a focus group, and an expert panel). Structural equation modelling analysis.	The construct of PSR comprises the economic, legal, ethical, philanthropic, and environmental dimensions of individual behaviour. Perceived consumer effectiveness and collectivism have a positive influence on personal responsibility behaviours and being more responsible leads to higher levels of self-esteem and satisfaction with life.
Mallory et al. (2021) USA	To explore the antecedents and consequences of felt responsibility for constructive change within the context of CSR.	Survey.	135 employees from a small public liberal arts university.	Scales to measure Proactive personality, Felt responsibility for constructive change, Employee perceptions of CSR, CSR behaviours, General socially responsible behaviours, and Counterproductive work behaviour. Regression analysis.	A proactive personality drives socially responsible behaviours via felt responsibility, but when individuals perceive a high level of CSR, the predictive power of felt responsibility is diminished (illustrating the potential power of socially responsible workplace environments). Internal CSR communication strategies may play an important role in encouraging prosocial behaviours of even those employees less predisposed to be socially responsible.
Bénabou and Tirole (2010) France	To shed some light on socially responsible behaviour (SRB), its future and its limits.	Theoretical analysis around CSR and ISR.	N/A	Theoretical analysis.	SRB holds real promise, if we understand its motivations and limitations. There are three possible understandings of corporate social responsibility: the adoption of a more long-term perspective, the delegated exercise of philanthropy on behalf of stakeholders, and insider-initiated corporate philanthropy. The latter two build on individual social responsibility, which led us to review individual motivations for prosocial behaviour. We saw that prosocial behaviour by investors, consumers and workers is driven by a complex set of motives: intrinsic altruism, material incentives (defined by law and taxes) and social- or self-esteem concerns.

Nevertheless, this research stream has excellent potential for future investigation. Faris et al. (2019) considered that there are gaps related to the moral and psychological aspects that still need to be solved. Gond et al. (2017) presented six ideas for further development that are adapted here: (1) exploration of the interactions among CSR drivers; (2) ISR construct clarification and measure development; (3) bridging the underlying mechanisms of CSR reactions; (4) considering new and more relevant individual differences; (5) exploring new constructs related to CSR; and (6) incorporate individual-level dynamics and learning processes. We add to this list another idea for future research: to develop a broad model that includes social responsibility at the individual (ISR), organizational (CSR), and societal levels (SSR – Societal Social Responsibility), studying their different impacts in different cultures.

4 CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to answer the following research question: How have the relationships between CSR and ISR been developed in the literature? The literature is still scarce and dispersed. We chose 11 articles that presented theoretical reflections and quantitative and qualitative approaches to the relationships between CSR and ISR. These diverse approaches to this topic started with the CSR concept and its evolution and continued with the individual approach and their relationships, mainly using psychological aspects. Today, a growing body of knowledge about the relationships between CSR and ISR led recently to the development of a scale to measure Personal Social Responsibility, which goes beyond consumer or organizational behaviours. In general, the impact on society, and even on organizational performance, is considered positive.

There is a need for new modelling approaches that give us broader insights into what happens in the inter-relationships among the contextual, behavioural, and performance variables related to the social responsibility of individuals, organizations and communities. Moreover, including topics like ethics and sustainability in future models is inevitable.

Thus, as with any phenomena study, one needs a multi-transdisciplinary approach to understand all the complexities of human behaviour and its reflection on organizations and society.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, J. & Dogan, E. (2022). The impacts of organizational green culture and corporate social responsibility on employees' responsible behaviour towards the society. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29, 60024–60034. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-20072-w>
- Acuña-Moraga, O.E., & Severino González, P.E. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage. The study of small mining companies in Chile. *Revista Encuentros*, 17(02). <https://doi.org/10.15665/encuent.v17i02.979>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.25275678>
- Altman, B. (1998). Corporate community relations in the 1990s: a study in transformation. *Business & Society*, 37(2), 221–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039803700205>
- Anderson, W.T., Jr., & Cunningham, W.H. (1972). The socially conscious consumer. *Journal of Marketing*, 36(3), 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251036>
- Ansari, N.Y., Farrukh, M., & Raza, A. (2021). Green human resource management and employees pro-environmental behaviours: Examining the underlying mechanism. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(1), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2044>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Toward a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Arlow, P., & Gannon, M. J. (1982). Social responsiveness, corporate structure, and economic performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(2), 235–341. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1982.4285580>
- Ashley, P.A. (2005). *Ética e responsabilidade social nos negócios* [Ethics and social responsibility in business]. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Saraiva.
- Aupperle, K.E., Carroll, A.B., & Hatfield, J.D. (1985). An empirical investigation of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(2), 446–463. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256210>
- Barnard, C.I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnett, C., Cafaro, P., & Newholm, T. (2005). Philosophy and ethical consumption. In T. Newholm, D. Shaw, & R. Harrison (Eds.), *The ethical consumer* (pp. 11–24). Sage. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446211991.n2>
- Basil, D.Z., Runte, M.S., Easwaramoorthy, M., & Barr, C. (2009). Company support for employee volunteering: A national survey of companies in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 387–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9741-0>

- Bénadou, R., & Tirole, J. (2010). Individual and corporate social responsibility. *Economica*, 77, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2009.00843.x>
- Bowen, H.R. (1953). *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Caligiuri, P., Mencin, A., & Jiang, K. (2013). Win-win-win: The influence of company-sponsored volunteerism programs on employees, NGOs, and business units. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 825–860. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12019>
- Carroll, A.B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257850>
- Carroll, A.B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>
- Carvalho, J.M.S., Jonker, J., & Dentchev, N. (2014). What's in a word? An exploration of the changes in meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility over the last century with an emphasis on the last decades. In D. Turker, H. Toke & C. Altuntas (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 1–18). Lexington Books.
- Clark, J.M. (1939). *Social control of business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*, 2, 70–76.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 312–322. <https://doi.org/10.5465/255331>
- Davis, K., & Blomstrom, R.L. (1966). *Business and its environment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Davis, S.L., Rives, L.M., & Ruiz-de-Maya, S. (2017). Introducing personal social responsibility as a key element to upgrade CSR. *Spanish Journal of Marketing – ESIC*, 21, 146–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sjme.2017.04.001>
- Davis, S.L., Rives, L.M., & Ruiz-de-Maya, S. (2021). Personal social responsibility: Scale development and validation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28, 763–775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/csr.2086>
- Dayananda Swamy, H. R., Nagarajan, K., & Babu, N. (2021). Yogic principles of artha and dāna with reference to individual and corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Yoga*, 14, 248–55. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijoy.ijoy_106_21
- De Bakker, F., Groenewegen, P., & Den Hond, F. (2005). A bibliometric analysis of 30 years research and theory on corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance. *Business & Society*, 44(3), 283–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650305278086>
- Drucker, P.F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Collins, 2006.
- Epstein, E.M. (1987). The corporate social policy process: Beyond business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social responsiveness. *California Management Review*, 29(3), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165254>
- Faria, M.J.S. (2015). *Responsabilidade Social Empresarial - Relato e análise econômica e financeira* [Corporate Social Responsibility - Economic and financial reporting and analysis]. Porto: Grupo Editorial Vida Econômica.
- Farid, T., Iqbal, S., Ma, J., Castro-González, S., Khattak, A., & Khan, M.K. (2019). Employees' perceptions of CSR, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effects of organizational justice. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16, 1731. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16101731>
- Fisk, G. (1973). Criteria for a theory of responsible consumption. *Journal of Marketing*, 37(2), 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1250047>
- Fitch, H.G. (1976). Achieving corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 1, 38–46.
- Fonseca, D.E.M. (2017). A importância do conceito de Responsabilidade Social das Empresas. *Comunicação*, 37, 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.18566/comunica.n37.a06>
- Frederick, W. (1960). The growing concern over business responsibility. *California Management Review*, 2, 54–61.
- Freestone, O.M., & McGoldrick, P.J. (2008). Motivations of the ethical consumer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(4), 445–467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9409-1>
- Freeman, E.R., & Stoner, J.A.F. (1992). *Administração [Management]*. Rio de Janeiro: Prentice Hall.
- Friedman M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, September 13, pp. 32–33.
- Gao, Y., Zhang, D., & Huo, Y. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and work engagement: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 33, 661–673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9517-6>
- Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(12), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000039399.90587.34>
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers of Psychology*, 7, 796. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00796>
- Glavas, A., & Kelley, K. (2014). The Effects of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(2), 165–202. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq20143206>
- Glavas, A., & Piderit, S.K. (2009). How does doing good matter? Effects of corporate citizenship on employees. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 36, 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2009.wi.00007>

- Gond, J.-P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2-Special issue), 225-246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2170>
- Griffin, J.J., & Mahon, J.F. (1997). The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: Twenty-five years of incomparable research. *Business & Society*, 36(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039703600102>
- Hart, S.L., & Sharma, S. (2004). Engaging fringe stakeholders for competitive imagination. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2004.12691227>
- Hay, R., Gray, E.R., & Gates, J.E. (1976). *Business and Society*. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern Publishing.
- Henriques, A. (2010). *Corporate Impact – Measuring and Managing your Social Footprint*. London: Earthscan.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, H.L. (1971). *Business in contemporary society: Framework and issues*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Jones, T. (1996). Missing the forest for the trees: A critique of the social responsibility concept and discourse. *Business & Society*, 35(1), 7–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039603500102>
- Kanji, G.K., & Chopra, P.K. (2007). Poverty as system: Human contestability approach to poverty measurement. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 34, 1135–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02664760701619142>
- Kanji, G.K., & Chopra, P.K. (2009). Psychosocial system for work well-being: On measuring work stress by causal pathway. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 20, 563–580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360902875741>
- Kanji, G.K., & Chopra, P.K. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in a global economy. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 21(2), 119-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360903549808>
- Kreps, T.J. (1940). Measurement of the social performance of business. In: *An investigation of concentration of economic power for the temporary national economic committee* (Monograph No. 7). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lantos, G.P. (2002). The ethicality of altruistic corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(2-3), 205–230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760210426049>
- Lee, M. (2008). A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(1), 53-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00226.x>
- Levitt, T. (1958). The dangers of social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 36(5), 41-50.
- Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Review*, 12(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00277.x>
- Lu, J., Rong, D., Zhang, C., Wang, C., Saeidi, P., & Streimikis, J. (2021). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility and sales growth of small and medium enterprises: A combined case study in the light of a literature review. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 18(2), 177-197.
- Maignan, I., Ferrell, O.C., & Hult, T. (1999). Corporate Citizenship: Cultural Antecedents and Business Benefits. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(4), 455-469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070399274005>
- Maignan, I., & Ralston, D.A. (2002). Corporate social responsibility in Europe and the U.S.: Insights from businesses' self-presentations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(3), 497–514. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8491028>
- Mallory, D.B., Rupp, D.E., Pandey, N., & Tay, L. (2021). The effect of employee proactive personality and felt responsibility on individual corporate social responsibility behaviors: The CSR context matters. *Journal of Sustainability Research*, 3(1), e210002. <https://doi.org/10.20900/jsr20210002>
- Margolis, J.D., & Walsh, J.P. (2001). *People and profits? The search for a link between company's social and financial performance*. New Jersey: Mahwah.
- Margolis, J.D., & Walsh, J.P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268–305. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3556659>
- Matten, D., Crane, A., & Chapple, W. (2003). Behind the mask: revealing the true face of corporate citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(1/2), 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024128730308>
- McElroy, M.W., Jorna, R.J., & van Engelen, J. (2008). Sustainability Quotients and the Social Footprint. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15, 223–234. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.164>
- McGuire, J.W. (1963). *Business and society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117-127. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259398>
- Miller, D. (1998). *A theory of shopping*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Munn, Z., Peters, M.D.J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18, 143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
- Mulligan, T. (1986). A critique of Milton Friedman's essay —the social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 5, 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00383091>
- Olsen, L.M., Vogt, C., & Andereck, K. (2018). Sustaining the common good: Tourism professional motives to volunteer for the tourism industry. *Tourism Recreation*

- Research*, 43(1), 68-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2017.1371474>
- Ostermeier, K., Soelberg, C., Sigdya, P., & Xu, L. (2015). Individual Social Responsibility [ISR]: *An Antecedent to CSR and Intentions to Work*. St. Pete Beach, Florida: Southern Management Association. Retrieved from: <https://slideplayer.com/slide/13266594/> (Accessed on October 23th 2022)
- Parra, C., Ripoll-i-Alcon, J., & Martí, G. (2017). Putting in Value Corporate Social Responsibility. *Symphony: Emerging Issues in Management*, 1, 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.4468/2017.1.09parra.riponialcon.marti>
- Peng, Y., Dashdeleg, A., & Chih, H.L. (2014). National culture and firm's CSR engagement: A cross-nation study. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 5(1), 38–49.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (2002). *The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy*. Harvard Business Review, 80(12), 56–68.
- Prahalad, C.K. (2010). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits* (revised and updated 5th anniversary edition). New Jersey: Wharton School Publishing.
- Rivera, J.J., Bigne, E., & Curras-Perez, R. (2019). Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility on consumer brand loyalty. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios*, 21(3), 395–415. <https://doi.org/10.7819/rbgn.v21i3.4003>
- Roman, R.M., Hayibor, S., & Agle, B.R. (1999). The relationship between social and financial performance: Repainting a portrait. *Business & Society*, 38(1), 109–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800105>
- Rupp, D.E., Shao, R., Thornton, M.A., & Skarlicki, D.P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 895–933. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12030>
- Sebastião, S.P. (2009). *Comunicação estratégica. As Relações Públicas* [Strategic communication. Public Relations]. Lisboa: Guide-Artes Gráficas.
- Sheldon, O. (1924). *The Philosophy of Management*. London, New York: Pitman.
- Straughan, R.D., & Roberts, J.A. (1999). Environmental segmentation alternatives: A look at green consumer behavior in the new millennium. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16(6), 558-575. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769910297506>
- Valentine, S., & Fleischman, G. (2008). Ethics programs, perceived corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77, 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9306-z>
- Venkatesh, U., Chaudhuri, A., & Mathew, J. (2021). Benevolence in new-age businesses of developing economies: Some conclusions from the information technology companies/sector of India. *Journal of Human Values*, 27(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685820973187>
- Wartick, S.L., & Cochran, P.L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 758–769. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279099>
- Windsor, D. (2001). The future of corporate social responsibility. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(3), 225–256. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028934>
- Wood, D.J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691–718. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258977>
- Wood, D.J. (2000). Theory and integrity in business and society. *Business & Society*, 39(4), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765030003900402>
- Wood, D.J., & Logsdon, J.M. (2002). Business citizenship: from domestic to global level of analysis. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12(2), 155–187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3857809>