p-ISSN : 2708-2474 | e-ISSN : 2708-2482
DOI(Journal): 10.31703/gmsr
DOI(Volume): 10.31703/gmsr/.2024(IX)
DOI(Issue): 10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX.I)

www.gmsrjournal.com

GMSR
Global Management Sciences Review
managing humanity

GMSR

GLOBAL MANAGEMENT SCIENCES REVIEW

HEC-RECOGNIZED CATEGORY-Y

VOL. IX, ISSUE I, WINTER (MARCH-2024)

Double-blind Peer-review Research Journal
www.gmsrjournal.com

HumanityPublications
sharing research
www.humapub.com
US | UK | Pakistan

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Article title

Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review

Global Management Sciences Review

p-ISSN: 2708-2474 e-ISSN: 2708-2482
DOI(journal): 10.31703/gmsr
Volume: IX (2024)
DOI (volume): 10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX)
Issue: I (Winter-March 2024)
DOI(Issue): 10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I)

Home Page
www.gmsrjournal.com

Volume: IX (2024)
https://www.gmsrjournal.com/issues

Issue: I-Winter (March-2024)
https://www.gmsrjournal.com/issues/9/1/2024

Scope
https://gmsrjournal.com/about-us/aims-and-scope

Submission
https://humaglobe.com/index.php/gmsr/submissions

Google Schlor

Visit Us

Abstract

The major points are summed up in this. Looking at the causal effects of these two forms of governance on CSR involvement, the goal of this work is to establish the empirical link between "corporate governance (CG) and corporate social responsibility (CSR)". Initially, delayed "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)" seems to have minimal effect on "Corporate Governance (CG)". On the other hand, delaying the CG variable favours corporate involvement in CSR projects. This is still the case when one takes into account other aspects unique to the company. We use a sizable and varied American sample. Agency theory and stakeholder theory are examined in connection to CFP and CSR. The purpose is to prioritise these three concepts. Despite endogeneity bias, CSR actions boost corporate CFP. The facts do not support stakeholder conflict-resolution theory or agency CSR overinvestment hypothesis. CFP growth is also driven by company diversification, worker, community, and environment programmes.

Key Words: Social Responsibility, Endogenous, Corporation, Conflict.

Authors:

Muhammad Shoaib: Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Farooq Shah: (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, CECOS University Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.
Email:(farooq@cecos.edu.pk)

Shiraz Khan: Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences at CECOS University Peshawar,KP, Pakistan.

Pages: 24-28
DOI:10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03
DOI link: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03
Article link: https://gmsrjournal.com/article/effect-of-corporate-governance-on-corporate-social-responsibility-a-theoretical-review
Full-text Link: https://gmsrjournal.com/fulltext/effect-of-corporate-governance-on-corporate-social-responsibility-a-theoretical-review
Pdf link: https://www.humapub.com/admin/alljournals/gmsr/papers/klBHMkk0JC.pdf

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Citing Article

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">02</td><td colspan="7">Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review</td></tr>
<tr><td>Author</td><td colspan="2">Muhammad Shoaib
Farooq Shah
Shiraz Khan</td><td>DOI</td><td colspan="3">10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pages</td><td>24 - 28</td><td>Year</td><td>2024</td><td>Volume</td><td>IX</td><td>Issue</td><td>I</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="7">Referencing & Citing Styles</td><td>APA</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, M., Shah, F., & Khan, S. (2024). Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review. Global Management Sciences Review, IX(I), 24-28. https://doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03</td></tr>
<tr><td>CHICAGO</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, Muhammad, Farooq Shah, and Shiraz Khan. 2024. "Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review." Global Management Sciences Review IX (I):24-28. doi: 10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03.</td></tr>
<tr><td>HARVARD</td><td colspan="6">SHOAIB, M., SHAH, F. & KHAN, S. 2024. Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review. Global Management Sciences Review, IX, 24-28.</td></tr>
<tr><td>MHRA</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, Muhammad, Farooq Shah, and Shiraz Khan. 2024. 'Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review', Global Management Sciences Review, IX: 24-28.</td></tr>
<tr><td>MLA</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, Muhammad, Farooq Shah, and Shiraz Khan. "Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review." Global Management Sciences Review IX.I (2024): 24-28. Print.</td></tr>
<tr><td>OXFORD</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, Muhammad, Shah, Farooq, and Khan, Shiraz (2024), 'Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review', Global Management Sciences Review, IX (I), 24-28.</td></tr>
<tr><td>TURABIAN</td><td colspan="6">Shoaib, Muhammad, Farooq Shah, and Shiraz Khan. "Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review." Global Management Sciences Review IX, no. I (2024): 24-28. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03.</td></tr>
</table>

e-ISSN: 2708-2482 Volume: IX (2024) Issue: I-Winter (March-2024) p-ISSN: 2708-2474

Global Management Sciences Review
www.gmsrjournal.com
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gmsr

Pages: 24-28 URL: https://doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03 Doi: 10.31703/gmsr.2024(IX-I).03

Cite Us

Title

Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Review

Abstract

The major points are summed up in this. Looking at the causal effects of these two forms of governance on CSR involvement, the goal of this work is to establish the empirical link between "corporate governance (CG) and corporate social responsibility (CSR)". Initially, delayed "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)" seems to have minimal effect on "Corporate Governance (CG)". On the other hand, delaying the CG variable favors corporate involvement in CSR projects. This is still the case when one takes into account other aspects unique to the company. We use a sizable and varied American sample. Agency theory and stakeholder theory are examined in connection to CFP and CSR. The purpose is to priorities these three concepts. Despite indigeneity bias, CSR actions boost corporate CFP. The facts do not support stakeholder conflict-resolution theory or agency CSR overinvestment hypothesis. CFP growth is also driven by company diversification, worker, community, and environment programmers.

Keywords: Social Responsibility, Endogenous, Corporation, Conflict

Contents

Authors:

Muhammad Shoaib: Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Farooq Shah: (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, CECOS University Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.
Email:(farooq@cecos.edu.pk)

Shiraz Khan: Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences at CECOS University Peshawar,KP, Pakistan.

Introduction

Throughout the last few years, academics and business experts have extensively researched "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" programmers and what constitutes effective "corporate governance (CG)" procedures. Ever since 1960, at least, financial performance, corporate governance, & CSR have been hot topics of discussion. Corporate social responsibility, abbreviated CSR, is one notion showing how committed companies are to helping the communities where they operate. There hasn't been much study done on "corporate governance (CG), corporate social responsibility (CSR), or certified financial planners (CFPs)" up until recently. While doing his research, Margolis carried out several studies. Concerning Freeman (1984), a business keeps in constant communication with all its interested stakeholders. Among the numerous parties that are stakeholders are news sources, government organizations, consumer & environmental advocacy organizations, and many more. Though CSR is entirely optional, Wood (1991) counsels managers to apply their discretion in all facets of the issue to get results that are acceptable to society. In view of the connections between CFP, CG, & CSR, this research examines the connection between agency theory, stakeholder theory, and CSR. This will be done initially by investigating the connection between CSR and corporate governance, or CG. The effect of CSR upon CG and, hence, CFP (the bottom line of the company) is the main topic of this study. More and more, works on "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" are referencing stakeholder theory. How CSR initiatives impact value & general significance has been a hot topic of conversation. It is divisive since views regarding what "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" is as well as how to define it differ. One could contend that the next natural step for a business is to implement good "corporate governance (CG)". The emphasis CG places on ethical business conduct & social responsibility is a key component of their sustainability strategy. And at last intentional acts of kindness were recognized for who they are. According to Carroll (2000), companies can pursue both ethical behavior and financial success, and perhaps should. Studies refuting this claim show that businesses cannot ignore social and economic concerns at the same time. In 2001, McWilliams and Siegel defined "corporate social responsibility" (CSR) of a company as pursuing financial success for the company as well as meeting its legal responsibilities and enhancing society. Beyond a company's financial, legal, & technological objectives, the social component is the main emphasis of most CSR definitions (Carroll 2008). Through their "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" initiatives, companies go much beyond what is mandated by law to support people, communities, & the environment. The agency theory of Jensen and Mackling forms the basis of the overinvestment hypothesis proposed by "Barnea and Rubin (2010)". This idea has as its foundation the agency hypothesis. Proponents of this viewpoint contend that corporate CSR programmers are worthless unless they raise the worth of the company. The authors claim that people who have inside knowledge are more likely to make significant CSR investments. Researchers investigate in-depth if ownership & financial structures of a firm affect its CSR scores. According to the overinvestment argument, "corporate governance (CG)" programmers and CSR are incompatible since CSR is linked to negative results. Competence with cost management is most often linked to strong corporate governance. We also expect a negative relationship between CFP and CSR because excessive investment harms CFP. At the same time, conflict resolution is getting more and more attention. Data gathered by "Jensen (2002), Calton and Payne (2003), Campbell, (1996), Cespa and Cestone (2007), and Harjoto and Jo (2011)" bolsters these claims. According to the stakeholder theory put forth by Freeman (1984), "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" ought to be applied in addition to good business management. This is especially valid for resolving conflicts between management & parties apart from investors. The instrumental component is built upon the difference between normative, instrumental, & descriptive definitions for stakeholders as described by "Donaldson and Preston (1995)". Conflicts of interest can develop between other stakeholders and management, who usually owns shares in the company; CSR-compliant companies are better prepared to handle these situations. The CFP, or financial health for the company, is improved by this. Conflict resolution theory states a favorable correlation between active participation in CSR & well-functioning corporate governance systems. Moreover, CFP & CSR need to be intimately intertwined. One of the goals of social responsibility programmers is to lessen the likelihood of bias and dispute between stakeholders and the management. All parties require accountability and openness, not just shareholders. Furthermore, this has an impact on the community at big. A lot of various activities fall under the category of "company social responsibility (CSR)". Then “Friedman (1970)" first defined "corporate social responsibility (CSR) "as follows: Application of business techniques to the benefit of shareholders is known as corporate social responsibility, or CSR. This usually involves maximizing profits while upholding social ideals, which encompass both moral and legal obligations. Hill et al. (2007), Gate wood and Carroll (1991) and Carroll (1979, 1991, 1999) have acknowledged the social, legal, ethical, & economic aspects of CSR. A firm deals with many different stakeholders during its life, as Freeman (1984) points out. Under the word "stakeholder" include companies, clients, news sources, environmental organizations, and even governmental agencies. In every aspect of CSR, Wood argues, managers need to exercise discretion (1991). Some decide on this beforehand. This research aims to assess the implications of stakeholder theory vs agency theory in the context of CFP, CG, and CSR partnerships. To that purpose, in order to establish a cause-and-effect link, we shall first investigate the relationship between CG and CSR. We next get into how CSR impacts CG and ultimately the CFP, or the company's financial performance. In the literature on "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" there is growing interest in stakeholder theory. Arguments over the general importance, value creation, and worth loss brought about by CSR programmers are still hot topics. It is controversial since many people have varied definitions of "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" and its significance. "Corporate social responsibility (CSR)" is a branch of strong corporate governance (CG), which by implementing moral business practices ensures the long-term survival of an organization. Later on, planned acts were also given charitable status. According to Carroll (2000), businesses may and ought to pursue their moral values and financial goals at the same time. Other research that show companies can only give social or financial concerns the same importance dispute this claim. According to McWilliams and Siegel (2001), "corporate social responsibility" (CSR) is actions made by a firm that are mandated by rules and that claim to benefit society beyond the company's own self-interests. Generally speaking, most definitions of "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" focus on its social component, which encompasses activities beyond what is required by law, economics, and technology (Carroll 2008). Companies follow "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" practices beyond what is required by law. Expanding upon "Jensen and Meckling's (1976) agency theory," Barnea and Rubin (2010) suggested overinvestment. This concept first appears in the agency theory. This point of view holds that "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" initiatives waste valuable resources and may even lower value if they do not help businesses maximize their value. The authors contend that people with access to private information are more likely to overspend on CSR initiatives. They investigate extensively to see whether the ownership or financial structure of a firm and its CSR rating are connected. The overinvestment argument shows that corporate social responsibility (CSR) and corporate governance (CG) are at odds since they are adversely connected. It should not come as a surprise that good company governance and the capacity to halt excessive investment go hand together. Overinvestment in corporate financial performance (CFP) is a given, hence a skewed relationship between CFP and CSR is expected. Published works on the idea of conflict resolution include those by "Jensen (2002), Calton and Payne (2003), Scherer et al. (2006), Cespa and Cestone (2007), and Harjoto and Jo (2011)". Stakeholder theory developed by Freeman (1984) implies that companies can use "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" as a means of establishing excellent corporate governance. Particular benefits from this could be in the resolution of conflicts between management and stakeholders who are not investors. Stakeholder definitions with their normative, instrumental, and descriptive properties provide the foundation of an instrumental component originally proposed by Donaldson and Preston (1995). Taking part in corporate social responsibility (CSR) helps you to handle any conflicts of interest that could develop between stakeholders—those who usually own shares in the business—and management. The company will so have better overall financial performance (CFP). Well functioning corporate governance systems and involvement in corporate social responsibility (CSR) are ideally related. Moreover, it is necessary to clearly distinguish between CFP (corporate financial performance) and social responsibility. CSR efforts try to reduce the potential of conflicts of interest between stakeholders and management. Shareholders need to be accountable and open just like other stakeholders. Moreover, this is true for the whole society. Definitions of CSR abound. Friedman (1970) proposed the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR), which consists of the subsequent: Corporate social responsibility, or CSR for short, is the application of shareholder-interested business practices by an enterprise. Usually, this means maintaining the basic principles of society, such moral and legal obligations, while maximizing profits. Social, legal, ethical, and economic are the four primary elements of corporate social responsibility as acknowledged by Hill et al. (2007), Carroll (1979, 1991, 1999), and Gatewood and Carroll (1991).

Methodology

Freeman (1984) argues that a corporation's contacts with its stakeholders are ongoing. Stakeholders include, among other things, governments, consumer and environmental advocacy groups, and the media. Wood (1991) argues that in order to achieve socially acceptable outcomes in all aspects including "corporate social responsibility (CSR)", managers must exercise discretion. You can easily back out of this agreement. This research evaluates, taking into account the relationships between CSR, "corporate governance (CG), and corporate financial performance (CFP)", the applicability of agency theory and stakeholder theory to "corporate social responsibility (CSR)". To that purpose, we will first look into the connection between "corporate governance (CG) and corporate social responsibility (CSR)". Next

Discussion

"Corporate governance (CG) and corporate social responsibility (CSR)" of a firm can raise its worth significantly. Using an indigeneity adjustment, we can appropriately handle this problem and explain the treatment's impact. Indigeneity ignorance makes it more likely that the worth of a corporation will be overestimated by corporate social responsibility. A company with a special organizational structure that chooses to start its CSR initiatives right away is said to be endogenous. Intimately related to CSR are many corporate governance rules. Engaging in CSR programs helps a company stand out from other, seemingly comparable companies and demonstrates its own personality. This is true since CSR activities have the ability to immediately affect the value of the business. Furthermore, companies with multiple "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" projects may require close observation from both internal and external sources. There is no widely utilized and efficient monitoring technique, therefore organizations engaged in CSR activities are unable to reduce management entrenchment. We now know why this is happening. Tobin's q regression analysis is a first approach to find out how CSR initiatives impact a company's value. This paper looks at a binary variable that represents the decision to participate in CSR (corporate social responsibility) activities. This variable is a part of a bigger research of governance and business-related problems. Companies who actively engage in "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" may, on the other hand, surpass their non-participating rivals in terms of quality and performance. The decision of the business to forego "corporate social responsibility (CSR)" is irrelevant. The coefficient of the CSR dummy variable contributes to convey the notion that CSR activities have value, even though it is false. If the indigeneity issue is not tackled at any point throughout the estimation process "Ordinary least squares estimate (OLS)" will yield subjectively biased parameter values. First to identify an indigeneity problem, Tobin (1958) provided statistical support for his assertion. Gauss-Markov assumption states that there should be no correlation between the error component and the independent variables. This theory is disproved by the corpus of evidence now at hand. As will be discussed in the explanation that follows, this infraction is directly caused by the process of choosing the dependent variables. The inverse Mills' ratio was part of a two-stage estimation technique that Heckman created between 1976 and 1979. Using this method was supposed to reduce indigeneity bias. First in the process to get a positive result from the dependent variable, or variable under examination, is a probity (or logit) model regression analysis. Building the inverse Mills' ratio using the parameters, it is then added as an extra explanatory variable to the OLS estimate (Greene, 2003). One can obtain an approximation of the inverse Mills' ratio by changing the settings. The indigeneity problem of the model is addressed by Heckman two-stage estimate. We evaluate the overall value of the organization in relation to CSR initiatives as well.

Conclusion

Although closely related, “corporate governance (CG), corporate social responsibility (CSR), and corporate financial performance (CFP)” have received little research attention. To start filling this information vacuum, we will look at the relationship between CSR, CFP and CG. More precisely, we wish to know whether and in what ways CSR influences CG, unilaterally or reciprocally. The relationships amongst these three ideas will thus become more evident. We project that CSR and CG will be adversely correlated based on the overinvestment hypothesis derived from agency theory. On the other hand, we postulate, using the conflict-resolution paradigm from stakeholder theory, a direct link between CSR and CG. After then, we will actively monitor any relevant events and assess the relationship between increased CFP and CSR involvement. The ideas of indigeneity and causation will be discussed as well. Our case is that excessive investment will cause CFP to encounter CSR. Companies could anticipate greater financial returns from the execution of CSR initiatives, according to the conflict-resolution hypothesis. These two topics are connected to one other. We gather information about every American business that participated in CSR projects between 1993 and 2004. We find that “corporate governance (CG)” is not much impacted by CSR evaluations. Delaying the assessment of “corporate governance (CG)” on the other hand, really encourages corporate social responsibility (CSR). This paper validates the idea that stakeholder theory may be helpful in resolving conflicts. But every statistic in this paper disproves the agency theory-based overinvestment hypothesis. “Corporate social responsibility (CSR)” so raises the value of a company, so confirming the conflict-resolution theory, particularly when the two-stage approach is applied. Strategic partnerships with businesses engaged in community development, environmental protection, and diversity promotion are possible to benefit the CFP. Moreover, our study shows a significant correlation and suggests that the degrees of CFP (Corporate Financial Performance) and CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) have been shifting. This is true even when one takes into account the possibility of prejudice against CFP as opposed to CSR stemming from business value. Moreover, I would want to convey my gratitude and my sincere apologies. In great part, guest editors Antonino Vaccaro and Michele Andreaus made the JBE special issue possible. We also like to express our gratitude to Luc Van Lied-ekerke, the other attendees of the 2010 EBEN annual conference, and the two anonymous assessors for their wise and useful criticism. For the financial support, Harjoto is grateful to the Julian Virtue Professorship endowment. Dona Maurer helped to improve the technique.

References

Barnea, A., & Rubin, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility as a conflict between shareholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *97*(1), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0496-z
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Calton, J. M., & Payne, S. L. (2003). Coping with paradox. *Business & Society*, *42*(1), 7–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650302250505
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Campbell, J. Y. (1996). Understanding risk and return. *Journal of Political Economy*, *104*(2), 298–345. https://doi.org/10.1086/262026
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Carroll, A. B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual model of Corporate performance. *the Academy of Management Review*, *4*(4), 497. https://doi.org/10.2307/257850
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, *34*(4), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-g
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility. *Business & Society*, *38*(3), 268–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Carroll, A. B. (2000). Ethical Challenges for Business in the new Millennium: corporate social responsibility and models of management morality. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *10*(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/3857692
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Cespa, G., & Cestone, G. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and managerial entrenchment. *Journal of Economics &Amp Management Strategy*, *16*(3), 741–771. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9134.2007.00156.x
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, evidence, and Implications. *the Academy of Management Review*, *20*(1), 65–91. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9503271992
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: a stakeholder approach*.

Friedman, M. (1970). Comment on Tobin. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *84*(2), 318–327. https://doi.org/10.2307/1883017
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Gatewood, R. D., & Carroll, A. B. (1991). Assessment of Ethical Performance of Organization Members: A Conceptual framework. *the Academy of Management Review*, *16*(4), 667. https://doi.org/10.2307/258976
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric analysis*.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Harjoto, M. A., & Jo, H. (2011). Corporate Governance and CSR Nexus. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *100*(1), 45–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0772-6
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Heckman, J. J. (1976). The common structure of statistical models of truncation, sample selection and limited dependent variables and a simple estimator for such models. *Annals of Economic and Social Measurement*, *5*, 475–492. https://www.nber.org/chapters/c10491.pdf
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrical*, *47*(1), 153. https://doi.org/10.2307/1912352
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext