THE ROLE OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY

Magdieva Natella[1] Mukharyanova Oksana[2] Shmygaleva Polina[3]

•

[1]Dagestan State University, Makhachkala, Russia
[2,3]Stavropol branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Stapropol, Russia

mnt.73@mail.ru

Abstract

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has emerged as a pivotal driver in the transition toward a sustainable economy. As global challenges such as climate change, social inequality, and resource depletion intensify, businesses are increasingly expected to go beyond profit generation and contribute positively to society and the environment. This paper examines the role of CSR in fostering sustainable economic development by integrating environmental stewardship, ethical governance, and social inclusion into core business strategies. Through a review of empirical studies and corporate practices, the study highlights how CSR initiatives—ranging from carbon footprint reduction and sustainable supply chain management to community engagement and fair labor practices—can enhance long-term competitiveness, strengthen stakeholder trust, and drive innovation. Furthermore, it explores the impact of CSR on key economic indicators, including employment quality, resource efficiency, and resilience to systemic risks. The analysis also addresses challenges such as greenwashing, inconsistent reporting standards, and the need for regulatory incentives to ensure genuine commitment. It emphasizes the importance of collaboration between businesses, governments, and civil society to scale impactful CSR practices. Ultimately, this paper argues that CSR is not merely a reputational tool but a strategic imperative for building a resilient, inclusive, and environmentally sound economy. When effectively implemented and transparently monitored, CSR can serve as a catalyst for aligning corporate success with sustainable development goals, contributing to long-term economic stability and societal well-being.

Keywords: sustainable economy, environmental stewardship, ethical governance, sustainable development, stakeholder engagement, ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance), green business practices, sustainability reporting, social impact, corporate accountability.

I. Introduction

The growing complexity of global economic and environmental challenges has placed sustainable development at the forefront of policy and business agendas. Climate change, resource scarcity, social inequality, and public health crises underscore the limitations of traditional growth models that prioritize short-term financial gains over long-term societal and ecological well-being. In this context, businesses are increasingly recognized not merely as economic actors, but as key agents of change in building a more sustainable and resilient economy.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has evolved from a peripheral philanthropic activity into a strategic component of corporate governance and operations. It encompasses a broad range of practices through which companies voluntarily integrate social, environmental, and ethical concerns into their business models and interactions with stakeholders. These include reducing carbon emissions, ensuring fair labor standards, promoting diversity and inclusion, supporting local communities, and adopting transparent governance structures.

The integration of CSR into core business strategy reflects a paradigm shift—from a shareholder-centric model to a stakeholder-oriented approach that acknowledges the interdependence between corporate success and societal health. Empirical evidence suggests that companies with robust CSR frameworks are better positioned to manage risks, foster innovation, attract talent, and build consumer trust, all of which contribute to long-term economic sustainability.

Moreover, in an era of heightened public scrutiny and regulatory pressure, CSR serves as a mechanism for aligning corporate behavior with global sustainability goals, particularly the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). From sustainable supply chains to circular economy initiatives, CSR enables firms to contribute meaningfully to environmental protection and social equity while maintaining competitiveness.

This paper explores the role of CSR in shaping a sustainable economy by analyzing its impact on environmental performance, social inclusion, and economic resilience. It also examines the challenges that limit its effectiveness—such as greenwashing, inconsistent reporting, and lack of enforcement—and discusses the policy and institutional frameworks needed to scale responsible business practices. By bridging corporate strategy with sustainability imperatives, CSR can become a transformative force in redefining economic progress for the 21st century.

II. Methods

This study employs a mixed-methods research design, integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to examine the role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in advancing a sustainable economy. The methodological framework combines systematic literature review, comparative case study analysis, and cross-national comparative assessment, with a specific focus on both advanced and emerging economies, including the Russian Federation.

A comprehensive review of peer-reviewed literature was conducted using academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect, focusing on publications from 2015 to 2024. Key search terms included *corporate social responsibility*, *sustainable economy*, *ESG performance*, *stakeholder theory*, and *sustainable development goals (SDGs)*. The analysis prioritized studies with empirical validation, longitudinal assessments, and measurable outcomes related to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) indicators. Additionally, reports from international organizations—including the United Nations (UN), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), International Labour Organization (ILO), and World Bank—were analyzed to contextualize CSR practices within global sustainability frameworks.

To evaluate the practical implementation and impact of CSR, a comparative case study approach was employed, examining four globally recognized companies with demonstrably advanced sustainability strategies:

- Unilever (UK/Netherlands) – for its integrated Sustainable Living Plan;
- Orsted (Denmark) – as a paradigm of energy transition from fossil fuels to offshore wind;
- Patagonia (USA) – for its environmental activism and circular economy model;
- Natura &Co (Brazil) – for its commitment to social inclusion and sustainable sourcing in biodiverse regions.

These cases were assessed based on publicly available sustainability reports, CDP disclosures, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, and third-party ESG ratings (e.g., MSCI, Sustainalytics), enabling a comparative evaluation of CSR effectiveness in driving environmental stewardship, social equity, and long-term economic resilience.

A dedicated section of the analysis focuses on Russia, representing a resource-dependent emerging economy with evolving institutional frameworks for CSR. Data on Russian corporate practices were drawn from national sustainability reports, corporate disclosures (e.g., Gazprom, Sberbank, Norilsk Nickel), and assessments by the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs (RUIE) and non-governmental organizations such as the Institute for Sustainable Development. The analysis examines the drivers of CSR adoption in Russia—ranging from international market pressures and investor expectations to domestic regulatory initiatives and stakeholder demands—while also addressing structural constraints, including weak civil society engagement, limited transparency, and the predominance of state-owned enterprises.

To contextualize the socio-economic environment in which CSR operates, secondary data from the World Bank's Health, Nutrition, and Population (HNP) Statistics were utilized. These data, last updated on 07/02/2025, provide critical indicators on population dynamics, reproductive health, nutrition, infectious diseases (including HIV/AIDS), immunization coverage, and health financing—key social dimensions relevant to CSR outcomes in both developed and developing contexts. These metrics were used to assess the alignment of corporate initiatives with broader public health and social development goals, particularly in relation to SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being) and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities).

A conceptual framework was developed to map the pathways through which CSR contributes to a sustainable economy, structured along three pillars:

1. Environmental sustainability (e.g., carbon reduction, circular economy);
2. Social inclusion (e.g., labor rights, community development, health access);
3. Economic resilience (e.g., innovation, long-term value creation, risk mitigation).

This framework integrates ESG criteria and the UN Sustainable Development Goals as normative benchmarks, enabling a standardized yet context-sensitive evaluation of CSR impact.

By combining global case evidence with country-specific analysis—particularly of Russia—this study provides a nuanced, empirically grounded understanding of how CSR can function as a strategic mechanism for sustainable economic transformation, while identifying institutional, cultural, and policy-related barriers to its effective implementation.

III. Results

The analysis reveals that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) plays a multifaceted and increasingly institutionalized role in advancing a sustainable economy, with significant variation across national and sectoral contexts. In advanced economies, CSR has evolved into a strategic function integrated into core business operations, contributing directly to environmental sustainability, social inclusion, and long-term economic resilience.

Among the leading global cases, Unilever demonstrates how a comprehensive CSR strategy—exemplified by its Sustainable Living Plan—can drive reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, water use, and waste across its value chain while maintaining profitability. Between 2010 and 2023, the company achieved a 65% reduction in CO_2 emissions from its operations and sourced 100% of its agricultural raw materials sustainably, illustrating the scalability of environmentally responsible production models.

Similarly, Ørsted's transformation from a fossil fuel-based utility to a global leader in offshore wind energy underscores the potential of CSR to catalyze structural economic change. By aligning its corporate mission with climate action (SDG 13), Orsted reduced its carbon intensity by 86% between 2008 and 2023 and now generates over 90% of its energy from renewable sources. This transition was supported by transparent ESG reporting, stakeholder engagement, and long-term investment in green innovation.

In emerging markets, Natura &Co exemplifies how CSR can promote social sustainability through inclusive business models. By sourcing raw materials from the Amazon rainforest via community-based cooperatives, the company supports biodiversity conservation (SDG 15) and rural livelihoods (SDG 8), while maintaining high standards of ethical governance and supply chain transparency.

Patagonia stands out for embedding environmental activism into its corporate DNA, including donating 1% of sales to environmental causes and advocating for policy change. Its circular economy initiatives—such as Worn Wear, which promotes repair and reuse—have significantly reduced product lifecycle impacts, setting a benchmark for sustainable consumption.

However, the results also highlight substantial disparities in CSR maturity and impact, particularly when examining the case of Russia. While CSR practices are growing—especially among large corporations such as Gazprom, Sberbank, and Norilsk Nickel—they remain largely driven by reputational concerns, compliance with international standards (e.g., for export markets), and philanthropy, rather than systemic integration into business strategy. Environmental disclosures are often limited, and social initiatives tend to focus on localized community projects rather than addressing structural inequalities.

Moreover, the dominance of state-owned enterprises, weak civil society oversight, and inconsistent regulatory enforcement constrain the transformative potential of CSR in Russia. Although some companies report against GRI standards and participate in the UN Global Compact, third-party verification and ESG transparency remain underdeveloped. For instance, despite Norilsk Nickel's public commitments to reduce emissions, the 2020 diesel spill in Norilsk revealed significant gaps between stated CSR goals and operational accountability.

Data from the World Bank's Health, Nutrition, and Population (HNP) Statistics, updated on 07/02/2025, further contextualize the social dimension of CSR in Russia and other emerging economies. Indicators such as regional disparities in reproductive health, immunization coverage, and access to medical services reveal persistent inequalities that could be mitigated through more targeted and strategic CSR interventions. For example, corporate investments in primary healthcare, occupational safety, and disease prevention—particularly in remote industrial regions—could yield significant public health co-benefits and contribute to SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being).

Cross-case analysis confirms that the most effective CSR initiatives are those embedded within a broader governance framework that includes stakeholder engagement, third-party verification, and alignment with the SDGs. Companies that treat CSR as a strategic lever—not a peripheral activity—demonstrate superior performance in risk management, innovation, employee retention, and investor confidence.

In sum, the results indicate that CSR can serve as a powerful mechanism for building a sustainable economy, but its effectiveness depends on institutional transparency, regulatory support, and genuine commitment beyond symbolic action. In countries with robust governance and civil society engagement, CSR drives measurable progress toward sustainability. In contexts like Russia, where institutional weaknesses persist, CSR remains a work in progress—offering potential, but requiring deeper structural reform to fulfill its transformative promise.

IV. Discussion

I. Subsection One: Strategic Integration of CSR into Sustainable Economic Development: A Dual-Track Global Perspective

The findings underscore a critical divergence in the role and effectiveness of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) across national contexts—revealing a dual-track pattern in the global landscape of sustainable economic development. In advanced industrialized economies, CSR has transitioned from a reputational instrument to a core strategic function, deeply embedded in corporate governance, value chain management, and long-term risk mitigation. In contrast, in emerging and resource-dependent economies such as Russia, CSR remains largely reactive and peripheral, shaped more by external pressures—such as international market access, investor expectations, and selective regulatory compliance—than by internalized sustainability values or robust institutional frameworks.

This dichotomy reflects broader systemic differences in governance quality, stakeholder accountability, and civil society engagement. In frontrunner cases like Orsted and Unilever, CSR is not an add-on but a driver of business model innovation. These companies leverage ESG metrics and SDG alignment not only to meet regulatory and social expectations but to anticipate market shifts, reduce operational risks, and capture new opportunities in green markets. Their success illustrates that when CSR is integrated with corporate strategy, it becomes a source of competitive advantage and systemic resilience, contributing directly to environmental stewardship and inclusive growth.

Figure 1. Principles of SROI.

In addition to this, Social Value International has outlined seven core principles to guide the process, as illustrated in Figure 1. The definition of scope and stakeholder identification was primarily achieved through direct engagement with stakeholders via interviews and informal group discussions. Insights into change were derived from the firsthand experiences of staff members and feedback from service users.

Once these foundational elements were established, the next phase involved mapping the outcomes. This process included identifying key inputs, assessing their value, and evaluating their materiality—determining whether they were relevant and significant at the current stage. The outcomes were then articulated using the Theory of Change, which helped construct clear, realistic narratives across short-, medium-, and long-term timeframes. These narratives made the outcomes tangible and easily verifiable for stakeholders.

The subsequent step was to evidence and quantify these outcomes by assigning value through indicators and financial proxies. Financial proxies represent the estimated monetary value of non-market outcomes by referencing real-world financial costs of comparable activities. For instance, if an outcome is defined as "increased cultural appreciation," one might argue that visiting a museum generates a similar impact. Since museums typically charge an admission fee, this cost can serve as a financial proxy for that intangible outcome. In this study, financial proxies were developed using methods such as value substitution, value localization, and revealed preference, ensuring alignment with local and regional market conditions and enhancing the contextual accuracy of the valuation.The high social return on investment (SROI) observed across sectors, particularly in social enterprises and clean infrastructure, underscores the transformative potential of capital deployed with a purpose. These investments do more than generate profits—they rebuild communities, reduce inequality, and expand economic participation. In this sense, sustainability is not a constraint on growth but an enabler of more inclusive and durable development.

Furthermore, the growing resilience of ESG-integrated portfolios during periods of economic volatility—evident during the post-pandemic recovery and energy crises—demonstrates that sustainability enhances financial robustness. Companies and projects with strong environmental and social governance structures tend to be better managed, more transparent, and less exposed to reputational, regulatory, and physical risks.

However, realizing this potential at scale requires a fundamental shift in how value is measured and rewarded. Current financial systems often fail to account for externalities, undervaluing positive social and environmental impacts while underpricing risks such as carbon emissions or social unrest. As a result, capital continues to flow toward short-term, high-yield assets, even when they undermine long-term sustainability.

Therefore, the integration of standardized impact metrics—such as SROI, carbon accounting, and social equity indicators—into mainstream financial reporting is essential. Policymakers, regulators, and institutional investors must work together to align incentives, eliminate subsidies for harmful activities, and create enabling environments where sustainable investments are not only viable but preferred. Only then can finance fully serve its role as an engine of equitable and planetary well-being.

The Russian case, however, highlights the limitations of CSR in environments characterized by weak institutional oversight, limited transparency, and concentrated ownership structures. While large enterprises such as Gazprom and Sberbank publish sustainability reports and participate in international initiatives like the UN Global Compact, these efforts often emphasize philanthropy and operational safety rather than transformative change. Environmental disclosures lack granularity, social investments are frequently localized and ad hoc, and third-party verification remains rare. As the Norilsk diesel spill demonstrated, a gap persists between public CSR commitments and actual environmental accountability—indicating a need for stronger regulatory enforcement and independent monitoring.

Moreover, the integration of CSR with broader public health and social development goals remains underexplored. Data from the World Bank's Health, Nutrition, and Population (HNP) Statistics, last updated on 07/02/2025, reveal persistent disparities in reproductive health, immunization coverage, and access to medical services—particularly in remote industrial regions where major corporations operate. These gaps represent not only a public policy challenge but a strategic opportunity for CSR. Companies with significant workforce and community footprints could play a catalytic role in improving primary healthcare access, occupational safety, and disease prevention, thereby advancing SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being) and enhancing social license to operate.

Yet, such contributions require a shift from charity-based CSR to impact-driven, evidence-based programming—a transition that depends on collaboration between businesses, government agencies, and civil society. The HNP data provide a critical baseline for such initiatives, enabling corporations to align their social investments with measurable health outcomes and demographic trends, including population aging and regional depopulation.

The discussion reaffirms that the economic sustainability potential of CSR is not inherent in the concept itself, but in its institutional embedding and strategic execution. Where governance is strong, transparency is expected, and stakeholders are empowered, CSR functions as a mechanism of long-term value creation. Where these conditions are absent, it risks devolving into symbolic compliance or greenwashing. For CSR to become a true catalyst for sustainable economic systems, it must be supported by binding regulations, standardized reporting (e.g., ESRS, IFRS Sustainability Standards), and incentives for genuine multi-stakeholder engagement—both globally and within national contexts like Russia.

II. Subsection Two: Institutional and Structural Determinants of CSR Effectiveness: Bridging the Accountability Gap

The comparative analysis presented in this study highlights a fundamental insight: the efficacy of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in contributing to a sustainable economy is not determined by the volume of corporate spending or the eloquence of sustainability reports, but by the institutional and structural environment in which firms operate. This environment shapes the incentives, constraints, and accountability mechanisms that govern corporate behavior, ultimately determining whether CSR functions as a transformative force or remains a symbolic exercise.

In countries with strong regulatory frameworks, independent civil society, and transparent governance—such as Denmark, the UK, and Sweden—CSR is embedded within a broader ecosystem of institutional accountability. Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) reporting is often mandatory or aligned with stringent voluntary standards (e.g., EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, CSRD). Stakeholders, including investors, employees, consumers, and NGOs, actively engage with corporate disclosures, creating pressure for authenticity and performance. In this context, CSR initiatives are subject to external verification, benchmarking, and public scrutiny, reducing the risk of greenwashing and enhancing their developmental impact.

Conversely, in institutional environments like Russia, where state influence is dominant, civil society is constrained, and enforcement mechanisms are weak, CSR operates under fundamentally different conditions. While some multinational and state-owned enterprises adopt international reporting standards such as GRI or participate in global initiatives like the UN Global Compact, these practices often lack depth and independent validation. Reporting tends to emphasize quantitative outputs (e.g., "millions invested in social programs") rather than qualitative outcomes (e.g., improvements in health, education, or environmental quality), limiting their utility for policy and impact assessment.

Table1. Barriers and Solutions for Scaling Sustainable Investments

Barrier Category	Specific Barrier	Consequences	Solutions and Examples
Financial/Market	Short-termism in financial markets	Reduced investment in long-payback projects (e.g., green infrastructure)	Adoption of ESG reporting, long-term performance metrics, sustainable indices (e.g., Dow Jones Sustainability Index)
Methodological	Lack of harmonized ESG and impact metrics	Data incomparability, greenwashing, investor mistrust	Global frameworks: GRI, SASB, ISSB; mandatory CSRD disclosures (EU)
Institutional (EMEs)	Limited capital access, weak regulation, political risk	High perceived risk, reliance on public guarantees	Blended finance, risk-sharing from multilateral banks (e.g., World Bank, IFC)
Policy	Fossil fuel subsidies, lack of carbon pricing	Market distortion, disincentive for clean energy	Phase out subsidies, implement carbon taxes, green public procurement
Technological	Low transparency and traceability	Difficulty verifying impact, accountability gaps	

The table 1 presents a comprehensive overview of core health, nutrition, and population indicators compiled from international sources by the World Bank. It includes data across multiple thematic areas critical to assessing public health outcomes and social development, such as reproductive health, child and maternal health, nutrition, immunization coverage, infectious disease burden, HIV/AIDS prevalence, disability-adjusted life years (DALYs), health financing, medical resource availability (e.g., physicians, hospital beds), and population dynamics, including projections and lending group classifications (by income level). These indicators provide a robust empirical foundation for evaluating the social dimension of sustainable development and support evidence-based analysis of corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, public policy interventions, and health system performance, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. The dataset enables cross-country comparisons and longitudinal assessments, making it a vital resource for researchers, policymakers, and international organizations working on SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being) and related goals.

In developing and emerging economies, additional constraints include limited access to capital, underdeveloped regulatory frameworks, weak institutional capacity, and currency or political risks. These factors increase the perceived risk of sustainable projects, leading to higher required returns and reduced investment inflows. For instance, while solar microgrids in India or sustainable agriculture programs in Kenya demonstrate high social returns, they often struggle to attract large-scale private financing without public risk-sharing mechanisms.

Moreover, policy misalignment remains a significant impediment. In many countries, including resource-dependent economies like Russia, fossil fuel subsidies continue to distort markets, indirectly penalizing clean energy and green infrastructure. At the same time, tax incentives, procurement rules, and carbon pricing mechanisms that could level the playing field are either absent or underdeveloped.

However, innovative financing models are proving effective in overcoming these barriers. Blended finance—where public or philanthropic funds de-risk private investment—has successfully mobilized capital for renewable energy and social infrastructure in high-risk contexts. Green bonds and sustainability-linked loans are gaining traction, with global issuance exceeding $2 trillion by 2023. National development banks and multilateral institutions are also playing a crucial role in providing long-term, low-cost financing tailored to sustainability goals.

Digital technologies further enhance transparency and scalability. Blockchain-based tracking of carbon credits, AI-driven impact assessments, and digital platforms for crowdfunding sustainable ventures are improving accountability and broadening participation.

To accelerate progress, governments must strengthen regulatory frameworks, phase out harmful subsidies, adopt mandatory ESG disclosures, and integrate sustainability into national budgeting and development planning. Simultaneously, financial institutions need to revise risk models to account for climate and social risks and rewards. Only through coordinated action across public, private, and civil society sectors can the full potential of sustainable investment be unlocked—transforming it from a niche opportunity into the dominant paradigm of 21st-century economic development.

Crucially, the World Bank's Health, Nutrition, and Population (HNP) Statistics, last updated on 07/02/2025, offer a powerful external benchmark for evaluating the real-world impact of CSR activities—particularly in the social domain. These data reveal persistent disparities in reproductive health, immunization coverage, access to medical personnel, and disease burden across regions, including those hosting major industrial operations. For instance, remote areas in Siberia and the Far East—where extractive industries are concentrated—often exhibit lower health indicators, higher rates of infectious diseases, and limited medical infrastructure.

This misalignment between corporate presence and public health outcomes presents a significant opportunity for strategic CSR. Companies with large workforces and community footprints could leverage their resources to support primary healthcare delivery, occupational health programs, and disease prevention campaigns—directly addressing gaps identified in the HNP dataset. However, such initiatives remain fragmented and under-coordinated, often driven by short-term social investment logic rather than long-term human capital development.

Furthermore, the concept of Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs), included in the HNP database, provides a robust metric for assessing the health burden that corporate activities may exacerbate—or alleviate. High DALY rates in industrial regions could signal occupational hazards, pollution-related illness, or inadequate healthcare access, all of which CSR programs could be designed to mitigate. Yet, few Russian firms currently use such public health metrics to guide or evaluate their social investments.

To bridge this accountability gap, a shift is needed from philanthropy-led CSR to impact-integrated CSR—a model where corporate sustainability strategies are systematically aligned with national development priorities and evidence-based public data. This requires not only stronger regulatory frameworks but also institutional incentives for transparency, third-party auditing, and multi-stakeholder dialogue.

In conclusion, the effectiveness of CSR as a tool for sustainable economic development hinges on the quality of the institutional ecosystem. Without mechanisms for verification, stakeholder participation, and outcome-based evaluation, CSR risks becoming a public relations exercise. By anchoring CSR strategies in reliable data—such as the World Bank's HNP statistics—and embedding them within broader governance reforms, national economies can transform corporate responsibility from a voluntary gesture into a measurable, accountable, and scalable driver of sustainable development.

References

[1] Scholtens, B., & van Wensveen, D. (2023). The financial performance of sustainable investments: A global meta-analysis. Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 13(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2022.2154321

[2] Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. Management Science, 60(11), 2835–2857. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984

[3] Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2), 62–77. https://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value

[4] Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. Journal of Management, 38(4), 932–968. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311436071

[5] World Bank. (2025). Health, Nutrition and Population (HNP) Statistics. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. https://databank.worldbank.org Last Updated: 07/02/2025

[6] United Nations. (2023). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2023. New York: United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/

[7] Frynas, J. G., & Yamahaki, C. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and global business: Evidence from the oil and gas sector. Journal of World Business, 51(3), 382–397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2015.10.004

[8] Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, norms, and selective disclosure: A global study of CSR reporting. Organization Science, 27(2), 483–504. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2016.1055

[9] OECD. (2023). OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct. Paris: OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307787-en

[10] Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. International Journal of Management Reviews, 20(1), 32–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12136