saki
Studi Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia

e-ISSN: 2654-6221

Vol. 7 | No. 2

Corporate Social Responsibility as Strategy in Indonesia Context

Rifeald Romauli Sinaga

School of Business and Economics, Universitas Prasetiya Mulya
Edu Town Kavling Edu I No. 1, Jalan BSD Raya Barat 1, Serpong, Pagedangan, Kabupaten Tangerang, Banten 15339, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
CSR,
Literature Study,
Strategy,
Stakeholder Mapping,
Indonesia.

Kata Kunci:
Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan,
Studi Literatur,
Strategi,
Pemetaan Pemangku Kepentingan, Indonesia

Corresponding author:
rifeald.sinaga@pmbs.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This paper discussing Corporate Social Responsibility as part of company's strategy in Indonesia context as CSR become mandatory since 2007 through Company Act No. 40. However, to date there are a lot of companies not taking advantage of CSR program by integrating it into company's strategy. Using qualitative methods, particularly a systematic literature review, this article outlines the debates that currently exist in CSR area before suggesting tools for CSR strategy. The result indicates the importance of stakeholders for the creation of CSR program. Therefore, a company should first identify and rank the stakeholders from the most important to the least important. Then, a company should create a stakeholder mapping as a guidance in creating CSR part of the strategy.

SARI PATI

Tulisan ini membahas tentang Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (Corporate Social Responsibility) sebagai bagian dari strategi perusahaan dalam konteks Indonesia karena CSR telah menjadi kewajiban sejak tahun 2007 melalui Undang-Undang Perusahaan No. 40. Namun, hingga saat ini masih banyak perusahaan yang belum memanfaatkan program CSR dengan mengintegrasikannya ke dalam strategi perusahaan. Dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif, khususnya tinjauan pustaka yang sistematis, artikel ini menguraikan perdebatan yang saat ini ada di bidang CSR sebelum menyarankan alat untuk strategi CSR. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan pentingnya pemangku kepentingan dalam terciptanya program CSR. Oleh karena itu, perusahaan harus terlebih dahulu mengidentifikasi dan mengurutkan pemangku kepentingan dari yang paling penting hingga yang paling tidak penting. Kemudian, perusahaan harus membuat pemetaan pemangku kepentingan sebagai panduan dalam menjadikan CSR sebagai bagian dari strateginya.

INTRODUCTION

The concept on Corporate Social Responsibility is developing along the changes in a business world (Isaksson et al., 2014). Looking from various perspectives, CSR divided both business communities and academia into two sides, those who support CSR and those who are against it. Interestingly, the development of CSR become a significant issue in emerging country such as Indonesia. Companies that particularly listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange try their best to translate the CSR program into their business strategy. At the end of 2020, Reputation Institute, a reputation-based advisory firm based in New York ranked fifty companies in terms of who had the best CSR program. Two companies from the top five came from the entertainment industry. They are Lego, The Walt Disney Company, Rolex, Ferrari, and Microsoft. Interestingly, out of fifty companies in the list, none are from mining companies and few from manufacturing.

In understanding the CSR, academia and practical often have divergent perspectives. Businesses prefer to define CSR from an operational perspective, while scholars seek to define it from different point of view depending on specific category and characteristics, such as business ethics, social issues, and environmental impact. In academia, the term corporate social responsibility first emerged in the 1950s, as a response to the growing criticism of the profit-centric approach. Howard Bowen (1953) was the first who able to crystalizes the idea of Social Responsibility that "refers to the obligation of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society" (Bowen et al., 2013). In 1960, two academia support the CSR idea by Bowen. Davis (1960) suggest that CSR is "businessman's decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm's direct economic or technical interests" (p. 1). While Frederick (1960) discussed that the key responsibility of a company is to manage operational activity to fulfil economic system that fulfils public expectations.

To achieve its objective of identifying better designed and targeted CSR in Indonesia, this article will be focus on the discussion on CSR strategy in Indonesia context from literature perspective. First, it will explore the literature on CSR to identify both sides of the debate in this field of research as well as the best frameworks in applying CSR program to the situation that currently prevails for Indonesia. The discussion then outlines a proposed strategy based on literature for improving CSR examine the gaps in our understanding of CSR programs that currently exist in Indonesia.

Literature Study

Concept on Corporate Social Responsibility

Socially responsible behavior could not appear automatically because the present business system is a result of past history and cultural traditions. McGuire (1963) stated that "the idea of social responsibilities supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations" (p. 144). Shortly, the development of CSR concept conflicted with established economic ideas in businesses. Friedman (1970) argued that a company should focus only on enhancing its profitability through utilizing the resources and undertaking initiatives, as long as the company operate within established market rules and norms and engage in open and transparent competition without deceptive or fraudulent practices. This argument supported earlier opinion by Levitt (1958) that suggested the one who should be concerned on social responsibility was government and not businesses. The view from Friedman and Levit is known as "shareholder approach". Later, Drucker (1984) added that a company has moral obligation to its stakeholder. In particular, those communities and environment that are affected with company's operational activity. Additionally, it is important for a company to encourage the employees to participate in achieving their legal obligation. This view is known as "stakeholder approach".

According to Amin-Chaudhry (2016), CSR concept in the early stage was primarily focused on the macro-societal effects of corporate activities. In 1970s the conceptual understanding of CSR evolved to incorporate a more nuanced and multifaceted approach. Committee for Economic Development (CED) as a public institution have also defined CSR. Social Responsibilities of Business Corporation is a document that classify CSR through three concentric circles: economics, social, and environment (Cumming et al., 2016). Rather than solely prioritizing profits, this perspective recognized the obligation of businesses to actively contribute to the broader well-being of the communities and environments in which they operate, acknowledging their interdependence and responsibility to the wider social and environmental context.

Furthermore, a company required "social license to operate", which can be obtained in the situation when the company take into consideration issues from political, social welfare, education, to employees' interests (Jo et al., 2015; Lindorff et al., 2012). Davis (1973) then introduced the Iron Law of Responsibility stating that a company will lose its economic position in the long run if not utilize its social power that could resulted in a community and social acceptance. It because others will eventually gain the social license and take over the position.

Businesses are required to take action in fulfilling various societal needs and demands. For this reason, Sethi (1975) argued that corporate behaviors can be classified through to be social obligation, social responsibility, or social responsiveness. Social obligation emphasis on both economic and legal aspects, which provide an explanation that corporate actions was driven by market interests and legal concerns. Meanwhile, social responsibility indicates corporate behavior needs to be in line with society's prevailing norms, values, and expectations. In addition to that, an approach to prevent or to minimize potential environmental hazards is corporate social responsiveness. This approach involuntarily triggered by social and political transformation.

With the aim to understand the CSR concept more effectively, Carroll (1991) attempted to define CSR through the pyramid and encompassed all fundamental aspects of CSR. The pyramid reflects the relationship between stakeholder and businesses in managing its operational activities, with economic obligations forming the base, followed by legal responsibilities, then ethical responsibilities, with philanthropic commitments at the highest level. According to the pyramid, a company must first and foremost focus on maintaining profitability through sales maximization, cost reduction, and focus on long-term financial performance. Hence, a company must strictly comply with all relevant laws and regulations and with ethical principles in conducting their operational activities. This forms the baseline of their corporate social responsibility. Then to demonstrate good citizenship by considering engaging in additional philanthropic activities that go beyond mere compliance. By adopting this hierarchical approach, organizations can ensure they are on a solid financial foundation while also contributing to the sustainable development of the communities and environments in which they operate. Moreover, the pyramid emphasize that these four elements should be implemented together.

From the above discussion, it shows that the concept of corporate social responsibility started with philanthropy concept, then incorporates economic, social, environmental, and stakeholder elements. A company acts in a responsible ways will be depend on economic conditions and institutional conditions (Agarwal et al., 2024; Risi et al., 2023). A company would engage in CSR in a situation where they are financially sound, as this would provide them with sufficient resources to invest in their CSR initiatives. However, a company tend to show little interest in a monopoly market because customers and suppliers have few alternatives. From an institutional perspective, a strong regulations and systems will force a company to engage in CSR. These regulations could be issued by governments or other international instutions, such as the International Organisation for Standardization (ISO).

On the other hand, from operational terminology Lane & Devin (2018) argued that there are four factors behind company's motivation in doing CSR activities. First is CSR as an instrumental theory that found the objective of a company engage in CSR as an opportunity to improve their financial performance and profitability. There are three ways to utilize CSR as wealth creation. First by maximizing shareholder's value (Jahn & Brühl, 2018), next is achieve competitive advantage through strategy (McWilliams et al., 2016), and caused related marketing (Malla & Sharma, 2021). CSR as a political theory is another key factor. A company take advantage its CSR as political power in society to obtain a license to operate (Famiyeh et al., 2019; Hasan & Jiang, 2023). Moreover, a company may also engage in CSR initiatives as a strategic response to social and political pressures, such as the need to maintain their license to operate or to address the concerns of influential stakeholder groups, including regulators, local communities, and activist organizations (Gupta et al., 2017; Waheed & Zhang, 2022). Furthermore, CSR as an integrative theory explains that a company engage in CSR to fulfill social demands (Ring, 2021). Last factor that motivate a company engage in CSR can be explained through ethical theory. This theory found that a company perform CSR activites because of its ethical responsibility in their society (Ogola & Mària, 2020).

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that from the perspective of operational terminology, a company could utilize its CSR as strategy to obtain a license to operate. Particularly, in the area where they perform their main operational activity. However, it is important to highlight that a company should not only conduct philantophy activities when engaging in CSR. As Porter & Kramer (2006) found that CSR programs that are dominated by philanthropic activities can only be seen as public relations projects with minimum value to both society and businesses.
Although CSR is still a voluntary action in most countries, many companies invest their resources because of the beliefs of its advantages in the long run. A regression analysis suggests that CSR could improve company's financial performance (Kunz et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2016). As a result, existing literature tried to link CSR with business strategy. It is found that a maximum benefit can be obtained when a company integrate its CSR into their long-term strategy along the value chain (Flammer, 2018). Additionally, CSR can have a positive impact on company's financial performance when a company able to differentiate their CSR from its competitors (Siltaloppi et al., 2021). However, how can CSR program have the ability to pursue a differentiation strategy?

Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia Context

Indonesia is an archipelago with thirty-eight provinces. With a population of more than 279 million (BPS, 2024), Indonesia is the fourth most populous nation on the planet. Indonesia's economy is also large, with GDP estimated at US$1.37 billion in 2023 (IMF, 2024), making it the worlds' sixteenth largest. Outside Java and Sumatera in particular, the economy remains in a relatively undeveloped state, heavily reliant on traditional activities such as farming, fishing, and forestry. However, manufacturing and mining industry currently are contributing the most to the Indonesian GDP. Looking from sustainability point of view, tese industries are closely linked to environment and social issues.

Since 2007, corporate social responsibility become mandatory for all companies having businesses activity in Indonesia. Company Act No. 40/2007, sets out the legal basis for incorporation of firms in Indonesia. Article 74 requires that all companies "shall be obliged to perform its social and environmental responsibility". Moreover, article 74 (2) states that such tasks should be "budgeted and calculated as the cost of the company". Furthermore, mining in its various forms has been subject to a high degree of government regulation. Most notable is the Ministerial Regulation No.

7/2012, where the Indonesian government banned all raw material exports from 2014. The background to this regulation was the increasing export of mineral resources such as iron ore and iron sand, the export of the latter growing by 800 per cent in 2011. According to Devi & Prayogo (2013) without such action, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources predicted that within ten years iron ore reserves would be completely drained. Additionally, Sinaga & Bowden (2018) found that the enforcement of CSR in Indonesia is embedded in various law and government regulation.

In complying with government regulation, numbers of money that being spent by companies in Indonesia to create their CSR is increased. In the mining industry, companies spent US$10.5 million in 2019 for CSR program (Eiti, 2021). Furthermore, the report stated that 86 percent of the CSR fund came from the mineral and coal sectors and the remaining 14 percent came from the oil and gas. Despite great expense, the Indonesian mining industry is still regarded as having a poor record in terms of environmental performance and community relations. To date in Papua, PT. Freeport Indonesia which owned Grasberg gold mine, the world's largest, was beset by constant violence. At Sidoarjo in East Java, a drill operated by PT. Lapindo Brantas inadvertently released an uncontrolled flow of superheated mud in May 2006 with devastating social and environmental consequences. Hence, there is no significant solution to fix thedamage up to now and the society who get the impact still trying to fight for the compensation that being promised since the incident happen. Money spent by mining companies is considered to be poorly targeted. In 2019, 24.77 percent involved "charitable donations" and 54.87 percent was for "regional and community development" (Eiti, 2021). However, this expenditure returned no clear benefit to the mining companies themselves.

Meanwhile, in manufacturing industry big companies such as Unilever awarded as gold winner in Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion (DEI) & Environment, Social, and Governance (ESG) Awards 2023 because of their CSR program. However, this industry also not having a better performance than mining industry. Take an example is the development on palm oil plantation that has negative impact to the environment (Rintis & Darsa, 2021). Most of the companies only seek short-term benefit as they consider CSR a community charity rather than a form of community development. Moreover, Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), media, and other social organizations generally perceive CSR programs by the mining industry in a negative light. Consequently, the government has found that sustainable development has been hard to achieve.

Given both the poor targeting of past CSR expenditures by Indonesian mining companies, and the recent fall in the amount of money being spent, the research question that guides this thesis is the following: What have been the main guidelines for CSR activities by mining companies, and how can such programs be better designed and targeted in the future so as to maximize the benefit to the mining companies, local communities, the environment, and the wider Indonesian society? Currently, there has been significant amount of academic and scholarly articles that discussing on CSR in Indonesia. Sinaga & Bowden (2018) studied the historical development of CSR in Indonesia. Rosser & Edwin (2010) and Waagstein (2011) reviewed CSR in Indonesia based on the political context, while Nainggolan et al. (2021) and Wedayanti et al. (2022) exploring the relationship between CSR and political connection. Additionaly, academia trying to analyze the effect of CSR on company's value (Hermawan et al., 2023; Rakhmantari et al., 2019), profitability (Asmeri et al., 2017), and marketing (Susanto et al., 2020). The discussion on CSR from management perspective, particularly from strategic view in Indonesia context has so far escaped attention.

RESEARCH METHODS

To achieve its objective of identifying better designed and targeted CSR in Indonesia, this article will be focus on the discussion on CSR strategy in Indonesia from literature perspective. This article will explore the literature on CSR to identify both sides of the debate in this field of research as well as the best frameworks to apply to the situation that currently prevails for Indonesia. It will also outline, based on literature, a proposed strategy for improving CSR and it is hope that the discussion section could examine the gaps in our understanding of CSR programs in Indonesia.

Data Collection

Given the importance of outlining the scope of the search prior to the data collection process, this article focused solely on research studies that exclusively examined the concept of CSR strategy and implementation. The literature search was conducted across various academic databases to capture both published and unpublished works on the topic (Gillan et al., 2021).

Data Analysis

The initial literature review was conducted by searching published article using the word “corporate social responsibility” and “CSR implementation” on the online databases of ProQuest and Science Direct, along with Google Scholar. From the articles that being collected, then further analysis being conducted to focus on articles that discussing CSR from strategy perspective. In applying this, this article able to provide the findings based on CSR as company’s strategy to the elements that a company needs to focus in integrating its CSR as strategy.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Corporate Social Responsibility as Strategy

CSR becomes strategic when it creates benefits or value to a company in line with the company’s vision. In other words, CSR programs can be a source of opportunity, innovation, and competitive advantage. Given this point, it is widely argued in the strategic management literature that companies should create CSR activities that fit into a company’s mission, strategic issues, markets, stakeholders, and create CSR activities that have competitive advantage (Bérangère L. S (D) & Boughzala, 2021; Poveda-Pareja et al., 2024).

Various social issues can affect a company, internally, either externally, or from both internal and external sources. According to Hollstein & Rosa (2023) a company only needs to focus on social issues that affect the company in order to meet its objectives. Ford Motor as an automotive company has profound knowledge on how to produce cars and trucks. Therefore, it does not make sense to give donations to support breast cancer research, for example, as their CSR activity. No one would argue that breast cancer research is not a worthy community issue. However, there is no strategic link between Ford as an automotive company and breast cancer research. It would make more sense for Ford to support research to create environmentally friendly transportation as their CSR program (McElhaney, 2009). Similarly, Porter & Kramer (2006) suggested that every company should prioritize social issues that are associated with their industry. For example, Ben & Jerry’s Homemade Ice Cream differentiates the products into various flavors by using high-quality ingredients through a three-part mission: product, economic strategies, and social interaction. With this strategy, the company supports their local community (Belay et al., 2023) and promotes diversity in the work place (Mu et al., 2024). In the same way, The Body Shop claims that all their products are free from animal testing. The company successfully integrates CSR activity into its marketing strategy (McWilliams et al., 2016; O’Brien et al., 2018). For that reason, the highlights would be that companies do not have the ability to solve all social issues within a community and it is not always possible to link a company’s mission with CSR programs.

In planning a CSR strategy, Porter & Kramer (2006) demonstrate that companies should look from two dimensions, inside out and outside in, to identify the opportunities that occur along the value chain. A CSR strategy must go beyond being merely good corporate citizenship or making it difficult or costly to imitate. On the other hand, CSR program is very transparent. Competitors can easily "copy" the programs through CSR reporting that is publicly available. Stakeholder relationships are perhaps the answer to this issue. The stakeholder relationship involves the combination of people or groups from outside and inside company (Schaltegger et al., 2019). Consequently, it will be more difficult for competitors to imitate multiple activities than one activity. Equally important, Carrolls's pyramid shows that the relationship between companies and stakeholders should be profitable, obey the law, be engaged with ethical behavior, and be giving back to the community through responsible activities (Carroll, 2016; Spence, 2016). Therefore, a company should have a good relationship with all stakeholders in every intersection of activity in a company (looking inside out).

In the context of social dimension, a company should look outside in by choosing social initiatives that will have immense value and benefit both the company and society. These social initiatives should be a priority for a company because they may significantly affect the company's ability to achieve their competitive advantage. Therefore, to maximize the result in undertaking CSR strategy, Porter (1997) found that a company should define the industry structure before formulating CSR strategy and map the social impact. APP's CSR program is an example of the stakeholder relationship. Through Chain of Custody (CoC) and verification certificates (Verifikasi Legalitas Kayu/SLVK), APP ensures that not all the materials for their factory are from illegal logging.

Many companies only focus on the tension between business and society that compels the companies to undertake CSR as a form of insurance and to get a license to operate (Bui & Le, 2023). As a result, most of companies adopting a high-profile cause and linking it to a marketing campaign (Georgieva, 2020; Shin et al., 2023). O'Brien et al. (2018) suggest that companies can benefit from a CSR strategy if the CSR programs are plan specifically, supervise carefully, and evaluate regularly. Nevertheless, in planning CSR as a long-term strategy, da Silva et al. (2023) argues that companies must comprehend the mutually reinforcing relationship between their business activities and the wider societal landscape in which they are operate. There are opportunities for a company to create CSR programs that link with their business strategy and are not purely on philanthropy. Unilever succeeded in implementing a CSR program in line with the company's business strategy by supporting education for soybean farmers in Indonesia. The program included giving free seeds to farmers, education in cultivation techniques, and setting up a co-op to market the soybean. Indeed, this program benefits both Unilever and the farmers. Farmers become suppliers for Unilever, and Unilever gets good quality soybean for their product.

For some companies, environmental issues play a significant role as well as social issues in planning their CSR strategy. Consequently, as part of their CSR strategy, various companies have implemented specific environmental and social management systems. However, to be beneficial, these systems need to connect with a company's mission and strategy. In 1992, Kaplan & Norton (1996) introduced The Balance Scorecard (BSC), a strategic tool for a company to identify strategically relevant issues in a company. This tool not only gives emphasis to financial perspectives, however, also on soft factors within a company such as human resources or customer orientation. Using the BSC system, a company formulate its strategy into four perspectives: financial, customer, internal organization, and learning and growth. All four perspectives connect to each other in a cause-and-effect relationship. Using BSC, a company is able to translate their strategy into business. In order to achieve sustainability while undertaking CSR strategy, the BSC then developed into the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard (SBSC) (Georgieva, 2020). Moreover, Felber et al. (2019) indicate that SBSC is suitable for CSR as well, specifically for companies that are closely involved with social and environmental issues.

In creating CSR strategy with SBSC, a company should identify social and environmental issues that affect the company, define the company's vision/mission and clarify the company's sustainability strategy. As a result, a company might integrate social and environmental issues into four perspectives of BSC or add those two aspects as the fifth perspective (Hansen & Schaltegger, 2018) depending on the challenges that faced the company. Hansen & Schaltegger (2016) classify sustainability strategy according to a company's strategic orientation. Thus, creating the fifth perspective will be more suitable for companies that are close to social and environmental issues because both management and employees will focus on CSR as a corporate value. For example, from environmental perspectives, a company could focus on total waste disposal by the company or focus on identifying their stakeholder for the social dimension. When a company decides to create the fifth perspective, they need to add social and environmental elements such as a non-market perspective. Asia Pulp and Paper and Unilever are a couple of examples if manufacturing companies in Indonesia that succeed in capturing social and environmental issues and integrating them into CSR programs which align with their business strategy.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that there are three important elements when a company formulate its CSR strategy, economic element as the main goal of CSR strategy, followed by social and environmental elements.

The Importance of Stakeholder on CSR Strategy

The relationship between a company and its stakeholders is one of the CSR strategies that has benefits but is difficult to imitate. The stakeholder perspective currently has almost replaced the shareholder perspective. Freeman et al. (2010) define stakeholder as "anyone or any group that is affected by an organization's activities to achieve their objectives" (pp. 207-208). Furthermore, the term 'group' refers to those who could have an influence on company's stability (Schaltegger et al., 2019). From this view, stakeholders include shareholders, employees, consumers, creditors, surrounding communities, as well as any individuals or groups closely associated with the company, such as environmental groups or governments' institution.

Other scholar clasiffy stakeholder into two groups, primary stakeholder and secondary stakeholder (Miles, 2017). Those who are directly influence or are impacted, either positively or negatively, by a company's activities are included in primary stakeholders. Hence, a company cannot survive without their involvement. Through this perspective, a company is described as a complex system of relationships between and among interest groups with different rights, objectives, expectations, and responsibilities. Meanwhile, secondary stakeholders are individuals or groups that do not directly impact or are affected by company's activities (Thijssens et al., 2015). Moreover, stakeholders in this category are not important to the company and not involved in any business transaction (Kim et al., 2018).

From theoretical perspective, Donaldson & Preston (1995) categorize stakeholder based on three key dimensions: descriptive/empirical (what the company actually does), instrumental (the outcomes of management behavior), and normative (what the company should do). The descriptive/empirical aspect captures what the company actually does in practice, while the instrumental dimension examines the outcomes of management behavior. The normative validity dimension, on the other hand, identifies what a company should do from an ethical and moral standpoint. However, currently stakeholder's perspective has shifted from businesses focus where stakeholder was regarded as a subject that needs to be managed, to a network-based perspective. Build on this findings, stakeholder theory then modified into three perpectives.

First is a corporate perspective that explore company's efforts in dealing with its stakeholders. This perspective suggest that a company should conducts a comprehensive approach that includes identification, engagement, transparency, integration, and continuous improvement. By actively managing these aspects, companies can create effective corporate social responsibility programs that align with stakeholder expectations and contribute to long-term sustainability (Henisz et al., 2014). Next, a stakeholder perspective explores the efforts of various stakeholders to influence the company and shape its corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices. This approach examines how different stakeholder groups, such as employees, local communities, environmental advocates, and government regulators, can exert pressure on the company to address social and environmental concerns. Stakeholder theory suggests that by focusing to the interests and needs of a broad range of stakeholders, companies can create long-term value for both the business and society (Siltaloppi et al., 2021). However, the degree to which companies prioritize and balance the competing demands of various stakeholder groups is a key determinant of their CSR strategy and implementation (Park et al., 2014). Finally, a conceptual perspective offers a more nuanced analysis of the multi-faceted interaction and dynamic relationship between the company and its diverse stakeholders. This approach examines how the company's engagement with various stakeholder groups, such as employees, local communities, environmental advocates, and government regulators, can shape and influence the development and implementation of its corporate social responsibility strategy. By considering the complex interplay between the company's business activities and the broader social, environmental, and regulatory landscape, this conceptual framework provides a more holistic understanding of the factors that drive and shape a firm's CSR practices (Lahtinen et al., 2018).

To have an effective CSR strategy based on the stakeholder, a company should identify the needs of the stakeholder inside the network and translate it into action through CSR activities (Taghian et al., 2015). Stakeholder involvement is the key in CSR. Therefore, the impact of a companys' actions and decision-making on various stakeholders should be considered. There is a debate on stakeholder definition to this extent. On one side, academia suggest that stakeholder concept only related to people (Miles, 2017). On the other hand, in CSR context, many include environment elements as a company's stakeholder (Nora et al., 2023; C. B. van Rees et al., 2019; C. van Rees & Reed, 2015). From strategy perspective, Weiss (2014) argues that anything that could give impact to company's strategy should be included as stakeholder of a company.

Companies in a mining industry are always associated with environment (Ansu-Mensah et al., 2021). Therefore, environmental issues that arise can give negative impact to company's reputation. When Newmont mining operation was accused polluting the environment, the company appealed to the Indonesian Supreme Court to defend its reputation (Septiani, 2013). The company's executive denied any wrongdoing that addressed to Newmont as the issue can harm company's image. Therefore, it can be concluded that in mining industry, environment should be included as company's stakeholder.

According to Weiss (2014), a company should balance stakeholder's expectation along its operational activities. Therefore, it is important for a company to morally create an ethical decision and consider the fairness in achieving its economic goals. From a normative view, stakeholder rights and various expectation should be considered when management creating a decision (Chowdhury et al., 2024). In conclusion, those ethical principle can be considered as company's social responsibility to stakeholders.

Stakeholder Mapping as a Tool for CSR Strategy

Above discussion illustrates that existing literature has shown the connection between CSR strategy and stakeholders. Therefore, in creating a CSR strategy, a company should take into consideration its stakeholders. Servaes & Tamayo

(2013) suggest that the interests of the company and its stakeholders should be aligned by considering stakeholder engagement. Through the interaction with its stakeholder, a company could see from the lense of stakeholder. Particularly, when it relates to the company's mission. Therefore, identifying the key players in CSR strategy is crucial before a company begins to plan its CSR initiatives. The company should provide an analysis on how stakeholders can contribute to the strategy and what function and the impact that the stakeholder have. From a strategy perspective, analyzing stakeholders enables managers to identify and rank its stakeholders, thereby generating public value.

Perrault & Shaver (2021) create a schematic representation of rationale derived from descriptive, normative, and instrumental approaches, resulting in three distinct stages for stakeholder analysis. involves identifying the stakeholder. Second, it is important to distinguish between the different categories of stakeholders. The last step is to investigate the relationships between stakeholders. However, there are various methods in each step when doing a stakeholder analysis. Adding environment elements into the analysis, Taghian et al. (2015) found fours steps in stakeholder analysis. Started with the identification on individuals or groups that could affect or be affected by the companies environmental marketing activities. Second, establishing the importance of each group and linked it to the environmental marketing strategy. Thirdly, determine if the expectations have been met and, ultimately, enabling the company to prepare an environmental marketing strategy on the most significant stakeholder of the company. Despite the complexity of this analysis, it can guarantee that a company comprehends the various stakeholders and their corresponding implications.

From a communication perspective, stakeholder characteristic become an important element in stakeholder mappping (del Mar García-De los Salmones & Perez, 2018; Marín et al., 2016). Since stakeholders are interested in knowing everything that the company did to fulfill its responsibilities, responses to CSR activity will vary. Therefore, it is essential for a company to identify its stakeholder based on strategic concern when implementing CSR strategy. A company can use its CSR as a communication tool to their stakeholders. Unilever, as one of the manufacturing companies in Indonesia, has "Cuci tangan Lifeboy" as one of CSR program. Through this activity, Unilever visited many schools in rural areas and introduced one of its products. The message they gave to the children was that they should wash their hands regularly to keep healthy. However, a company should be aware that the success of CSR as a communication tool could be achieve only if the company gets a complete and accurate stakeholder analysis.

For CSR strategy that is stakeholder oriented, it is essential to map the findings from stakeholder identification. When a company identifies its stakeholders, they will find that not all of them are partners. Singh & Rahman (2022) added that undertaking stakeholder mapping would show the correlation among stakeholders, their strengths, and a potential coalition between important stakeholders. Moreover, stakeholder-mapping aims to classify stakeholders based on the company's mission and strategy. Pedrini & Ferri (2019) stated that stakeholder mapping is only a technique. However, it is crucial and one of the most important activities in managing changes. Thus, this is the starting point where a company can integrate their CSR activities into a long-term strategy to achieve sustainability (Bocken et al., 2015).

There are varying methods to create stakeholder mapping depending on the purpose of a company. Miles (2017) suggests a stakeholder mapping by degree of relevance and classified into power, legitimacy, and urgency. Stakeholders who have power can influence a company's survival and they can be acquire as well as lost. From a legitimacy perspective, a company must be able to assess the applicable norms practiced by each stakeholder on their community. This power and legitimacy attribute can be combine to create authority. From an urgent point of view, stakeholders are categorize based on the stakeholder's time sensitivity, the degree to which delay is acceptable, and how important the claim is to the status of the relationship with the company. From these three general categories, the company then narrows the mapping and categorizes its stakeholders into dormant stakeholder, discretionary stakeholder, demanding stakeholder, dominant stakeholder, dangerous stakeholder, dependent stakeholder, definitive stakeholder, and non-stakeholder. Using this approach, a company can determine which stakeholders require greater attention from the company.

CONCLUSION

The adoption of CSR strategies has become increasingly essential for organizations seeking to enhance their sustainability, reputation, and competitive positioning within the contemporary business landscape. This article has provided a discussion of the importance of integrating CSR into a company's strategy that not only can provide a short-term benefit for a company. Moreover, a company needs to carefully consider the ethical and non-ethical motivations behind implementing CSR initiatives. Some organizations may adopt CSR to enhance their public image and financial performance, rather than out of a genuine commitment to social responsibility. For that reason, this article has provided elements that a company needs to consider in integrating CSR into its strategy.

This review of CSR strategy revealed that the basic concept of CSR is a company's responsibility based on triple bottom lines, economic, social, and environmental practices. To optimize the benefits of CSR strategy, a company should have value added CSR programs that are link with company's strategy and mission. Stakeholders are the most essential element in creating CSR strategy. However, it also clearly stated that the company could not benefit from CSR programs if they fail to identify the stakeholders correctly. There is limitation in this article as it only provides a discussion from literature perspective. Further research using quantitative methods might help to show the possibility of integrating CSR into the company's strategy.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, N., Krishnan, R., & Weiler, L. (2024). Institutional theory and hybrid accounting and control systems. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *36*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.2308/JMAR-2023-024

Amin-Chaudhry, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility-from a mere concept to an expected business practice. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-02-2015-0033

Ansu-Mensah, P., Marfo, E. O., Awuah, L. S., & Amoako, K. O. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and stakeholder engagement in Ghana's mining sector: A case study of Newmont Ahafo mines. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, *6*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-020-00054-2

Asmeri, R., Alvionita, T., & Gunardi, A. (2017). CSR disclosure in the mining industry: Empirical evidence from listed mining firms in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, *1*(1), 16–22.

Belay, H. A., Hailu, F. K., & Sinshaw, G. T. (2023). Linking internal stakeholders' pressure and corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Cogent Business & Management*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2229099

Bérangère L. S (D), & Boughzala, Y. (2021). The role of design thinking in corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategy and its influence on innovation. *Journal of Innovation Economics and Management 2021/1 No 34*, *1*(34), 169–195.

Bocken, N. M. P., Rana, P., & Short, S. W. (2015). Value mapping for sustainable business thinking. *Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering*, *32*(1), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/21681015.2014.1000399

Bowen, H. R., Bowen, P. G., & Gond, J. P. (2013). Social responsibilities of the businessman. In *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. https://doi.org/10.2307/3708003

Bui, M. T., & Le, H. L. (2023). Digital capability and creative capability to boost firm performance and formulate differentiated CSR-based strategy. *Heliyon*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14241

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, *34*(4), 39–48.

Carroll, A. B. (2016). Carroll's pyramid of CSR: Taking another look. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, *1*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-016-0004-6

Chowdhury, R., Sarasvathy, S. D., & Freeman, R. E. (2024). Toward a theory of marginalized stakeholder-centric entrepreneurship. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *34*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2022.29

Cumming, D., Hou, W., & Lee, E. (2016). Business ethics and finance in greater China: Synthesis and future directions in sustainability, CSR, and fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *138*(4), 601–626. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3288-2

da Silva, A., de Oliveira Martins-Silva, P., Coelho, V. D., & de Sousa, A. F. (2023). The corporate social responsibility pyramid: Its evolution and the proposal of the spinner, a theoretical refinement. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *19*(2), 358–376. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-05-2021-0180

Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*, *2*(3), 70–76.

Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *16*(2), 312–322.

del Mar García‐De los Salmones, M., & Perez, A. (2018). Effectiveness of CSR advertising: The role of reputation, consumer attributions, and emotions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *25*(2), 194–208. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1453

Devi, B., & Prayogo, D. (2013). *Mining and development in Indonesia: An overview of the regulatory framework and policies*. International Mining for Development Centre.

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.

Drucker, P. F. (1984). The new meaning of corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review*, *26*(2). https://doi.org/10.2307/41165066

Eiti, I. E. (2021). *Report of EITI Indonesia 2019-2020: Executive summary*. Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources Republic of Indonesia.

Famiyeh, S., Asante-Darko, D., Kwarteng, A., Gameti, D. K., & Asah, S. A. (2019). Corporate social responsibility initiatives and its impact on social license: Some empirical perspectives. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *16*(3), 431–447. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-06-2018-0147

Felber, C., Campos, V., & Sanchis, J. R. (2019). The common good balance sheet, an adequate tool to capture non-financials? *Sustainability*, *11*(14), 3791. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11143791

Flammer, C. (2018). Competing for government procurement contracts: The role of corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(5). https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2767

Frederick, W. C. (1960). The growing concern over business responsibility. *California Management Review*, *2*(4), 54–61.

Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & de Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase profit. *The New York Times Magazine*, *33*, 124–126.

Georgieva, M. G. (2020). Sustainable development through corporate social responsibility. *Global Journal of Business, Economics and Management: Current Issues*, *10*(3), 183–192. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjbem.v10i3.4690

Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *66*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889

Gupta, A., Briscoe, F., & Hambrick, D. C. (2017). Red, blue, and purple firms: Organizational political ideology and corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, *38*(5), 1018–1040. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2550

Hansen, E. G., & Schaltegger, S. (2016). The sustainability balanced scorecard: A systematic review of architectures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *133*, 193–221.

Hansen, E. G., & Schaltegger, S. (2018). Sustainability balanced scorecards and their architectures: Irrelevant or misunderstood? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *150*(4), 937–952. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3531-5

Hasan, M. M., & Jiang, H. (2023). Political sentiment and corporate social responsibility. *The British Accounting Review*, *55*(1), 101170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2022.101170

Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Nartey, L. J. (2014). Spinning gold: The financial returns to stakeholder engagement. *Strategic Management Journal*, *35*(12), 1727–1748. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2180

Hermawan, S., Sari, Y. A., Sarwenda, B., Rahayu, D., & Rahayu, R. A. (2023). Corporate social responsibility, firm value, and profitability: Evidence from pharmaceutical companies in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, *8*(2).

Hollstein, B., & Rosa, H. (2023). Social acceleration: A challenge for companies? Insights for business ethics from resonance theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *188*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05506-w

Isaksson, L., Kiessling, T., & Harvey, M. (2014). Corporate social responsibility: Why bother? *Organizational Dynamics*, *43*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.10.008

Jahn, J., & Brühl, R. (2018). How Friedman's view on individual freedom relates to stakeholder theory and social contract theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *153*(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3353-x

Jo, H., Kim, H., & Park, K. (2015). Seeking legitimacy through CSR: Evidence from controversial industries. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2591910

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. (1996). Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. *Harvard Business Review*, *74*(1), 75–85.

Kim, C., Kim, J., Marshall, R., & Afzali, H. (2018). Stakeholder influence, institutional duality, and CSR involvement of MNC subsidiaries. *Journal of Business Research*, *91*, 40–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.044

Kunz, M. B., Ratliff, J. M., Blankenbuehler, M., & Bard, T. (2014). A preliminary examination of sustainable disclosures on Fortune 500 company websites. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *13*(1).

Lahtinen, S., Kuusela, H., & Yrjölä, M. (2018). The company in society: When corporate responsibility transforms strategy. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *39*(4). https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-05-2017-0069

Lane, A. B., & Devin, B. (2018). Operationalizing stakeholder engagement in CSR: A process approach. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *25*(3), 267–280. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1460

Levitt, T. (1958). The dangers of social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, *36*(5), 41–50.

Lindorff, M., Prior Jonson, E., & McGuire, L. (2012). Strategic corporate social responsibility in controversial industry sectors: The social value of harm minimisation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *110*(4), 457–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1493-1

Malla, S. S., & Sharma, S. C. (2021). Consumer attitudes and marketing strategies: A corporate social responsibility perspective. *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review*, *5*(3), 18–33. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgsrv5i3p2

Marín, L., Cuestas, P. J., & Román, S. (2016). Determinants of consumer attributions of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *138*(2), 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2578-4

McElhaney, K. (2009). A startegic approach to corporate social responsibility. *Leader to Leader*, *52*(1), 30–36.

McGuire, J. W. (1963). *Business and society*. McGraw-Hills Paperbacks.

McWilliams, A., Parhankangas, A., Coupet, J., Welch, E., & Barnum, D. T. (2016). Strategic Decision Making for the Triple Bottom Line. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *25*(3), 193–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1867

Miles, S. (2017). Stakeholder theory classification: A theoretical and empirical evaluation of definitions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *142*(3), 437–459. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2741-y

Mu, H.-L., Xu, J., & Chen, S. (2024). The impact of corporate social responsibility types on happiness management: A stakeholder theory perspective. *Management Decision*, *62*(2), 591–613. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-02-2023-0267

Nainggolan, Y. A., Astuti, E. D., Rahadi, R. A., & Afgani, K. F. (2021). Political connection and corporate social responsibility: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *22*(2), 922–940.

Nora, G. A. M., Alberton, A., & Ayala, D. H. F. (2023). Stakeholder theory and actor-network theory: The stakeholder engagement in energy transitions. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *32*(1), 673–685. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3168

O'Brien, I. M., Jarvis, W., Soutar, G., & Ouschan, R. (2018). *Co-creating a CSR strategy with customers to deliver greater value* (pp. 89–107). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71449-3_6

Ogola, F. O., & Mària, J. F. (2020). Mechanisms for development in corporate citizenship: A multi-level review. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, *5*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-020-00051-5

Park, B. I., Chidlow, A., & Choi, J. (2014). Corporate social responsibility: Stakeholders influence on MNEs' activities. *International Business Review*, *23*(5), 966–980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2014.02.008

Pedrini, M., & Ferri, L. M. (2019). Stakeholder management: A systematic literature review. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, *19*(1), 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-08-2017-0172

Perrault, E., & Shaver, K. (2021). A stakeholders' attributions approach to integrating normative, descriptive, and instrumental corporate social responsibility. *Business and Society Review*, *126*(3), 239–261. https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12238

Porter, M. E. (1997). Competitive strategy: Measuring business excellence. *Harvard Business Review*, *1*(2), 12–17.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(4), 78–92.

Poveda-Pareja, E., Marco-Lajara, B., Úbeda-García, M., & Manresa-Marhuenda, E. (2024). Innovation as a driving force for the creation of sustainable value derived from CSR: An integrated perspective. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *30*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2024.100241

Rakhmantari, N. L., Sitiari, N., & Dharmanegara, I. B. (2019). Effect of corporate social responsibility on company value with company size and profitability as moderated variables in pharmaceutical companies listed on the Indonesia stock exchange. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Jagaditha*, *6*(2), 121–129.

Ring, J. E. (2021). Operationalizing sustainable development, stakeholder theory, corporate social responsibility to improve community engagement outcomes. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, *15*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v15n1p1

Rintis, E., & Darsa, M. (2021). *Indonesia's sustainable transformation*. PWC.

Risi, D., Vigneau, L., Bohn, S., & Wickert, C. (2023). Institutional theory-based research on corporate social responsibility: Bringing values back in. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *25*(1), 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12299

Rosser, A., & Edwin, D. (2010). The politics of corporate social responsibility in Indonesia. *The Pacific Review*, *23*(1), 1–22.

Schaltegger, S., Hörisch, J., & Freeman, R. E. (2019). Business cases for sustainability: A stakeholder theory perspective. *Organization & Environment*, *32*(3), 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026617722882

Septiani, D. (2013). The Buyat case: Straddling between environmental securitization and desecuritization. *Media Jurnal Global Dan Strategis*, *7*(2), 183–195.

Servaes, H., & Tamayo, A. (2013). The impact of corporate social responsibility on firm value: The role of customer awareness. *Management Science*, *59*(5), 1045–1061. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1120.1630

Sethi, S. P. (1975). Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytical framework. *California Management Review*, *17*(3), 58–64.

Shin, S., Aiken, K. D., Lynch, N., & Seok, S. (2023). Exploring the implications of corporate social responsibility assurance messages in cause-related social media marketing. *Business Communication Research and Practice*, *6*(2), 70–79. https://doi.org/10.22682/bcrp.2023.6.2.70

Siltaloppi, J., Rajala, R., & Hietala, H. (2021). Integrating CSR with business strategy: A tension management perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *174*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04569-3

Sinaga, R. R., & Bowden, B. (2018). History of social responsibility: The Indonesian government role in economy development. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *20*(1), 37–52.

Singh, A. P., & Rahman, Z. (2022). Exploring the antecedents and consequences of firm-stakeholder engagement process: A systematic review of literature. *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review*, *6*(3), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgsrv6i3p3

Spence, L. J. (2016). Small business social responsibility. *Business & Society*, *55*(1), 23–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650314523256

Susanto, F., Farida, J., Hamdy, H., & Kristaung, R. (2020). Social responsibility and marketing impact on hospital business sustainability: Lessons from Indonesia. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, *26*(8), 21–35.

Taghian, M., D'Souza, C., & Polonsky, M. J. (2015). A stakeholder approach to corporate social responsibility, reputation and business performance. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-06-2012-0068

Thijssens, T., Bollen, L., & Hassink, H. (2015). Secondary stakeholder influence on CSR disclosure: An application of stakeholder salience theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *132*(4), 873–891. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2623-3

van Rees, C. B., Cañizares, J. R., Garcia, G. M., & Reed, J. M. (2019). Ecological stakeholder analogs as intermediaries between freshwater biodiversity conservation and sustainable water management. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *29*(4), 303–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1856

van Rees, C., & Reed, J. M. (2015). Water diplomacy from a Duck's perspective: Wildlife as stakeholders in water management. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research & Education*, *155*(1), 28–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2015.03193.x

Waagstein, P. R. (2011). The mandatory of corporate social responsibility in Indonesia: Problems and implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(3), 455–466.

Waheed, A., & Zhang, Q. (2022). Effect of CSR and ethical practices on sustainable competitive performance: A case of emerging markets from stakeholder theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *175*(4), 837–855. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04679-y

Wang, Q., Dou, J., & Jia, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance: The moderating effect of contextual factors. *Business & Society*, *55*(8), 1083–1121.

Wedayanti, M. D., Nurmandi, A., Jubba, H., & Pulungan, B. I. (2022). Political interaction strategy corporate social responsibility of PT. Riau Andalan Pulp and Paper in Riau Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development Planning*, *17*(8), 2393–2399.

Weiss, J. W. (2014). *Business ethics: A stakeholder and issues management approach* (Sixth). Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.