

## FROM EMPOWERMENT TO DEPENDENCY: EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON COMMUNITY INDEPENDENCE

Dadan Ramdhan<sup>1</sup>, Amirah Azzahra<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Rafi Thoriq<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Management Study Program, Universitas Ary Ginanjar

<sup>2</sup>Development Economics Study Program, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta

<sup>3</sup>Master of Management Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta

E-mail: [dadan@esqbs.ac.id](mailto:dadan@esqbs.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>, [amirahazzahra81@gmail.com](mailto:amirahazzahra81@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>, [mrafithoriq@gmail.com](mailto:mrafithoriq@gmail.com)<sup>3\*</sup>

Received: 01/04/2026 | Revised : 10/04/2026 | Accepted: 15/05/2026 | Published : 24/05/2026

### Abstract

This study aims to analyze corporate social responsibility (CSR) implementation motives and their implications for community self-reliance. The study employed a qualitative approach with a literature review method, analyzing scientific articles, sustainability reports, and CSR-related regulations. The results indicate that CSR implementation is influenced by three primary motives: regulatory compliance, corporate image building, and business interests through the creating shared value (CSV) approach. Although CSR contributes to improving community well-being, its impact on self-reliance remains limited. This is due to the dominance of aid-based approaches, low community participation, and a program orientation that emphasizes the legitimacy and strategic interests of the company over capacity building. As a result, CSR tends to produce dependency and pseudo-impact, where improvements in well-being are not accompanied by sustainable improvements in community capacity. Therefore, the effectiveness of CSR in promoting self-reliance depends heavily on participatory program design, based on local needs, and oriented toward long-term capacity building.

**Keywords:** *Corporate Social Responsibility; Community Independence; Dependence; Empowerment; Sustainability.*

### INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the role of companies has undergone a significant shift. Whereas companies were once viewed merely as economic entities oriented toward profit maximization, they are now increasingly seen as social actors with responsibilities toward the environment and society. The classical perspective popularized by Freeman (2010) has begun to be questioned, particularly in the context of growing global pressure for sustainable business practices. This shift in perspective has encouraged the development of the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a framework that bridges the economic interests of companies with social and environmental demands. CSR is no longer understood merely as an additional activity outside the core business, but is increasingly integrated into corporate strategy as part of efforts to create broader value (Commission, 2001; ISO, 2010). Over time, the concept of CSR has also expanded, evolving from a philanthropic approach toward more strategic approaches, such as creating shared value (Dahlsrud, 2008; Porter & Kramer, 2006).

Nevertheless, the conceptual development of CSR is not always aligned with its practical implementation. In many cases, CSR still tends to be symbolic and oriented toward the strategic interests of the company, such as enhancing reputation and social legitimacy (Du et al., 2010; Romani et al., 2016). In addition, CSR is often carried out as a response to external pressures, whether in the form of regulations or stakeholder demands, making its implementation more reactive in nature (Hall & Jeanneret, 2015; van der Meer & Jonkman, 2021). One issue that has received increasing attention in CSR studies is the paradox between improving welfare and fostering community independence. On the one hand, CSR programs can provide direct benefits through infrastructure development, education, and social services. On the other hand, CSR programs do not always lead to independence and, in some contexts, may even create dependency—especially when they are dominated by a charity-based approach without sustainable capacity building for communities (Riansyah & Lampe, 2020).

This issue is closely related to the underlying motives behind CSR implementation. The literature shows that CSR can be driven by both intrinsic and extrinsic motives, each influencing the design and impact of programs (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; H. Wang et al., 2016). Strategically oriented CSR tends to be short-term, whereas CSR based on intrinsic values is more likely to generate sustainable social impacts (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019). In the extractive and energy sectors, the complexity of CSR implementation becomes even more evident. Companies not only face pressure to comply with legal obligations but are also required to maintain social stability and secure a social license to operate. In this context, CSR often functions as an instrument to manage relationships with communities while minimizing potential social conflicts (Hall & Jeanneret, 2015). However, when CSR is oriented more toward legitimacy than empowerment, its impact tends to be limited to short-term welfare without strengthening community capacity. Based on this background, this study aims to analyze corporate motives in CSR implementation and evaluate their implications for community independence. The study emphasizes the relationship between CSR motives and the resulting social outcomes, with the expectation of contributing to a better understanding of CSR effectiveness as an empowerment instrument.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Legitimacy Theory**

Legitimacy theory explains that organizations strive to align their activities with social values and norms in order to gain acceptance from society (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). From this perspective, a company's survival depends on its ability to meet dynamic social expectations (Deegan, 2022; Velte, 2022). Therefore, in the context of CSR, legitimacy becomes a key driver for companies to build and maintain a positive image among stakeholders. However, such efforts do not always reflect substantive change, as in some cases CSR is carried out symbolically and may lead to greenwashing practices—creating a positive perception without actual improvements in social and environmental performance (Forliano et al., 2025; Torelli et al., 2020).

### **Stakeholder Theory**

Stakeholder theory emphasizes that companies are responsible not only to shareholders but also to all stakeholders involved in or affected by corporate activities (Freeman, 2010). Within this framework, a company's success is determined by its ability to create value and maintain sustainable relationships with stakeholders. CSR is thus understood as a strategic instrument to manage these relationships while responding to increasingly complex social and environmental demands (Mahajan et al., 2023). However, in practice, companies often face dilemmas between economic interests and social demands, so stakeholder management does not always operate optimally and may lead to conflicts of interest (Dmytriiev et al., 2021).

### **Instrumental Theory**

Instrumental theory views stakeholder management, including through CSR, as a means to achieve corporate objectives. In this perspective, CSR is positioned not only as an ethical obligation but also as a strategy that can enhance organizational performance (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Jones, 1995). CSR implementation can strengthen reputation, increase stakeholder trust, and contribute to a company's financial performance (Deren Van Het Hof & Hostut, 2017; Flammer, 2021). However, this approach also has limitations, as it risks reducing CSR to merely a business tool, thereby giving less attention to broader social objectives.

## **METHOD**

This study uses a qualitative approach with a conceptual analysis method to examine companies' motives in implementing corporate social responsibility (CSR) and their implications for community independence. This approach allows for a systematic integration of theoretical concepts and empirical findings (Jabareen, 2009; Smith & Mörelius, 2021). The data used are secondary data from indexed journals, regulatory documents, and company sustainability reports. The analysis is conducted descriptively and qualitatively through concept identification, classification of CSR motives, and assessment of the relationship between theory and practice to understand CSR effectiveness (Sovacool et al., 2018).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Corporate Motives in Implementing CSR**

#### **1. Regulatory Compliance**

The development of corporate social responsibility (CSR) shows a shift from a voluntary approach toward a mandatory one, reflecting a transformation from soft law to hard law in promoting corporate social and environmental responsibility (Sheehy et al., 2023). In this context, CSR is no longer viewed merely as an ethical commitment but also as a formal instrument supporting sustainable development. However, compliance with regulations does not always guarantee the quality of CSR implementation. Companies may implement CSR due to external pressures or internal motivations, which ultimately affect the depth of its impact (Pillai et al., 2022). Regulatory pressures, including ESG reporting requirements, have been shown to increase CSR adoption, but a dominant profit orientation may limit its quality. Additionally, stakeholder expectations encourage companies to implement CSR more substantively, as it relates to corporate image and social acceptance (Yulia & Ayu Jati Putri, 2025). In Indonesia, CSR is reinforced by various mandatory regulations, such as Law No. 40 of 2007 on Limited Liability Companies, which requires the implementation of social and environmental responsibility as part of a company's commitment to sustainable development. This provision is further strengthened by Law No. 25 of 2007 and Government Regulation No. 47 of 2012, which governs CSR implementation technically. Moreover, sectoral regulations such as Minister of State-Owned Enterprises Regulation No. PER-1/MBU/03/2023 and Financial Services Authority Regulation (POJK) No. 51/POJK.03/2017 further enhance CSR obligations and transparency in Indonesia. Compared to other ASEAN countries, this approach is relatively stricter, making CSR largely driven by formal obligations (Anggusti et al., 2025). Thus, CSR implementation reflects the interaction between regulation, stakeholder pressure, and internal corporate commitment.

#### **2. Corporate Image Building**

Beyond being an obligation, CSR is also implemented as part of corporate strategy to build image and reputation. Through CSR, companies can enhance intangible value that supports competitive advantage (Mai et al., 2021; Maisaroh et al., 2025). CSR is also used to meet stakeholder expectations while strengthening the company's market position (Q. Wang et al., 2023). In the long term, integrating CSR with innovation and sustainability principles has been shown to improve corporate performance and strengthen relationships with stakeholders (Alshukri et al., 2024; Fosu et al., 2024; Melero-Polo & López-Pérez, 2017). However, an image-oriented approach does not always produce substantive impact. In many cases, CSR is used to gain social legitimacy and a social license to operate, particularly in sectors with significant societal impact (Khailifa et al., 2023). When this orientation becomes dominant, CSR risks becoming merely a branding tool without real change. This condition may lead to greenwashing practices, where there is a mismatch between communicated commitments and actual implementation (Basrawi et al., 2025; Kudłak, 2025; Zervoudi et al., 2025). Therefore, the motive of image-building in CSR can be both constructive and manipulative, depending on how substantively it is integrated into business practices.

#### **3. Business Interests (Creating Shared Value / CSV)**

CSR motives have also evolved toward business interests through the creating shared value (CSV) approach, where CSR is integrated into corporate strategy to generate both economic and social value. This shift from a philanthropic to a strategic approach indicates that CSR is increasingly linked to core business activities (Kim et al., 2021; Ollivier de Leth & Ros-Tonen, 2022; Royo-Vela & Cuevas Lizama, 2022). CSV enables companies to enhance competitiveness while benefiting society through innovation, operational efficiency, and collaboration with various stakeholders (Arena et al., 2022; Chihambakwe et al., 2021). This approach has been shown to positively impact corporate performance, both financially and non-financially, such as increased profitability, customer satisfaction, and business sustainability (Seo et al., 2023). In practice, CSV is implemented through mechanisms such as developing products that address social needs, improving efficiency within the value chain, and strengthening stakeholder relationships (Taskin et al., 2023). It is also expanded through supply chain strategies and partnership development, including engagement with base-of-the-pyramid groups (Alexandre et al., 2023; Chihambakwe et al., 2021; Taghipour et al., 2022). The success of CSV implementation is also influenced by organizational change management (Elsaman, 2024). However, CSV is not without criticism, particularly regarding difficulties in measuring social impact and potential conflicts between business objectives and societal interests (Ollivier de Leth & Ros-Tonen, 2022). This indicates that although CSR is increasingly integrated into business strategy, its effectiveness still depends on balancing economic orientation with social goals.

### **The Impact of CSR on Community Independence**

Conceptually, corporate social responsibility (CSR) is often positioned as an empowerment instrument aimed at enhancing community independence through capacity building and participation. However, in practice, there is a clear gap between this normative goal and the reality of implementation. Several studies show that while CSR can improve community welfare, it does not automatically enhance individual or collective capacity, meaning that community independence is not optimally achieved (Said et al., 2022). This indicates that CSR programs often stop at the level of community well-being without addressing the capacity-building dimension, which is essential for independence. These limitations are closely related to the dominance of charity-based approaches in CSR implementation. In some cases, CSR programs focus more on short-term benefit distribution rather than long-term capacity development. Evidence from PT Freeport Indonesia shows that despite substantial social investment, its impact on community independence remains limited. Programs focusing on infrastructure, education, and health do not automatically lead to self-reliance but instead may reinforce dependency on the company (Tarigan et al., 2022). This pattern suggests that the scale of resource allocation does not always align with the quality of outcomes.

This phenomenon reflects a more structural issue in CSR design, namely the dominance of top-down approaches and the lack of community participation. In the extractive sector, CSR is often designed based on corporate interests without involving communities as key actors in the planning process. As a result, programs may not fully align with local needs and community capacities (Idemudia & Osayande, 2016). In contrast, literature shows that CSR has the potential to enhance adaptive capacity and collective action when designed participatively (Zainuddin Rela et al., 2020). When participation is neglected, CSR not only loses effectiveness but also reinforces dependency relationships between communities and companies. A similar condition is observed in economic-based CSR programs. Studies on CSR initiatives by PT Pertamina indicate that assistance in the form of production tools and economic interventions does not lead to business sustainability due to the lack of technical and managerial capacity building within communities (Wedayanti et al., 2023). This demonstrates that without capacity strengthening, economic interventions result only in what is termed pseudo-independence—where communities appear productive but remain dependent on external support.

Furthermore, the limited impact of CSR is also related to its underlying motives. In some cases, CSR functions as an instrument to maintain social stability and secure operational legitimacy, particularly in the context of a social license to operate (Widiartanto et al., 2023). CSR is also often positioned as part of corporate reputation strategy rather than as a mechanism for structural empowerment (Faizah et al., 2023; Gond et al., 2017). When CSR is driven more by legitimacy and image concerns, the resulting programs tend to be symbolic and short-term, limiting their contribution to community independence. On the other hand, literature shows that the success of CSR in fostering independence largely depends on community participation and the strengthening of social capital. CSR programs that actively involve communities have been proven to enhance trust, collaboration, and knowledge-sharing, which are essential foundations for empowerment (Rudito et al., 2022). Independence can only be achieved when communities possess the capacity to manage resources and make decisions autonomously (Maria et al., 2024). However, in post-mining contexts, unsustainable and poorly institutionalized CSR can instead increase socio-economic vulnerability (Santoso et al., 2025).

In general, although CSR contributes positively to improving welfare, its impact on independence remains limited due to the dominance of charity-based approaches and weak program designs that fail to reflect local needs (Bhukya, 2023). Criticism of the conventional CSR paradigm has intensified, with CSR often seen as a mechanism for short-term benefit distribution rather than a tool for social transformation (Banerjee, 2008; Jamali et al., 2017). Under such conditions, CSR may produce a pseudo-impact—where welfare improvements are not accompanied by capacity enhancement, leaving communities in structurally dependent relationships with companies (Fatima & Elbanna, 2023; Mangin & Kriswibowo, 2022).

### **CONCLUSION**

This study shows that the implementation of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is strongly influenced by corporate motives, namely compliance with image-building regulations and business interests, which ultimately shape the orientation and quality of the programs implemented. Although CSR contributes to improving community welfare, its impact on independence remains limited due to the dominance of charitable approaches, low community participation, and program designs that are not fully based on local needs. This condition indicates that CSR has not fully functioned as an instrument of social transformation, but rather tends to be a mechanism for short-term benefit distribution and a tool for corporate legitimacy, thus potentially producing pseudo-impacts and strengthening community dependency. Therefore, future CSR implementation needs to be directed towards a more participatory

and empowerment-based approach, by placing the community as the main actor and balancing business interests and social goals to be able to encourage community independence in a sustainable manner.

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2019). On Corporate Social Responsibility, Sensemaking, and the Search for Meaningfulness Through Work. *Journal of Management*, 45(3), 1057–1086. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691575>
- Alexandre, C., Tresch, L., Sarron, J., Lavarenne, J., Bringer, G., Chaham, H. R., Bendahou, H., Carmeni, S., Borianne, P., Koffi, J.-M., & Faye, E. (2023). Creating shared value(s) from On-Farm Experimentation: ten key lessons learned from the development of the SoYield® digital solution in Africa. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 43(3), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-023-00888-7>
- Alshukri, T., Seun Ojekemi, O., Öz, T., & Alzubi, A. (2024). The Interplay of Corporate Social Responsibility, Innovation Capability, Organizational Learning, and Sustainable Value Creation: Does Stakeholder Engagement Matter? *Sustainability*, 16(13), 5511. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135511>
- Anggusti, M., Dewi Siregar, F. Y., & Chansrakaeo, R. (2025). Corporate Social Responsibility Legal Framework in Southeast Asia: Comparing Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand. *SASI*, 31(2), 188. <https://doi.org/10.47268/sasi.v31i2.2984>
- Arena, M., Azzone, G., & Piantoni, G. (2022). Uncovering value creation in innovation ecosystems: paths towards shared value. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 25(6), 432–451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-06-2021-0289>
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. *Critical Sociology*, 34(1), 51–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920507084623>
- Basrawi, B., Karim, M. S., & Ilmar, A. (2025). The Politics of Criminal Law Behind the Mining Industry's Image: Uncovering CSR Scandals in Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 6(1), 179–208. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v6i1.14464>
- Bhukya, V. (2023). Corporate Social Responsibility Practices in the Top Ten Indian Companies and Its Impact on Community Development. *International Journal of Humanities, Management and Social Science (IJ-HuMaSS)*, 6(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.36079/lamintang.ij-humass-0601.521>
- Chihambakwe, Z. J., Grobbelaar, S. S. (Saartjie), & Matope, S. (2021). Creating Shared Value in BoP Communities with Micro-Manufacturing Factories: A Systematized Literature Review. *Sustainability*, 13(18), 10289. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810289>
- Commission, E. (2001). *Promoting a European framework for Corporate Social Responsibility*.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.132>
- Deegan, C. (2022). *Financial Accounting Theory*. Cengage Learning Australia. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=ak2MEAAAQBAJ>
- Deren Van Het Hof, S., & Hostut, S. (2017). Instrumental, Strategic and Political Conception of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.29333/ojcm/2583>
- Dmytriiev, S. D., Freeman, R. E., & Hörisch, J. (2021). The Relationship between Stakeholder Theory and Corporate Social Responsibility: Differences, Similarities, and Implications for Social Issues in Management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(6), 1441–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12684>
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258887>
- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1), 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226>
- Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing Business Returns to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Role of CSR Communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 8–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00276.x>
- Elsaman, H. A. (2024). Conceptualise the model of creating shared value, organisational performance and the mediating role of change management. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2766>

- Faizah, L., Witjaksono, A. D., & Kistyanto, A. (2023). The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Program on Increasing Community Empowerment. *INFLUENCE: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE REVIEW*, 5(1), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.54783/influencejournal.v5i1.99>
- Fatima, T., & Elbanna, S. (2023). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Implementation: A Review and a Research Agenda Towards an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 183(1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05047-8>
- Forliano, C., Battisti, E., de Bernardi, P., & Kliestik, T. (2025). Mapping the greenwashing research landscape: a theoretical and field analysis. *Review of Managerial Science*, 19(11), 3407–3456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00856-3>
- Fosu, E., Fosu, F., Akyina, N., & Asiedu, D. (2024). Do environmental CSR practices promote corporate social performance? The mediating role of green innovation and corporate image. *Cleaner and Responsible Consumption*, 12, 100155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clrc.2023.100155>
- Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Cambridge University Press. [https://books.google.co.id/books?id=NpmA\\_qEiOpkC](https://books.google.co.id/books?id=NpmA_qEiOpkC)
- Gond, J., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 225–246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2170>
- Hall, N. L., & Jeanneret, T. (2015). Social licence to operate. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 20(2), 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-01-2014-0005>
- Idemudia, U., & Osayande, N. (2016). Assessing the effect of corporate social responsibility on community development in the Niger Delta: a corporate perspective: Table 1. *Community Development Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsw019>
- ISO. (2010). *Discovering ISO 26000*.
- Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a Conceptual Framework: Philosophy, Definitions, and Procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(4), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406>
- Jamali, D., Karam, C., Yin, J., & Soundararajan, V. (2017). CSR logics in developing countries: Translation, adaptation and stalled development. *Journal of World Business*, 52(3), 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2017.02.001>
- Jones, T. M. (1995). Instrumental Stakeholder Theory: A Synthesis of Ethics and Economics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 404. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258852>
- Khailifa, Q. D., Khusnia, H. N., Yohanes, Y. T. S., & Miharja, D. L. (2023). Implementasi Corporate Social Responsibility PT. Amman Mineral Nusa Tenggara Dalam Membentuk Citra Perusahaan. *Tuturlogi*, 4(2), 48. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.tuturlogi.2023.004.02.5>
- Kim, S., Baek, W., Byon, K. K., & Ju, S. (2021). Creating Shared Value to Enhance Customer Loyalty: A Case of a Sporting Goods Company in Korean Athletic Shoe Market. *Sustainability*, 13(13), 7031. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13137031>
- Kudlak, R. (2025). Greenwashing or Striving to Persist: An Alternative Explanation of a Loose Coupling Between Corporate Environmental Commitments and Outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 197(2), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05778-w>
- Latapí Agudelo, M. A., Jóhannsdóttir, L., & Davídsdóttir, B. (2019). A literature review of the history and evolution of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 4(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-018-0039-y>
- Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Sareen, M., Kumar, S., & Panwar, R. (2023). Stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 166, 114104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114104>
- Mai, N. K., Nguyen, A. K. T., & Nguyen, T. T. (2021). Implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy to Enhance Firm Reputation and Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 13(4), 96–114. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2021.04.06>
- Maisaroh, H., Rohman, M. A. Z., & Lama, A. V. (2025). Education Management in Building a Strong and Sustainable Brand Image. *Business and Applied Management Journal*, 2(2), 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.61987/bamj.v2i2.507>
- Mangin, A. Y., & Kriswibowo, A. (2022). Corporate Social Responsibility dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa Wisata Baruga Collaboration Center di Malili Kabupaten Luwu Timur. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 22(2), 1153. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v22i2.2344>

- Maria, G. A. R., Rudi Saprudin Darwis, & Santoso Tri Raharjo. (2024). Is It True That CSR Programs Can Empower Local Communities: A Lesson from the People of Gag Raja Ampat Island Indonesia. *EVOLUTIONARY STUDIES IN IMAGINATIVE CULTURE*, 525–535. <https://doi.org/10.70082/esiculture.vi.708>
- Melero-Polo, I., & López-Pérez, M. E. (2017). Identifying Links between Corporate Social Responsibility and Reputation: Some Considerations for F. *Journal of Evolutionary Studies in Business-JESB*, 2(2), 191–230. <https://doi.org/10.1344/jesb2017.2.j034>
- Ollivier de Leth, D., & Ros-Tonen, M. A. F. (2022). Creating Shared Value Through an Inclusive Development Lens: A Case Study of a CSV Strategy in Ghana's Cocoa Sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178(2), 339–354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04808-1>
- Pillai, R. D., Wang, P., & Kuah, A. T. H. (2022). Unlocking corporate social responsibility in smaller firms: Compliance, conviction, burden, or opportunity? *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 64(6), 627–646. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.22315>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92.
- Riansyah, Moh., & Lampe, I. (2020). PERLAWANAN MASYARAKAT ATAS IMPLEMENTASI CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) PT. DONGGI SENORO LIQUIFIED NATURAL GAS (LNG) DI KELURAHAN BALANTANG KECAMATAN BATUI KABUPATEN BANGGAI. *KINESIK*, 7(2), 124–132. <https://doi.org/10.22487/ejk.v7i2.117>
- Romani, S., Grappi, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2016). Corporate Socially Responsible Initiatives and Their Effects on Consumption of Green Products. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(2), 253–264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2485-0>
- Royo-Vela, M., & Cuevas Lizama, J. (2022). Creating Shared Value: Exploration in an Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. *Sustainability*, 14(14), 8505. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148505>
- Rudito, B., Famiola, M., & Anggahegari, P. (2022). Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Capital: Journey of Community Engagement toward Community Empowerment Program in Developing Country. *Sustainability*, 15(1), 466. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010466>
- Said, L. R., Anisah, H. U., Firdaus, M. R., Rusniati, R., & Rachman, M. K. (2022). The Impact of Perceived Benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives on Wetland Farming Communities in Indonesia. *WSEAS TRANSACTIONS ON BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS*, 19, 402–413. <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2022.19.36>
- Santoso, T. I., Octavenda, C. P., & Alamsyah, M. N. (2025). Corporate Social Responsibility and Community Empowerment in the Mining Sector: Post-Mining Closure and Sustainable Development in Gunung Pongkor, Indonesia. *International Journal of Islamic Business and Management Review*, 5(1), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.54099/ijibmr.v5i1.1341>
- Seo, J., Lee, J., Jung, S., & Park, S. (2023). The Role of Creating Shared Value and Entrepreneurial Orientation in Generating Social and Economic Benefits: Evidence from Korean SMEs. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 6168. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15076168>
- Sheehy, B., Khan, H. Z., Prananingtyas, P., & Sophiana Sunarso Putri, P. (2023). Shifting from Soft to Hard Law: Motivating Compliance When Enacting Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 24(4), 693–719. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40804-023-00284-4>
- Smith, S., & Mörelius, E. (2021). Principle-Based Concept Analysis Methodology Using a Phased Approach With Quality Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211057995>
- Sovacool, B. K., Axsen, J., & Sorrell, S. (2018). Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 45, 12–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.07.007>
- Taghipour, A., Khazaei, M., Azar, A., Rajabzadeh Ghatari, A., Hajiaghaei-Keshteli, M., & Ramezani, M. (2022). Creating Shared Value and Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility through Outsourcing within Supply Chain Management. *Sustainability*, 14(4), 1940. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14041940>
- Tarigan, G. H., Radyati, M. R. N., & Utha, M. A. (2022). PROGRAM CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) BIDANG KESEHATAN PT FREEPORT INDONESIA DI ERA PANDEMI COVID-19. *JURNAL PENELITIAN DAN KARYA ILMIAH LEMBAGA PENELITIAN UNIVERSITAS TRISAKTI*, 8(1), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.25105/pdk.v8i1.15094>

- Taskin, S., Javed, A., & Kohda, Y. (2023). Creating Shared Value in Banking by Offering Entrepreneurship Education to Female Entrepreneurs. *Sustainability*, 15(19), 14475. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151914475>
- Torelli, R., Balluchi, F., & Lazzini, A. (2020). Greenwashing and environmental communication: Effects on stakeholders' perceptions. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(2), 407–421. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2373>
- van der Meer, T. G. L. A., & Jonkman, J. G. F. (2021). Politicization of corporations and their environment: Corporations' social license to operate in a polarized and mediatized society. *Public Relations Review*, 47(1), 101988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101988>
- Velte, P. (2022). Meta-analyses on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): a literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 72(3), 627–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00211-2>
- Wang, H., Tong, L., Takeuchi, R., & George, G. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility: An Overview and New Research Directions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 534–544. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.5001>
- Wang, Q., Sun, M., & Wang, K. (2023). Do Reputation Incentives Matter? Busy Directors and Corporate Social Responsibility in China. *Sustainability*, 15(6), 4857. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064857>
- Wedayanti, M. D., Yogia, M. A., Prihatin, P. S., Pulungan, B. I., & Desriadi, D. (2023). DEVELOPMENT OF THE MINAPOLITAN VILLAGE CSR PROGRAM MODEL PT. PERTAMINA RU II DUMAI. *Natapraja*, 11(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.21831/natapraja.v11i1.58668>
- Widiartanto, W., Wahyudi, F. E., Pradika, B., Adistya, B., Rahman, A. Z., & Paramasatya, S. (2023). Green Leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility: Study of Community Responses to CSR Activities PT. Pertamina Fuel Terminal Boyolali. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 12(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jab.v12i1.52901>
- Yulia, A., & Ayu Jati Putri, F. (2025). Implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility By Companies To Establish Corporate Existence In Society (A Review From Business and Legal Norm Perspectives). *Journal of Social Research*, 4(2), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v4i2.2447>
- Zainuddin Rela, I., Awang, A. H., Ramli, Z., Taufik, Y., Md Sum, S., & Muhammad, M. (2020). Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Community Resilience: Empirical Evidence in the Nickel Mining Industry in Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Sustainability*, 12(4), 1395. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041395>
- Zervoudi, E. K., Moschos, N., & Christopoulos, A. G. (2025). From the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Criteria to the Greenwashing Phenomenon: A Comprehensive Literature Review About the Causes, Consequences and Solutions of the Phenomenon with Specific Case Studies. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 2222. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052222>