Corporate Social Responsibility and Marginalized Groups (Review Of Literature)

James E. Mrema[1]
Research Scholar
Department of Human Resource Management
Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur
Andhra Pradesh

Makawa Newa Laurent[2]
Research Scholar
Department of Commerce and Business Administration
Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur
Andhra Pradesh

Abstract: This article investigates the possibilities of corporate social responsibility (CSR) advancing the needs of marginalized groups in the modern societies. There are many people who find themselves at the margins of society. This could be due to social issues such as poverty, substance abuse or mental health issues, their cultural values. It can further be a minority group due to discrimination (race, colour, and ethnicity, religious) or gender based (women), children, physically challenged people, the poor, etc. It has been vividly witnessed that the economic liberalization era has brought vast impact to the social life of people than ever before. With the expanding role of the private sector in national and global governance systems, the issue of corporate accountability on social issues has become increasingly important. It is also recognized that business is a social and economic institution which cannot live in isolation. Essentially, the survival and growth of any firm is largely depending upon the loyal society. Financial success is no longer the sole measure to judge any organization's performance. Thus firms are expected to perform in the areas of human rights, environment policies, corporate contributions, community development, business ethics, corporate governance and workplace issues. The economic and global business trends have brought with it many challenges. Whilst hoping for positive outcome from liberal policies it has also led to adverse outcomes. Some people have found themselves deprived of their inherent rights in their countries yet still others suffering from the "artificial values" from the ridges and tides of globalization. The proliferation and mushrooming of corporate operations has created not only public goods but also public bad. The society is becoming fragmented to such an extent that within themselves marginalized groups have emerged. How to harness the positive potential of business, while at the same time containing corporate irresponsibility, presents an enormous challenge for development practitioners. For many, CSR provides some of the answers with its emphasis on win-win solutions, partnership and voluntary responses to a range of social and environmental problems. Understanding the potential and limitations of CSR initiatives to tackle development issues is, therefore, key.

Keywords: CSRs, marginalized groups, modern society

I. INTRODUCTION

The dynamics in the world economy has increasingly compelled organizations and firms to surge for variety of strategies and approaches in all business affairs for their survival and success. In recent years the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility has become an important term within the language of business. Financial success is no longer the sole measure to judge any organization's performance. Keeping abreast of global trends and remaining committed to financial obligations to deliver both private and public benefits have forced organizations to reshape their frameworks, rules, and business models. To understand and enhance current efforts, the most socially responsible organizations continue to revise their short- and long-term agendas, to stay ahead of rapidly changing challenges.

James et al.,

International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies
Volume 4, Issue 1, January 2016 pg. 1-10

II. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES (CSRs)

Despite attempts to formulate generally applicable definitions, there is a lack of clear consensus about what is and what is not CSR, reflecting a more fundamental debate about the appropriate role of the private firm in society. The European Commission defines CSR as 'a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interactions with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis'.[1] Anything from environmental management, health and safety rules and human rights to community capacity building and philanthropic activities has been considered under the CSR umbrella.

The Corporate Social Responsibilities are related to the obligation of business towards the society with a view to contribute to its welfare. Today, these objectives have become common to all the companies. For example, to contribute the medical facilities, learning facilities, infrastructures, etc, of the community where the company is located. "Corporate social responsibility is an obligation of business to account for the interests of several groups that constitute society beyond the consideration of profit. It has become an integral part of the wealth-creation process. Business is created by society anticipating that it will aid the society and vice versa. Business enterprise is an economic institution and society provides infrastructure facilities for its smooth functioning" argue Balachandran and Chandrasekaran (2013: *"Corporate social responsibility is the continuing commitment by the business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large"* Lord Home and Richard Watts.

Over the past several decades, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has grown from a narrow and often marginalized notion into a complex and multifaceted concept, one which is increasingly central too much of today's corporate decision making. To the extent that corporate social responsibility was even discussed several decades ago, these discussions were confined to a small group of academics. CSR is something of a trend in contemporary business. Although, the concept's application is essentially contested (Moon et al. 2005), it has been defined as business responsibility for its economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic activities (Carroll 1999). These responsibilities arise both from the social imperatives of business success and from the social externalities of business activity.

III. EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

A main rationale for this phenomenon is that globalization has deeply changed the way companies, institutions, and citizens interact with each other. Before it, in a non-globalized economic framework, companies maximized profits and domestic institutions solved problems related to negative externalities, public goods, and other market failures with taxes and regulations. After the global integration of financial, product, and labor markets, corporations started to act on a global scale, while institutions and governance remained domestic and highly fragmented, thereby loosing large part of their enforcement and bargaining power. Stakeholders and the public opinion reacted to this imbalance by putting pressure on corporations and asking them to "internalize the externalities," even in absence of institutional pressure or regulatory constraints. As a consequence, the phenomenon of CSR took place and progressively gained strength[2].

There have been over years lengthy debate on whether or not CSRs obligatory to business. The proponents of CSR hold the following arguments:-

i. Business helps solve many social problems that exist today, so it should play a significant role.

ii. It has the financial and technical resources to help social problems.

---

[1] Commission of the European Communities, 'Promoting a European framework for corporate social responsibility', Green paper, European Commission, Brussels, 2001

[2] Leonardo Becchetti, Nazaria Solferino and Maria Elisabetta Tessitorey, Corporate social Responsibility and Profit Volatility: Theory and Empirical Evidence, Industrial and Corporate Change Advance Access , November 13, 2014, pp 1-41

iii.   As member of society, business should do its fair share to help others.

iv.   Socially responsible decision-making by business organizations can prevent increased government regulation.

v.   Social responsibility is necessary to ensure economic survival.

vi.   Business must take steps to help solve social and environmental problems that exist today

On the other hand, the opponents of the CSR maintain that:-

i.   Business sidetracks from primary objective of earning profits. Engaging into CSRs reduces the amount of profits, hence a loss to the business.

ii.   Participation in social programmes gives business greater power, perhaps at the expense of particular segment of the society

iii.   Social problems are the responsibility of the government agencies and officials not the responsibility of business.

3.1.1. Traditional Views on CSRs

In traditional societies, the prime purpose of the business was profit maximization. Milton Friedman in late 1970s was quoted saying "the business of business is business meaning that the only objective of business is the making of profits. Friedman argues that the profit earned by business belongs to exclusively to the shareholders of the business and these profits cannot be diverted to any other social purpose"[…..], if the executive uses corporate resources for social ends, he is using the money for the purposes for which it was intended"[3]. He further argues that, there is one and only one social responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits[4]. John Lodd, expressed a similar opinion in 1970, saying "it is improper to expect organizational conduct to conform to the ordinary principles of morality…"[5]

3.1.2 Modern Views on CSRs

Today it is now being increasingly recognized that business is not an end in itself. It is only a means to an end. That end is man, be it an employee, customer, consumer or any member of the society. It is also recognized that, business is a social and economic institution which cannot live in isolation. The establishment and development of business is dependent on the contributions made by society. Society has to bear the cost and consequences of the establishment and operation of business. It is the society that offers land, water, infrastructural facilities, human resources, security, and other materials that enable business operations. It is the same society which act as consumers of the business products and services and therefore allow the business to continue its operations by creating effective demand for the goods and services produced.

"[i]n the long run…social and economic goals are not inherently conflicting but integrally connected. Many economic investments have social returns, and many social investments have economic returns. Instead of trying to keep these two types of returns totally separate, businesses should emphasize projects that have both significant financial and social returns".[6]

It is vividly seen that most of business today feel that their objectives not merely profit maximization but also contributing something towards solving the problems of their employees, consumers and society at large. In a broader business perspective, CSRs includes responsibilities towards consumers/customers, employees, owners/shareholders, inter-Business, the State and the community. Balachandran and Chandrasekaran (2013), affirm that, the old forgotten ideology of giving back to the society what

---

[3] Milton Friedman, The Social Responsibility of Business to Increase Profits, New York Time Magazine, September 13, 1970, p.32

[4] Milton Friedman, The Social Responsibility of Business, in Tom L and Norman (Eds), Ethical Theory and Business, Prentice Hall Inc., New Jersey, 1979, p.136.

[5] John Lodd, Morality and the Ideal Rationality in Formal Organizations, October 1970, p.499, Quoted in Subba Rao P., p.39.

[6] Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002), The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. Harvard Business Review, 80(12), 56−68.

it got from it has emerged as the concept of social responsibility. Today, business feels that it is imperative that they care for society and its need; otherwise it will be difficult for them to grow.

Corporate power and responsibility are matters of public concern (for an excellent conceptual overview, (Parkinson, 1993). Corporations have a decisive impact on outcomes of employment, consumption, environmental quality, social inequality and a host of other issues. The influence of corporations penetrates into the very fabric of modern cultural understandings and practices,

3.1.3 Why CSR?

Fernando (2011), has came out with four arguments as why should there be CSR

i.   *The Moral aspect:* argument that justifies CSR as a company's duty to be a good corporate to citizen obliged to do the right thing.

ii. *Sustainable development:* meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The long-run self-interests of business are best served when corporate assume social responsibilities.

iii. *The license to operate:* every organization requires tacit or explicit license from government, communities or civil society and other stakeholders to be in business and as such it should earn their goodwill through its CSR engagement. Corporations are creatures of the society and should, therefore, respond to its demands.

iv. *Reputation:* companies establish their reputation through CSR whereby they improve their image, strengthen their brand and enhance the value of their stocks all of which earn for them the goodwill of the society.

3.1.3.1 Advantages of CSRs to the firm

It is imperative to argue that company's success is the function of managerial strategies. A powerful strategy enables a company to overcome rival's drives. CSR grants a number of advantages to the firms. CSRs not only enable corporations to fulfill their duty towards society, but can also bring them competitive advantage. Thus companies, through an effective CSR programme can yield the following the company:

a) Increase sales through enhanced brand image of their products

b) Improve access to the capital

c) Attract, retain, motivate and develop employees

d) Earn respect, besides earning the esteem of peer companies,

e) Sharpening and improving decision-making process

f) Reduces costs

g) Enjoys protection and security from the society

h) Gains acceptance and popularity from the society

As put clear by Fernando (2011), that in the new global economy, companies that are responsive to the demands of all of their stakeholders are arguably better positioned to achieve long-term financial success. He further pointed **why business should consider CSR:-**

i.   Companies, which draw innumerable resources from society such as land, manpower, law and order, health and hygiene, have a responsibility to pay back to the society.

ii.   A corporation is an integral part of social system and as such has to cater to its varied needs to the extent possible

iii.   CSR would foster a healthy and harmonious relationship between firms and the society, which will be mutually beneficial

iv.   CSR activities such as waste management and recycling of water will lead to better management of society's scarce resources

v.   CSR activities will discourage unnecessary government interference in business and save companies from much of irksome and annoying government intervention.

vi.   CSR involvement may create a better public image for companies, and thereby help them in attracting good investors, employees and customers. This will promote industrial peace and harmony.

"[…..]Today, business feels that it is imperative that they care for society and its need; otherwise it will be difficult for them to grow"[7].

It can conceivably be argued that business is created by society and the success of business depends on society since goods and services of business are ultimately consumed by the society. Perhaps the most important intellectual breakthrough regarding modern conceptions of CSR is that socially responsible activities can, and should, be used to enhance the bottom line. The corollary is that most, if not all, economic decisions should also be screened for their social impact. Economic returns and social returns should not remain quarantined in isolated units. Firms that successfully pursue a strategy of seeking profits while solving social needs may well earn better reputations with their employees, customers, governments, media, etc. This can, in turn, lead to higher profits for the firms' shareholders. Business is an integral part of the society and the social system in which it functions. It influences other elements of the society which, in turn, affect business. It is a sub system of the social system and therefore business activity cannot isolate itself from the rest of the society.

IV. CSRs and Marginalized Groups

4.1 Who is marginalized? How? and Why?

Marginalization is a slippery and multi-layered concept. Whole societies can be marginalized at the global level while classes and communities can be marginalized from the dominant social order. Similarly, ethnic groups, families or individuals can be marginalized within localities. To a certain extent, marginalization is a shifting phenomenon, linked to social status. So, for example, individuals or groups might enjoy high social status at one point in time, but as social change takes place, so they lose this status and become marginalized. Similarly, as life cycle stages change, so might people's marginalized position.

Mala Htun & Juan Pablo Ossa (2013)in their paper "Political inclusion of marginalized groups: indigenous reservations and gender parity in Bolivia, Politics, Groups, and Identities" pointed that, historically excluded social groups – whether defined by gender, ethnicity, race, caste, religion, or other markers – confront a political context seemingly more receptive to their demands for inclusion than ever before.

The experience of marginality can arise in a number of ways. For some people, those severely impaired from birth, or those born into particularly marginal groupings (e.g. members of ethnic groups that suffer discrimination - the Roma in Europe, Indigenous people in Australasia and the American continent, African Caribbean people in Britain), this marginality is typically life-long and greatly determines their lived experience. For others, marginality is acquired, by later disablement, or by changes in the social and economic system. As global capitalism extends its reach, bringing more and more people into its system, more communities are dispossessed of lands, livelihoods, or systems of social support (Chomsky, 2000; Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001; Potter, 2000; Pilger, 2002).

---

[7] Balachandran, V and Chandrasekaran, V, (2013), Corporate Governance, Ethics and Social Responsibility,(2nd Ed.), Asoke K. Ghosh, PHI Learning Private Limited, Delhi, pp.2

The point to underscore in this phrase is that marginalization is at the core of exclusion from fulfilling and full social lives at individual, interpersonal and societal levels. People who are marginalized have relatively little control over their lives and the resources available to them; they may become stigmatized and are often at the receiving end of negative public attitudes. Their opportunities to make social contributions may be limited and they may develop low self confidence and self esteem.

Newell & Frynas(2007), held that there are multiple forms of deprivation and social exclusion at work, often based on gender, race, ethnicity and class inequalities. Contributions to poverty alleviation which rest solely on the potential of business to promote growth or provide jobs are, therefore, limited in addressing underlying causes of poverty which exclude people from labour markets in the first place.

There are number of vivid examples of marginalization and ways on how various actors respond to the phenomenon. Previous work by members of our International Research Network on Business, Development and Society has illustrated the importance of this diversity clearly.[8] For example, firms in Argentina, faced with a context of financial collapse in the economy in the wake of the crisis of 2001, have increasingly been expected to get involved in programmes that tackle directly the poverty created by the crisis rather than focus exclusively on more traditional CSR concerns such as working conditions and the environment.[9] In India, despite strong legislation on environmental issues, pollution control at state level is often weak, creating an important role for community-based monitoring and enforcement.[10] In Nigeria, community protests and an almost total neglect of oil-producing areas by government agencies have forced foreign oil companies to invest in basic social infrastructure, including building roads, schools and hospitals, performing state-like roles which would be inconceivable and perhaps considered illegitimate in other countries.[11] In China, there is a strong state but weak levels of civil society development, so that independent monitoring of working conditions presents a difficult, sometimes dangerous, task.[12] In Bangladesh, dependence on the garment industry raises a particular set of issues for the women and child workers that make up the majority of employees in the sector, for whom viable employment alternatives are hard to find.[13] In South Africa, the unique legacy of apartheid has meant that companies have had to address issues of racial inequality through initiatives on black empowerment.[14] In many countries small and medium-sized enterprises are the key employers of the poor, where direct developmental contributions could be greatest, but where CSR is currently most weakly embedded.[15] Recognizing this diversity provides an important check against importing CSR models from one context to the next without sufficient regard for key differences that determine success. In such diverse settings it is unsurprising that CSR initiatives take different forms and have differing impacts upon poverty and the marginalization of people from development opportunities. While codes of conduct may be able to improve basic working conditions in some instances, they are currently less able to tackle patterns of discrimination and harassment in the workplace.

Stevens et al. (2003), articulated that, social exclusion is broadly interpreted as the process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live. This includes their lack of participation in decision-making processes. Recognizing the multidimensional nature of deprivation, de Haan and Maxwell (1998) attempted to make this definition more explicit by describing the three main dimensions of social exclusion, namely

---

[8] See website of the International Research Network on Business, Development and Society, at http:// bdsnetwork.cbs.dk/.

[9] Peter Newell & Ana Muro, 'Corporate social and environmental responsibility in Argentina', Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 24, 2006, pp 49 – 68.

[10] Chandra Bhushan, 'CSR in India: debate, perspectives and challenges', paper presented at the conference on 'Southern perspectives in the global CSR debate', Copenhagen Business School, September 2005.

[11] Jedrzej George Frynas, 'Corporate and state responses to anti-oil protests in the Niger Delta', African Affairs, 100, 2001, pp 27 – 54.

[12] Anita Chan, 'Recent trends in Chinese labour issues: signs of change', China Perspectives, 57, 2005, pp 23 – 31.

[13] Michael Nielsen, 'The politics of corporate responsibility and child labour in the Bangladeshi garment industry', International Affairs, 81 (3), 2005, pp 559 – 581.

[14] David Fig, 'Manufacturing amnesia: CSR in South Africa', International Affairs, 81 (3), 2005, pp 599 – 619.

[15] Søren Jeppesen, 'Enhancing competitiveness and securing equitable development: can small, micro and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) do the trick?', Development in Practice, 15 (3 – 4), 2005, pp 463 – 475.

rights – human, civic, and democratic; resources – including human and social capital, as well as state services and common property; and relationships – from family to wider community support networks. In other words, people can be 'excluded' from any or all of these elements, with the result being an increase in their level of poverty.

"Marginalized young people between the ages of 15 and 24 comprise one of the most highly victimized segments of society and, as such, deserve special attention within victimology research" argues Spencer (2014). Corporate community involvement contributes capital or resources in various forms to a community. However, such involvement may also influence local institutions that determine how well these resources are used, that is, the extent to which they are used to promote the public good rather than being subject to private capture. For community involvement to have a beneficial effect on local development, corporations need to consider their impact on local institutions.

Business plays an increasingly important role in development. This is linked both to the decline in confidence in the role of the state as an agent for development and to global deregulation from the 1980s resulting in a more limited role for the state in the economy.[16] Amid this restructuring key developmental functions traditionally associated with the state, such as the provision of basic infrastructure and enabling access to water, electricity, health and education, are now performed by a range of civil society and market actors.[17] As providers of goods and services, as employers, as investors, and increasingly as shapers of developing countries' policies, there is no doubt that the private sector is central to efforts to tackle poverty. But can this role be performed through business-as-usual practices, voluntarily and through the market, or does it need to be guided, regulated and driven by broader state-led developmental priorities? Do states still have the power to play this role? In a context of globalisation there are concerns that businesses enjoy unprecedented power, which enables them to pressure weaker governments, to locate their enterprises in areas of weak or non-existent social and environmental regulation and to exploit poorer communities.[18] How to harness the positive potential of business, while at the same time containing corporate irresponsibility, presents an enormous challenge for development practitioners. For many, CSR provides some of the answers with its emphasis on win-win solutions, partnership and voluntary responses to a range of social and environmental problems. Understanding the potential and limitations of CSR initiatives to tackle development issues is, therefore, key.

In their article, *"The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Gender Mainstreaming" Kate Grosser & Jeremy Moon (2005),* argued that with the expanding role of the private sector in national and global governance systems, the issue of corporate accountability on social (including gender) issues has become increasingly important. Despite some limitations, CSR provides an important new political space where tools for such accountability are being developed. CSR now extends beyond the traditional 'business case' to encompass new governmental and social drivers. Increased participation by women's organizations in this field is necessary if gender equality is to be addressed by all the main actors in emerging new systems of societal governance. New developments in the role of corporations as sites of citizenship in changing global governance structures makes CSR an important area for the participation of those involved in the project of gender mainstreaming. Such involvement could effectively complement work on gender mainstreaming in local, national, regional and intergovernmental contexts.

In their views, Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) opined that human history demonstrates that minority groups tend to be disadvantaged compared with majority groups in their societies. They are frequently discriminated against in the allocation of resources and excluded or under-represented in decision making bodies. Furthermore, minorities often experience pressure to assimilate in order to advance socio economically, while external forces such as the job market and linguistic pressures erode

---

[16] Jenkins, 'Globalization, corporate social responsibility and poverty', p 529.

[17] Peter Newell, Shirin Rai & Andrew Scott (eds), Development and the Challenge of Globalisation, London: ITDG Press, 2002.

[18] David C Korten, When Corporations Rule the World, London: Earthscan, 1995; Naomi Klein, No Logo, London: Flamingo, 2000; and Noreena Hertz, The Silent Takeover: Global Capitalism and the Death of Democracy, London: Heinemann, 2001.

their individual and collective identities. The numerical majority usually constitutes the dominant group; as such it can use its superior status to establish a mainstream discourse that further entrenches its favored position.

Accordingly, initiating special actions on behalf of marginalized groups is an important strategy for promoting full and meaningful equality (Eide 1995; Kymlicka 2008; Jabareen 2008b). Simultaneously, as the forces of globalization give rise to ever more diverse _ and often conflict-ridden _ societies, the rights of ethnic and national minorities are gaining ascendancy in the current international regime. This is reflected in the development of international human rights law specifically tailored to meet the needs of minorities and indigenous peoples.[19]

Experience from developing countries like Tanzania is clear that the operations of multinational firms in various economic activities have brought about adverse outcome to the society. For instance in the mining areas, people have been displaced their land have been taken by the government and given to the investors. The livelihoods of the community surrounding the mining areas have become marginalized. It was expected that for the Mining Companies to implement CSR, they could address specific needs of the community like providing employment, building sustainable shelters, infrastructures, social amenities, etc. The fact is these companies are not doing enough on CSRs. Similarly, the role of government in ensuring quality of life of its citizens is not seen since there a lot of conflicts between community and investors over land, environment pollution, lack of peace and security.

The argument can be made here that CSRs should go beyond the generic meaning and the debates around it by addressing specific needs of the marginalized groups in the society. For example the killings of people with albinism in some parts of Tanzania call for CSR to cater for needs of this group by providing protection and secured life. As it can be noted from the literature that there are numerous forms of discriminations that has led the marginalization in and among the societies thus need special attention to ensure quality of life to these groups. The initiatives by government are of paramount importance by imposing policies and strategies that could alleviate the situation.

V. CONCLUSION

Companies face challenges and limitations as they implement CSR. These usually relate either to political issues or to organizational-level con¬cerns and are often embedded in culture. The complexity of operating in a global society places new demands on organizations and their leadership. As the roles and responsibilities of government are being redefined and the boundaries between business and government become less clear, the lit¬erature shows that business leaders are facing a daunting array of challenges. In the new age of CSR, the needs of the stakeholders, consumers, employees, national as well as international regulators, watchdogs, NGOs, and activist groups have to be satisfied (Hatcher, 2002).

For sustainable growth of modern organizations need effective management. Effective leadership requires that one adapt according to the needs of the situation (Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971). "In today's organizations leaders face continual change and increased environmental complexity. This is caused in part by factors such as technological advancement, increased competition, shorter product lifecycles, the boundary less nature of career, cultural complexity, globalization, and an increase in mergers and acquisitions. This requires leaders to manage planned organizational change, as well as manage the more micro-level". Companies are expected to perform in the areas of human rights, environment policies, corporate contributions, community development, business ethics, corporate governance and workplace issues for their survival and growth.

CSR initiatives work for some firms, in some places, in tackling some issues, some of the time. Rather than seek win-win solutions that apply across all settings, all of the time, the challenge for engaged researchers is to explore the potential and limitations of CSR in specific settings. What works in one situation may well not work elsewhere. Current CSR models assume responsive business interested in CSR, an active civil society willing to enter into partnership with business and a strong state

---

[19]Yousef T. Jabareen & Rebecca Vilkomerson (2014), Public policy in divided societies: the role of policy institutes in advancing marginalized groups, Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 27:1, 46-66

able to provide an enabling environment for CSR, yet these conditions are absent in the majority of the world. Despite the appeal of exportable CSR models that can be readily adapted to whichever country a business operates in, the empirical evidence presented here strongly suggests the need to assess the potential of CSR to address particular groups in the light of prevailing local political and social conditions. Working through and with civil society to deliver meaningful community development is not an option in settings of weak and under-developed civil society or where democratic space does not exist for the free expression of voice. By leaving unquestioned CSR's reliance on consensus and win–win outcomes, we leave the poor and marginalized exposed to the possibility of further exploitation and marginalization as a result of inequitable exertions of power. Much should be seen beyond the generic CSR to ensure quality of life to the marginalized groups.

References

1. Anita Chan, 'Recent Trends in Chinese Labour Issues: Signs of Change', China Perspectives, vol. 57, pp 23 – 31, 2005.

2. Balachandran, V and Chandrasekaran, V, (2013), Corporate Governance, Ethics and Social Responsibility,(2nd Ed.), Asoke K. Ghosh, PHI Learning Private Limited, Delhi.

3. Carroll, A. B. 1999. 'Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct', Business and Society, vol. 38, Issue 3, pp. 268–95.

4. Chandra Bhushan, 'CSR in India: debate, perspectives and challenges', paper presented at the conference on 'Southern perspectives in the global CSR debate', Copenhagen Business School, September 2005.

5. Chomsky, N. (2000), Rogue States: The Rule of Force in World Affairs. London: Pluto Press.

6. Darren J. Good & Garima Sharma (2010) A Little More Rigidity: Firming the Construct of Leader Flexibility, Journal of Change Management, vol.10, issue 2, pp. 155-174

7. David C Korten, When Corporations Rule the World, London: Earthscan, 1995; Naomi Klein, No Logo, London: Flamingo, 2000; and Noreena Hertz, The Silent Takeover: Global Capitalism and the Death of Democracy, London: Heinemann, 2001.

8. David Fig, 'Manufacturing amnesia: CSR in South Africa', International Affairs, 81 (3), 2005, pp 599 – 619.

9. Fernando, A.C (ed.) 2011, Corporate Ethics, Governance, and Social Responsibility: Precepts and Practices, Dorling Kindersley, India

10. Fiedler, F.E. (1967), A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, McGraw-Hill, New York

11. House, R.J. (1971), A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness, Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, Pp. 321–339

12. Jedrzej George Frynas, 'Corporate and state responses to anti-oil protests in the Niger Delta', African Affairs, 100, 2001, pp 27 – 54.

13. Jenkins, 'Globalization, corporate social responsibility and poverty', p 529.

14. Kate Grosser & Jeremy Moon (2005), The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Gender Mainstreaming, International Feminist Journal of Politics, 7:4, 532-554

15. Leonardo Becchetti, Nazaria Solferino and Maria Elisabetta Tessitorey, Corporate social Responsibility and Profit Volatility: Theory and Empirical Evidence, Industrial and Corporate Change Advance Access , November 13, 2014, pp 1-41

16. Michael Nielsen, 'The politics of corporate responsibility and child labour in the Bangladeshi garment industry', International Affairs, 81 (3), 2005, pp 559 – 581.

17. Moon, J., Crane, A. and Matten, D. 2005. 'Corporations and Citizenship', Business Ethics Quarterly 15 (3): 429–53.

18. Parkinson, J. (1993), Corporate Power and Responsibility: Issues in the Theory of Company Law, Oxford University Press.

19. Peter Newell & Ana Muro, 'Corporate social and environmental responsibility in Argentina', Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 24, 2006, pp 49 – 68.

20. Peter Newell & Jedrzej George Frynas, Beyond CSR? Business, Poverty and Social Justice: An Introduction Third World Quarterly, Vol. 28, No. 4, 2007, pp 669 – 681

21. Peter Newell, Shirin Rai & Andrew Scott (eds), Development and the Challenge of Globalisation, London: ITDG Press, 2002.

22. Petras, J. & Veltmeyer, H. (2001), Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century. London: Zed Books.

23. Pilger, J. (2002), The New Rulers of the World. London: Verso.

24. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002), The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. Harvard Business Review, 80(12), 56−68.

25. Potter, G.A. (2000), Deeper than Debt: Economic Globalisation and the Poor. London: Latin America Bureau.

26. Rami Kaplan, Who has been regulating whom, business or society?: The mid-20th-century Institutionalization of 'Corporate Responsibility' in the USA, Socio-Economic Review (2014),pp. 1–39

27. Richard Marens, Generous in victory? American Managerial Autonomy, Labour Relations and the Invention of Corporate Social Responsibility, Socio-Economic Review (2012) 10, 59–84

28. Søren Jeppesen, 'Enhancing competitiveness and securing equitable development: can small, micro and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) do the trick?', Development in Practice, 15 (3 – 4), 2005, pp 463 – 475.

29. Dale C. Spencer (2014) Exposing the Conditions of Precarity: Compounding Victimization and Marginalized Young people, Contemporary Justice Review, 17:1, 87-103

30. Stephen Brammer, Gregory Jackson, and Dirk Matten, Corporate Social Responsibility and Institutional Theory: New Perspectives on Private Governance, Socio-Economic Review (2012) 10, 3–28

31. Stevens, A., A. M. Bur, and L. Young (2003) 'People, jobs, rights and power: the role of participation in combating social exclusion in Europe', Community Development Journal 38 (2): 84–95.

32. Yousef T. Jabareen & Rebecca Vilkomerson (2014), Public policy in divided societies: the role of policy institutes in advancing marginalized groups, Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 27:1, 46-66