THE CSR-COMMUNITY GAP: STRATEGIES FOR BETTER ALIGNMENT – A REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS

Mrs. Ankana Tasphi [1], Dr Akshita Sharma [2]

[1] Research Scholar, MSMSR, MATS University, Raipur
[2] Research Supervisor, MSMSR MATS University, Raipur

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i3.2024.5248

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

The Companies Act, 2013 mandates that corporations undertake socially responsible initiatives, with Schedule VII outlining diverse areas aimed at improving the welfare of marginalized communities. While the provisions are broad enough to allow flexibility based on corporate interests, implementation often falls short of addressing the actual needs of communities. This paper examines the misalignment between CSR interventions and community priorities, analyzing three key contributing factors.

First, the paper highlights how CSR projects are typically designed and approved at the corporate level, with minimal involvement from the intended beneficiaries. This top-down approach creates a disconnect between planned initiatives and the real needs of communities. Second, internal corporate policies often prioritize customer interests over community welfare, creating conflicts that discourage companies from challenging existing frameworks. Finally, the paper explores potential strategies to bridge this gap, ensuring CSR efforts are more responsive to community needs.

Keywords: CSR Intervention, Community Needs, Community Participation

1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) constitutes a strategic management process that evaluates and distributes the costs and benefits of business activities across both internal stakeholders (employees, shareholders, investors) and external stakeholders (governmental bodies, local communities, civil society organizations, and business partners) (World Bank, 2002). As defined by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), CSR represents a comprehensive business approach where companies systematically integrate social and environmental considerations into their core operations and stakeholder engagements. This management framework enables organizations to pursue the Triple Bottom Line approach - simultaneously addressing economic profitability, environmental sustainability, and social welfare imperatives - while balancing the often competing expectations of shareholders and diverse stakeholder groups. The conceptualization underscores CSR's dual nature as both a business strategy and a mechanism for sustainable development, requiring careful alignment of corporate objectives with broader societal needs.

This definition reveals that CSR remains fundamentally a corporate management function, with community participation typically excluded from the decision-making process. The framework intrinsically links CSR to core business operations and stakeholder management, meaning companies develop and execute CSR policies primarily through a commercial lens. Organizational constraints prevent engagement in initiatives that might conflict with key stakeholder interests, despite communities being nominal beneficiaries. While target populations are technically stakeholders, their needs invariably become secondary to corporate objectives, creating a fundamental disconnect between community requirements and company-led CSR interventions. This structural imbalance inevitably produces a misalignment between grassroots needs and corporate social responsibility initiatives.

This study specifically examines how Indian corporations implement CSR policies in urban communities. While acknowledging each community's unique characteristics, the research focuses on common socioeconomic challenges faced by marginalized urban populations across India. The analysis evaluates how effectively CSR initiatives address the needs of underprivileged urban groups, particularly those lacking basic amenities despite their location in cities. The investigation concentrates on specific vulnerable communities including jhuggi-jhopri (JJ) clusters, slum settlements, and resettlement colonies, which represent the most disadvantaged segments of urban society. By focusing on these populations, the study aims to assess the gap between corporate CSR interventions and the actual requirements of urban communities living in precarious conditions. The observations provide a focused lens to examine these dynamics while offering insights potentially applicable to similar urban contexts across India.

While talking about CSR policy of any company, it is important to have an idea what all constitutes the policies that guides the interventions. Policy includes somewhat the following things:-

- Objectives
- Stakeholders
- Established procedure for selecting area of intervention
- Budget and expenditure
- Planning
- Implementation
- Composition of CSR team
- Monitoring and evaluation.
- Display of CSR activities on website.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative research methodology grounded in comprehensive analysis of secondary data, including corporate CSR reports, policy documents, and stakeholder analyses, to examine how CSR formulation and implementation processes often limit meaningful community engagement. The investigation progresses through three key analytical phases: first, systematically reviewing how companies develop CSR policies that inadvertently restrict community participation; second, analyzing corporate motivations for selecting specific CSR focus areas and the frequent disconnect between these choices and actual community requirements; and third, proposing actionable strategies to align CSR initiatives with grassroots needs, drawing from the authors' direct field experience working with both urban marginalized communities and corporate CSR divisions. The research particularly benefits from the researchers' practical engagement underserved populations and CSR practitioners, which provides critical context to the secondary data analysis and helps bridge the theoretical-practical divide in CSR implementation.

This study primarily relies on secondary data analysis due to the inherent limitations in accessing corporate CSR policymaking processes. Since companies typically restrict CSR policy formulation to internal personnel and often maintain confidentiality around these documents, direct participation or observation was unfeasible. Consequently, the research draws substantially from publicly available CSR information on corporate websites, which proved sufficient for analyzing companies' intervention strategies within the study's defined scope. The authors systematically evaluated these disclosures to assess how effectively corporate initiatives address identified community needs. Additionally, scholarly literature and industry reports provided valuable insights into the decision-making frameworks that shape CSR interventions, helping to identify the key factors influencing how companies design and implement their community projects. This methodological approach, while constrained by data accessibility limitations, enabled a comprehensive critical analysis of CSR initiatives through available secondary sources.

For the purpose of understanding the nuances 5 companies have been looked at. These 5 have been chosen randomly which either have very good reputation in terms of its CSR initiatives. However, it has been ensured that while evaluating the CSR initiatives, their interventions on urban communities only have been taken into consideration.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Instrumental Nature of CSR in India

Existing scholarship consistently demonstrates that corporate social responsibility initiatives in India predominantly serve as profit-driven undertakings, with genuine community needs often receiving secondary consideration. Research indicates that even when companies approach CSR earnestly, they predominantly frame such activities through a lens of corporate benefit rather than altruistic community development.

Seema G. Sharma's seminal work, "Corporate Social Responsibility in India: An Overview" , analyzes how globalization has compelled corporations to adopt multi-stakeholder approaches. While maintaining rhetorical commitments to community welfare, contemporary business strategies strategically balance financial stakeholders' interests, employee concerns, and community engagement. This calculated approach reflects corporate recognition that sustainable development performance requires addressing the "Triple Bottom Line" (People, Planet, Profit) paradigm. The gradual corporate embrace of this framework has fostered cautious optimism about more responsible corporate-community relations.

Strategic Imperatives for Community Development

From a business perspective, community-oriented CSR offers dual advantages: enhanced corporate branding and optimal resource utilization. Companies possess substantial resources that, if not strategically deployed for social development, may ultimately constrain long-term corporate success by exacerbating socioeconomic disparities that affect business ecosystems. This pragmatic understanding increasingly drives corporations to incorporate community development into their CSR calculus, though often within carefully constructed parameters of mutual benefit.

The author has written:- "Adoption of these practices is critical to the businesses because business cannot survive, let alone succeed, in a society that fails. Moreover, public acceptance of the operations of any business, particularly in an alien society, often determines the success of the corporation; and acceptance will come only when the company in question is seen as having empathy for the aspirations and values of the society in which it functions. Investors now often consider the social performance of the company when making investment decisions. They do not want to put their money into the operations of a corporation that is neglecting its social responsibility. Hence, the social report card of the corporation has become an important factor in attracting potential investors. Additionally, even though the public expectations in India of the corporations might seem excessive at first...... These expectations are in no way unreasonable or unjustified because the socio economic condition of India is such that CSR in India has considerable potential for improving corporate environmental and social conduct…." (Sharma, 2009).

In their 2011 article *"Integrating CSR Initiatives in Business: An Organizing Framework,"* Yuan et al. explore strategies to maximize the value of CSR investments. They argue that aligning CSR efforts with societal expectations ensures an external fit, ultimately prioritizing corporate interests over community needs. The study emphasizes integrating CSR initiatives into existing business operations to enhance their effectiveness (Wenlong Yuan, 2011).

Similarly, Seema Sharma's study, *"Corporate Social Responsibility in India"* (2011), analyzes data from 17 businesses and reveals that CSR initiatives are primarily driven by corporate interests. Companies often treat CSR as part of their public image strategy and a means to generate profits. The study notes that these initiatives are typically designed at the corporate level without community involvement, resulting in short-term, unsustainable efforts—often limited to monetary or material contributions rather than long-term engagement.

Even critics who argue that CSR is unrelated to profitability often fail to present a convincing case. Carroll et al. (1985) examined this relationship in their study *"An Empirical Examination of the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Profitability"* and found no clear connection. However, they ultimately concluded that the debate over whether CSR impacts profitability may never be definitively settled.

Similarly, in India, CSR initiatives are frequently driven by profit motives. Gupta and Sharma (2009) highlight in their article *"CSR—A Business Opportunity"* that CSR is increasingly viewed as a strategic tool for enhancing profits and brand reputation. They argue that addressing employee welfare, community needs, and environmental concerns can boost profitability, provided businesses apply innovative and targeted approaches.

Amita V. Joseph (2009) further elaborates in *"Successful Examples of Corporate Social Responsibility"* that CSR should be both a core value and a sustainable business strategy. While many companies opt for financial donations to NGOs or charities, Joseph emphasizes that true social responsibility requires ethical business practices. Simply funding community projects without ethical compliance, she argues, does not qualify as genuine CSR. Thus, the underlying corporate mindset determines the effectiveness of such initiatives.

The discourse on CSR reveals diverse approaches, as evidenced by various scholarly works. In the edited volume *The Debate over Corporate Social Responsibility* (May et al.), contributors emphasize that corporations should not be homogenized, as doing so overlooks critical variations in their objectives, organizational structures, and operational practices. This perspective is particularly valuable because recognizing these differences allows companies to identify internal role models, making external prescriptions for sustainable CSR initiatives less relevant.

Building upon existing literature, this paper examines the prevalent lack of community engagement in CSR initiatives. Drawing from scholarly sources and the authors' observations, it explores potential reasons for companies' failure to incorporate community perspectives into their CSR strategies. The study concludes by proposing actionable intervention strategies to address these gaps in participatory CSR implementation.

CSR interventions

A critical examination of CSR processes reveals a systemic lack of community participation, from policy formulation to project implementation, creating a disconnect between corporate initiatives and actual community needs. As Sharma (2011) notes, "Senior management typically determines CSR budgets and selects initiatives independently, without meaningful stakeholder engagement, basing decisions primarily on executive preferences rather than community input."

In development-focused CSR, companies frequently bypass local needs assessments, preferring instead to align with international frameworks like the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These goals, which include poverty alleviation, education improvement, gender equality, and public health initiatives, often form the basis of corporate CSR programs. While some MDG objectives may coincidentally match urban Indian community needs, the cookie-cutter application of these global benchmarks frequently misses contextual realities. Consequently, despite significant CSR expenditures, many interventions fail to resolve the actual problems communities face.

This disconnect underscores the necessity of community engagement. A case in point involves a Delhi gas company that funded school toilet construction through an implementing partner, believing it would reduce student dropout rates. However, subsequent discussions with students revealed that while toilet availability wasn't a major concern, hygiene and maintenance issues were the actual barriers to consistent school attendance - a nuance missed due to the lack of preliminary community consultation.

Root Cause Analysis of CSR Implementation Gaps

The fundamental issue stems from corporate mindset differences in approaching CSR initiatives. Many organizations operate under a paternalistic philanthropic model (Sharma, 2011), which fosters a problematic donor-recipient dynamic. This paradigm positions companies as benefactors granting favors rather than duty-bearers, creating an implicit expectation of gratitude from communities perceived as passive recipients.

Such an approach leads to several problematic assumptions:

1) Corporations believe any assistance, regardless of relevance, inherently benefits "needy" communities
2) Organizations feel justified in determining solutions without community consultation
3) Implementation focuses on visible outputs rather than sustainable outcomes

In contrast, a rights-based approach fundamentally transforms this relationship. When companies recognize stakeholders' entitlements to essential services, their intervention strategy becomes:

1) Needs assessment through participatory methods
2) Context-specific solution design
3) Sustainable impact measurement

For instance, in sanitation projects:

- A rights-based approach would first identify whether water access, maintenance, or hygiene education constitutes the primary barrier
- A philanthropic model might simply construct toilets without addressing functionality concerns

This conceptual divergence directly correlates with intervention effectiveness - the greater the alignment with community-identified needs, the smaller the implementation gap. The corporate perspective ultimately determines whether CSR initiatives genuinely solve problems or merely create the appearance of social responsibility.

To delve into this matter in finding out the level of engagement of people in CSR initiatives, reports of 5 companies have been studied.

These 5 companies include:-

- TATA Steel
- Panasonic India
- Aditya Birla Group
- Ambuja Cements Limited
- Hindustan Unilever Limited

TATA STEEL

Analysis of Tata Steel's CSR Approach

Tata Steel's CSR framework traces its origins to the vision of its founder and Group Chairman in 1904, with formal policy structures emerging from 1980 onward. The company currently implements its corporate social responsibility through both internal and external initiatives, governed by the Tata Business Excellence Model for monitoring and enforcement.

Focusing specifically on urban community engagement, Tata Power's external CSR initiatives include:

- Reproductive health services
- HIV/AIDS prevention programs
- Sports training initiatives
- Disaster relief operations

This portfolio reveals two significant observations about their CSR methodology:

1) **Policy Formulation Process**: The historical development of these initiatives suggests limited participation from community members or target beneficiaries in the policy-making stages.
2) **Implementation Framework**: The nature of these projects appears to offer minimal opportunities for ongoing community engagement or participatory implementation.

Notably, Tata's CSR efforts predominantly target rural and tribal populations. While the company has demonstrated commitment to empowerment programs, critical questions remain regarding:

- The degree of alignment between corporate interventions and actual community needs
- The effectiveness of top-down approaches in addressing grassroots-level challenges
- The sustainability of programs developed without substantive stakeholder consultation

Despite Tata's recognized leadership in CSR implementation, the fundamental issue persists - whether these well-intentioned initiatives truly respond to the expressed needs of beneficiary communities or merely reflect corporate perceptions of social responsibility.

PANASONIC INDIA

Critical Examination of Panasonic India's CSR Strategy

Panasonic India's CSR framework operates under its proclaimed "5 Cs" principle, emphasizing commitment to Indian society through community engagement for inclusive growth. The company positions its CSR evolution from traditional philanthropy to embedded social responsibility, claiming substantial progress in community empowerment.

Key Intervention Areas:

- Health initiatives
- Women's empowerment programs
- Educational scholarships
- Livelihood and skill development
- Environmental sustainability
- Broad societal contributions
- Analysis reveals several critical observations:

1) **Policy-Community Disconnect**:

While citing Millennium Development Goals as their intervention basis, Panasonic's approach demonstrates a top-down methodology rather than community-consultative needs assessment. This creates a fundamental paradox between their engagement rhetoric and actual practice.

2) **Urban-Rural Implementation Gap**:

The company predominantly focuses on rural development - a commendable targeting of under-resourced areas. However, their urban interventions (primarily vocational training centers) raise questions about relevance:

- Field evidence suggests vocational training rarely addresses immediate community needs
- Program effectiveness remains questionable as completion seldom translates to employment
- The approach reflects supply-driven rather than demand-responsive solutions

3) **Strategic Limitations**:

The broad categorization of intervention areas allows for corporate-determined project selection rather than community-identified priorities. This manifests in:

- Potential misalignment between programs and actual needs
- Limited mechanisms for beneficiary feedback
- Questionable sustainability of interventions

While Panasonic's structured approach demonstrates corporate commitment to social responsibility, the absence of robust community participation mechanisms fundamentally limits the transformative potential of their CSR investments. The vocational training case exemplifies how well-intentioned programs may fail to create meaningful impact when divorced from ground realities.

ADITYA BIRLA GROUP

The Aditya Birla Group has maintained a structured CSR policy since 1999, targeting six key areas: healthcare, education, sustainable livelihoods, empowerment initiatives, infrastructure development, and broader social causes. The organization emphasizes a participatory approach in its official communications, stating:

"We collaboratively design all projects through direct community engagement, employing participatory rural appraisal techniques to identify fundamental needs. Working in conjunction with village Panchayats, we establish development priorities through consensus-building, leading to project conceptualization. The implementation process involves shared responsibility between community members and our team, with joint monitoring of progress through physical verification of outputs."

Key observations about this model:

1) **Participatory Framework**: The group's methodology establishes best practices for inclusive development planning, particularly through:
   - Ground-level needs assessment
   - Democratic priority-setting with local governance bodies
   - Co-ownership of implementation
2) **Geographical Focus**: Despite its exemplary participatory model, the program maintains a predominantly rural orientation, potentially limiting its application to urban CSR challenges.

This approach represents an advanced CSR implementation framework that successfully bridges corporate resources with grassroots participation. However, its effectiveness in urban contexts remains untested, suggesting an area for potential expansion and adaptation of their proven methodologies.

AMBUJA CEMENTS LIMITED

While Ambuja Cement officially emphasizes stakeholder well-being and sustainable development, a closer look reveals a stronger focus on corporate reputation-building than on genuine community needs. The company's CSR implementation strategy relies entirely on institutional partners—including its own Ambuja Vidya Niketan Trust, NGOs, and other professional organizations—while systematically excluding direct community participation. Notably, Ambuja mandates three years of professional experience for implementation partners, privileging formal expertise over the lived realities of the communities it serves. This approach suggests that the company prioritizes measurable outcomes and professionalized interventions over participatory, context-sensitive development. The emphasis on structured partnerships and quantifiable experience, while ensuring operational efficiency, risks creating a disconnect between corporate-designed solutions and the actual needs of stakeholders. Ultimately, Ambuja's CSR model appears more aligned with maintaining its brand image than fostering meaningful, community-driven change.

HINDUSTAN UNILEVER LIMITED

Hindustan Unilever's CSR portfolio reveals several noteworthy yet problematic aspects. The company's *Project Shakti*, aimed at women's empowerment through income generation, operates on the flawed assumption that financial independence alone ensures empowerment, overlooking systemic gender dynamics—such as domestic violence—that may prevent women from retaining control over their earnings. Similarly, while their hand-washing awareness campaigns are well-intentioned, the company overestimates their impact, as awareness does not automatically translate to sustained behavioral change.

Additionally, their sanitation and preventive healthcare programs rely on secondary data from UNICEF rather than direct community needs assessments, indicating a top-down approach. The same issue persists in their safe drinking water initiatives, which are justified by generic "developing country" needs rather than specific community consultations. Collectively, these projects demonstrate Hindustan Unilever's preference for broad, standardized interventions over localized, participatory solutions—prioritizing scalability over genuine stakeholder engagement and contextual relevance. This approach risks rendering their CSR efforts ineffective in addressing the nuanced, ground-level challenges faced by communities.

WHY COMPANIES CANNOT ENGAGE PEOPLE?

Businesses often struggle to integrate community perspectives into their CSR initiatives due to systemic operational patterns. Even when organizations demonstrate willingness to incorporate stakeholder inputs, structural barriers frequently prevent meaningful engagement. The primary impediment stems from corporate priorities—as Milton Friedman famously asserted, "the business of business is business." This profit-centric philosophy manifests in CSR programs that prioritize brand visibility over community needs, as evidenced by numerous empirical studies. Companies consequently favor image-building interventions rather than participatory, people-centric projects.

However, this perspective remains contested. Martin R. Moser (1986) contends that profit motives need not inherently conflict with social welfare objectives, arguing that "a company should not seek profit in a situation where social well-being is at stake, but this is clearly a personal choice." This debate underscores the tension between corporate social responsibility's idealistic aims and business's practical realities—a tension that continues to shape CSR implementation strategies across industries. The challenge lies in reconciling these competing priorities to develop interventions that benefit both businesses and communities equitably.

Contemporary businesses increasingly adopt multi-stakeholder frameworks in their strategic planning, encompassing employees, investors, and local communities. As Sharma (2009) observes, "While traditional philanthropy remains significant in India's CSR landscape, globalization has fostered a multi-stakeholder model that integrates CSR into sustainable business strategies, holding companies accountable to all stakeholders." However, this inclusive approach often relegates communities to the lowest priority, given their limited direct financial contribution to corporate interests.

A significant implementation barrier emerges from government resistance. When corporations propose development projects, officials frequently obstruct them by claiming existing governmental coverage or questioning the intervention's necessity. This resistance stems from two perceptions: first, that corporate involvement highlights governmental inefficiencies, and second, that companies pursue CSR primarily for branding rather than genuine social impact. A revealing instance involved a Gautam Budh Nagar IAS officer who blocked a corporate initiative to install school water coolers, insisting benches were more urgent and alleging the company sought merely photo opportunities rather than addressing real needs. Such cases exemplify the adversarial dynamic where officials view corporate social initiatives as implicit critiques of public sector efforts, leading them to employ regulatory hurdles or outright rejections to maintain developmental hegemony, irrespective of actual community requirements. This institutionalized skepticism creates substantial obstacles for meaningful public-private partnerships in social development.

Companies do not want to engage social workers**:** Corporate companies have certain type of work patterns. These include swift planning and implementation, immediate result of interventions, profit orientated approach and so on. They even give stress to income generating activities as that is their primary aim. Therefore, they do not have the scope to provide time and in-depth interventions that is required for ensuring social well being. Due to their inherent approach towards work, corporate companies feel that CSR is being imposed upon them. To shrug off this burden they do not want to hire social workers or maintain a proper CSR department. Often the CSR activities are taken care of by other departments of the company. Therefore they take up implementing partners which are mostly NGOs. Due to lack of a proper CSR department or presence of social workers, monitoring and evaluation of the projects also do not have the perspective of finding out whether the needs of the communities are being fulfilled or not.

For example, in a company which operates CSR activities by the corporate communications department, when the people went for monitoring the toilets being made by the company at schools, the people checked the quality of sand, thickness of walls, diameters of pipes, etc. However, when a social work trainee was included by them in the monitoring process, she could find out the importance of toilets in the scenario. From her assessment it could be understood how much the toilets were needed and what change those would bring about. However, for that the social work trainee had to spend a considerable amount of time with the people which was much more than required for monitoring the construction materials. Companies cannot always afford to devote so much time for social responsibility. They also apprehend that appointing social workers will delay the work and will take a lot of time for in depth interventions and their nature of interventions will bring the corporate officers out of their comfort zones. Therefore they tend to avoid employing social workers within their office setting which eventually results in maintaining the corporate attitude towards CSR interventions thereby failing to associate with people's needs.

Fault in the law: Schedule VII of the Companies Act, 2013 describes the areas of intervention for the companies as a part of their CSR initiatives. It covers almost all possible areas of social work intervention. Based on this law, companies make intervention plans. However, the law does not force companies to empower people. Its inherent approach is that intervention up to any extent in any of these fields will bring substantial change in the lives of the people. Therefore, companies also do not have any obligation or legal binding to ensure that their interventions bring empowerment in the lives of people. The areas like contribution to environment, architecture, sports, technology, can be helpful from the perspective of development. But it is doubtful up to what extent the communities feel that these things are priority in their lives. Other aspects also like Prime Miniter's Relief fund and new additions to the law: contribution to 'Swachh Bharat Kosh' and 'Clean Ganga Fund' also do not figure in the priority list of the communities. However, it is easy for companies to spend money in those activities.

Therefore most of the companies will tend to contribute in these areas rather than on the areas which address the felt needs of the communities. For example, an NGO provides free students from low income families to crack entrance tests of engineering colleges. After the students pass out, they have good income packages and as a result help their families economically and raise their standards of living. But this NGO depends fully on CSR funds. One of its funding companies backed off this year because they find it easier to contribute to Swachh Bharat Kosh and also have vested interests in doing so. If the contribution of the company towards society is gauged, earlier by funding this NGO, it was ensuring brighter future of several families.

But due to provision in the law, they preferred to change their area of intervention. Moreover, companies often feel that since no indemnification for not undertaking CSR activity except giving reason in written, many companies do not feel convinced to engage in CSR initiatives. This shows how the law also enhances the attitude of the companies which eventually result in widening gap between their interventions and needs of the communities.

The fundamental character of a business, particularly the type of products or services it offers, significantly influences its ability to engage communities in CSR initiatives. Companies manufacturing potentially harmful products often struggle to find credible implementation partners, as NGOs and social workers frequently perceive their CSR efforts as attempts to whitewash negative social impacts. This skepticism creates substantial barriers to meaningful corporate-community collaboration, even when companies genuinely seek to incorporate social perspectives.

A telling example comes from Deborah Doane's critique in *Good Intentions-Bad Outcomes? The Broken Promise of CSR Reporting*, which highlights British Aerospace's paradoxical attempt to position itself as a responsible arms manufacturer through environmental initiatives like reducing toxic chemicals in weapons. As Doane sharply observes, "This isn't just silly; it's absurd" (Richardson, 2004). This case exemplifies the widespread cynicism toward CSR efforts by companies whose core business contradicts social welfare principles.

Furthermore, many corporations approach CSR with a burdensome mindset rather than genuine commitment. Rooted in human psychology that prioritizes rights over responsibilities, companies often view mandated social welfare obligations as inconvenient impositions to be addressed with minimal effort. Since the primary consequence for CSR negligence is reputational damage rather than legal penalties, businesses frequently opt for superficial compliance rather than substantive engagement with community needs. This fundamental attitude problem creates an initial disconnect that perpetuates throughout the CSR implementation process, ultimately resulting in interventions that fail to address actual community requirements. The combination of industry sector stigma and this compliance-driven mentality creates systemic barriers to effective, needs-based corporate social responsibility.

4. SUGGESTIONS

The above mentioned points have been based on secondary data and field observations. Accordingly, certain points have been discussed below suggesting certain steps that can be taken up to increase participation of communities so that the initiatives taken up by companies can address the needs on the communities in a better way. Such steps will also be beneficial for the companies because good CSR practices eventually result in increasing their profitability. These suggestions are based on field experiences of working in CSR department of a company and also working with NGOs that are implementing partners of CSR projects of companies.

1) While direct community participation in corporate policy formulation may present practical challenges, integrating professional social workers into the process offers a viable alternative. These field-experienced professionals possess dual competencies: they understand grassroots realities while appreciating corporate constraints, enabling them to craft policies that balance business objectives with genuine community empowerment.

   Current policy development often suffers from structural deficiencies, typically involving MBA-trained personnel from non-CSR departments who lack specialized training in social development methodologies. This results in policies that frequently miss critical community perspectives. The solution lies in:

   - -Establishing dedicated, well-resourced CSR departments staffed with qualified professionals
   - -Recognizing these units as strategic assets rather than compliance obligations
   - -Leveraging social workers' field expertise to bridge the corporate-community divide

   This approach transforms CSR from a perfunctory exercise into a strategic function that creates shared value while maintaining policy coherence with corporate goals. By institutionalizing specialized CSR capabilities, companies can develop more effective, context-sensitive policies that authentically address social needs without compromising business interests.

2) Effective social interventions require meaningful community involvement from the planning stage itself. While some corporations engage local stakeholders during implementation, such limited participation proves insufficient. The invaluable lived experience of community members makes them uniquely qualified to identify appropriate solutions for their own challenges. When excluded from decision-making, beneficiaries often develop a passive recipient mentality, focusing on short-term gains rather than sustainable outcomes.

   A phased engagement strategy proves most effective: initially incorporating respected community elders and leaders who command local trust, then gradually expanding participation. This approach achieves dual objectives:

   - Leveraging traditional authority structures to build program legitimacy
   - Fostering organic community ownership of development initiatives

The psychological shift from passive beneficiaries to active participants fundamentally transforms intervention effectiveness. When communities see their voices reflected in planning decisions, they transition from extracting maximum immediate benefits to investing in long-term program success. This participatory model not only yields more culturally appropriate solutions but also enhances project sustainability through genuine grassroots ownership.

3) It is important to understand the felt needs of the community so that the companies can cater to such needs. For finding out such needs, a baseline need assessment survey can be made compulsory. For this professionals who either have experience or knowledge can be involved. Without this understanding, the interventions made may be of some use to Page 17 of 18 the communities yet would not address the basic requirements that they feel is needed and unless the basic requirements are met, people will not be able to develop however facilities are provided just like a hungry child will not be able to concentrate on education.
4) For CSR initiatives to achieve meaningful impact, companies must commit to extended project timelines that allow for deep community involvement. Sustained engagement demonstrates authentic commitment to community welfare, fostering trust and organic participation over time. True sustainability requires designing interventions that continue functioning independently after corporate support concludes - this demands careful planning regarding:
   - Resource Independence: Developing locally-managed systems for financial, material, and knowledge resources
   - Capacity Building: Training community members to assume leadership and operational roles
   - Phased Transition: Implementing gradual withdrawal strategies that ensure.
5) Last, but not the least, most of the time people are not aware of the interventions of the communities as it is not feasible for them to go through the websites of the companies to find out which companies are working up on that area for CSR projects. Therefore there should be other mechanisms for reaching out to people. Communities should be made aware of the initiatives so that they not only can avail the benefits of the projects but also can engage in bringing about change within their own communities. They will be able to contribute in a way which will improve the nature of engagements.

5. CONCLUSION

While corporate operations inherently face difficulties in addressing community needs effectively, such alignment remains achievable through deliberate commitment. The fundamental differentiator lies in organizational resolve rather than structural constraints. Several pioneering companies have demonstrated that obstacles can be overcome when genuine determination exists.

This reality underscores the critical need for corporate sensitization that transcends legal compliance. Regulatory mandates alone prove insufficient to foster authentic community-oriented approaches. What's required is:

- Conscious corporate decision-making prioritizing social impact
- Institutional willingness to adapt operational models
- Leadership commitment to stakeholder engagement

Successful cases confirm that when companies move beyond perfunctory compliance to embrace social purpose as core to their identity, they develop innovative solutions that reconcile business objectives with community needs. The transformation begins not with stricter regulations, but with awakening corporate consciousness about their societal role and mutual interdependence with communities.

This paradigm shift from mandatory to voluntary commitment represents the most sustainable path toward meaningful corporate-community partnerships that create shared value.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Carroll, et al. (1985). An Empirical Examination of the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and. The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 28, No. 2 , 4446463.

Joseph, A. V. (2009). Successful Examples of Corporate Social Responsibility. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 44, No. 3, JSTOR , 402-409.

May, S. (2007). The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mehra, M. (2006). Who's who in CSR in India - A Resource Guide 2006. Kolkata: Centre for Social Markets.

Moser, M. R. (Feb., 1986). A Framework for Analyzing Corporate Social Responsibility. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 5, No. 1, JSTOR , pp. 69-72.

Richardson, A. H. (2004). The Triple Bottom Line. London: Earthscan.

Sharma. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility in India. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 46, No. 4, JSTOR , 637-649.

Sharma, N., & Gupta, S. (2009). CSR-A Business Opportunity. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 44, No. 3, JSTOR , 396-401.

Sharma, S. G. (2009). Corporate Social Responsibility in India: An Overview. The International Lawyer, Vol. 43, No. 4 , 1515-1533.

Wenlong Yuan, e. a. (2011, June). Integrating CSR Initiatives in Business: An Organizing Framework. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 101, No. 1, Published by: Springer, JSTOR , pp. 75-92.