

Understanding the Theoretical Convergence of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting in Practice: A Thematic analysis of Automobile Websites

Prof. (Dr.) Sabyasachi Dasgupta

Prof. Anurupa Ghatge

Symbiosis Institute of Media and Communication (SIMC-PG)
Pune, Symbiosis Knowledge Village
Lavale, Mulshi
Pune: 412115, Maharashtra
India

Abstract

Corporate Social Responsibility is a term that is present in every possible medium throughout the globe. While there are practitioners trying to implement Corporate Social Responsibility as part of the sustainability model, there are researchers across the globe trying to understand its meaning and impact. The objective of this paper is to understand the level of convergence between the theoretical understandings of Carroll's Corporate Social Responsibility model and its digital reporting by the corporate. The methodology adopted in this paper is simple content analysis using a deductive approach. The scope of this paper would take into account the website reporting of Automobile sector consisting of six automobile companies, Tata Motors, Bajaj, Mahindra & Mahindra, Hyundai, Ford and Audi. The findings from this paper suggest a wide gap between theory and practice. Hence, eight themes are suggested to the corporate for effective Corporate Social Responsibility activities and its reporting.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, Archie Carroll, themes, content analysis, philanthropy, practitioner, globalization

1. Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility has become a very popular phrase in the context of globalization. Some critics call it a fancy word, others call it a part of guilt economy. Still others feel, there must be something good about it. Decades of scholarly research has proved that Corporate Social Responsibility is not just a buzz word. There are serious academic outcomes and some serious implications to the corporate world if it can be in sync with the academic rigor. In fact, the interest in Corporate Social Responsibility as a concept has gained prominence primarily due to the effect of globalization where alien companies made an effort to become citizens of the host country. "Moreover, while governments have traditionally assumed sole responsibility for the improvement of the living conditions of the population, society's needs have exceeded the capabilities of governments to fulfill them. In this context, the spotlight is increasingly turning to focus on the role of business in society and progressive companies are seeking to differentiate themselves through engagements in CSR." (Jamali & Mirshak, 2007) The government has also mandated Corporate Social Responsibility as part of Companies Bill 2013 and has asked the companies to spend 2 % of their average net of last three year's profits. Hence, according to Aiyar (2012), corporate must aim for social goals, not just profits.

2. Literature Review

"Corporate Social Responsibility involves the idea of business being proactive in its relationship with a range of social actors and doing more than just trying to avoid breaking moral rules." (Theaker, 2001) Corporate Social Responsibility in very simple terms is the responsibility that firms have towards society. However, the number of debates that were triggered since its inception proves Corporate Social Responsibility is not that simple a concept at all. In fact, the word "social" in Corporate Social Responsibility is itself subjected to debate regarding the scope of society. Edward Freeman and Archie Carroll (1979) have said that 'society' includes specific groups of people who are immediately involved in firm's activities.

This notion of society is backed by stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) that suggests companies have responsibility to those stakeholders who form immediate part of company's responsibilities. (Freeman and Liedtka, 1991) McGuire (1963) defined society in terms of a whole community or nation where people share their common values and traditions.

The term Corporate Social Responsibility gained prominence from 1950 and has shown that whenever there has been a lack of social responsibility by the firms there have been movements affecting production. (Ablander, 2011) It is also observed that this concept had shifted its meanings across time from stockholder benefit to shareholder benefit and from the questions of "why" to "what" to "how" corporates can maximize value for the firm and society. (Basu and Palazzo, 2008)

An attempt to conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility started with Bowen (1953) who defined social responsibility "refers to the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society". Theodor Levitt (1958) who opined, "Corporate welfare makes good sense if it makes good economic sense- and not infrequently it does. But if something does not make economic sense, sentiment or idealism ought not to let it in the door". McGuire (1963) stated, "the idea of social responsibility supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations, but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations." Although the word "obligation" was not well defined, McGuire had talked elsewhere about "corporation must take an interest in politics, in the welfare of the community, in education, in the happiness of its employees, and in fact in the whole social world about it. Therefore, business must act justly as a proper citizen should." Walton (1967), a scholar in Business and society, defines corporate social responsibility as "in short, the new concept of social responsibility recognizes the intimacy of the relationships between the corporation and the society and realizes that such relationships must be kept in mind by top managers as the corporation and the related groups pursue their respective goals".

Milton Friedman (1970) stated, "There is one and only one responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competitions, without deceptions and fraud". Contrary to his statement, Morrell Heald (1970) was of the opinion that the Corporate Social Responsibility would actually deal with subjects such as "philanthropy, employee improvements (working conditions, industrial relations, and personnel policies), customer relations and stockholder relations." Supporting Heald, Keith Davis (1973) opined that Corporate Social Responsibility encompasses "consideration of issues beyond the narrow economic, technical, and legal requirements of the firm." Summarizing the debate, Carroll (1979) defined Corporate Social Responsibility as "the social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary (philanthropic) expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time".

Different arguments have been raised regarding the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. Davis (1960) tried to balance both sides of the debate by stating on one hand that decisions and actions taken by the firm should go partially beyond the firm's direct economic or technical interests but on the other hand he also states that "some socially responsible business decisions can be justified by a long, complicated process of reasoning as having a good chance of bringing long run economic gain to the firm, thus paying it back for its socially responsible viewpoint." However, Milton Friedman in 1962 stuck to only economic responsibility by the firm by suggesting, "Few trends could so thoroughly undermine the very foundation of our free society as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their stockholders as possible." This point of view has been critiqued by both Paul Samuelson and George Steiner stating that although economic responsibility forms a major part of a firm's responsibility, the firm cannot ignore the other social responsibilities that it has towards society. (Paul Samuelson, 1971; George Steiner 1971) In addition to these scholars, Johnson (1971) proposed a conventional wisdom definition of corporate social responsibility, "A socially responsible firm is one whose managerial staff balances a multiplicity of interests. Instead of striving only for larger profits for its stockholders, a responsible enterprise also takes into account employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities and the nation." His second definition, dealing with profit maximization, states that "businesses carry out social programs to add profit to their organization." His third definition dealing with utility maximization, states that "the prime motivation of the business firms is utility maximization; the enterprise seeks multiple goals rather than only maximum profits."

Finally his fourth definition dealing with lexicographic view of social responsibility, states “the goal of the enterprise, like those of the consumers, are ranked in order of importance and the targets are assessed for each goal.”

Votaw (1973) was of the opinion that “to some, it conveys the idea of legal responsibility or liability; to others, it means socially responsible behavior in an ethical sense; to still others, the meaning transmitted is that of ‘responsible for’, in a causal mode; many simply equate it with a charitable contribution; some take it to mean socially conscious; many of those who embrace it most fervently see it as a mere synonym for ‘legitimacy’, in the context of ‘belonging’ or being proper or valid; a few see it as a sort of fiduciary duty imposing higher standards of behavior on businessmen than on citizens at large (p. 11). S. Prakash Sethi (1975), a renowned scholar in this field, considers social responsibility as going beyond the concept of social obligation which is economic and legal only. He argues that “social responsibility implies bringing corporate behavior up to a level where it is congruent with the prevailing social norms, values, and expectation of performance.” Different scholars across the globe stressed on how Corporate Social Responsibility can bring about social change and address to a larger social good through different means and how they get reported in the annual reports of the companies. (Nichols, 1969; Backman, 1975; Bowman and Haire, 1975; Davis & Blomstorm, 1975; Holmes, 1976; Jones, 1980, Marrewijk and Were, 2003; Willard, 2002; Frederick, 2006, Crane, et al, 2008) Another reputed scholar, Teach (2005) was of the opinion that Corporate Social Responsibility is “a major secular development, driven by a long-term reevaluation of the role of corporations in society”. But Teach is also skeptical about the fact that “Corporate Social Responsibility will not be successful until mainstream companies begin reporting some aspect of Corporate Social Responsibility as being critical to the company’s past or future performance.” Matten & Craine (2005) were of the opinion that Corporate Social Responsibility is executed for “self-interested reasons and hence their ethical contributions is somewhat tarnished”. However, according to Althusser (2005), “although ethics is one of the ways in examining Corporate Social Responsibility, on its own it is insufficient, because it usually closes down the social and political nature of organizations which are embedded in practice.”

Carroll (2008) was of the opinion that there are 5 critiques of Corporate Social Responsibility. The first argument is the classical economics critique which says that business has only one motive that is to maximize profit of its owners. The second argument is that managers in business organizations are not trained for Corporate Social Responsibility activities; rather they are equipped in finance and operations. The third argument is that Corporate Social Responsibility may dilute the actual business aim of the company. The fourth argument is that business already has so much of power in terms of economics and technology. The social activity would be adding another power to its jurisdiction. The fifth argument is that producing socially responsible products may increase the cost of the product and eventually decrease the global competitive advantage of the company.

These are some of the debates of Corporate Social Responsibility in different sectors which make research on this topic interesting. However, in order to understand which argument holds true in the multinational companies of the Indian automobile industry, it is required to delve into different models of Corporate Social Responsibility.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Carroll (1991) made the first attempt to develop a pyramidal structural model for Corporate Social Responsibility.

2.1.1 Development of a Model (Carroll’s Model)

Carroll (1991) developed a model for Corporate Social Responsibility and it became the base of almost every research in Corporate Social Responsibility. The model has been successful in capturing different dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility through the formation of a pyramid. Various authors like Aupperle, K E. (1985), Donna Woods (1996) David Vogel (2005) have supported Carroll’s model. According to Wood and Jones (1996), “Carroll’s four domains have enjoyed wide popularity among social issues in management scholars”. Carroll’s pyramid (1991) consisted of four parts: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary

Economic responsibility: Carroll (1991) was of the opinion that corporate as an economic institution should produce and sell goods to society at fair prices which the society feels to be its true value. The corporate should look upon the profitability part as a mechanism of survival, growth and reward to the corporate. In this dimension, Carroll received full support from the Shareholder Value theory (1980) and from various scholars who were of the opinion that only economic responsibility and self interest should be the legitimate responsibility of a business firms leading to profit maximization.

(Friedman, 2001; Vogel, 2005) The support for the economic perspective was very pronounced from different scholars and from the study done by Carroll and his colleagues. (Levitt, 1958; Davis 2005)

Legal responsibility: Carroll (1991) was of the opinion that legal responsibilities are codified ethics. It is the responsibility of the business to adopt and adhere to the fair practice as developed by the lawmakers of society. Safeguarding the stakeholders is a part of corporate laws. Corporate has the option to oppose such law but it will come to effect only after the consent of the society. However, the jurisdiction of corporate laws is limited in the sense that it is subjective and may be influenced or biased by the corporate.

Ethical responsibility: Beyond the boundaries of legality, Carroll (1991) was of the opinion that there are activities and practices which are either expected by society or prohibited by societal norms. These are ethical responsibilities embodying norms, values, standards, expectations that stakeholders consider as just, fair and consistent with their moral rights. Studies (Enderle, 1995; Donaldson & Dunfee, 1999) have tried to elevate the ethical component to the global domain by taking into account the norms and cultural differences of various geographic location both in the local and in the global level. In this process, Carroll's model would be valid in the global settings of cultural differences.

Philanthropic responsibility: These are purely voluntary initiatives which the business desires to serve to the society. (Porter, 2003; Marrewijk & Were, 2003) Since it is not mandated, it can neither be called legal or ethical responsibility. It originates from company's visions to become a good corporate citizen by understanding the secret desires of the public. This dimension of Carroll's model is supported by corporate citizenship theory (2005). According to Aupperle et al. (1985), Carroll's conceptualization has multiple components that lend themselves to measurement and testing. One of the considerations to be taken into account is that all the four tiers that is economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic together make up the framework for Corporate Social Responsibility and each of them are equally responsible. The company should be fulfilling all the responsibilities simultaneously and in any order.

Carroll (2004) later on transformed the pyramid into a Venn diagram. In the Venn diagram, there were two advantages. The first advantage is that it is not hierarchical in nature. This takes into account the fact that any of the parameters can be chosen first for executing Corporate Social Responsibility. The second advantage is that in the Venn diagram, there are overlapping areas. This is of great importance as there are scholars who have stated that Corporate Social Responsibility cannot be polarized into one dimension or the other. However, a combination of two or more dimensions is required. Even the eleventh five year plan of "Indian environmental regulatory reform" suggested the norms of ethical responsibility of not harming the environment and philanthropic responsibility by doing something to restore environmental balance.

According to Baxi et al (2012), "in the Indian context, four models of Corporate Social Responsibility have emerged." They spoke about the ethical model of public welfare, the legal requirements designed by the state, liberal responsibility limited to private owners and the responsibility to stakeholder which would cater to their needs and the needs of the community. A close look at the models of Corporate Social Responsibility showed that the four layers of Archie Carroll's pyramid were being satisfied. This shows the reliability of using Carroll's model as the base of this research.

A careful understanding of literature review suggests that although Corporate Social Responsibility activities are executed by different corporate organizations, yet their approach and effectiveness of Corporate Social Responsibility has been different. There are companies who are reputed for doing good Corporate Social Responsibility and there are other companies which do Corporate Social Responsibility just for the sake of it or for compliances. However, Corporate Social Responsibility as a concept has been judiciously percolated by different academic scholars across the globe. Hence, an understanding is required as to whether there is a deviation between theory and practice of Corporate Social Responsibility. So the broader research question is whether the reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities promoted by companies in their website actually reinforces the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility?

3. Methodology

The methodology taken for this research is qualitative and the method adapted to answer the research question is content analysis. This content analysis is a mixture of both conventional and didactic content analysis.

This paper would take into account thematic analysis for analyzing the data, finding out the themes that emerge from the data and comparing it with the themes that have emerged from the literature review and the theoretical framework. The analysis will be both inductive and deductive in nature. In the first stage, there will be deduction of themes from the literature review and the theoretical framework. In the second stage, the researcher would get immersed in the data and cull out themes from the content in an inductive manner. In the final stage, the researcher would compare and contrast the themes of the reporting in the website with the themes that were deductively culled out from the literature review and the theoretical framework.

3.1 Data Collection Process

The participating sector that this paper would take into account is the automobile sector and include both Indian and multinational automobile companies operating in India. The reason for choosing this sector is because of its open market and a substantial influence of globalization since 2005. For restricting the scope of this paper, the analysis would take into account three Indian companies (Tata, Mahindra & Bajaj) and three multinational companies, Hyundai based out of South Korea, Ford based out of USA and Audi based out of Germany. The reason for taking these companies is to have participation from three major continents USA, Europe & Asia that are majorly into the automobile business. The content would be gathered from the website reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities of these companies and the themes would be generated from the data. The reason for taking the text of content from the website reporting of these companies comes from the inferences of managers who suggest that promoting Corporate Social Responsibility activities through the website would be beneficial to their company image as a wider population of stakeholders and investors would come to know about the benevolent activities that they are doing for society. Hence, this paper would concentrate on the website reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities for Indian and foreign automobile companies in India and undertake an inductive and a deductive process of thematic extraction and analysis.

4. Findings & Analysis

The analysis of this paper is derived from the content analysis done of the websites for 3 Indian and 3 foreign automobile companies. The process was both inductive and deductive in nature. Hence, the approach adapted for doing the content analysis was both conventional and directed content analysis. The themes derived from the deductive content analysis of literature review were economic responsibility, legal responsibility, ethical responsibility and philanthropic responsibility. The themes derived from inductive content analysis were the look and feel of the website, terminologies related to Corporate Social Responsibility, positioning of the Corporate Social Responsibility report in the website and visibility of the annual report to understand whether it is at all a part of the corporate website. These themes were considered when the researchers were immersed in the data and the themes emerged out of the content that was present in the website. The researchers felt that these themes were equally important when analyzing the contents of Corporate Social Responsibility reporting on website. These themes differed with the theoretical framework of Carroll who had not used websites for thematic analysis. Hence there were eight themes present in the content of the website:

4.1 Economic Responsibility

As far as Carroll's definition of economic responsibility is concerned, it is found that among the foreign automobile companies operating in India, Hyundai and Ford does not explicitly mention economic responsibility as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. However, Audi mentions it in the form of economic report publications and measured performance for future action. As far as the Indian automobile companies are concerned, Tata reports Corporate Social Responsibility in the form of business responsibility report and economic recycling. Bajaj also speaks of economic responsibility by mentioning about Corporate Social Responsibility both as an investment and expenditure. Mahindra & Mahindra does not mention economic responsibility as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility reporting.

So, it is seen that, among the automobile companies taken, very few automobile companies consider reporting economic responsibility as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. It is found from this study, that although Indian companies are inclined to consider economic responsibility as part of their reporting, foreign companies do not overtly consider economic responsibility to be stated as part of Corporate Social Responsibility activity. Hence, it can be inferred that while Indian companies consider reporting economic responsibility upfront and disclose their hidden interest, foreign companies are more cautious in their reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities.

4.2 Legal Responsibility

As far as Carroll's definition of legal responsibility is concerned, it is found that among the foreign automobile companies operating in India and the Indian automobile companies, none of the companies except Tatas report legal responsibilities in an overt manner. While the Tatas refer to maintaining international compliances, other Indian companies like Bajaj & Mahindra and foreign companies like Hyundai, Ford & Audi do not consider reporting their legal responsibilities overtly in their websites.

It is already known from literature review that companies operating in India have to abide by the 2% government compliances of giving back to the society. Thus, it becomes a general rule and probably one of the reasons why the automobile companies do not report legal responsibilities in their websites. It can also be inferred from this analysis that only if automobile companies are adhering to minimum governmental compliances, they are actually doing the bare minimum required for legal approvals. Companies need to do more on legal compliances and report them as their investors would be in a better position to understand whether companies are legally compliant with the norms of the country. Foreign companies need to do more of legal compliance reporting as it would show that they are in liaison with the rules of the host country.

4.3 Ethical Responsibility

As far as Carroll's definition of ethical responsibility is concerned, it is found that among the foreign automobile companies operating in India, Hyundai and Audi report the ethical responsibilities of the company. Hyundai speaks of the ethical responsibilities that they have towards their employees and suppliers, their policy of free trade, their corruption prevention measures and their empathetic understanding towards their stockholders' benefit. Their ethical responsibilities are also ingrained in their core values and philosophies. Audi speaks only of the health management initiatives that have been organized for the employees. However, Ford does not speak of any ethical responsibility initiatives as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. From the point of view of Indian companies, Tatas have reported very few ethical responsibilities that they have undertaken as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. Mahindra & Mahindra, however, has spoken of employees being given social responsibilities as part of their business work life and organizing cultural programs for their employees. Similarly, Bajaj has also mentioned ethical responsibilities in their reporting by suggesting that they work towards self-development of the employees and have made the ambience of their factories eco-friendly.

Thus it can be inferred that, unlike economic and legal responsibilities for which the reporting was slightly less, ethical responsibility seems to be slightly more reported as part of the Corporate Social Responsibility activities. Probably this issue is due to the fact that companies want to suggest that their organization has a better working environment and hence can attract the attention of both investors and talented professionals.

4.4 Philanthropic Responsibility

As far as Carroll's definition of philanthropic responsibility is concerned, it is found that among the foreign automobile companies operating in India, Hyundai takes special care for being empathetic towards the host country and undertake activities for the benefit of underprivileged section of society, the local communities in which they operate and are conscious about not polluting the environment around them. Ford primarily believes in charity through the distribution of food, materials and clothing. Apart from their foundations, they do specific community activities like blood donation campaigns and global caring initiatives. They have also undertaken specific activities like development of schools, health centres, celebrating festivals with the orphans and activities for environmental protection. For Audi, it is the environmental protection that is primary for their philanthropic activities. As far as Indian automobile companies are concerned, the Tatas, with their creation of the Tatanagar, is very much involved in community development and social initiatives. Apart from these philanthropic activities, the Tatas also take care of the environmental safety measures so that their product does not harm the society in any ways. Mahindra & Mahindra performs their philanthropic activities under four heads: education for the under-privileged, environmental safety, health check-ups and charity through foundations. Bajaj also reports their philanthropic responsibilities in their website. They speak of environmental protection, caring for the society, educating under-privileged children, health care centres, woman empowerment and rural development.

So it becomes amply clear that the philanthropic responsibility of a company is mostly reported as Corporate Social Responsibility activities in the websites. Probably, companies are still under the impression that philanthropic responsibilities have major roles in the reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities. However, from a theoretical standpoint, all the responsibilities should be executed and reported in the website.

4.5 Look and Feel of the Website

As far as look and feel of the websites are concerned, Hyundai has green mint leaves signifying that the colour has a lot to do with the company's propagation of being conscious about the environment in which they operate. However, the websites of both Ford and Audi does not show any visual element which signifies that the company is conscious about propagating the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. From the point of view of the Indian companies, Tata has the element of the colour green in the tabs and in the visual of a balloon. Similar is the case of Bajaj where its brand Ninja is written with green fonts. However, no such visual element is present in the website of Mahindra & Mahindra. This issue suggests that just by looking at the website, stakeholders will not be able to understand the magnitude of the interest and intention of performing Corporate Social Responsibility activities by the automobile companies.

4.6 Terminologies Related to Corporate Social Responsibility

It is interesting to see that while corporate personalities talk about Corporate Social Responsibility as a credible terminology for communicating their intentions to do good to their stakeholders, employees and communities at large, their websites do not always contain this term as a standard terminology. In fact, different portals have used different terminologies to report their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. Hyundai has used the words HMI foundation, Ford has used the terminology as sustainability, environmental policy & community, whereas Audi has used the terms as environmental protection. Among the Indian companies, Tata has used the terms as we care, sustainability, Mahindra & Mahindra has used the term as how we help, whereas only Bajaj has used the term as CSR & distinctly green. A careful look at all the terms mentioned in lieu of Corporate Social Responsibility would suggest that although they may in some way be associated with Corporate Social Responsibility, yet there are differences in the meaning of the terms. Foundations, environmental protection, help and distinctly green as all different parts of the philanthropic responsibilities of a company. Sustainability is the only term which covers the whole meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility and moves beyond it. However, the totality of the meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility in most of the terms is missing and reductionist in nature.

4.7 Positioning of the Corporate Social Responsibility Report in the Website

The analysis of the positioning of the reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities is important to understand whether a company is overtly trying to report Corporate Social Responsibility activities or covertly trying to do so. In this case, if the front page of the website contain terms related to Corporate Social Responsibility activities, it is considered that the company is overtly reporting its Corporate Social Responsibility activities. However, if a company has tabs which would lead to a second linking page which has reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility activities, then it is considered that the company is covertly doing the reporting in their website. Among the present brands of automobile companies, among the foreign companies, Hyundai and Ford overtly propagate terms related to Corporate Social Responsibility activities, whereas Audi covertly does so. In the Indian automobile scenario, Tata and Mahindra & Mahindra overtly reports the terms related to Corporate Social Responsibility activities, whereas Bajaj covertly does so. This observation suggests that the automobile companies are indeed keen to propagate the terms related to Corporate Social Responsibility activities in their website even if there are changes in its meanings from the conceptual meaning of Corporate Social Responsibility.

4.8 Visibility of the Annual Report

It is an important endeavor to analyze whether annual reports based on Corporate Social Responsibility activities has been shared in the website for the information of the public. The visibility of Corporate Social Responsibility reports in the public domain suggests the eagerness and transparency of companies in their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. In the present context, none of the foreign automobile companies have their annual reports published in their websites. For the Indian automobile companies, both Tata and Mahindra & Mahindra have published their annual reports whereas there is no such report in the website of Bajaj. These findings suggest that Indian companies are keener on clearly letting their stakeholders know the kind of initiatives that their companies are undertaking for their investors, employees and society at large.

5. Reliability & Validity of the Research

Inter-coder reliability was done in order to understand whether the codes analysed by one researcher was legitimate for the researcher.

It was found that inter coder reliability was maintained and the second researcher came up with similar codes as the first researcher. Regarding the validity of this research, validity was measured on four parameters:

Credibility: peer de-briefing was conducted as a method of understanding whether the research is credible or not. It was found that the research holds credible for the other researcher as well.

Transferability: by superimposing the themes of one website on another, it was found that transferability holds good for this research.

Dependability: the paper has a coherent flow in the methodology of data collection and is logical as far as inductive and deductive processes were concerned. Hence the dependability of this research was maintained.

Conformability: in discussion with another researcher, it was found that the results were logical and holds true in the context of the study. Hence, conformability was maintained.

Thus it was found, that apart from this research being reliable, it is also valid on all four parameters of validity. Hence, it can be inferred that the research holds true for all practical implications in the context of this study.

6. Conclusion

The findings and analysis of the study suggest that there still remains a wide gap between what has been suggested as a theoretical concept of Corporate Social Responsibility and the practical aspect of it. When the theoretical framework of Corporate Social Responsibility was deductively positioned in analyzing the contents of the website, it was found that except philanthropy, other themes were less emphasized. On the contrary, there were other themes which emerged out of the website contents but were not a part of the conceptual understanding. Hence, there is definitely a lack of rigor in the implementation and reporting of Corporate Social Responsibility. The problem with the implementation is the gap of in-depth understanding of the concept and its practical execution between the researchers and the practitioners. Whereas, scholars like Carroll have emphasized that all the four responsibilities need to be fulfilled, the reporting suggests that only one of the responsibilities is being reported. The other themes that emerged from the contents to showcase Corporate Social Responsibility activities of the company lack depth and the influence level of the public to admire the company for its social initiatives will definitely be low.

What needs to be done at this point is that, practitioners need to take into account all the eight themes that are discussed in this paper and report it so that the company has a much larger influence on the society, convincing the society that they are actually doing something good for the society. This paper would really be helpful for the foreign and Indian automobile industry to fine tune and stream-line their Corporate Social Responsibility activities. The activities need to have a larger influence on all stakeholders of the company and also protect the environment from its harmful effects. The academic implication of this paper is that the researchers need to understand what the practical problems are, that are hindering companies to accomplish all the eight themes and how to overcome them. The collective effort of the researchers and the practitioners would help in better understanding and implementing the conceptual construct of Corporate Social Responsibility into a practical and executional orientation.

References

- Ablander, Michael S. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility as Subsidiary Co-Responsibility: A Macroeconomic Perspective, *Journal of Business Ethics*, pg. 115–128
- Aiyar, S. (2012). CSR: a cloak for crooks, *Times of India*, Pune, 21st October edition
- Althusser, L (2005). *For Marx*, Verso, London
- Aupperle, K E., Carroll Archie B. & Hatfield John D. (1985). An empirical examination of the relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and profitability, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pg. 446-463.
- Backman J. (ed.) (1975). *Social responsibility and accountability*, New York University press, New York.
- Basu, K. & Palazzo G. (2008). 'Corporate Social Responsibility: A Process Model of Sensemaking', *Academy of Management Review* 33(1), 122–136
- Baxi, C.V. & Sinha Ray, Rupamanjari (2012). *Corporate Social Responsibility: A study of Corporate Social Responsibility practices in Indian Industry*, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd
- Bowen Howard R. (1953). *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, Harper & Row, New York, pp. 6
- Bowman, E.H and Haire, M. (1975). A strategic posture towards corporate social responsibility, *California Management Review*, 18, pg. 49-58.

- Carroll, Archie (2004), Managing ethically with Global stakeholders: A present and Future challenge, Academy of Management Executive, Vol 18 (2)
- Carroll, Archie B. (1979). A three-dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Social Performance, Academy of Management Review (Vol 4. No. 4. Pg. 497-505)
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders, Business Horizons, 34, p. 39-48
- Crane, Abigail McWilliams, Matten Dirk, Moon Jeremy & Stegel, Donald S. (2008), The Oxford handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility, Oxford University Press
- Davis, I. (2005). What is the Business of Business? McKinsey Quarterly, No. 3
- Davis, Keith & Blomstorm Robert L. (1975). Business and Society: environment and responsibility, McGraw-Hill, New York, 3rd edition, pp 39
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against Business Assumption of Social Responsibility, Academy of Management Journal, 16 (2), pg. 312-22.
- Davis, Keith. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? California Management Review, 2, spring: pg. 70-6
- Donaldson, Tom & Dunfee, T (1999). When ethics travel: The promise and perils of global business ethics, California Management review, 41 (4), pg. 48-49
- Enderle, G. (1995). What is international? A typology of international spheres and its relevance for business ethics, Paper presented at the international association for Business and society, Vienna, Austria.
- Frederick William C. (2006) Corporation Be Good: The story of Corporate Social Responsibility, Dog Ear Publishing, Indianapolis
- Freeman, R. E. & Liedtka, J. (1991). Corporate Social Responsibility: A critical approach. Business Horizon, 34 (4), pg. 92-9
- Freeman, R. Edward (1984). Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach. Boston: Pitman
- Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. The New York Times Magazine, 13th September, pg. 32-3, 124-6.
- Friedman, M. (2001). The social responsibility of business is to increase profits. In W. M. Hoffman, R. Frederick, & M. S. Schwartz (Eds.), Business ethics: Readings and cases in corporate morality (4th ed., pp. 156-160). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill
- Friedman, Milton (1962). Capitalism and freedom. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Heald Morrell (1970). The social responsibilities of Business: Company and community 1900-1960, the Press of Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
- Holmes S.L. (1976). Executive perceptions of corporate social responsibility, in Business Horizons, 19, pg. 34-40.
- Jamali, D. & Mirshak, R. (2007). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Theory and Practice in a Developing Country Context, Journal of Business Ethics (72) pp. 243-262
- Jones, Thomas M. (1980). Corporate Social Responsibility Revisited, Refined, in California Management Review, spring, pg. 59-67
- Levitt, T. (1958). The dangers of social responsibility, in Harvard Business Review, 36(5), pg. 41-50
- Marrewijk, M. V & Werre, M. (2003). Multiple levels of corporate sustainability, in Journal of Business ethics, 44 (2/3), pg. 107-119
- Matten D and Crane A. (2005). Corporate citizenship: towards an extended theoretical conceptualization, in Academy of management review, 30 (1), pg. 166-79
- McGuire Joseph W. (1963). Business and Society, McGraw-Hill, New York, pp.144
- Nichols, T. (1969). Ownership, control and ideology: An enquiry into certain aspects of modern business ideology. George Allen & Unwin, London
- Porter, Michael (2003). CSR- a religion with too many priests, European Business Forum, Autumn, Issue 15
- Samuelson P.A. (1971) Love That Corporation, Mountain Bell Magazine, spring
- Sethi S. Prakash (1975), Dimensions of Corporate Social Performance: An analytical framework, California Management Review, 17, spring, pg 58-64
- Steiner George A. (1971) Business and Society, Random House, New York
- Teach Edward (2005) Two Views of Virtue. CFO Dec, pg. 31-4
- Theaker, Alison (2001). The public relations handbook, Routledge, 2001
- Vogel, David (2005). The market for virtue: The potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility. The Brookings Institution, Washington.
- Votaw Dow. (1973). 'Genius becomes Rare', in Dow Votaw and S. P. Sethi (eds.) The Corporate Dilemma, Prentice Hall, Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ
- Walton, Clarence C. (1967), Corporate Social Responsibilities, Wadsworth Publishing Co. Inc., Belmont, Calif, pp 18
- Willard, B. (2002). The sustainability advantage: seven business case benefits of a triple bottom line, New Society, Canada.
- Wood, D.J. and Jones R.E. (1996). Research in corporate social performance: what have we learned? , in Corporate philanthropy at the crossroads, ed. D.R. Burlingame and D.R. Young, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pg. 7-22