

Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability, and Stakeholder Management

A Strategic Report Evaluating the Role of CSR and Sustainability Initiatives in Creating Long-Term Organisational Value

Name: Shalin Narendrabhai Bhakhar

Institution: EIIET

Submission Date: 17 September 2026

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	6
2.1 Meaning and Development of Corporate Social Responsibility.....	6
2.2 Stakeholder Theory.....	6
2.3 The Triple Bottom Line.....	7
2.4 Sustainable Development Principles.....	8
2.5 Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Management.....	8
2.6 CSR, Reputation and Organisational Performance.....	9
Methodology.....	10
Findings.....	11
4.1 Case Study: Unilever and the Sustainable Living Plan.....	11
4.2 Impact on Stakeholders.....	11
4.3 Impact on Reputation and Business Performance.....	12
4.4 Challenges in Implementing CSR.....	13
Discussion.....	15
Conclusion.....	17
References.....	19
Appendices.....	21

Abstract

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and sustainability have moved from the periphery of business strategy to its centre, as organisations face growing pressure from investors, customers, regulators, and employees to demonstrate responsible conduct. This report critically evaluates the role of CSR and sustainability initiatives in creating long-term organisational value. It traces the meaning and historical development of CSR, and critically examines the major theoretical frameworks that underpin contemporary practice, including stakeholder theory, the Triple Bottom Line, and sustainable development principles. The report explores how organisations manage environmental, social, and governance (ESG) obligations, and uses Unilever's Sustainable Living Plan as a real-world case study to assess how CSR strategy affects stakeholder relationships, corporate reputation, and business performance. It further examines the practical challenges organisations face in implementing CSR, including greenwashing, conflicting stakeholder interests, and resource constraints. The report concludes with evidence-based recommendations for organisations seeking to embed CSR and sustainability into core strategy rather than treating it as a peripheral or reputational exercise. The findings suggest that CSR initiatives generate genuine long-term value only when they are integrated into governance structures, supported by transparent measurement and reporting, and pursued with authentic commitment rather than as a defensive or promotional tool.

Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) refers to the ways in which organisations voluntarily integrate social and environmental concerns into their business operations and their interactions with stakeholders, going beyond what is strictly required by law (Carroll, 1991). Once viewed as a discretionary, philanthropic add-on to core business activity, CSR has become an increasingly central component of corporate strategy, driven by rising stakeholder expectations, tightening regulation, and mounting evidence that environmental and social performance can materially affect long-term financial performance.

This shift has been reinforced by the growing prominence of sustainability as a strategic concern. Climate change, resource scarcity, and social inequality have moved from being background risks to being recognised as material issues that can directly affect an organisation's licence to operate, its cost of capital, and its reputation among customers and investors alike. In response, many organisations have adopted formal environmental, social, and governance (ESG) frameworks, published sustainability reports, and set public targets for reducing their environmental footprint and improving social outcomes across their value chains.

At the same time, the practical implementation of CSR remains contested and difficult. Organisations must balance the sometimes competing interests of shareholders, employees, customers, communities, and the environment, and face persistent criticism that CSR initiatives can amount to superficial reputation management, or 'greenwashing', rather than substantive change (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). This report critically assesses the role of CSR and sustainability in creating long-term organisational value. It explains the meaning and development of CSR, critically evaluates key CSR models including stakeholder theory, the Triple Bottom Line,

and sustainable development principles, examines how organisations manage ESG obligations, and assesses the CSR practice of a real organisation, Unilever, in relation to its impact on stakeholders, reputation, and performance. The report also examines common implementation challenges and proposes evidence-based approaches to effective and sustainable CSR practice.

Literature Review

2.1 Meaning and Development of Corporate Social Responsibility

CSR has evolved considerably since it first emerged as a distinct field of management thought in the mid-twentieth century. Early conceptions, associated with Friedman (1970), held that the primary social responsibility of business was to maximise shareholder value within the rules of the game, with little scope for organisations to pursue broader social goals. This narrow, shareholder-centric view has since been substantially widened. Carroll's (1991) influential pyramid of CSR identifies four layers of responsibility: economic (being profitable), legal (obeying the law), ethical (doing what is right, just, and fair), and philanthropic (being a good corporate citizen), and argues that responsible organisations must satisfy all four simultaneously rather than treating economic performance as separate from ethical and social obligations.

More recent scholarship has reframed CSR not as a cost or constraint on business, but as a potential source of competitive advantage. Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) concept of 'creating shared value' argues that the most effective CSR strategies are those that simultaneously advance social objectives and reinforce the organisation's core competitive position, rather than being pursued as an activity separate from strategy. This shift reflects a broader move away from CSR as philanthropy toward CSR as a strategic and operational discipline embedded across the organisation.

2.2 Stakeholder Theory

Freeman's (1984) stakeholder theory provides one of the most widely used frameworks for understanding CSR in practice. It holds that organisations are accountable not only to shareholders

but to a broader set of stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and regulators, each of whom can affect, or be affected by, the achievement of the organisation's objectives. Stakeholder theory reframes the purpose of the firm as the creation of value for this wider group, rather than shareholder wealth maximisation alone.

A key contribution of stakeholder theory is its recognition that stakeholder interests can conflict, and that managing these tensions is a core managerial task rather than a peripheral one. Organisations must therefore develop mechanisms, such as stakeholder mapping and structured engagement processes, to identify the relative salience of different stakeholder groups and to balance competing claims in a way that supports long-term organisational legitimacy (Freeman, 1984).

2.3 The Triple Bottom Line

Elkington's (1997) Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework extends the stakeholder concept into a practical performance model, arguing that organisations should measure and report their performance across three dimensions: economic (profit), social (people), and environmental (planet). The TBL framework has been highly influential in shaping corporate sustainability reporting, encouraging organisations to move beyond purely financial metrics and to account explicitly for their social and environmental impact alongside profitability.

Critics of the TBL approach note that, in practice, the three dimensions are rarely given equal weight, and that organisations often continue to prioritise economic performance while treating social and environmental reporting as a communications exercise rather than a driver of decision-making. Nonetheless, the TBL remains a widely used organising framework for corporate sustainability strategy and reporting.

2.4 Sustainable Development Principles

CSR and sustainability are also shaped by broader international sustainable development frameworks, most notably the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which set out seventeen interconnected global goals covering poverty, inequality, climate action, and responsible consumption and production, among others (United Nations, 2015). Many organisations now map their CSR and sustainability strategies against the SDGs, using them as a common reference point for setting targets and reporting progress. The principle of intergenerational equity, central to the original Brundtland Commission definition of sustainable development as development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, continues to underpin much of the theoretical justification for corporate sustainability practice (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

2.5 Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Management

ESG has emerged as the dominant practical framework through which investors, regulators, and organisations themselves assess corporate sustainability performance. ESG criteria cover environmental factors such as carbon emissions and resource use; social factors such as labour practices, diversity, and community relations; and governance factors such as board composition, executive pay, and business ethics. Organisations increasingly formalise ESG management through dedicated sustainability committees, third-party ESG ratings, and standardised reporting frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, which aim to improve the comparability and credibility of corporate sustainability disclosures (Global Reporting Initiative, 2021).

The growth of ESG investing has reinforced the strategic importance of ESG management, as institutional investors increasingly incorporate ESG performance into capital allocation decisions. This has strengthened the business case for CSR, but has also raised concerns about the reliability and comparability of ESG ratings, which can vary considerably between rating agencies using different methodologies.

2.6 CSR, Reputation and Organisational Performance

A substantial body of research has examined the relationship between CSR performance and financial performance, generally finding a positive, though modest and context-dependent, association (Porter & Kramer, 2006). CSR is understood to affect performance through multiple channels: strengthening corporate reputation and brand equity, improving employee attraction and retention, reducing regulatory and reputational risk, and, in some cases, driving product and process innovation. Reputational effects are particularly significant, since a strong CSR record can enhance stakeholder trust and customer loyalty, while poor CSR performance, or perceived hypocrisy, can generate significant reputational damage that extends well beyond the immediate incident.

Methodology

This report adopts a qualitative, desk-based research approach, drawing on a review of academic literature on CSR, stakeholder theory, and sustainability, together with corporate sustainability reports, independent commentary, and secondary case study material relating to the organisation examined in the Findings section. Sources were selected for their relevance to the report's key themes: the meaning and development of CSR, core CSR and sustainability theory, ESG management, and the practical challenges of CSR implementation.

Unilever was selected as the primary case study organisation because it is widely recognised as one of the most prominent adopters of an integrated CSR and sustainability strategy through its Sustainable Living Plan and its successor Compass strategy, and because its experience, including both achievements and criticisms, offers a rich and well-documented basis for critical analysis of how CSR strategy affects stakeholders, reputation, and performance in practice.

As a desk-based qualitative report, this study does not involve primary data collection such as interviews or surveys, and its findings should be interpreted as a critical synthesis of existing secondary evidence rather than new empirical research. This approach is appropriate for a report of this nature, which aims to connect established CSR theory with observable organisational practice and to generate practical, evidence-based recommendations.

Findings

4.1 Case Study: Unilever and the Sustainable Living Plan

Unilever, a global consumer goods company, launched its Sustainable Living Plan (USLP) in 2010, committing to decouple business growth from environmental impact while increasing its positive social contribution. The plan set out ambitious, time-bound targets across three areas: improving health and wellbeing for more than a billion people, reducing the environmental footprint of its products, and enhancing the livelihoods of people across its value chain. In 2021, Unilever replaced the USLP with the Unilever Compass strategy, which similarly integrates sustainability goals directly into the company's overall business strategy rather than treating them as a separate corporate responsibility programme.

A distinctive feature of Unilever's approach is the explicit attempt to embed sustainability within brand strategy itself, exemplified by so-called 'Sustainable Living Brands' such as Dove and Ben & Jerry's, which combine social or environmental purpose with product marketing. Unilever has reported that these purpose-led brands have, in several years, grown faster than the rest of the business, which the company has used to support the argument that sustainability and commercial performance can be mutually reinforcing rather than competing objectives.

4.2 Impact on Stakeholders

Applying stakeholder theory to the Unilever case illustrates both the potential benefits and the complexity of managing CSR across a diverse stakeholder base. For employees, the company's sustainability commitments have been associated with enhanced employer brand and talent attraction, particularly among younger employees who report placing significant weight on

employer purpose and values. For consumers, sustainability claims embedded in product marketing have supported premium positioning and brand loyalty for some Unilever brands, although this has also exposed the company to greater scrutiny of the credibility of its claims.

For suppliers and smallholder farmers within Unilever's supply chains, programmes such as sustainable sourcing initiatives have aimed to improve livelihoods and environmental practices, reflecting the TBL's social and environmental dimensions in practice. For investors, Unilever's consistent inclusion in ESG indices and sustainability rankings has supported its accessibility to ESG-focused capital, illustrating the growing financial materiality of ESG performance discussed in the literature review. However, tensions between stakeholder groups remain evident: cost pressures associated with sustainable sourcing and packaging changes can conflict with shareholder expectations for margin performance, illustrating the trade-offs that stakeholder theory predicts organisations must actively manage.

4.3 Impact on Reputation and Business Performance

Unilever's sustainability strategy has contributed to a strong overall corporate reputation and consistent recognition in sustainability indices and rankings over the past decade, supporting the literature's argument that CSR can enhance brand equity and stakeholder trust. The company has also pointed to sustained growth in its purpose-led brands as evidence of a positive commercial return on its sustainability investment, consistent with Porter and Kramer's (2006) shared value argument that well-designed CSR strategies can reinforce rather than undermine competitive position.

At the same time, Unilever's experience illustrates that strong CSR positioning does not eliminate reputational risk. The company has faced periodic criticism, including scrutiny over whether all of

its original USLP targets were fully achieved by their original deadlines, and broader industry-wide criticism regarding plastic packaging and consumer goods companies' contribution to plastic pollution. This suggests that even organisations widely regarded as CSR leaders remain exposed to reputational risk when ambitious public commitments are not, or are perceived not to be, fully met.

4.4 Challenges in Implementing CSR

The Unilever case, read alongside the broader literature, illustrates several recurring challenges in CSR implementation. The first is greenwashing risk: as organisations increasingly use sustainability claims in marketing, they face growing scrutiny from regulators, media, and consumers over whether such claims are substantiated, and any gap between stated commitments and demonstrated outcomes can generate accusations of greenwashing, damaging credibility even where genuine progress has been made (Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

The second challenge is stakeholder conflict. As illustrated in the Unilever case, the interests of shareholders, who typically prioritise short-term financial returns, can conflict with the interests of environmental and social stakeholders, who prioritise longer-term, harder-to-monetise outcomes. Resolving these tensions requires strong governance structures and a willingness by leadership to accept short-term costs in pursuit of longer-term value, which can be difficult to sustain under quarterly earnings pressure.

The third challenge is resource constraints, which affect organisations of all sizes but fall particularly heavily on small and medium-sized enterprises that lack the dedicated sustainability functions, reporting infrastructure, and capital available to large multinationals such as Unilever. This creates a risk that CSR becomes concentrated among large, well-resourced organisations able

to absorb the associated costs and reporting burden, while smaller organisations struggle to participate meaningfully in ESG-driven supply chains and capital markets.

A further, related challenge is measurement and comparability: the absence of fully standardised global reporting requirements means that organisations retain considerable discretion over what they report and how, complicating efforts by stakeholders to compare CSR performance across organisations or to verify claims independently, notwithstanding the growing influence of frameworks such as the GRI standards.

Discussion

The findings suggest that CSR and sustainability can contribute meaningfully to long-term organisational value, but that this contribution is conditional on how CSR is designed, governed, and communicated, rather than being an automatic outcome of adopting CSR language or publishing a sustainability report. The Unilever case supports Porter and Kramer's (2006) shared value argument: where sustainability is embedded directly into brand and business strategy, rather than treated as a separate corporate responsibility function, it appears more capable of generating both social and commercial returns simultaneously.

At the same time, the analysis highlights that even well-resourced, widely praised CSR leaders remain vulnerable to the tensions identified in stakeholder theory and to reputational risk when public commitments are not fully met. This suggests that the credibility of CSR strategy depends heavily on the gap, real or perceived, between stated ambition and demonstrated outcome. Organisations that set highly ambitious public targets accept a degree of reputational exposure if those targets are missed or delayed, even where genuine progress has been made; this is a strategic trade-off that leadership must manage deliberately rather than treating ambitious target-setting as a purely positive communications exercise.

The findings also reinforce the argument that greenwashing risk is not confined to organisations acting in bad faith. Even genuine sustainability efforts can be perceived as greenwashing if reporting lacks transparency, if claims are not adequately substantiated, or if marketing outpaces demonstrated impact. This points to the importance of independent verification, standardised reporting frameworks such as the GRI standards, and restrained, evidence-based communication of

sustainability claims, rather than aggressive promotional framing, as key tools for protecting organisational credibility.

The resource constraint challenge identified in the findings raises a broader question about the scalability of current CSR practice beyond large multinational organisations. If effective ESG management depends on dedicated sustainability functions, sophisticated reporting systems, and the capacity to absorb short-term costs for long-term gain, there is a risk that CSR leadership becomes concentrated among a small number of large, well-capitalised firms, while smaller organisations, often collectively responsible for a very significant share of economic activity and environmental impact, struggle to participate fully. This suggests a continuing need for proportionate CSR frameworks, sector-level collaboration, and support mechanisms that make meaningful sustainability practice more accessible to smaller organisations, alongside the leadership shown by larger firms such as Unilever.

Conclusion

This report has critically evaluated the role of CSR and sustainability initiatives in creating long-term organisational value. It has shown that CSR has evolved from a narrow, discretionary, shareholder-focused concept into a strategic discipline informed by stakeholder theory, the Triple Bottom Line, and international sustainable development principles, and increasingly operationalised through formal ESG management systems. The Unilever case study demonstrates that CSR and sustainability can support stakeholder value, corporate reputation, and business performance when integrated directly into core strategy, but also illustrates that even leading organisations remain exposed to reputational risk, stakeholder conflict, and scrutiny over the credibility of their claims.

The analysis indicates that the principal barriers to effective CSR are not primarily conceptual but practical: the risk of greenwashing when claims outpace substantiated outcomes, the difficulty of reconciling competing stakeholder interests, resource constraints that limit meaningful participation by smaller organisations, and inconsistent measurement and reporting standards that make performance difficult to compare and verify.

To support effective and sustainable CSR practice, organisations should: embed sustainability objectives directly into core business and brand strategy rather than treating them as a separate function; adopt recognised, standardised reporting frameworks such as the GRI standards to improve transparency and comparability; set ambitious but realistic public targets, with clear, honest reporting of progress and setbacks; establish governance structures, such as dedicated board-level sustainability oversight, capable of balancing short-term financial pressure against longer-term stakeholder value; and provide proportionate support, such as simplified reporting

tools and sector collaboration, to help smaller organisations participate meaningfully in ESG-driven markets. Organisations that pursue CSR with strategic integration, transparency, and genuine stakeholder engagement are best positioned to translate sustainability commitments into durable competitive advantage and long-term organisational value.

References

- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39–48.
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, 54(1), 64–87.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman Publishing.
- Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). *GRI standards*. Global Reporting Initiative.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62–77.
- Unilever. (2021). *Unilever Compass strategy*. Unilever PLC.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our common future. Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Summary of Core CSR and Sustainability Frameworks

- Carroll's CSR Pyramid — economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities.
- Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984) — organisations accountable to a broad set of stakeholders, not shareholders alone.
- Triple Bottom Line (Elkington, 1997) — performance measured across profit, people, and planet.
- UN Sustainable Development Goals — seventeen global goals used as a reference point for CSR strategy.
- ESG Framework — environmental, social, and governance criteria used by investors and organisations to assess sustainability performance.
- Shared Value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) — CSR strategies that simultaneously advance social goals and competitive position.

Appendix B: Unilever Sustainable Living Plan / Compass — Key Focus Areas

- Health and Wellbeing — improving health and hygiene outcomes for consumers and communities.
- Environmental Footprint — reducing greenhouse gas emissions, water use, and waste, including plastic packaging.
- Livelihoods — improving incomes and working conditions across the value chain, including smallholder farmers.