Legal Obstacles to CSR: Examining Legal Loopholes and Corporate Gains

Anya Rasmussen

Introduction:

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has become an increasingly important element of current corporate practices. CSR is a business approach that encourages companies to be socially responsible to their stakeholders, employees, and the general public. By adopting CSR standards, companies become more mindful of their impact on all areas of society–social, economic, and environmental. For example, companies have implemented training for employees to recognize discrimination in the workplace. In the age of corporate globalization, companies must increasingly contribute to a greater society while minimizing the negative impacts of their business practices.

If implemented properly, CSR efforts can also result in greater consumer loyalty and trust, attract employees, improve brand image, and increased revenue. Initially, CSR efforts were considered charitable, where companies participated in social welfare programs. However, companies maintained this participation at a surface level since no corporations incorporated CSR practices in their fundamental business operations. Critics have pointed out that companies' increased participation in social and charitable programs was geared more toward improving reputation and social standing than it was toward actually implementing change in company practices. A *Harvard Business Review* study revealed that 94% of business executives believe CSR efforts greatly improve a company's social standing ("The Truth about CSR). Regardless of a company's original intent, awareness and implementation of CSR have developed into an essential part of many corporations' practices, and CSR now includes a wide range of issues, such as ethical labor standards, corporate management, and sustainability. This transformation indicates a growing awareness of the connection between the corporate world and society, and of the degree to which they influence each other.

CSR in the United States is not legally mandated, and companies engaging in CSR practices therefore must go beyond legal expectations and voluntarily take action to better the standard of living for all. CSR is a new concept in the business world, so there hasn't been enough time to mandate laws that are intended to enhance it. However, while CSR wasn't necessarily the intention when foundational labor laws and environmental policies were instituted, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, these regulations play a vital role in defining CSR efforts today (EEOC, 2024), (US EPA, 2018). For instance, environmental policies demand companies to oversee waste management, conserve natural resources, and minimize their carbon footprint, while labor laws safeguard hazard-free working conditions, fair compensation, and protection from discrimination. When examined on a global scale, legal frameworks like the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights also establish guidelines for companies to address any negative societal impacts concerning their corporate procedures (United Nations, 2011).

Even with these measures, there is a substantial difference between national and international CSR principles. National standards tend to differ greatly from country to country, indicating varying levels of regulatory systems, societal progression, and cultural norms. On the other hand, international standards tend to offer a consistent approach to CSR by facilitating positive corporate practices worldwide. This clear distinction frequently results in inconsistencies when executing CSR standards, leading global enterprises to comply with different standards based on the countries in which they reside. The separation between country-specific standards and worldwide uniformity brings light to a deeper concern: the insufficiency of existing legal frameworks to address the intricate realities of corporate responsibility. Since current legal frameworks inadequately address the nuances of CSR, companies exploit loopholes and weaken voluntary ethical practices, indicating a need for legal language revision to remove ambiguity and ensure corporate dedication to social responsibility.

In this article, I begin by laying out an overview of different CSR standards to provide context on how the distinctions of CSR standards have affected their implementation. The paper then covers various legal barriers both internationally and domestically, which ultimately hinder these CSR standards from becoming a reality. I provide two recent examples of companies taking advantage of the inconsistencies that result in part from the various legal barriers and the gaps within CSR application. It precedes by laying out some of the legal solutions that could presumably address CSR-related legal hindrances, though these solutions have their own practical and logistical issues. In consideration of the complexities of CSR, I then conclude the paper by applying these solutions to countries that have attempted to mandate CSR but have been unable to account for the nuances that continue to challenge the US and other countries yet to implement it.

CSR Standards / Legal vs. Ethical Considerations:

It is crucial to comprehend the range of standards that mold CSR efforts. These standards include social and environmental matters, such as racial inclusivity, eco-friendly practices, and gender equality. Three themes that tend to be the most central focus of CSR are race, gender, and the environment.

Standards on racial inclusivity focus on maintaining non-discriminatory work environments where all people of any ethnic and racial background have equal opportunities. Gender equality standards focus on providing impartial treatment and recognition for all workers, regardless of gender identity. Gender standards tend to address issues like diversity and inclusion policies, equal pay, and the support of female executives. Environmental standards encourage corporations to mitigate their ecological footprint and adopt more sustainable practices. These standards include many environmentally-friendly approaches, such as efficient energy use, waste reduction strategies, and resource conservation.

While these are just the central themes of CSR, there remains a difference in the specificity of standards on the national and international levels. Internationally, several standards provide guidelines for CSR implementation. A notable example is the ISO 26000 standard, created by The International Organization for Standardization, which provides fundamental guidelines on social responsibility. This includes individual rights, employment policies, ethical business practices, and environmentalism (ISO, 2010). This standard highlights the significance of incorporating CSR efforts into everyday business operations. Another important international standard is SA8000, created by Social Accountability International in 1997, which focuses more on workers' rights (Assoune, 2020). It covers employment issues such as forced labor, child exploitation, workplace conditions, and discrimination.

At the national scale, United States standards such as the Civil Rights Act and B Corp Certification are some of the many mandates linked to CSR. The Civil Rights Act, a transformative law in the United States, established protections for any form of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, and gender. Even though this Act is a law, and therefore not voluntary, its principles align with and strengthen CSR efforts. The other example, B Corp Certification, is not a law but a certification that companies can earn by undergoing thorough evaluation that assesses its impacts on the community and environment. This certification is advantageous to many organizations because it shows their dedication to CSR and sets them apart from others. These differing standards reveal that while the fundamental components of

CSR are well-established, the existing legal frameworks often are not consistent or comprehensive.

When taking into account legal and ethical considerations, the problems intensify. Laws set the official regulations companies must follow, but ethics reflect a company's fundamental values. More frequently than expected, businesses exploit legal circumstances to meet the minimum criteria while neglecting the ethical side of CSR. Thus, the importance of strengthening regulation is significant, as it will ensure that CSR efforts create and reflect the legal requirements and ethical principles of responsibility and inclusion.

Legal Barriers to CSR Implementation:

Identifying the key legal barriers that hinder CSR implementation is essential when tackling the loopholes that enable companies to weaken voluntary moral efforts. These barriers include ambiguity in legal language, lack of enforcement measures, and historical progression. By analyzing these obstacles, we can gain a clearer understanding of the shortcomings of current CSR efforts and how there is a need for more effective legal frameworks.

A major legal barrier to CSR execution is the vagueness of legal terminology. Numerous standards, particularly international ones, are often general and imprecise, permitting businesses to have considerable flexibility in their interpretations and executions of said standards. For example, the ISO 26000 standard often faces criticism due to its lack of enforceable guidelines. Although it addresses important topics such as employment practices, environmentalism, and civil liberties, it needs to detail measurable requirements, so its non-certifiability makes it challenging to implement (Wilhite, 2021). This means companies can claim alignment with CSR regulations without implementing any significant changes to their business practices.

Despite this, the fact that many countries still need to adopt this global standard is tied to a different problem surrounding international trade. In countries where this standard is adopted, every company must adhere to the ISO 26000 guidelines to do business in those countries. This dramatically disrupts international trade and is disadvantageous for many global corporations residing in countries without the ISO 26000 standard. This suggests that a trade-off between international commerce and ethical practices exists, ultimately complicating CSR implementation even more.

One of the primary reasons companies fly under the radar is the need for effective enforcement strategies. Even with CSR standards existing, the tools needed to implement them often need to be more effective and present. This deficiency in enforcement enables companies to pay more attention to their CSR obligations without severe penalties. Take, for example, the SA8000 standard, which provides thorough expectations for workplace conditions, but to implement them, it relies heavily on third-party evaluations that assess a company's level of social accountability and treatment of workers (Social Accountability International, 2023). Companies can evade these standards without strict government oversight and penalties by falsifying evaluations or avoiding compliance altogether. That said, while this standard is helpful for sizeable corporations, it is also impractical for smaller businesses, as maintaining oversight bodies for every company is costly and inefficient. Thus, aligning effective enforcement strategies and the status of a company is crucial to ensuring CSR implementation remains productive without being overly extensive.

Historical context also contributes significantly to the development of legal frameworks concerning CSR. Changes in political views, economic conditions, and social norms throughout various countries have significantly affected the evolution of CSR execution, resulting in vastly distinct regulatory frameworks (ACCP, 2021). With globalization and businesses residing in different regulatory environments, maintaining consistency in CSR application is near impossible. The lack of uniformity in standards from one country to another has allowed companies to leverage areas of weaker regulations, compromising effective CSR implementation. To illustrate, in 2011, several global corporations, such as Nestlé, were revealed to be acquiring palm oil from Indonesian distributors associated with labor exploitation and deforestation (Limb, 2021). Despite their alleged CSR initiatives, these multinational corporations managed to capitalize on Indonesia's weaker environmental and labor standards just to obtain inexpensive palm oil. In general, areas that have faced historical events of economic crisis and significant political shifts often have limited enforcement and oversight of companies. To overcome these challenges, eliminating ambiguity and harmonizing standards across countries can help eliminate the inconsistencies that enable companies to exploit legal loopholes, ultimately resulting in more uniform and efficient CSR practices globally.

Examples of Companies Exploiting CSR:

Historically, there have been many instances where companies have exploited gaps within CSR-related legal frameworks. Towards the end of the 20th century, various global enterprises were said to have used inhumane labor practices in developing countries while promoting their dedication to CSR principles (Sayeed, 2018). These businesses abused the vagueness of international labor standards and lack of enforcement in the countries where they operate to cut costs and maximize profits. For example, most recently, multiple companies have been accused of “greenwashing” or marketing themselves as eco-friendly without making significant changes to minimize their environmental impacts (United Nations, 2022). The increased number of companies “greenwashing” also shows a shift from focusing on labor standards to environmental concerns and branding. To provide examples of these issues, the two cases of CSR exploitation involving Starbucks and Volkswagen demonstrate a relatively good outcome and a detrimental outcome.

Case 1: Back in 2018, Starbucks faced a reputational crisis after two African-American men were wrongfully detained at one of their stores in Philadelphia because a manager contacted the authorities when they were sitting but not ordering (“Starbucks Closed,” 2018). The widespread outrage was severe, with protests and national boycotts of the corporation ensuing; Starbucks immediately closed 8,000 stores across the United States for one day to implement racial-bias training for all employees (“Starbucks Will Temporarily Close,” n.d.). This decision was viewed as a genuine CSR initiative, helping rebuild their public image and demonstrate their dedication to ethical practices. Despite this, critics argued that the company’s decision was a PR strategy rather than a sincere attempt to confront discrimination and would only be a one-time event (Calfas, 2018). After taking these criticisms into account, the CEO of Starbucks, Kevin Johnson, met face-to-face with the two men to apologize and invite their suggestions on avoiding the recurrence of such situations (“2 Black Men Arrested,” 2018). This, along with Starbucks’s racial bias training, ultimately left them without any significant damage to their reputation, underlining how CSR efforts are not only used for societal benefit but can be used to shape public image and preserve consumer loyalty.

Case 2: In 2015, Volkswagen had a considerable emission scandal dubbed the “diesel dupe” when it was discovered the company had installed software in their cars to deceive emission tests (Hotten, 2015). The tech permitted their vehicles to cheat the test by mitigating the cars' emissions when under testing conditions while emitting pollutants well over legal limits during everyday driving. This software was installed in over 11 million cars globally, enabling the company to advertise these vehicles as eco-friendly. This resulted in intense fallout, making Volkswagon face billions in legal fees, penalties, and fines. Their stock value fell dramatically and experienced widespread public backlash. In contrast to Starbucks, which was able to restore consumer trust through its socially responsible actions, Volkswagen's intentional dishonesty left no room for them to correct their mistakes, leading to a sharp drop in stocks of around 40% within the first two weeks after the incident, revealing the company's substantial loss of trust and reliability (Jung and Sharon, 2019).

These two instances offer different outcomes when a corporation is accused of exploiting legal loopholes regarding CSR. When Starbucks responded to the incident in Philadelphia, they faced criticism with little impact as their decision was viewed as a pledge to improve their ethical standards. In comparison, Volkwagon's intentional rigging of emission tests revealed their apparent disregard for environmental standards, leading to extensive damage to their reputation. The case with Starbucks demonstrates how genuine CSR efforts can sometimes help with PR management, while Volkswagen's case illustrates that being exposed for manipulating CSR can have severe repercussions. Even with this, it is also essential to recognize the differences between the circumstances. Starbucks's situation mainly impacted the local population and resulted in a national boycott limited to a specific audience and problem. Volkwagon's scandal was a multinational issue, affecting many consumers and raising significant sustainability concerns. This contrast points out the diverse circumstances and outcomes of CSR abuse and the value of integrity and transparency when upholding a company's reputation.

In addition, these cases show the profound impacts exploiting CSR can have on business morals and public trust. When corporations are seen leveraging CSR as a branding strategy instead of a voluntary commitment to bettering society, it can undermine customer trust. As seen with Starbucks' approach, while being effective at the moment, it risks coming across as disingenuous and can still affect the company's public perception. Though what Volkwagon had done was apparent, leading to significant consequences both reputationally and financially. Ultimately, these situations reveal a need for a sincere commitment to corporate responsibility, as deceptive or exploitative actions threaten a company's standing and undermine overall trust in CSR.

Legal Solutions:

Significant changes are necessary to increase clarity and strengthen enforceability in CSR-related frameworks, managing the existing loopholes and inconsistencies. These revisions should concentrate on refining legal terminology, facilitating business transparency, enforcing penalties for non-adherence, and establishing third-party oversight bodies to assess CSR compliance.

A central issue with current legal frameworks regarding CSR is the ambiguity in legal language. To resolve this issue, standards should provide requirements with clear definitions of key terms and detailed explanations of corporate conduct. For example, rather than making general statements like "support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges," which is said in the UN Global Compact, standards should outline specific practices such as limiting waste, reducing carbon footprint, and promoting ethical material sourcing (Karbassi, 2024). In addition, the extent of the laws should be well specified, listing which corporations fall under these requirements through determinants like industry, size, and market influence (Madu, 2024). With this in mind, it is also important to acknowledge the possibility that if CSR standards become overly specific, companies can claim they don't apply to them, so walking the fine line between being more specific but not excessively precise is profound ("Moving from Corporate Responsibility," 2023).

Another strategy to positively impact CSR is establishing mandated business transparency in CSR-related activities. Companies must be obligated to share any details regarding their CSR efforts, disclosing their goals and initiatives to the public. Such transparency would allow consumers and stakeholders to examine a company's devotion to CSR efforts. Corporations would also be more willing to commit to more ethical and sustainable practices if they knew the public was supervising their actions. This can improve employment standards, environmental practices, and more conscientious company actions. However, it can be argued that implementing such requirements would be too logistically challenging. Things like competition, regulatory framework differences, data collection, and the complexity of global supply chains would all make this extremely difficult to execute.

Effective penalties should be mandated for any company that violates CSR-related standards to discourage businesses from taking advantage of regulatory gaps. Possible penalties include fines or limitations on corporate operations. However, to ensure fairness, these liabilities must be proportionate to the extent of the damage of non-compliance. For example, a significant global enterprise violates an environmental policy, but instead of being fined a predetermined amount, they are fined proportionately to the ecological damage inflicted. This signifies the importance of making the penalties impactful enough to a company that they act as a repellent to such behavior instead of merely a business expense. Despite the fairmindedness of this approach, inflicting financial burdens on a company after violating CSR regulations won't necessarily make the corporation change for the better (Wu et al., 2023). This means incorporating financial and managerial revisions may be a more effective alternative to just fining a company and expecting a genuine acknowledgment of their wrongdoing. The case of Volkwagon demonstrates this well, as following the exposal of their scandal, they received significant fines, but in the long run, their reputational damage ultimately affected the corporation the most and led to their stock market value dropping.

Lastly, forming independent external oversight bodies might be beneficial to guarantee company adherence to CSR standards. These bodies would be authorized to conduct in-depth assessments of CSR-related corporate activities, validate company report accuracy, and examine claims of non-adherence to regulations. They would play a vital role in maintaining established CSR standards, pressuring companies to comply and commit to genuine CSR engagement. This oversight would keep consistent CSR efforts across different areas and industries and narrow the gap between legal regulations and corporate behavior. These legal reforms would ensure corporations exceed their commitments to CSR, contributing to increased voluntary ethical actions and uniformity for businesses overall. However, it's essential to acknowledge the logistical and financial concerns of implementing something like this, as organizing and funding oversight bodies for thousands of companies is no easy task. A minor adjustment to lighten this might be, similar to penalties, creating oversight bodies that would be proportionate to the company's market influence so time and money are spent more efficiently as opposed to having an equal amount per company.

The Possibility of CSR Laws:

Rising interest has been shown in the potential to legally mandate CSR in countries yet to do so. This would require all companies to comply with fixed CSR regulations, removing the voluntary aspect. Many factors, such as public approval, government support, and existing legal frameworks determine the likelihood of such laws being implemented.

Creating new statutes enforcing CSR offers both benefits and challenges. From one perspective, enforced CSR regulations could result in more consistent and uniform business practices, aligning them with international standards and eliminating the specificity disparity. From another perspective, enacting these laws would require an analysis of current political and economic environments across multiple nations. While some countries have already started incorporating CSR into their regulatory frameworks, others have yet to begin due to flawed government systems or economic limitations.

Recent government initiatives in various countries have advanced the possibility of enforced CSR worldwide. As a starting point, within the European Union, there have been several legislative actions regarding the enforcement of CSR, such as the creation of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive of 2014. This law requires large corporations to be transparent about their environmental practices, societal involvement, work environment, and diversity. The initiative was created to hold companies accountable by providing consumers with information on their businesses' internal CSR performance, yet it proved to have more problems than anticipated (European Parliament, 2021). There has been considerable acknowledgment of this directive being too ambiguous by allowing corporations to select a range of standards to report on, such as ISO 26000. This has led to inconsistencies since these standards have shortcomings, leaving more room for companies to provide vague and fragmented data. The EU has even recognized these issues and decided to implement a stricter framework, the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive, to help reverse some of the faults of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (Wilhite, 2021).

A further illustration is India's less recent efforts to integrate CSR into their legal system with the creation of the Companies Act of 2013, which prescribes certain businesses to set aside at least 2% of their net profits to use towards CSR efforts. This Act was initially created to systematize CSR and help alleviate national poverty, healthcare issues, and environmental concerns. What came about was companies viewing this law as a tax obligation instead of a step toward positive social change. There also arose loopholes in non-compliance as this law allowed companies to simply outline their grounds for non-compliance without any considerable penalties (Aswani, 2024).

Both these initiatives had a goal that began with supporting CSR and having positive societal and environmental impacts but has faced serious obstacles with implementation. In the European Union, the directive's accountability expectations have been insufficient, leading to surface-level data collection due to imprecise legal language. In India, the increasing discontent of companies due to their interpretation of the law as a tax obligation and the exposure of legal gaps has hindered genuine CSR engagement. Examining the legal revisions mentioned earlier, it is clear that they apply to the flaws of these two initiatives. With the Non-Financial Reporting Directive, creating more specified terms requiring companies to report only on one or two CSR standards will improve consistency and reduce the chances of imprecise reporting. Regarding the Companies Act of 2013, instituting more stringent penalties for non-compliance and attentively tracking companies' obedience can contribute to meaningful CSR involvement and business transparency.

Conclusion:

This paper has examined the nuances of implementing CSR within existing legal frameworks and systems. Legal constraints such as ambiguity in legal terminology, lack of effective enforcement mechanisms, and historical circumstances have all enabled businesses to exploit legal loopholes, undermining the fundamental moral aspects of corporate responsibility. In the case studies involving Starbucks' enforcement of racial-bias training and Volkswagen's "diesel dupe" scandal, it is apparent how utilizing these legal gaps can either strengthen a company's image or destroy its reputation entirely. Having an external oversight body, less ambiguous legal terminology, stronger business transparency, and additional penalties could have mitigated the harm from Volkwagon's actions and also reduce cases of company's manipulating CSR altogether. Although challenging, implementing these reforms is vital for protecting consumers' physical and psychological well-being, fostering ethical business environments, and prioritizing social accountability over profit.

This analysis reveals the significant gaps between CSR-related frameworks and current legal systems, often allowing corporations to bypass participating in sincere CSR efforts. By addressing these legal loopholes, the integrity of CSR efforts will be strengthened, ensuring that companies engage in genuine ethical practices instead of manipulating regulatory inconsistencies. In the future, government officials and industry leaders must dedicate effort toward developing more defined, enforceable standards that are aligned with CSR principles. This approach will promote long-term business accountability and help regain public trust in both the corporate and legal sectors permanently.

References

1. "2 Black Men Arrested at Starbucks Get an Apology from Police." *AP News*, 20 Apr. 2018, apnews.com/general-news-45547c3ae5324b679e982c4847ee1378.
2. ACCP. "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Brief History." *Association of Corporate Citizenship Professionals*, 1 Mar. 2021, accp.org/resources/csr-resources/accp-insights-blog/corporate-social-responsibility-brief-history/.
3. Assoune, Alex. "All You Need to Know about the SA8000 Certification." *Panaprium*, 20 Oct. 2020, www.panaprium.com/blogs/i/sa8000-certification.
4. Aswani, Jitendra, and Jitendra Aswani. "The Costs of India's Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility Rule - ProMarket." *ProMarket*, 11 July 2024, www.promarket.org/2024/07/11/the-costs-of-indias-mandatory-corporate-social-responsibility-rule/.
5. Calfas, Jennifer. "Was Starbucks' Racial Bias Training Effective? Here's What These Employees Thought." *Time*, Time, 30 May 2018, time.com/5294343/starbucks-employees-racial-bias-training/.
6. Campbell, John L. "Why Would Corporations Behave in Socially Responsible Ways? An Institutional Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility." *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 32, no. 3, July 2007, pp. 946–967, www.jstor.org/stable/20159343, https://doi.org/10.2307/20159343.
7. Cave, Bryan. 2013. Columbia Law Review. "CORPORATE RACIAL RESPONSIBILITY - Columbia Law Review." *Columbia Law Review*, 2024, columbialawreview.org/content/corporate-racial-responsibility/. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.
8. ESG, Seneca. "Ethical Business Practices: Case Studies and Lessons Learned." *Seneca ESG*, 25 Sept. 2023, senecaesg.com/insights/ethical-business-practices-case-studies-and-lessons-learned/.
9. European Commission. "Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility." *Single-Market-Economy.ec.europa.eu*, 2023, single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/industry/sustainability/corporate-sustainability-and-responsibility_en.
10. European Parliament. *Non-Financial Reporting Directive*. Jan. 2021.https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/654213/EPRS_BRI(2021)654213_EN.pdf
11. "Explained: The Corporate Transparency Act - Blog." *Transparency.org*, 2021, www.transparency.org/en/blog/explained-the-corporate-transparency-act. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.
12. Fernando, Jason. "What Is CSR? Corporate Social Responsibility Explained." *Investopedia*, 6 Mar. 2024, www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corp-social-responsibility.asp.
13. Filloon, Whitney. "Starbucks Attempts to Recover from PR Nightmare Following Philadelphia Arrests." *Eater*, 17 Apr. 2018, www.eater.com/2018/4/17/17246796/starbucks-black-men-arrests-philadelphia-kevin-johnson-response. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.

14. Harper, Shaun. "Where Is the $200 Billion Companies Promised after George Floyd's Murder?" *Forbes*, 17 Oct. 2022, www.forbes.com/sites/shaunharper/2022/10/17/where-is-the-200-billion-companies-promised-after-george-floyds-murder/?sh=4ce7b0434507.
15. Harvard Business Review. "The Truth about CSR." *Harvard Business Review*, Jan. 2015, hbr.org/2015/01/the-truth-about-csr.
16. Holeiciuc, Ana-Maria. "Building an Impactful Corporate Social Responsibility Policy." *Www.yarooms.com*,www.yarooms.com/blog/building-an-impactful-corporate-social-responsibility-policy.
17. Hotten, Russell. "Volkswagen: The Scandal Explained." *BBC News*, 2015, www.bbc.com/news/business-34324772.
18. "ILO Research Guides: Corporate Social Responsibility: International Labour Standards." *Ilo.org*, 2024, libguides.ilo.org/corporate-social-responsibility-en/standards. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.
19. International Organization for Standardization. "ISO 26000 Social Responsibility." *ISO*, 2010, www.iso.org/iso-26000-social-responsibility.html.
20. Jung, Jae C., and Elizabeth Sharon. "The Volkswagen Emissions Scandal and Its Aftermath." *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2019, pp. 6–15.
21. Karbassi, Lila. "Environment | UN Global Compact." *Unglobalcompact.org*, 2024, unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/our-work/environment.
22. Kinderman, Daniel. "The Challenges of Upward Regulatory Harmonization: The Case of Sustainability Reporting in the European Union." *Regulation & Governance*, vol. 14, no. 4, 13 Feb. 2019, https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12240.
23. Limb, Lottie. "Death and Deforestation: The Dirty Palm Oil Companies Supplying the EU." *Euronews*, 8 Oct. 2021, www.euronews.com/green/2021/10/08/nestle-kellogg-s-linked-to-shocking-palm-oil-abuses-in-papua-new-guinea.
24. Madu, Kelechi. "The Challenges of Implementing Corporate Social Responsibility in a Democratic Capitalist System." *Georgetown Law*, 26 Apr. 2024, www.law.georgetown.edu/denny-center/blog/corporate-social-responsibility/.
25. "Moving from Corporate Responsibility to Impact." *World Economic Forum*, 26 Apr. 2023, www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/04/moving-from-corporate-responsibility-to-impact/.
26. "Publishers Panel." *Ijols.com*, 2024, ijols.com/resources/html/article/details?id=197250&language=en.
27. Reinhardt, F. L., et al. "Corporate Social Responsibility through an Economic Lens." *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, vol. 2, no. 2, 11 July 2008, pp. 219–239, scholar.harvard.edu/files/stavins/files/reinhardt_stavins_vietor_reep.pdf, https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/ren008.
28. Robinson, Deena. "10 Companies and Corporations Called out for Greenwashing." *Earth.org*, 17 July 2022, earth.org/greenwashing-companies-corporations/.
29. Sayeed, Kishwar. "It Is the Most Common Form of Exploitation and Discrimination Used by People with Authority, Power or Having a Strong Network of Powerful People. It Is a Process of Dominance Reflected by Their Unwelcome Verbal, Physical or Psychological Behavior Centered on Race, Color, Religion, Gender, Financial." *Linkedin.com*, 11 July 2018,

www.linkedin.com/pulse/workplace-harassment-common-form-manipulation-kishwar-sayeed/. Accessed 1 Nov. 2024.

30. Social Accountability International. "SA8000® Standard." *SAI*, 2023, sa-intl.org/programs/sa8000/.
31. "Starbucks Closed More than 8,000 Stores for an Afternoon of Bias Training. Will It Work?" *PBS NewsHour*, 29 May 2018, www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/starbucks-closed-down-for-an-afternoon-of-bias-training-will-it-work.
32. "Starbucks Will Temporarily Close 8,000 U.S. Stores for Racial-Bias Training." *NBC News*, www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/starbucks-will-temporarily-close-8-000-u-s-stores-racial-n866746.
33. Stobierski, Tim. "What Is Corporate Social Responsibility? 4 Types." *Harvard Business School Online*, Harvard Business School, 8 Apr. 2021, online.hbs.edu/blog/post/types-of-corporate-social-responsibility.
34. Tamvada, Mallika. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Accountability: A New Theoretical Foundation for Regulating CSR." *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2020, pp. 1–14. *Springeropen*, link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40991-019-0045-8.
35. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. "Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." *Www.eeoc.gov*, 2024, www.eeoc.gov/statutes/title-vii-civil-rights-act-1964.
36. United Nations. "Greenwashing – the Deceptive Tactics behind Environmental Claims." *United Nations*, 2022, www.un.org/en/climatechange/science/climate-issues/greenwashing.
37. ---. *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*. United Nations, 2011.https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/guidingprinciplesbusinesshr_en.pdf
38. United States Department of Labor. "OSH Act of 1970." *Occupational Safety and Health Administration*, 1 Jan. 2004, www.osha.gov/laws-regs/oshact/completeoshact.
39. US EPA. "Summary of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act | US EPA." *US EPA*, 15 Aug. 2018, www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-resource-conservation-and-recovery-act.
40. Wilhite, Tamara. "The Limits and Pitfalls of ISO 26000 (Social Responsibility)." *HubPages*, 2 Aug. 2021, discover.hubpages.com/business/The-Limits-and-Problems-with-ISO-26000.
41. Wu, Chao-Chan, et al. "Exploring the Factors Affecting the Implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility from a Strategic Perspective." *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 10, no. 1, 26 Apr. 2023, pp. 1–11, www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-01664-4#citeas, https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01664-4.