

How to Cite:

Salam, M. A., & Nawrin, R. (2022). Business response to COVID-19 through CSR: Evidence from Thai top corporations. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S1), 6196–6210.
<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS1.6276>

Business response to COVID-19 through CSR: Evidence from Thai top corporations

Md Abdus Salam

St. Theresa International College, 1 Moo 6 Rangsit Nakhon Nayok Road, Bungsan, Ongkharak, Nakhon Nayok, Thailand

Email: abdus@stic.ac.th

Rubaba Nawrin

Faculty of Business Administration, St. Theresa International College

Abstract---The disastrous economic, health, and social impact of the pandemic once again highlighted the need for helping each other during crises. This study aims to explore the CSR effort of the top corporation in Thailand to help the society in need. To pursue that goal, the news and media section of 42 SET50 indexed companies was explored utilizing the content analysis method. The findings reveal that several corporations exhibit great commitment toward society to fight against adversity caused by Covid-19 through different kinds of CSR actions. 120 types of community CSR activities were discovered, then those are divided into nine categories and three themes. According to the content analysis 76.2% of the company conducted Local community support CSR, 85.71% conducted medical support CSR, and 26.2% conducted administrative support CSR. The research also remarks on key theoretical and practical implementation based on the findings of this study. This study might be beneficial for the sustainability policymakers and HR departments of the corporations to draw and implement CSR plans.

Keywords---CSR, SET50, COVID-19, society, sustainability, Thailand.

Introduction

Our beloved world is passing a difficult time with the multifaceted effects of the pandemic. The ripple effect of one of the worst health disasters (Bae & Chang, 2020) in human history devastated human lives and workplaces all over the world. To be more precise, the world has observed more than 359 million COVID-19 cases and more than 5.6 million deaths due to the pandemic as of 26th January 2022.

The impact of the pandemic on the economy and society has surpassed the loss of the 2008 financial meltdown (García-Sánchez & García-Sánchez, 2020). It causes an overall 4.5 percent drop in global economic growth (in terms of GDP) (Szmigiera, 2022) and a loss of 255 million jobs (CRS, 2021). This condition causes substantial social problems for many families as well as significant liquidity and survival issues for small businesses.

A tendency for temporary layoffs has been observed by corporations to reduce the economic impact of a pandemic or to avoid medium-term revenue/profit uncertainty. However, many corporations demonstrated significant effort to respond to the health, economic and social needs of different stakeholders through their CSR activities (Aguinis, Villamor, Gabriel, 2020).

People all over the world are still battling to recover from the financial and health disaster created by the Covid-19 crisis. Therefore during this period, corporations' public health awareness efforts represent a critical social engagement dimension in CSR activities (Bapuji et al., 2020; Guerriero et al., 2020). As a result, it is important to call attention to companies' Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) efforts in limiting the pandemic's possible effects on different stakeholders.

We have observed the response of corporations during previous natural disasters, man-made crises, and epidemics/pandemics (Monachino & Moreira, 2014), after two years of the "Covid" era it could be a good time to re-explore corporations' voluntary role in society in a difficult time. Companies around the world are reforming and expanding their CSR strategies to fit the dynamic world (Droppert & Bennett, 2015). Community health concerns and the growth of public health safety objectives have prompted more CSR-based sponsorships in numerous events in society in recent years (Batty et al., 2016). Companies are reforming and expanding their CSR strategies to fit the dynamic world due to increasing pressure from different stakeholders to act as socially responsible organizations.

The COVID-19 outbreak began on December 31, 2019, when the World Health Organization (WHO) received formal notification of 27 cases of pneumonia of unknown etiology, which were later identified as a novel virus, SARS-CoV-2, with a COVID-19-like clinical presentation. On March 11, 2020, over three months later, the WHO declared the global pandemic, which had surpassed 32.5 million cases and 989,000 deaths at the time (World Health Organization, 2022).

In Thailand, the current figures are 2,770,793 cases and 22,730 deaths until 23rd February 2022 (World Health Organization, 2022). The measures taken by the government to curve the spread were effective but they hurt the economy severely. It causes loss of jobs, incomes, businesses food security, public debt, education for children, and so on (World Bank, 2021).

To halt the spread of the pandemic, governments around the world have undertaken policies including total or partial population "lock-down", as well as the cessation of non-essential social and economic activity. To compensate for the loss of inhabitation and businesses, the governments' have initiated relief packages and undertook many financial incentives. In Thailand, measures include Tax relief, cash support, 50% salary support, no collateral loan, interest

reduction, soft loans to businesses, SME loan restructuring, policy rate reduction, and so on (KPMG, 2020).

But only government-sponsored financial and relief activities are not enough to cover the loss of the pandemic. In this vein, the goal of this research is to identify the community CSR initiatives taken by the largest Thai corporations (according to the SET50 index) towards society in response to the epidemic. Previously, a theoretical framework based on the identification of five forms of corporate responsibility: economic and legal, commercial, ethical, philanthropic, and strategic, was developed to characterize company commitments.

This study will contribute to the CSR literature by depicting the role of modern corporations as responsible entities in society. Besides, it might create a new trend of sustainable business models to survive and contribute to the changing world.

Literature Review

CSR has become an emerging research field as today's businesses acknowledge that the relationship between business and different stakeholders is not merely a transactional one but complex chemistry between employees, customers, suppliers, and the community (McLennan & Banks, 2019). CSR is commonly referred to as the social responsibility of businesses (Carroll, 1999). It is more than simple adherence to government laws and regulations; it is a voluntary contribution to society (Batty et. al., 2016). CSR is described as a discretionary use of company resources to increase social welfare as a method of improving relationships with important stakeholders (Barnett, 2007). Different CSR definitions include different stakeholder groups. According to Costa and Menichini (2013), the most common three groups are internal stakeholders, external stakeholders, and the society at large on the other hand, Deng et al. (2020) divide CSR into two categories: internal and external CSR. External CSR refers to "practices focused on stewardship toward the local community, the natural environment, and consumers," while internal CSR refers to "formal CSR activities within which employees can participate and gain developmental benefits that show employers' regard for their employees" (Deng et al., 2020). Carroll (1979) claims that a company's social duty encompasses peoples' discretionary, ethical, legal, and economic expectations towards the corporations at any given time. Ararat et. al., (2018) believe that discretionary or philanthropic CSR is not only a voluntary response to social needs but also a valid tool to "pay off" to society in exchange for the privileges and safeguards provided by the nation/state. It is also a type of corporate social responsibility that involves allocating funds, in-kind services, time, and items to address a societal need at a vital time (Muller et al., 2014).

Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholders' approach to CSR is now considered a modern perspective (Freeman & Velamuri, 2006; Gürlek & Tuna, 2019). Today's CSR definition encompasses not only corporate charity but also ethical behavior toward all stakeholders. According to the stakeholder theory, CSR is described as corporate

behavior involving an organization's ethical and responsible behavior toward all stakeholders (Aktan & B.rü, 2007; Türker, 2009). Stakeholder theory is a great tool for evaluating CSR efforts since it helps to comprehend the dimensions of CSR operations. Organizations must make several difficult decisions regarding how to manage CSR initiatives. Stakeholder theory simplifies the situation and identifies the areas where social responsibility is required (Park & Ghauri, 2015). Stakeholder theory states that the business and stakeholders have a mutual interaction through CSR activities, and businesses are required to meet the expectations of their stakeholders (Freeman, 1984).

The epidemic has prompted businesses to reconsider their societal duties (Diamantis, 2020). In the past, companies were primarily concerned with making their stockholders happy. They are now focused on other stakeholders too, like employees, consumers, and society, in addition to their shareholders (Robichaud, 2020). However, even before the appearance of the dark cloud of the pandemic about 200 CEOs of top corporations agreed that the priority of the organization is to create value for the stakeholders (Roundtable, 2019). The stakeholder theory values all three stakeholders equally, however, our study focuses only on the community as a stakeholder because of the nature of the public health crisis at this moment.

Relationship between CSR and Employee and Customer

Employees are the principal stakeholders of any organization. Their positive contribution to the company is vital for brand image, corporate development, business reputation, as well as relationships between the company and its stakeholders (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Xiao et al., 2012). Employee participation in CSR reaps a slew of benefits for both employers and employees (Xiao et al., 2020). To keep corporate operations running smoothly, companies should implement employee-protection measures. In a similar line, employees should respond positively to employers' philanthropic practices to win the battle against the pandemic.

The twenty-first-century customers are concerned about the ethical and sustainable practices of corporations. They keep an eye on corporate activities whether it only focuses on generating profit or operating as a responsible social entity (Boccia & Sarnacchiaro, 2020). One example of such consumer awareness is sustainable fashion (Salam & Senasu, 2019). There is numerous benefit of being a socially responsible firm by undertaking CSR initiatives such as increased customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, brand identification, consumer trust, and so on (Randle et. al., 2019). Edinger-schons et. al., (2019) found that customers who feel a steady bond with the firm will support the company's positive image both intentionally and unintentionally. Such customers contribute to the healthy growth of the company by demonstrating a positive attitude towards the company (e.g. positive marketing like word of mouth, and brand loyalty).

Countries around the world are taking a variety of measures to slow the spread of COVID-19, including national quarantines, voluntary recommendations to stay at home, closures of education institutes and certain types of business operations, and indefinite bans on public gatherings. A big portion of the world's population

is now restricted in some way, and the majority of them are adhering to self-quarantine systems with the hashtag "Stay Home, Stay Safe" (Kaplan et al., 2020).

Firms reach out to clients with the required amount of daily necessities to fulfill their daily wants and critical things during this period of health calamity. As a result, a company's response to customers' needs is now a key to maintaining a genuine company-customer relationship.

CSR and community

Mahmud et al., (2020) describe CSR as a strategic management tool that provides win-win opportunities for both the community and the enterprise. A firm's "community" can be defined by any number of communal characteristics, such as history, religion, culture, geographic location, and associated beings to the firm's supply lines spanning localities or the globe as a whole (Kapelus, 2002). Company and community are two well-interconnected neighbors (Idemudia, 2009); they affect each other's decisions from time to time (Kochhar, 2014). Very often the firm's CSR policies (both plan and implementation) are influenced by community pressure (Skouloudis et al., 2015).

The community allows the firm to operate in the locality and expect it to provide different types of benefit to its people and environment that offsets the negative effects (if any) of running a business the society (Boadi et al., 2019; Mahmud et al., 2020). Therefore, businesses create CSR policies to recognize the negative effects of their operations on the environment, community, and the world at large (Randle et al., 2019). Firms' CSR implementation strategies are mostly focused on assisting specific communities and societies as a whole (Randle et al., 2019)

Although policymakers all over the world have various plans for the future, it is undeniable that the pandemic attacked us unprepared. We are still struggling to cope even after two years of "new normal". The COVID-19 pandemic calamity has once again pressed societal disparities into public consciousness. The discrepancy was visible in the millions of recent unemployed who are waiting in long lines for government security benefits in the industrialized world as most cities imposed lockdowns (Bapuji et al., 2020). The pandemic eventually affected community life; communities all over the world have become too vulnerable to lead healthy and stable daily lives as different waves of Covid-19 worsened the situation. Uncertainties developed by the worse hit of the century putting peoples' health, income, education, housing, and other life goals in jeopardy.

Some argue that a crisis could be an opportunity and a threat simultaneously for a business (Del Mar Miras Rodriguez (2013). Community trust is an important element to fulfill the shared interest of the community and the businesses, and empathy can play a vital role in developing trust in the community (Boadi et al., 2019). As a result, companies have a moral obligation to help their best neighbors (communities) with their empathetic actions (e.g., free food for the jobless, medical equipment for emergency services, cash donations, and, so on) during this critical period.

Nonetheless, many businesses involve making voluntary contributions to society, such as contributing money, in-kind, and time to charitable causes (Del Mar Miras Rodriguez, 2013). Mugova et al. (2017) argue that corporate giving not only fosters positive stakeholder attitudes and supportive behaviors (e.g., employment, purchasing, and investment opportunities) but also strengthens stakeholder-company identifications, maintains a corporate image, and shapes stakeholders' socially responsible and advocacy behaviors in the long run (Mugova et al., 2017).

Numerous social issues can be solved by supporting each other during difficult times (Aknin & Whillans, 2020). In this regard, humanitarian CSR could be a good response to minimize the negative impact of the pandemic and generate positive vibes by supporting temporarily distressed members of society. The corporations have a good opportunity to create a brand identity on one hand and the other hand proves themselves as an active supporting entity of the system by helping different stakeholders in need.

Thus, the goal of this research is to look into whether the top corporations of Thailand are taking steps to improve employee morale, brand image, and involvement in the community during the most pressing needs across the world by raising awareness, offering medical assistance, prevention kits, cash assistance, and other in-kind contributions as well as their time and expertise as well as their discretionary donations.

Methods

Population and sample

To explore the CSR actions to reduce the negative impact of Covid-19 this study looks into the activities of the companies enlisted in the Stock exchange of Thailand. Among them, top companies are listed on different indices. This study utilized companies listed in the SET50 index. We used the June 2021 list of SET 50.

The SET 50 Index of Thailand is a “capitalization-weighted index” comprising the stocks of the top 50 companies listed on the Bangkok SET considering liquidity and market capitalization. The SET 50 was developed with a base value of 100 as of August 16, 1995 (Bloomberg, n.d.). Every six months Thai stock exchange authority revises/updates the list. The authors found information regarding CSR activities of 42 companies out of 50 on their websites, therefore, the sample size is 42 companies. The sector-wise distribution of the sample companies is reflected in Table 3. The table shows that the highest percentage of sample companies are in the Energy & Utilities sector (28.57%) followed by Information & Communication Technology and Banking (9.52%).

Table 1
Sample distribution by sector

Sector	Sample	
	Number	Percentage
Energy & Utilities	12	28.57
Transportation & Logistics	2	4.76

Information & Communication Technology	4	9.52
Finance & Securities	2	4.76
Commerce	3	7.14
Construction Materials	1	2.38
Banking	4	9.52
Health Care Services	2	4.76
Packaging	1	2.38
Petrochemicals & Chemicals	2	4.76
Food & Beverage	4	9.52
Property Development	3	7.14
Electronic Components	1	2.38
Personal Products & Pharmaceuticals	1	2.38

After determining the companies to explore, we utilized the content analysis technique for their website. We particularly look for CSR policy, strategies, ongoing activities, performing tasks, and contingencies to reduce the effect of the Covid-19 crisis on the stakeholders, especially the community. The information regarding pandemic-related CSR is mainly qualitative in nature, thus, a textual reading is required to collect valid information which is systematic, objective, and reproducible. Content analysis allows data collection along with observation of information and its interpretation.

After collecting data, the researchers perform a codification process; based on performed activities the covid-related community CSR of SET50 companies is categorized into 9 major categories. The detailed analysis of companies' priorities while performing CSR activities is recorded in the appendix section of this study.

To satisfy the purpose of the research, we consider the objectives behind each activity. Three major themes of Covid-19 related community CSR activities are determined: Medical support, lifestyle support, and administrative support. Organizations' effort to support the medical facilities is considered as medical support; any activities to ease the hardship in day-to-day living is considered under lifestyle support, and CSR activities to the government and non-government organizations fall under administrative support. Under three themes we found nine categories of community CSR activities and tabulate them using descriptive statistics, and presented them graphically sector-wise and according to the number of companies.

Findings

According to the company website, we discovered nine categories of Community CSR activities under three major themes. As this research focuses only on community CSR, organizational activities to develop or support community and people are considered while labeling a category. The CSR activities are categorized as "local community welfare" when the work guarantee easing the sufferings of the common people of the local community (both in company location and other provinces); "support to health worker" for the actions aimed to facilitate health workers covid-19 related activities; direct and indirect donations and supports to medical institutions (both government and private) is categorized as "medical

institutions”; direct contribution to vaccinate the country is labelled as “vaccination support”; economic support to small and medium businesses is termed as “business support”; CSR activities toward government organization other than hospitals are categorized as “support to the govt. institutes”; different types of support toward the volunteer organizations is named as “volunteer groups”; “Novelty” code is used for innovative CSR related ideas to help the community and the country; and finally, all types of support to research and innovation towards prevention and cure of Covid-19 is categorized as “research and innovation”.

Our finding shows that almost all the SET50 companies contributed to all three themes of community CSR; most of the CSR activities come in medical support format followed by lifestyle support. Few companies also provided administrative support.

Table 2
Theme distribution

Themes	No. of Companies	Percentage
Lifestyle Support	32	76.20
Medical Support	36	85.71
Administrative Support	11	26.20

Table 3 shows category-wise content analysis result. Findings show that there are four categories of activities under medical support, three categories under lifestyle support, and two categories under administrative support. The percentage of companies that participated in each category of activity is also presented in the table. As predicted we observe that companies contributed to CSR activities related to their field.

Table 3
Category distribution

Themes	Categories	No. of Companies	Percentage
Lifestyle Support	Local community welfare	29	69.05
	Business support	5	11.90
	Novelty	8	19.05
Medical Support	Support to health worker	18	42.86
	Medical institutions	34	80.95
	Vaccination Support	13	30.95
	Volunteer groups	5	11.90
Administrative Support	Support to the Govt. Institutes	6	14.29
	Research and innovation	6	14.29

Through content analysis, nine categories of activities are determined under three community CSR themes from numerous philanthropic activities done by the SET50 companies. 120 types of community CSR activities were identified in the study through content analysis. Those activities were divided into nine categories. Then, three themes were emerged based on these categories which are Medical Support, Lifestyle Support, and Administrative Support. The majority of the company emphasized medical support (85.71%) followed by lifestyle (76.20%) and administrative support (26.20%). The findings reveal that the organizations aimed to develop the medical facilities as well as improve the lifestyle of the community.

For medical support, the organizations emphasized supporting medical institutions by providing medical supplies and equipment, establishing field hospitals, supporting vaccination centers, and so on. For Lifestyle support, providing essential items, donating cash, and food items played a major part.

The administrative support got less attention among the organizations. However, organizations produced various innovative items to support the medical institutions and the local community. In addition, they also contributed by providing protective materials, essential items, and financial support to the various govt. and non-profit organizations.

Discussion

The pandemic made the economies and health sectors vulnerable all over the world. For the last two years, businesses and individuals have been grappling to recover from the losses occurred by Covid-19. Philanthropic practices of the businesses could be useful to recover quicker from the aftershocks. Such practices are common in the corporate world for more than a century (Gao, 2011). Corporate social responsibility might react differently in different situations as it ranges from voluntary manner to moral responsibility (McLennan & Banks, 2019). Therefore, our study explored how the leading corporations in the country responded to support the society they operate.

The findings of this study showed that the business leaders of the country responded to support their community accordingly. Companies responded to the need of the community with both financial and non-financial resources.

Community CSR during COVID-19

Political, business and non-profit organization leaders are addressing the issues of humanitarian need during the covid-19 crisis. This study explored the community CSR activities that support society with different initiatives. Our findings revealed three major themes of community CSR done by the top 50 companies in Thailand, such as medical support, lifestyle support, and administrative support.

Medical support

The majority of the companies focused on direct medical support to society. Four categories of works are done under this theme: contribution towards medical

institutions, supporting health workers, vaccination support, and support to volunteer groups. The majority of the SET50 companies contribute to the Medical Institution category (about 80.95%), followed by health worker support (42.86%), vaccination support (30.95%), and volunteer groups (11.90%) respectively. Some corporations contribute remarkably to the covid-19 related medical activities ex. AIS, DTAC, TRUE provided network support to the largest field hospital, Bussarakam Field Hospital (AIS, 2021; Dtac, 2021; True, 2021). PTTEP donates funds and Xterlizer UV Disinfection Robots to Thammasat University Hospital (PTTEP, 2021). AIS provided robot support to deliver food and medicine to the medical personnel to reduce the risk of infection (AIS, 2020). BTS group offered cash compensation for life insurance in covid-19 death to the physicians (BTS Group, 2021). True Group donated 2,373,000 Baht to Bang Sue Central Vaccination Center (True, 2022). Gulf Energy provided 10,000 Gulf Care home Isolation kits to the volunteer groups (GULF, 2021).

Lifestyle support

Apart from addressing the medical need, the Thai corporations also assisted in easing the difficulties the communities are facing to lead regular personal life. Lifestyle support theme includes three categories: local community support, business support, and novelty. The top corporations of the country contributed to supporting the distressed lives of the community through their philanthropic activities. Their CSR activities touch almost all the wakes of lives ranging from food support to psychological support to education. Significant activities were observed in Local community welfare (69.05%), followed by Novelty (19.05%) and Business Support (11.90%). Many remarkable works were noted such as CP all introducing 10,000 jobs for economic growth during the Covid-19 Crisis (CP All, n.d.); Asset World Foundation offered goody bags worth over 10 million to communities affected by COVID-19 (Asset World Corporation, 2021). Gulf energy provided animal support through AOB Chang Project (GULF, 2020). True corp. offered vaccination registration to the elderly people (True, 2021). Thai oil provided fuel for the cremation support (Thaioil, n.d). DTAC donated THB 1100 worth of free disinfection service to the corporate customers (DTAC, 2020).

Administrative support

The SET50 companies not only supported local communities directly but also lend their hand to the government and NGOs to fight the pandemic. This theme includes two categories of work: support to government institutes and research and innovation. Government institutes including police, municipality, and public health authorities received different financial and non-financial support from corporations under their CSR effort. Findings show that administrative supports are equal in these two categories, i.e., 14.29% of support was allocated to Govt. institutes and research and innovation respectively. PTT donated N95 masks and alcohol gel to the Royal Thai Navy (PTT, 2020). Osotspa Public Company Limited donate beverage products worth more than 5 million baht to officers from the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, the army, the police, and the royal volunteers (OSOTSPA, 2020). PTTEP-ARV provides a 30 million Baht investment to help the development of a Thai-made Chula-Baiya" COVID-19 vaccine (PTTEP, 2021). SCG innovated paper field hospital beds, modular ICU rooms, modular

bathrooms, positive pressure swab cabinets, negative pressure isolation rooms, patient isolation capsules, dent guards, water-soluble laundry bags, and so on (SCG, 2021).

Implications

Theoretical Implication

According to the stakeholder theory, a company is a social organization, hence, its activities along with CSR involvement should benefit its major stakeholders (Costa & Menichini, 2013). This study reaffirms the stakeholder theory by demonstrating the inseparable relationship between the people and the organizations.

This study showed that the major corporations in the country care about their stakeholders. A cooperative and warm relationship with different stakeholders during ups and downs benefits companies with enhanced social and economic performance (Brulhart et al., 2019). This study encompasses the contemporary research findings by demonstrating that corporations are social organizations and exist in the system as a good neighbors of the community and vice versa. Our study extends the existing literature by demonstrating that the corporation is a good friend and/or neighbor of the community (and vice versa) who support each other during a critical time (Kochhar, 2014).

Practical Implication

The findings of this research will help different stakeholders to explore the role of any corporation towards its community during difficult times such as financial crises, health crises, natural disasters, and so on. On the other hand, the businesses might utilize this resource to plan their actions towards the community to enhance reputation, business performance, brand image, and so on. Many parts of the world are devastated after a long war with the pandemic. Many communities are scuffling with unemployment, food shortage, inflation, medical equipment, and medicine shortage. Local businesses can extend their hands through CSR activities to build a positive image in society, and academics, as well as policymakers, might evaluate the efforts given by the organization towards the community.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Despite its significant contribution to the CSR literature, this study does not go beyond limitations. First of all, only a handful of companies were chosen as the sample. Sample companies are top corporations in the country with the ability to spend a lot. Moreover, the information is collected only from the companies' news and media section of the websites, information outside the company website was not considered. Besides, manual content analysis with qualitative coding could be another limitation of this study. Exploring the contribution of one stakeholder could also limit the scope of generalization of this study. Moreover, this study considers Thai SET 50 indexed corporations, lack of comparison might not reflect the real picture. Comparative studies inside the country (between different indices) and cross-country research might explore new dimensions of CSR.

Besides, including more stakeholders groups in the study might make the findings more dynamic. Furthermore, global CSR practice in this difficult time considering legal obligations can create a new branch of philanthropic practices.

Conclusion

Communities worldwide are devastated by the unexpected waves after waves of the pandemic. Professional, social, and personal lives have changed their directions and priorities. The most important thing in people's life now is to stay safe and healthy and this study reaffirms that the Thai top corporations lent their hand to society to keep it healthy and functioning. The pandemic is not yet over; no one knows what might come next. It is best for all entities of the country to stick together for survival and development even in a difficult situation like this.

Reference

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 932–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311436079>
- Aknin, L. B., & Whillans, A. V. (2020). Helping and happiness: A review and guide for public policy. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 1–32. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12069>
- Aktan, C. C., & Börü, D. (2007). Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk. In C. C. Aktan (Ed.), *Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk: işletmeler ve sosyal sorumluluk* (pp. 11–36). İGİAD Yayınları.
- Ararat, M., Colpan, A. M., & Matten, D. (2018). Business groups and corporate responsibility for the public good. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(4), 911–929. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3920-4>
- Bae, S. Y., & Chang, P. J. (2020). The effect of coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) risk perception on behavioural intention towards 'untact'tourism in South Korea during the first wave of the pandemic (March 2020). *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1763269>
- Bapuji, H., Patel, C., Ertug, G., & Allen, D. G. (2020). Corona crisis and inequality: Why management research needs a societal turn. *Journal of Management*, 46, 1205–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320925881>
- Barnett, M. L. (2007). Stakeholder influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 794–816.
- Batty, R. J., Cuskelly, G., & Toohey, K. (2016). Community sport events and CSR sponsorship: Examining the impacts of a public health agenda. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 40(6), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723516673189>
- Boadi, E. A., He, Z., Bosompem, J., Say, J., & Boadi, E. K. (2019). Let the talk count: Attributes of stakeholder engagement, trust, perceive environmental protection and CSR. *SAGE Open*, 9(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019825920>
- Boccia, F., & Sarnacchiaro, P. (2020). Chi-squared automatic interaction detector analysis on a choice experiment: An evaluation of responsible initiatives on consumers' purchasing behavior. *Corporate Social Responsibility and*

- Environmental Management, 27(2), 1143–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1873>
- Brulhart, F., Ghera, S., & Quelin, B. V. (2019). Do stakeholder orientation and environmental proactivity impact firm profitability? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(1), 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3732-y>
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate governance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1979.4498296>
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social: Responsibility evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>
- Congressional Research Services (CRS)(2021). *Global Economic Effects of Covid-19*. Washington: The Library of Congress
- Costa, R., & Menichini, T. (2013). A multidimensional approach for CSR assessment: The importance of the stakeholder perception. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40(1), 150–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.07.028>
- Deng, X., Long, X., Schuler, D. A., Luo, H., & Zhao, X. (2020). External corporate social responsibility and labor productivity: A S-curve relationship and the moderating role of internal CSR and government subsidy. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(1), 393–408. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1877>
- Del Mar Miras Rodriguez, M. (2013). Is CSR in crisis. *Developments in Corporate Governance and Responsibility*, 5, 19–32. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S2043-0523\(2013\)0000005005](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2043-0523(2013)0000005005)
- Diamantis, D. (2020, April 9). What is the impact of COVID-19 on sustainability? <https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4098063.html>
- Droppert, H., & Bennett, S. (2015). Corporate social responsibility in global health: An exploratory study of multinational pharmaceutical firms. *Globalization and Health*, 11(15), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-015-0100-5>
- Edinger-Schons, L. M., Lengler-Graiff, L., Scheidler, S., & Wieseke, J. (2019). Frontline employees as corporate social responsibility (CSR) ambassadors: A quasi - field experiment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157, 359–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3790-9>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman
- Freeman, R. E., & Velamuri, S. R. (2006). A new approach to CSR: Company stakeholder responsibility. In A. Kakabadse, & M. Morsing (Eds.), *Corporate social responsibility: Reconciling aspiration with the application* (pp. 9–23). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gao, Y. (2011). Philanthropic disaster relief giving as a response to institutional pressure: Evidence from China. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1377–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.12.003>
- Guerriero, C., Haines, A., & Pagano, M. (2020). Health and sustainability in post-pandemic economic policies. *Nature Sustainability*, 3, 494–496. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-0563-0>
- Gürlek, M., & Tuna, M. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and work engagement: Evidence from the hotel industry. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 31, 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.05.004>

- Idemudia, U. (2009). Oil extraction and poverty reduction in the Niger Delta: A critical examination of partnership initiatives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(Suppl. 1), 91–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9916-8>
- Kapelus, P. (2002). Mining, corporate social responsibility and the “community”: The case of Rio Tinto, Richards Bay Minerals and the Mbonambi. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 39(3), 275–296. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016570929359>
- Kaplan, J., Frias, L., & McFall-Johnsen, M. (2020, July 11). A third of the global population is on coronavirus lockdown — Here’s our constantly updated list of countries and restrictions. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/countries-on-lockdown-coronavirus-italy-2020-3>
- Kochhar, S. K. (2014). Putting community first: Mainstreaming CSR for community-building in India and China. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 24(5), 421–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2014.905612>
- Mahmud, A., Ding, D., Kiani, A., & Hasan, M. (2020). Corporate social responsibility programs and community perceptions of societal progress in Bangladesh: A multimethod approach. *SAGE Open*, 10(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020924046>
- McLennan, S., & Banks, G. (2019). Reversing the lens: Why corporate social responsibility is not community development. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(1), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1664>
- Monachino, M. S., & Moreira, P. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and the health promotion debate: An international review on the potential role of corporations. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 7(1), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047971913Y.00000000058>
- Mugova, S., Mudenda, M., & Sachs, P. R. (2017). Corporate social responsibility in challenging times in developing countries shame. In S. Idowu, S. Vertigans, & A. Schiopoiu Burlea (Eds.), *CSR, sustainability, ethics & governance* (pp. 207–228). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52839-7_11
- Muller, A. R., Pfarrer, M. D., & Little, L. M. (2014). A theory of collective empathy in corporate philanthropy decisions. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0031>
- Park, B. I., & Ghauri, P. N. (2015). Determinants influencing CSR practices in small and medium-sized MNE subsidiaries: A stakeholder perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 50(1), 192–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.04.007>
- Randle, M., Kemperman, A., & Dolnicar, S. (2019). Making causerelated corporate social responsibility (CSR) count in holiday accommodation choice. *Tourism Management*, 75, 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.05.002>
- Robichaud, F. (2020, April 6). How COVID-19 is changing corporate social responsibility? <https://www.boreal-is.com/blog/covid-crisis-impact-on-corporate-social-responsibility/>
- Roundtable, B. (2019, Aug 19). Corporate Governance. <https://www.businessroundtable.org/business-roundtable-redefines-the-purpose-of-a-corporation-to-promote-an-economy-that-serves-all-americans>
- Skouloudis, A., Avlonitis, G. J., Malesios, C., & Evangelinos, K. (2015). Priorities and perceptions of corporate social responsibility: Insights from the perspective of Greek business professionals. *Management Decision*, 53(2), 375–401. <http://doi.org/10.1108/MD-12-2013-0637>

- Türker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9780-6>
- Xiao, M., Cooke, F. L., Xu, J., & Bian, H. (2020). To what extent is corporate social responsibility part of human resource management in the Chinese context? A review of literature and future research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(4), Article 100726.