


PAPER ID: 11A16Q


NATURE AND EXTENT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY DISCLOSURE: A CONTENT ANALYSIS APPROACH

Parvesh Kumar Aspal¹, Inass Salamah Ali^{2*}

¹ Department of Finance and Accounting, I K Gujral Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar, INDIA.

² College of Business, Dar-Al-Hekma University, Jeddah, SAUDI ARABIA.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 July 2020
Received in revised form 05 September 2020
Accepted 23 September 2020
Available online 28 September 2020

Keywords:

Indian industrial sector;
CSR disclosure; Industry compound growth;
Sustainable management.

ABSTRACT

In general, the organizations are created to satisfy community needs for sustaining better relationships with the shareholder groups. With this view, business organizations have executed innovative strategies with an intention to compete in the dynamic business environment. Among these strategies, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is regarded as one of the leading and most effective and a strong foundation of corporate sustainable development. This analysis aims to assess the attributes and extents of CSR disclosure among Indian companies. The study is based on the content analysis; provides insight on CSR disclosure of Indian industrial sectors. The CSR transparency in all industrial sectors has been progressively growing at an average cumulative growth of 8.68 percent. Further, industry-wise analysis reveals a subsequent overall increase in the CSR disclosure during the period of study.

Disciplinary: Management Science.

©2020 INT TRANS J ENG MANAG SCI TECH.

1 INTRODUCTION

The anticipating impact of commercial activities on the ever-dwindling environmental resources and, the pressure of consumers' more responsible choices, forces the corporate sector to incorporate sustainable and socially responsible business strategies (Fontaine, 2013). In this regard, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can be referred to as the efforts of an organization to achieves a balance in social, environmental, and economic imperatives, taking into consideration shareholders' and stakeholders' expectations (Maon et al, 2009). The conceptualization of CSR got momentum as a serious concern for the research in the 1960s since the business entities start to be in societal concern and the paradigm of shareholders shifted to the stakeholders (Wang et al. 2016). The proponent of wealth maximization, Friedman (1970) termed it as "the social responsibility of business is to increase its profits" and named corporate leaders as the agents of the stakeholders to spend their

money on social welfare activities. However, with time the shareholder's model got substituted with a comprehensive approach of stakeholders' theory (Freeman, 1984). Social accounting theories state that corporations are social creations and their existence depends on the willingness of society to operate (O'Donovan, 2002). Stakeholder theory emphasizes that companies have a social responsibility towards the interests of all parties influenced by their business activities. In recent times, the companies pursue the 'Enlightened Self Interest' theory, which emphasizes the development of business along with the development of the community (Cragg, 2012).

The emergence of the CSR concept is as old as the business itself. Business organizations are considered as a significant agent of modernization within the society during the last two centuries (Carroll, 2008). Companies gain the advantages of CSR to reap a constructive corporate image and CSR is considered as an indispensable component for sustainable corporate management (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). With effective management of CSR in their external and internal operations, corporations can be benefitted through enhanced market share, government relations, research and development, human development, and risk managing. CSR initiatives not only enhance financial performance but also work as a strategy to intrigue institutional investors (Weiser & Zadek, 2000). The CSR disclosure practices, especially the voluntary disclosures demonstrate the company's commitment to society (Perks, 1993). However, these days CSR is followed not only as donations but has also turned into a fundamental constituent of the company's strategy (Kiran & Sharma, 2011). Presently, companies are eager to yield more benefits by sustaining benevolence relations with the community and state. Eventually, it will convert these intangible resources into strategic advantages to attain corporate objectives effectively and efficiently (Silberhorn & Warren, 2007).

2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the conceptualization of CSR has been acknowledged as corporate philanthropy, it has become the center point of debate. The escalating significance of CSR among the practitioners and the corporate sector has received attention in academic research (Flammer, 2013). As per the annual report of KMPG (2019), 76 percent of Indian companies have spent 2 percent of profit in form of CSR activities, which was only 38 percent in 2014-15, and in case of CSR disclosure of amount spent to move to 99 percent in the year 2018-19. Presently, CSR disclosure has become the major concern for business sustainability, thus, transparent communication and disclosure of a corporate CSR initiative is as important as the involvement in the economic activities (Kumar & Kidwai 2018). The financial positions of the CSR disclosure organizations were found better as compared to the non-disclosure organizations in China. Comparing to past trends, from 2008-2015 a tremendous increase in CSR disclosure was observed across the Chinese companies listed on the Shanghai Stock Exchange (Naseem et al., 2019).

The literature suggests that in developing countries, CSR is mainly philanthropic. The philanthropic activities were more common in the USA and Canada and Asia follows the CSR development of the West, but Asia lags behind best practices in countries such as the UK (Welford (2005). However, Asian countries are experiencing a new wave of interest in CSR, especially from Japan. In a cross-country analysis (Australia, Hong Kong, and the United Kingdom) a significant variation in the CSR reporting was observed across the nations, industries, and organizations, while the overall CSR engagement has a significant positive influence on the financial performance (Beck, et al. 2018). It has been observed that 66 percent of the Egyptian companies reported the CSR

disclosure during 2005-2010 relatively on the product and consumer-related information (Hussainey et al. 2011). Since 2000, an incremental trend of CSR disclosure is observed in the Libya-based companies as the institutional pressure from stakeholder increases on the company's management, which signifies the positive association of CSR disclosure with the firm's reputation and performance (Pratten & Mashat 2009).

Economic and social performances are the two strong pillars of sustainable corporate growth and have a significant influence on the economic development of a nation. Earlier research carried out in developed nations highlighted that the extent of disclosure seems to be better in developed countries such as America, Britain, Australia, etc. (Guthrie and Parker, 1990) as against developing countries such as Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Bangladesh, and even India (Belal, 2001). Now, Indian companies are taking a genuine interest in the social welfare and upliftment of the stakeholders. Moreover, investigations on CSR in the Indian business environment have not yet been effectively and extensively explored; therefore, companies are taking CSR as a liability rather than a means of long-term advantages for the companies as well as the community. Consequently, there is a great need to study the nature and extent of CSR disclosure among Indian companies towards community development. In light of the discussion and literature, the prime objective of the present study is to investigate the extent of corporate social responsibility disclosure practices among Indian companies.

3 DATABASE AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The time frame for this study is 2014-2016, as in the year 2013; the Company Act is amended to the mandatory discharge of social responsibility. A sample of 89 companies listed on the Bombay Stock Exchange is selected for the study. The companies included in the sample are categorized based on industry classification, i.e. (1) Drugs and Pharmaceuticals, (2) Automobile, (3) Paint, Chemical, Leather and Pesticides, (4) Communication equipment and computer software, (5) Energy, (6) Oil and Gas, (7) Infrastructure, (8) Fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG), (9) Mineral and Metal and (10) Textile. The content analysis technique (Bowman and Haire, 1975) is applied used to extract information from sustainability, annual, and environmental reports.

4 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

To analyze the CSR disclosures the CSR score, rank, and compound growth of each company within the industry and of each industry are computed.

4.1 CSR DISCLOSURE OF DRUGS AND PHARMACEUTICALS INDUSTRY

There are 19 companies in the industry represents 21.34 percent of the total sample size. Table 1 reveals that the mean score of the industry is 30.05, 32.42, and 34.89 respectively. Whereas, the compound growth of the industry is 8.14 percent reveals that companies are achieving their social responsibility goal each year.

Note Tables 1, values in parentheses are percentages of scores obtained by each company, referenced to the total scores.

Table 1: Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Industry CSR Disclosure

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Ajanta Pharma Ltd.	25 (54.34)	16	32 (69.56)	10	33 (71.74)	14	14.89
Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	26 (56.52)	15	35 (76.08)	5	37 (80.43)	3	19.29
Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.	28 (60.86)	12	29 (63.04)	15	37 (80.43)	3	14.95
Biocon Ltd.	33 (71.73)	6	35 (76.09)	5	36 (78.26)	8	4.45
Cadila Healthcare Ltd.	36 (78.26)	1	37 (80.43)	2	36 (78.26)	8	0.00
Cipla Ltd.	36 (78.26)	1	40 (86.96)	1	37 (80.43)	3	1.38
Divi's Laboratories Ltd.	25 (54.34)	16	33 (71.74)	8	40 (86.96)	2	26.49
Dr. Reddy'S Laboratories Ltd.	36 (78.26)	1	36 (78.26)	3	42 (91.30)	1	8.01
Emami Ltd.	30 (65.21)	9	31 (67.39)	12	36 (78.26)	8	9.54
GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare Ltd.	31 (67.39)	8	36 (78.26)	3	36 (78.26)	8	7.76
GlaxoSmithKline Pharmaceutical Ltd.	35 (76.08)	4	32 (69.57)	10	37 (80.43)	3	2.82
Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	32 (69.56)	7	33 (71.74)	8	34 (73.91)	13	3.08
Ipsa Laboratories Ltd.	27 (58.69)	14	28 (60.87)	18	35 (76.09)	12	13.86
Lupin Ltd.	34 (73.91)	5	35 (76.09)	5	37 (80.43)	3	4.32
Natco Pharma Ltd.	29 (63.04)	11	29 (63.04)	15	27 (58.70)	19	-3.51
Sanofi India Ltd.	30 (65.21)	9	29 (63.04)	15	33 (71.74)	14	4.88
Strides Shasun Ltd.	25 (54.34)	16	31 (67.39)	12	33 (71.74)	14	14.89
Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	28 (60.86)	12	31 (67.39)	12	29 (63.04)	17	1.77
Wock Hardt Ltd.	25 (54.34)	16	24 (52.17)	19	28 (60.87)	18	5.83
Mean Score	30.05		32.42		34.89		8.14

4.2 CSR DISCLOSURE OF AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

There are 14 companies in the Automobile Industry, which represents 15.73 percent of the total sample size.

Table 2 reveals that the mean CSR disclosure score of the Automobile industry during the year 2014 is 30.42 and has enhanced to 33.14 in the year 2015, which is further increased to 36.64. As far as overall growth is concerned, the automobile industry has attained an 11.75 compound growth rate.

Table 2: Automobile Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Amara Raja Batteries Ltd.	31 (67.39)	9	32 (69.57)	10	37 (80.43)	7	9.25
Apollo Tyres Ltd.	33 (71.74)	6	33 (71.74)	9	39 (84.78)	2	8.71
Bajaj Auto Ltd.	34 (73.91)	4	34 (73.91)	7	34 (73.91)	12	0.00
Bharat Forge Ltd.	28 (60.87)	10	32 (69.57)	10	36 (78.26)	8	13.39
Bosch Ltd.	37 (80.43)	2	41 (89.13)	1	39 (84.78)	2	2.67
Cummins India Ltd.	34 (73.91)	4	38 (82.61)	3	38 (82.61)	6	5.72

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Eicher Motors Ltd.	14 (30.43)	14	14 (30.43)	14	35 (76.09)	10	58.11
Exide Industries Ltd.	32 (69.57)	8	36 (78.26)	5	35 (76.09)	10	4.58
Hero Motocorp Ltd.	35 (76.09)	3	38 (82.61)	3	39 (84.78)	2	5.56
MRF Ltd.	23 (50.00)	13	31 (67.39)	12	31 (67.39)	14	16.10
Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd.	38 (82.61)	1	39 (84.78)	2	41 (89.13)	1	3.87
Maruti Suzuki India Ltd.	33 (71.74)	6	35 (76.09)	6	39 (84.78)	2	8.71
Motherson Sumi Systems Ltd.	26 (56.52)	12	27 (58.70)	13	36 (78.26)	8	17.67
TVS Motor Co. Ltd.	28 (60.87)	10	34 (73.91)	7	34 (73.91)	12	10.19
Mean Score	30.42		33.14		36.64		11.75

4.3 CSR DISCLOSURE OF CHEMICAL AND LEATHER INDUSTRY

In the Chemical and Leather industry, 12 companies consist of 13.48 percent of the total sample size.

Table 3: Chemical and Leather Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Asian Paints Ltd.	31 (67.39)	2	37 (80.43)	2	37 (80.43)	4	9.25
Bata India Ltd.	26 (56.52)	6	27 (58.70)	12	35 (76.09)	6	16.02
Bayer Crop Science Ltd.	25 (54.35)	8	33 (71.74)	7	34 (73.91)	9	16.62
Berger Paints India Ltd.	24 (52.17)	11	28 (60.87)	11	28 (60.87)	12	8.01
Godrej Industries Ltd.	30 (65.22)	3	37 (80.43)	2	38 (82.61)	3	12.55
Jubilant Life Sciences Ltd.	25 (54.35)	8	29 (63.04)	10	29 (63.04)	11	7.70
Kansai Nerolac Paints Ltd.	25 (54.35)	8	34 (73.91)	5	35 (76.09)	6	18.32
PI Industries Ltd.	21 (45.65)	12	31 (67.39)	9	35 (76.09)	6	29.10
Pidilite Industries Ltd.	26 (56.52)	6	34 (73.91)	5	39 (84.78)	1	22.47
SRF Ltd.	29 (63.04)	5	32 (69.57)	8	32 (69.57)	10	5.05
Tata Chemicals Ltd.	33 (71.74)	1	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	8.71
UPL Ltd.	30 (65.22)	3	37 (80.43)	2	37 (80.43)	4	11.06
Mean Score	27.08		33.16		34.83		13.73

The mean score of the industry is increased from 27.08 in 2014 to 33.16 in 2015, which further progressed to 34.83 in 2016. It reveals that companies are achieving their social responsibility goal. As far as compound growth in CSR disclosure is concerned, the industry has achieved a growth rate of 13.73 percent.

4.4 CSR DISCLOSURE OF COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT AND COMPUTER SOFTWARE INDUSTRY

In the Communication Equipment and Computer software industry, six companies have been selected, which represents 6.74 percent of the total sample size.

Table 4: Communication and Computer Software Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Bharat Electronics Ltd.	37 (80.43)	2	38 (82.61)	2	38 (82.61)	2	1.34
H C L Technologies Ltd.	36 (78.26)	3	38 (82.61)	2	38 (82.61)	2	2.74
Infosys Ltd.	32 (69.57)	4	36 (78.26)	4	38 (82.61)	2	8.97
Oracle Financial Services Software Ltd.	27 (58.70)	5	36 (78.26)	4	36 (78.26)	5	15.47
Tata Consultancy Services Ltd.	38 (82.61)	1	41 (89.13)	1	39 (84.78)	1	1.31
Tata Elxsi Ltd.	23 (50.00)	6	30 (65.22)	6	30 (65.22)	6	14.21
Mean Score	32.16		36.50		36.50		7.34

The mean score of the industry is 32.16, 36.50, and 36.50 in the year 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively revealing that companies are fulfilling their social responsibility each year. As far as compound growth of the industry in CSR disclosure is concerned, the industry has attained an overall compound growth of 7.34 percent.

4.5 CSR DISCLOSURE OF ENERGY INDUSTRY

The energy industry in this study composes of 7 companies, which constitute 7.86 percent of the total sample size.

Table 5: Energy Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
CESC Ltd.	28 (60.87)	5	35 (76.09)	4	35 (76.09)	4	11.80
Havells India Ltd.	26 (56.52)	6	29 (63.04)	7	30 (65.22)	7	7.42
NTPC Ltd.	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	0.00
Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.	36 (78.26)	2	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	4.08
Reliance Infrastructure Ltd.	34 (73.91)	3	37 (80.43)	3	37 (80.43)	3	4.32
Thermax Ltd.	29 (63.04)	4	33 (71.74)	5	33 (71.74)	6	6.67
Voltas Ltd.	25 (54.35)	7	33 (71.74)	5	35 (76.09)	4	18.32
Mean Score	31.00		35.00		35.42		7.52

The mean CSR disclosure score in Energy Industry during the year 2014 is 31.00, which has excelled to 35.00 in the year 2015 and has further enhanced to 35.42 in the year 2016. It reveals that companies are fulfilling their social responsibility towards stakeholders year by year. The overall compound growth of the Industry is 7.52 percent.

4.6 CSR DISCLOSURE OF OIL AND GAS

In the present study, the Oil and Gas industry includes 8 companies, which constitutes 9 percent of the total sample size.

Table 6: Oil and Gas Industry CSR Disclosure (company wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Percentage
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd.	34 (73.91)	7	41 (89.13)	2	41 (89.13)	2	9.81
Castrol India Ltd.	29 (63.04)	8	37 (80.43)	8	36 (78.26)	8	11.42
G A I L (India) Ltd.	35 (76.09)	6	40 (86.96)	4	41 (89.13)	2	8.23
Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd.	40 (86.96)	2	39 (84.78)	6	39 (84.78)	6	-1.26
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.	37 (80.43)	5	39 (84.78)	6	39 (84.78)	6	2.67
Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.	40 (86.96)	2	40 (86.96)	4	40 (86.96)	4	0.00
Oil India Ltd.	41 (89.13)	1	41 (89.13)	2	40 (86.96)	4	-1.23
Reliance Industries Ltd.	38 (82.61)	4	42 (91.30)	1	42 (91.30)	1	5.13
Mean Score	36.75		39.87		39.75		4.35

The examination of Table 6 reflects that the mean score of the industry is 36.75, 39.87, and 39.75 in the year 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively with an annual compound growth of 4.35 percent, which reflects the industry is concerned about social welfare.

4.7 CSR DISCLOSURE OF INFRASTRUCTURE INDUSTRY

The infrastructure industry in the present study includes five companies with 5.6 percent of the total sample size.

Table 7: Infrastructure Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Percentage
Engineers India Ltd.	30 (65.22)	4	39 (84.78)	4	39 (84.78)	5	14.02
Larsen & Toubro Ltd.	34 (73.91)	1	41 (89.13)	1	41 (89.13)	1	9.81
Ramco Cements Ltd.	28 (60.87)	5	32 (69.57)	5	41 (89.13)	1	21.01
Shree Cement Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	41 (89.13)	1	41 (89.13)	1	11.46
Ultratech Cement Ltd.	32 (69.57)	3	40 (86.96)	3	40 (86.96)	4	11.80
Mean Score	31.40		38.60		40.40		13.62

The CSR disclosure means a score of the industry is calculated as 31.40, 38.60, and 40.40 for the years 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively with the annual compound growth of 13.62 percent. This reflects that the companies are performing resourcefully for the welfare of stakeholders.

4.8 CSR DISCLOSURE OF FMCG INDUSTRY

In this study, the FMCG industry contains nine companies, which constitute 10 percent of the total sample size.

Table 8: FMCG Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Britannia Industries Ltd.	24 (52.17)	9	26 (56.52)	9	32 (69.57)	9	15.47
Colgate-Palmolive (India) Ltd.	28 (60.87)	7	33 (71.74)	7	33 (71.74)	8	8.56
Dabur India Ltd.	32 (69.57)	4	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	10.40
Godrej Consumer Products Ltd.	30 (65.22)	6	35 (76.09)	5	37 (80.43)	6	11.06
Hindustan Unilever Ltd.	26 (56.52)	8	33 (71.74)	7	37 (80.43)	6	19.29
ITC Ltd.	36 (78.26)	1	39 (84.78)	1	39 (84.78)	1	4.08
Marico Ltd.	34 (73.91)	2	37 (80.43)	3	38 (82.61)	3	5.72
Nestle India Ltd.	31 (67.39)	5	35 (76.09)	5	38 (82.61)	3	10.72
Tata Global Beverages Ltd.	33 (71.74)	3	37 (80.43)	3	38 (82.61)	3	7.31
Mean Score	30.44		34.88		36.77		10.29

The mean CSR disclosure score in FMGC Industry is computed as 30.44, 34.88, and 36.77 during the years 2014, 2015, and 2016 with annual compound growth of 10.29 percent, respectively. It reveals that companies are taking initiatives for the well-being of employees, society, customers, and the environment year by year.

4.9 CSR DISCLOSURE BY MINERAL AND METAL INDUSTRY

Mineral and Metal in the present study is the composition of 6 companies, which constitute 6.74 percent of the total sample size.

Table 9: Mineral and Metal Industry CSR Disclosure (company-wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Hindalco Industries Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	40 (86.96)	1	40 (86.96)	1	10.10
Hindustan Zinc Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	38 (82.61)	5	38 (82.61)	6	7.31
N M D C Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	39 (84.78)	3	39 (84.78)	3	8.71
National Aluminium Co. Ltd.	35 (76.09)	1	39 (84.78)	3	39 (84.78)	3	5.56
Tata Steel Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	40 (86.96)	1	40 (86.96)	1	10.10
Titan Company Ltd.	33 (71.74)	2	36 (78.26)	6	39 (84.78)	3	8.71
Mean Score	33.33		38.66		39.16		8.41

The mean score of the industry has been increased from 33.33 in 2014 to 38.66 in 2015, which progressed to 39.16 in 2016, and the annual compound growth of CSR disclosure in the Mineral and Metal Industry is observed as 8.14 percent, which represents the industry's upsurge contribution towards the society.

4.10 CSR DISCLOSURE OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Textile in the present study is composition only 3 companies which is a meager representation of

the industry just 3.37 percent of the total sample size.

Table 10: Textile Industry CSR Disclosure (company wise)

Company	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth Percentage
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
Aditya Birla Nuvo Ltd.	37 (80.43)	2	41 (89.13)	2	41 (89.13)	1	5.27
Arvind Ltd.	36 (78.26)	3	35 (76.09)	3	35 (76.09)	3	-1.40
Grasim Industries Ltd.	40 (86.96)	1	42 (91.30)	1	41 (89.13)	1	1.24
Mean Score	37.66		39.33		39.00		1.70

The mean score of the Textile industry has been increased from 37.66 in 2014 to 39.33 in 2015, but it has slightly declined to 39.00 in 2016, managed to attain an overall annual compound growth of 1.70 percent.

4.11 INDUSTRY WISE CSR DISCLOSURE SCORE AND COMPOUND GROWTH

The mean score, rank, and compound growth of different industries are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Industry Wise CSR Disclosure Score and Compound Growth

Industry	2014		2015		2016		Compound Growth
	Mean Score	Rank	Mean Score	Rank	Mean Score	Rank	
Drugs and Pharmaceuticals	30.05	9	32.42	10	34.89	9	8.14
Automobile	30.42	8	33.14	9	36.64	6	11.75
Chemical and Leather	27.08	10	33.16	8	34.83	10	13.73
Communication and Computer software	32.16	4	36.50	5	36.50	7	7.34
Energy	31.00	6	35.00	6	35.42	8	7.52
Oil and Gas	36.75	2	39.87	1	39.75	2	4.35
Infrastructure	31.40	5	38.6	4	40.40	1	13.62
FMGC	30.44	7	34.88	7	36.77	5	10.29
Mineral and Metal	33.33	3	38.66	3	39.16	3	8.41
Textile	37.66	1	39.33	2	39.00	4	1.70
Mean Score	32.02 (69.60)		36.15 (78.58)		37.33 (81.15)		8.68

During the period of study, the overall CSR disclosure of all the industries is consistently increased as the annual compound growth rate of CSR disclosure of all industries is computed as 8.68 percent. As far as, the compound growth rate of the industries is concerned, the highest compound growth rate of 13.73 percent is attained by the Chemical and Leather industry. Whereas the least compound growth rate of 1.70 percent is attained by the textile industry. Ismail (1994) explored that the oil exploration industry has high damaging effects on the environment, but in the present study, Oil and Gas industry has done better and it has minimal damaging effects on the environment. Likewise, the Textile industry and infrastructure industry have contributed to the environment and society. Hettige, et al. (1998) observed that the case metal industry which is responsible for emissions of organic water pollutants had a low ranking, whereas, Indian Mineral and Metal industry has improved their CSR initiatives. On the contrary, the Pharmaceutical industry and Chemical & Leather industry obtained the lowest rank 9 and 10 respectively in terms of CSR disclosure in the respective

three years. These industries need to boost up as these are responsible for generating organic pollutants in the air. The findings of the study reflect that the extent of CSR disclosure of each industry varies across the industries. Numerous factors may affect the CSR disclosure level such as company size and industry type company's profile and origin of the country (Adams *et al.*, 1998); negative media observance, environmental prosecutions, changing societal concerns, taxes, and penalties (Lanis & Richardson, 2013).

5 CONCLUSION

The descriptive findings of this study about CSR disclosure in the current period can be correlated with the historical aspects relevant in India related to CSR. In the 20th century, business socially responsible practices took the shapes of philanthropic donations to charity, service to the community, enhancing employee welfare, and promoting religious conduct. The important change that has been observed now is that the industry has accepted social responsibility as part of strategic management (Gupta, 2007). It has also been observed that now companies are liable to report CSR activities to sustain legitimacy about their operations and meet stakeholders' expectations. In the present study, the proportion of companies disclosing CSR with narrative and monetary units are higher and is consistent with Kabir & Akinnusi (2012). But, the nature of CSR disclosure for Indian companies is different as compared to the developed nations of the world. They prefer to report both monetary and nonmonetary information (Thom and Decoutere, 2009) contrary to present findings where amongst Indian companies the nature of disclosure is more descriptive than quantitative.

The findings of the study reflect that CSR disclosure of Indian companies is low as compared to their counterparts in developed countries (Bhatia & Chander, 2014). The selected companies with a very high market capitalization represent the Indian economy. But, despite being the leading companies in the Indian economy, the extent of CSR disclosure is low. Still, the appreciable aspect of the present study is that there is a fair increase in the percentage of CSR disclosure among the sample industries over the three-year study period. These findings reflect that the stakeholder groups have gained benefits when the companies maintain their expectations. The above findings are in line with the stakeholder theory that states that CSR disclosure is positively considered by stakeholders (Tilt, 1994). Moreover, it is recommended that corporate managers ought to follow the shared value creation principle which implies that corporations should achieve their economic objective along with creating value for the community by addressing stakeholders' issues. Also, the New Company Act, 2013 has made mandated CSR reporting amongst Indian corporations. Hence, the corporate sector in India needs to pull up its socks and drive the next wave of innovation and productivity growth in the global economy, by transforming its business strategy.

6 AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIAL

Information regarding this study is available by contacting the corresponding author.

7 REFERENCES

- Adams, C. A., Hill, W. Y., & Roberts, C. B. (1998). Corporate social reporting practices in Western Europe: legitimating corporate behavior? *The British Accounting Review*, 30(1), 1-21.
- Beck, C., Frost, G., & Jones, S. (2018). CSR disclosure and financial performance revisited: A cross-country analysis. *Australian Journal of Management*, 43(4), 517-537.
- Belal, A.R. (2001). A study of corporate social disclosures in Bangladesh. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 16(5), 274-289.

- Bhatia, A., & Chander, S. (2014). Corporate social responsibility disclosure by SENSEX companies in India. *Management and Labour Studies*, 39(1), 1-17.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 9-24.
- Bowman, E. H., & Haire, M. (1975). A strategic posture toward corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review*, 18(2), 49-58.
- Carroll, A. B. (2008). A history of corporate social responsibility: Concepts and practices. *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*, 19-46.
- Cragg, W. (2012). Ethics, enlightened self-interest, and the corporate responsibility to respect human rights: A critical look at the justificatory foundations of the UN framework. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(1), 9-36.
- Flammer, C. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility and Shareholder Reaction: The Environmental Awareness of Investors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(3), 758-781.
- Fontaine, M. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and sustainability: the new bottom line? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(4), 110-119.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stockholder Approach*. Boston MA: Pitman Publishing.
- Friedman, M. (1970). A Friedman doctrine: The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, 13, 32-33.
- Gupta, A. (2007). Social responsibility in India towards a global compact approach. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34(9), 637-663.
- Guthrie, J., & Parker, L. D. (1990). Corporate social disclosure practice: a comparative international analysis. *Advances in Public Interest Accounting*, 3, 159-175.
- Hettige, H., Mani, M., & Wheeler, D. (1998). *Industrial pollution in economic development: Kuznets revisited*. World Bank, Development Research Group.
- Hussainey, K., Elsayed, M., & Razik, M. A. (2011). Factors affecting corporate social responsibility disclosure in Egypt. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 8(4), 432-443.
- Ismail, I. A. (1994). OPEC production: Capital limitations, environmental movements may interfere with expansion plans. *Oil and Gas Journal*, 92(19), 60-68.
- Kabir, H., & Akinnusi, D. M. (2012). Corporate social and environmental accounting information reporting practices in Swaziland. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 8(2), 156-173.
- Kiran, R., & Sharma, A. (2011). Corporate social responsibility: A corporate strategy for new business opportunities. *Journal of International Business Ethics*, 4(1), 10.
- Kumar, S. & Kidwai, A. (2018). CSR disclosures and transparency among top Indian companies. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 16(1), 57-70.
- Lanis, R., & Richardson, G. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and tax aggressiveness: a test of legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 26(1), 75-100
- Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2009). Designing and implementing corporate social responsibility: An integrative framework grounded in theory and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87(1), 71-89.
- Naseem, M. A., Ahmad, M. I., Rehman, R. U., Khan, M. A., & Ali, R. (2019). The Trend and Development of CSR Disclosure in Chinese Listed Firms. *Agathos*, 10(1), 267-279.
- Perks, R. W. (1993). *Accounting & Society*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Pratten, J. D., & Mashat, A. A. (2009). Corporate social disclosure in Libya. *Social Responsibility*

Journal, 5(3), 311-27.

Silberhorn, D., & Warren, R. C. (2007). Defining corporate social responsibility: A view from big companies in Germany and the UK. *European Business Review*, 19(5), 352-372.

Tilt, C. A. (1994). The influence of external pressure groups on corporate social disclosure: some empirical evidence. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 7(4), 47-72.

Wang, H., Tong, L., Takeuchi, R., & George, G. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: An overview and new research directions: Thematic issue on corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 534-544.

Weiser, J., & Zadek, S. (2000). *Conversations with disbelievers*. Retrieved February 2005.

Welford, R. (2005). Corporate social responsibility in Europe, North America and Asia. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 17, 33-52.



Dr. Parvesh Kumar Aspal is an Assistant Registrar with I K Gujral Punjab Technical University Jalandhar, India. He achieved four master's degrees including an M. Phill (Commerce), an MBA (Finance), a Master of Finance and Control, a Master of Commerce (Finance and Accounting). He earned his doctorate in Finance and Accounting, from Punjabi University Patiala, Punjab, India. Dr. Aspal is a Life Member of the Indian Society for Technical Education (ISTE), New Delhi and an honorary Rosalind Member of London Journals Press, London, UK. He is also an editorial board member of the American Journal of Management Science and Engineering, New York, USA. His main area of work is Educational Planning and Management, Financial Management, Corporate Social Responsibility and Banking.



Dr. Inass Salamah Ali is Dean of Hekma School of Business & Law at Dar Al-Hekma University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. She earned her undergraduate degree in Mathematics from Women's College of Education, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. She obtained her Master's degree from Colorado Technical University, USA, majoring in Software Engineering/Computer Science. She earned her Doctorate in Management from the University of Stirling, the U.K. with research focused on Customer Relationship Management. She was the Program Director for the Management Information Systems (MIS) program at Dar Al Hekma. Dr. Ali was also the Director of the Scientific Research Center & Library. She was Director of the Quality Assurance & Strategic Planning Department.
