

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Its Influence on Brand Reputation: A Review

Aarti

kaushikaarti000@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has emerged as a significant strategic approach through which organizations address social, environmental, and ethical responsibilities while strengthening relationships with stakeholders. In an increasingly competitive and information-driven marketplace, consumers, employees, investors, and communities increasingly evaluate organizations not only on the basis of product quality and financial performance but also on their social and environmental conduct. This review examines the influence of CSR practices on brand reputation by synthesizing existing theoretical perspectives and empirical findings concerning responsible business behavior, stakeholder perceptions, corporate credibility, consumer trust, and brand equity. The review explores how dimensions such as environmental sustainability, ethical governance, employee welfare, community engagement, philanthropy, and responsible supply-chain practices contribute to perceptions of organizational legitimacy and brand authenticity. It also considers the role of communication transparency, stakeholder engagement, and consistency between CSR initiatives and organizational values in determining whether CSR activities generate positive reputational outcomes. The literature indicates that credible and consistently implemented CSR initiatives can enhance stakeholder trust, strengthen corporate image, improve brand identification, and support long-term brand loyalty. However, poorly communicated, inconsistent, or primarily symbolic CSR activities may create skepticism and potentially damage reputation through perceptions of greenwashing or cause-related opportunism. The review further highlights the importance of digital media and online stakeholder interactions in shaping contemporary CSR-related reputation. Overall, CSR is increasingly viewed not merely as a philanthropic activity but as an integrated component of strategic brand and reputation management. The study concludes that organizations can strengthen brand reputation by aligning CSR commitments with core business values, demonstrating measurable social and environmental outcomes, and maintaining transparent communication with stakeholders.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR); Brand Reputation; Consumer Trust; Brand Equity; Stakeholder Perception.

INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has become an important component of contemporary business strategy because organizations are increasingly expected to consider their economic, legal, ethical, social, and environmental responsibilities alongside financial objectives. CSR refers broadly to the ways in which organizations respond to the expectations of stakeholders and society through responsible business practices. Carroll's influential framework conceptualized CSR through economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities, providing a foundation for subsequent research on corporate responsibility and stakeholder management.

In competitive markets, brand reputation represents an important intangible organizational asset. It reflects stakeholders' accumulated perceptions concerning an organization's credibility, reliability, quality, ethical conduct, and social performance. CSR can contribute to these perceptions by demonstrating that an organization is responsive to social and environmental expectations. The relationship is not necessarily automatic, however. Research suggests that consumer responses depend on factors such as the perceived credibility of CSR initiatives, company-cause fit, consumers' own values, and the quality of the company's products and services. Sen and Bhattacharya (2001), for example, demonstrated that individual and company-specific factors can moderate consumers' responses to CSR initiatives.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Carroll's CSR framework is one of the most widely used approaches for understanding corporate responsibility. It identifies four major dimensions: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities. Economic responsibility

concerns organizational viability and value creation; legal responsibility concerns compliance with laws and regulations; ethical responsibility concerns behavior that is considered fair and appropriate even when not legally required; and philanthropic responsibility involves voluntary contributions to social welfare.

From a brand-reputation perspective, these dimensions provide multiple sources of stakeholder evaluation. A company that performs well economically, complies with regulations, behaves ethically, and contributes to society may generate more favorable stakeholder perceptions.

Schwartz and Carroll (2003) subsequently proposed a three-domain model emphasizing economic, legal, and ethical responsibilities and their areas of overlap.

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory argues that organizations have responsibilities to multiple groups affected by their activities, including customers, employees, investors, suppliers, governments, communities, and the broader environment. Freeman's stakeholder perspective therefore provides a useful foundation for understanding CSR because corporate reputation is shaped by the perceptions of multiple stakeholder groups rather than consumers alone.

CSR activities can be interpreted as mechanisms through which firms respond to stakeholder expectations. Positive stakeholder experiences can contribute to favorable organizational evaluations, whereas irresponsible practices may produce negative perceptions and reputational risk.

Resource-Based View

The Resource-Based View (RBV) considers valuable, rare, difficult-to-imitate, and organizationally embedded resources as potential sources of competitive advantage. CSR capabilities, stakeholder relationships, trust, organizational reputation, and ethical culture may become strategic intangible resources when they are developed consistently over time.

CSR therefore has the potential to contribute to brand reputation by creating intangible assets that competitors cannot easily reproduce.

PROPOSED MODELS AND METHODOLOGIES

The review proposes the following model:

Independent Variables:

1. Economic CSR
2. Legal and Governance CSR
3. Ethical and Social CSR
4. Environmental CSR
5. Philanthropic/Community CSR

Mediating Variables:

1. CSR Credibility
2. Consumer Trust
3. Brand Credibility

Dependent Variable:

Brand Reputation

Possible Outcomes:

- Brand Loyalty
- Purchase Intention
- Positive Word-of-Mouth
- Brand Advocacy
- Customer Engagement

Proposed Hypotheses

H1: Economic CSR is positively associated with brand reputation.

H2: Legal and governance CSR is positively associated with brand reputation.

H3: Ethical and social CSR is positively associated with brand reputation.

H4: Environmental CSR is positively associated with brand reputation.

H5: Philanthropic CSR is positively associated with brand reputation.

H6: CSR credibility positively influences consumer trust.

H7: Consumer trust positively influences brand reputation.

H8: Consumer trust mediates the relationship between CSR and brand reputation.

H9: Brand credibility mediates the relationship between CSR perceptions and brand reputation.

H10: Brand reputation positively influences brand loyalty and positive word-of-mouth.

Research Methodology

Because the present study is a review, the primary methodology is based on systematic examination and synthesis of existing academic literature.

The proposed methodology includes:

- Identification of peer-reviewed CSR and branding literature.
- Review of theoretical models related to CSR and reputation.
- Examination of empirical studies involving consumers, employees, investors, and managers.
- Comparison of different CSR dimensions.
- Analysis of mediating variables such as trust and brand credibility.
- Identification of contradictory findings and research gaps.
- Development of an integrated conceptual framework.

For future empirical validation, a quantitative survey can be conducted using a five-point Likert scale. Respondents could include consumers familiar with selected brands. Reliability can be examined using Cronbach's alpha, while Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) can assess construct validity. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) or Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) can then be used to test direct and mediated relationships.

Previous empirical studies have used survey-based SEM to examine CSR, trust, reputation, and brand equity. For example, research among Indian banking consumers found direct and indirect effects of CSR on corporate reputation and brand equity, with trust functioning as a significant mediator.

STUDY DESIGN & DATA ANALYSIS

Study Design

For empirical validation of the proposed framework, an experimental study could expose participants to different CSR communication scenarios.

A hypothetical design may divide participants into four groups:

- **Group A:** Brand with strong environmental CSR
- **Group B:** Brand with strong community/social CSR
- **Group C:** Brand with ethical and transparent CSR communication
- **Group D:** Brand with minimal CSR information/control condition

Participants would evaluate the brand on:

- Perceived CSR
- CSR authenticity
- Consumer trust
- Brand credibility
- Brand image
- Brand reputation
- Purchase intention
- Brand loyalty
- Word-of-mouth intention

Data Collection

A sample of approximately 300–500 adult consumers could be selected using appropriate sampling procedures. Respondents would be asked to evaluate standardized scenarios or actual brands using validated Likert-scale measures.

Statistical Analysis

The proposed analysis would include:

1. Descriptive statistics
2. Reliability analysis
3. Exploratory Factor Analysis
4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

5. Correlation analysis
6. Multiple regression
7. Mediation analysis
8. Structural Equation Modeling
9. Multi-group analysis where appropriate

An experimental extension could use ANOVA to examine differences in perceived reputation among the CSR scenarios.

STUDY & ANALYSIS

The reviewed literature generally indicates a positive association between CSR and organizational reputation, brand image, trust, and brand equity, although the magnitude and consistency of the relationship vary according to context and methodology.

Research by Park et al. (2014) found that CSR activities could influence corporate reputation through different dimensions of consumer trust. Their findings demonstrated that trust can act as a mechanism through which CSR affects reputation.

Zhao et al. (2021) similarly reported significant relationships among CSR, corporate reputation, and brand equity and identified consumer trust as an important mediating mechanism.

Research in the Indian banking sector has also reported that CSR can influence corporate reputation and brand equity directly and indirectly through trust. Another Indian study involving retail banking consumers found that CSR perceptions positively affected brand trust and that brand trust partially mediated relationships involving brand image and positive word-of-mouth.

Recent Indian evidence provides additional support for the importance of specific CSR dimensions. A 2026 study of 403 managers from BSE-listed companies reported significant positive relationships between economic, governance/legal, social/ethical, and environmental CSR and corporate reputation; environmental CSR had the largest standardized coefficient in that study.

However, the literature also indicates that CSR does not guarantee reputational benefits. Research on the top 100 companies operating in India found results that contradicted the common assumption that CSR performance automatically produces stronger reputation outcomes. This suggests that CSR effectiveness may depend on authenticity, implementation quality, stakeholder perceptions, disclosure practices, organizational credibility, and contextual factors.

Overall, the review indicates that the strongest explanatory pathway is not simply:

CSR → Brand Reputation

but rather:

CSR → CSR Credibility → Trust → Brand/Corporate Reputation → Loyalty and Advocacy

This interpretation is also supported by research showing that corporate reputation, trust, and customer satisfaction can mediate relationships between CSR and customer loyalty.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis CSR And Customer Loyalty

CSR Dimension / Mechanism	Primary Focus	Expected Influence on Brand Reputation	Major Mediating Mechanism	Potential Risk
Economic CSR	Financial responsibility, product/service value and organizational sustainability	Positive when stakeholders perceive the company as reliable and sustainable	Perceived competence and trust	Excessive profit orientation
Legal & Governance CSR	Compliance, transparency, accountability and responsible governance	Positive	Institutional trust and credibility	Compliance-only approach
Ethical & Social CSR	Fairness, employee welfare, human rights and ethical conduct	Positive	Ethical credibility and trust	Ethical inconsistencies
Environmental	Climate action, resource	Potentially strong	Environmental	Greenwashing

CSR	efficiency, pollution and reduction sustainability	positive influence	trust and brand association	perceptions
Philanthropic CSR	Community development, donations and social welfare	Positive when authentic and relevant	Social identification and goodwill	Perceived publicity-seeking
CSR Communication	Disclosure and stakeholder communication	Can strengthen reputation when transparent	Credibility	Overstatement or misleading claims
CSR Authenticity	Consistency between commitments and actual practices	Strong potential positive influence	Trust	Skepticism
Consumer Trust	Confidence in corporate intentions and behavior	Strong positive influence	—	Loss of trust following misconduct
Brand Credibility	Perceived truthfulness and reliability of brand claims	Positive	Trust and brand associations	Inconsistent claims
Stakeholder Engagement	Dialogue and responsiveness to stakeholder expectations	Positive	Identification and relationship quality	Tokenistic engagement

Table 2: Comparative Findings from Selected Studies

Study	Context / Sample	Main Variables	Major Finding
Sen & Bhattacharya (2001)	Consumer response research	CSR and consumer reactions	Responses depend on company-specific and consumer-specific factors
Park et al. (2014)	South Korean consumers	CSR, trust, corporate reputation	Trust mediates relationships between CSR dimensions and reputation
Fatma et al. (2015)	Indian banking consumers	CSR, trust, reputation, brand equity	CSR influences reputation and brand equity directly and through trust
Zhao et al. (2021)	Banking consumers	CSR, trust, reputation, brand equity	CSR significantly influences reputation and brand equity; trust mediates relationships
Huang & Lien (2021)	Cosmetic consumers	CSR, brand equity, credibility, reputation	CSR perceptions influence purchase intentions through brand-related mediators
Indian banking study (2023)	328 banking consumers	CSR, brand trust, brand image, WOM	CSR positively influences trust; trust partially mediates brand outcomes
Baruah & Panda (2021)	Top 100 companies in India	CSR disclosure and reputation	Findings did not support an automatic positive CSR–reputation relationship

The comparative evidence demonstrates that CSR–reputation relationships are generally positive in many consumer-oriented studies but are not universally consistent. Differences in research design, stakeholder group, country, industry, CSR measurement, and reputation measurement can contribute to different findings.

[1] LIMITATIONS & DRAWBACKS

1. **Contextual variation:** CSR perceptions differ across countries, cultures, industries, and stakeholder groups.
2. **Measurement differences:** Researchers use different measures for CSR, brand reputation, trust, and brand equity, making direct comparisons difficult.
3. **Cross-sectional evidence:** Many empirical studies collect data at a single point in time, limiting strong causal conclusions.
4. **Self-reported responses:** Consumer and manager surveys can be affected by social desirability and response bias.
5. **Industry concentration:** A substantial portion of the literature focuses on sectors such as banking, telecommunications, retail, and consumer products.
6. **Communication effects:** CSR communication can influence perceptions independently of actual CSR performance.
7. **Greenwashing risk:** Environmental claims that are perceived as exaggerated or inconsistent with actual practices can reduce credibility.
8. **Stakeholder differences:** Consumers, employees, investors, and communities may evaluate the same CSR activity differently.
9. **Reverse causality:** Highly reputable organizations may have greater resources and incentives to undertake CSR, making the direction of causality difficult to establish in some studies.

10. **Generalizability:** Findings from one country or industry cannot automatically be generalized to all organizations.
11. **Dynamic reputation:** Brand reputation changes over time in response to new information, controversies, social media discussions, and organizational performance.
12. **CSR heterogeneity:** Economic, environmental, ethical, legal, and philanthropic CSR may have different effects rather than producing a uniform reputational outcome.

Future research should therefore employ longitudinal designs, cross-country comparisons, experimental methods, stakeholder-specific analysis, and objective CSR-performance indicators.

CONCLUSION

Corporate Social Responsibility has evolved from a primarily philanthropic concept into a broader strategic approach encompassing economic, legal, ethical, social, environmental, and governance responsibilities. The reviewed literature indicates that CSR can contribute to favorable brand and corporate reputation by improving stakeholder perceptions, strengthening trust, enhancing brand credibility, and creating positive brand associations.

The relationship, however, should not be considered automatic. The effectiveness of CSR depends on the credibility, authenticity, consistency, relevance, and transparency of corporate initiatives. Evidence from consumer studies frequently identifies trust as an important mechanism connecting CSR with reputation and brand equity.

The literature also demonstrates that different CSR dimensions may produce different outcomes. Recent evidence from India found environmental CSR to be the strongest predictor of corporate reputation among the dimensions examined in that particular sample, while other Indian research has shown that CSR disclosure does not necessarily translate automatically into stronger reputation.

Consequently, organizations seeking to strengthen brand reputation should view CSR as an integrated organizational responsibility rather than merely a promotional activity. Responsible practices should be supported by measurable outcomes, transparent communication, stakeholder engagement, ethical governance, and consistency between organizational claims and actual behavior. Future research should further investigate how digital communication, social media, sustainability reporting, stakeholder activism, and changing consumer expectations reshape the CSR–brand reputation relationship.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baruah, L., & Panda, N. M. (2021). The impact of corporate social responsibility on reputation: A study on top 100 companies operating in India. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/09726225211051866>
- [2] Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(1), 68–84.
- [3] Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505.
- [4] Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39–48.
- [5] Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295.
- [6] Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92–117.
- [7] Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1–13.
- [8] Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 8–19.
- [9] Fatma, M., Rahman, Z., & Khan, I. (2015). Building company reputation and brand equity through CSR: The mediating role of trust. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 33(6), 840–856. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-11-2014-0166>
- [10] Fatma, M., & Khan, I. (2023). Corporate social responsibility and brand advocacy among consumers: The mediating role of brand trust. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2777. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032777>
- [11] Fombrun, C. J., Gardberg, N. A., & Barnett, M. L. (2000). Opportunity platforms and safety nets: Corporate citizenship and reputational risk. *Business and Society Review*, 105(1), 85–106.
- [12] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- [13] Frynas, J. G., & Yamahaki, C. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: Review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 25(3), 258–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12115>

- [14] Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1–2), 51–71.
- [15] Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.4.001>.
- [16] Maignan, I. (2001). Consumers' perceptions of corporate social responsibilities: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 30(1), 57–72.
- [17] Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3–19.
- [18] McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117–127.
- [19] McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, P. M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 1–18.
- [20] Park, J., Lee, H., & Kim, C. (2014). Corporate social responsibilities, consumer trust and corporate reputation: South Korean consumers' perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(3), 295–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.016>.
- [21] Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225–243. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838>.
- [22] Schwartz, M. S., & Carroll, A. B. (2003). Corporate social responsibility: A three-domain approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13(4), 503–530. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq200313435>.
- [23] Zhao, Y., Abbas, M., Samma, M., Ozkut, T., Munir, M., & Rasool, S. F. (2021). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility, trust, corporate reputation, and brand equity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 766422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.766422>.
- [24] Fatma, M., & Khan, I. (2023). Corporate social responsibility and brand advocacy among consumers: The mediating role of brand trust. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2777. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032777>.