Jurnal Pajak dan Analisis Ekonomi Syariah
Volume. 2 Nomor. 1 Tahun 2025
e-ISSN:3046-9260, p-ISSN: 3046-871X, Hal 81-93
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61132/jpaes.v2i1.824
Available online at: https://ejournal.areai.or.id/index.php/JPAES

Exploring the Relationship Between Internal Governance and CSR Performance: Insights from Literature and Emerging Trends

Dadang Irawan[1*], Benardi[2]
[1-2] Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: dadang@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id[1], benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id[2]*

Abstract*. This qualitative literature review explores the relationship between internal governance mechanisms and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance. Drawing insights from recent studies, the review identifies key governance elements—such as board independence, ethical leadership, and audit committees—that enhance CSR outcomes by fostering accountability and stakeholder alignment. Additionally, emerging governance trends, including digital tools and ESG integration, are examined to understand their impact on CSR performance. Comparative analysis highlights the contextual differences across industries and regions, emphasizing the role of cultural, regulatory, and institutional factors in shaping governance-CSR dynamics. The findings underscore the importance of robust and context-specific governance strategies to optimize CSR initiatives and achieve sustainable development. This review also discusses its limitations and suggests directions for future research, including the integration of emerging technologies and sector-specific analyses.*

Keywords: *Internal Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), ESG Integration, Sustainable Development, Governance Mechanisms.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The interplay between internal governance and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance has become a focal point in recent discussions on corporate governance. Internal governance, defined as the process by which vice presidents (VPs) influence the chief executive officer (CEO) to shape a firm's strategic direction and policy, plays a crucial role in ensuring accountability and fostering long-term value creation (Acharya et al., 2011). This literature review seeks to explore the intricate relationship between internal governance mechanisms and CSR performance, providing insights into how emerging trends and scholarly findings illuminate this dynamic.

Internal governance mechanisms influence organizational outcomes by providing checks and balances on executive power. VPs often serve as intermediaries, leveraging their influence to mitigate agency problems and align corporate strategies with stakeholder interests (Adams et al., 2010). This dynamic has significant implications for CSR performance, as firms with robust internal governance structures tend to exhibit higher levels of social and environmental responsibility (Chen et al., 2024). Recent studies underscore that effective internal governance fosters better CSR outcomes, particularly when the CEO is subject to intensive monitoring and the VPs hold substantial power (Chen et al., 2024).

Received: Desember 20, 2024; Revised: Januari 05, 2025; Accepted: Januari 20, 2025;
Published : Januari 23, 2025

CSR represents a firm's commitment to ethical practices, environmental stewardship, and social equity (Bénabou & Tirole, 2010). Increasingly, stakeholders expect corporations to address social issues beyond profit maximization. The strategic alignment of CSR initiatives with corporate governance mechanisms is critical, as CSR performance often reflects the broader ethical orientation of the firm's leadership (Jo & Harjoto, 2012). Prior research suggests that internal governance enhances CSR by incentivizing executives to prioritize long-term sustainability over short-term financial gains (Cheng et al., 2014). Operational resilience as a novelty for corporate sustainable longevity is a differentiator to increase the capacity and responsiveness of the company's management to face conditions of uncertainty (Irawan, D., 2022).

Recent empirical studies provide robust evidence linking internal governance with improved CSR outcomes. For instance, Chen et al. (2024) analyzed a comprehensive dataset of U.S. firms and found that effective internal governance significantly enhances CSR performance. This relationship remains robust across various measures of governance and CSR, as well as after controlling for CEO incentives, corporate governance structures, and other determinants of CSR. CSR has a negative but not significant effect on accrual earnings management practices (Kumandang, C. & Hendriyeni, N.S., 2021). The study also revealed that the positive impact of internal governance on CSR is amplified under specific conditions, such as stronger product market competition and reduced short-term financial pressures (Chen et al., 2024).

Several mechanisms explain the relationship between internal governance and CSR performance. First, the monitoring role of VPs reduces managerial opportunism, ensuring that corporate actions align with stakeholder expectations (Cheng et al., 2016). Second, the power dynamics between the CEO and VPs create a system of checks and balances that fosters ethical decision-making (Byrd & Hickman, 1992). Effective corporate governance and sustainable leadership will help a company perform much better (Kusnanto, E., 2022). Finally, firms with less financial performance pressure are better positioned to invest in CSR initiatives, as their internal governance structures prioritize long-term goals over immediate profitability (Flammer, 2015). It is proven that in addition to being a precursor to the achievement of innovation performance and corporate sustainable longevity, human capital can also function as a moderator for innovation performance to achieve corporate sustainable longevity (Irawan et al., 2021)

Emerging trends in corporate governance and CSR underscore the evolving nature of this relationship. For instance, the increasing role of institutional investors in advocating for sustainable practices has amplified the importance of internal governance structures (Dyck et al., 2019). Moreover, globalization and technological advancements have heightened stakeholder expectations for transparency and accountability in CSR (Chin et al., 2013). However, challenges persist, such as balancing the dual demands of financial performance and social responsibility, as well as mitigating potential conflicts of interest within governance structures (Ferrell et al., 2016). Performance management systems are able to provide a framework to support various changes and drive innovation within a company culture (Sugiharti, T., 2022).

This review contributes to the literature by synthesizing existing studies on the relationship between internal governance and CSR performance. It highlights key findings, identifies gaps in the literature, and proposes avenues for future research. By integrating insights from recent empirical studies and theoretical frameworks, this review aims to advance our understanding of how internal governance mechanisms influence CSR outcomes and address the broader implications for corporate strategy and stakeholder engagement. Employee engagement behavior has a positive effect on employee creativity (Wajong et al., 2020).

The relationship between internal governance and CSR performance is multifaceted and context-dependent. Effective internal governance not only enhances CSR performance but also aligns corporate strategies with societal expectations. This review seeks to answer key research questions: What are the specific mechanisms through which internal governance impacts CSR performance? How do contextual factors, such as market competition and financial constraints, shape this relationship? Addressing these questions will provide a deeper understanding of the governance-CSR nexus and inform future research and practice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between internal governance mechanisms and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance has gained increasing attention in academic research. Internal governance structures, including board composition, managerial incentives, and internal controls, play a crucial role in influencing a firm's CSR outcomes. This literature review synthesizes existing research to identify key findings and emerging trends.

The theoretical link between internal governance and CSR performance often revolves around agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Governance mechanisms mitigate agency problems by aligning managers' incentives with shareholder and stakeholder interests. Fama and Jensen (1983a) highlight the importance of separating decision-making from control, emphasizing how governance structures ensure accountability in CSR activities. The integration of intellectual intelligence and emotional intelligence, technological proficiency, and meticulousness forms a comprehensive framework for achieving wise and accurate decisions, ensuring that organizations remain agile and responsive to dynamic environments (Ruslaini, & Ekawahyu Kasih, 2024).

Board diversity and independence are pivotal in shaping CSR strategies. Adams, Hermalin, and Weisbach (2010) argue that independent directors bring diverse perspectives, enhancing CSR oversight. Adopting aforward-thinking strategy that ensures both the company's financial success and its ability to thrive amidst challenges, changes, and uncertainties is a cornerstone of sustainable leadership for business resilience (Sugiharti, T., 2023). Bu et al. (2021) demonstrate that talented inside directors positively influence CSR performance, underscoring the dual roles of directors in governance and strategy formulation. Similarly, Harjoto and Rossi (2019) find that the presence of female directors correlates with higher CSR engagement, particularly in socially sensitive sectors.

Executive incentives significantly impact CSR activities. Deckop, Merriman, and Gupta (2006) suggest that equity-based compensation aligns managerial interests with long-term CSR goals. Conversely, Davidson, Dey, and Smith (2019) report that materialistic CEOs often deprioritize CSR initiatives, emphasizing the role of personal values in shaping corporate behavior. Jain, Jiang, and Mekhaimer (2016) highlight the interplay between executive horizons and CSR, where short-term focused managers are less likely to invest in long-term CSR initiatives. Sustainability, innovation, and dynamic factors are important capabilities for multi-finance companies that need to be strengthened and developed (Patricia, M. C, 2023).

Robust internal controls are instrumental in ensuring CSR performance. Cheng, Lee, and Shevlin (2016) discuss how strong governance reduces opportunistic behaviors, fostering ethical corporate practices. Similarly, Jo and Harjoto (2012) establish a causal relationship between internal governance quality and CSR performance, emphasizing effective monitoring mechanisms. The operational resilience influences corporate sustainable longevity directly and indirectly through innovation performance (Thoha et al., 2021).

CSR performance often intersects with financial outcomes, with governance playing a mediating role. El Ghoul et al. (2011) find that firms with robust CSR practices enjoy lower capital costs, attributed to enhanced stakeholder trust. Cheng, Ioannou, and Serafeim

(2014) report that access to finance improves for companies with strong CSR reputations, reflecting the financial market's recognition of governance-driven CSR initiatives. CSR has negative impact to accrual earnings management and positive impact to real earnings management through cash flow operation and they're not significant (Kumandang, C., & Hendriyeni, N., 2021).

Recent studies, such as Chen, Zhang, and Zhou (2024), explore dynamic governance mechanisms, highlighting their adaptability in fostering CSR performance amidst evolving stakeholder expectations. The integration of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) metrics into governance frameworks is another emerging trend, with researchers like Matos (2020) emphasizing responsible institutional investing's role in promoting CSR. A positive relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior human capital (Djap, W. et al., 2022).

Internal governance mechanisms are foundational in shaping CSR performance. Board composition, managerial incentives, and internal controls collectively influence CSR outcomes, highlighting the interconnectedness of governance and corporate responsibility. Future research should explore the dynamic interplay of these factors, particularly in the context of emerging ESG frameworks and global sustainability goals.

3. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative literature review methodology to explore the relationship between internal governance and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) performance. The qualitative literature review is appropriate for synthesizing existing research to identify patterns, trends, and gaps in the current body of knowledge (Snyder, 2019).

The study adopts a systematic approach to the literature review, following the guidance of Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003), which emphasizes transparency and rigor in reviewing the literature.

The initial step involves defining the research objectives, scope, and inclusion criteria. The focus is on studies that address the intersection of internal governance mechanisms—such as board structure, executive compensation, and stakeholder engagement—with CSR outcomes.

Relevant literature was retrieved from academic databases. Search terms included combinations of "internal governance," "CSR performance," "board structure," and "stakeholder engagement." Articles published between 2015 and 2025 were prioritized to ensure the inclusion of recent insights and emerging trends. A snowballing technique was also applied to identify additional relevant sources from reference lists of key studies.

Thematic analysis was employed to identify recurring themes and categorize the findings. This method allows for the extraction of patterns, relationships, and gaps in the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Inclusion Criteria: Peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and conference proceedings published in English, focusing on internal governance and CSR performance. Exclusion Criteria: Studies lacking empirical data, not related to the research topic, or published before 2015.

The thematic analysis involved the following steps (Nowell et al., 2017): Familiarization with the data by thoroughly reading selected studies. Generating initial codes to highlight significant findings. Organizing codes into overarching themes such as "role of board diversity," "executive compensation policies," and "stakeholder-driven governance." Reviewing themes to ensure alignment with research objectives.

To ensure reliability, the review applied a peer debriefing process, where initial interpretations were discussed with subject matter experts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, a framework was used to assess the quality of included studies, as suggested by CASP (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme) guidelines.

4. RESULTS

The results of this qualitative literature review reveal several critical themes and insights into the relationship between internal governance mechanisms and CSR performance. By synthesizing recent studies, the findings emphasize the importance of internal governance in shaping CSR outcomes and highlight emerging trends in this area.

Board composition and diversity are consistently identified as significant drivers of CSR performance. Studies suggest that diverse boards—characterized by gender, expertise, and independence—are more likely to advocate for sustainable practices and stakeholder-oriented strategies (Bear et al., 2010; Hafsi & Turgut, 2013). Female representation on boards, for instance, is linked to higher CSR engagement due to their collaborative decision-making style and attention to ethical considerations (Post et al., 2011).

Executive compensation policies that link incentives to CSR objectives encourage management to prioritize sustainable goals. Research indicates that firms with performance-based compensation structures are more likely to achieve superior CSR performance (Ikram et al., 2019). Such policies foster a long-term perspective, aligning managerial interests with stakeholders' expectations for environmental and social responsibility.

Effective internal governance enhances stakeholder engagement, which in turn drives CSR performance. Governance mechanisms such as regular stakeholder consultations and transparent reporting ensure accountability and trust, thereby improving a firm's reputation and commitment to CSR initiatives (Freeman et al., 2020).

Emerging trends reveal an increasing integration of technology and data analytics in governance practices. Artificial intelligence and big data are being leveraged to monitor CSR metrics, enhance transparency, and identify areas for improvement (Krause et al., 2021). Moreover, sustainability committees within boards are becoming a common feature, reflecting a strategic shift toward institutionalizing CSR in governance structures (Shaukat et al., 2016).

The relationship between internal governance and CSR performance varies across institutional and cultural contexts. In countries with stronger regulatory frameworks, firms demonstrate higher CSR performance due to external pressure and incentives (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2012). Conversely, in less regulated environments, internal governance plays a pivotal role in driving CSR efforts voluntarily.

Despite the advancements, significant gaps remain in understanding the dynamic interactions between governance mechanisms and CSR outcomes. For instance, limited research explores the role of informal governance structures, such as organizational culture, in influencing CSR performance. Additionally, further studies are needed to examine the impact of emerging governance trends, such as ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) integration, on CSR practices.

5. DISCUSSION

The relationship between internal governance and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance is a multifaceted and dynamic area of inquiry. This discussion synthesizes findings from the literature review, compares them with prior studies, and highlights theoretical and practical implications while identifying gaps and emerging trends.

Board composition and diversity have emerged as central elements in driving CSR performance. Diverse boards, particularly those inclusive of gender diversity, are linked to enhanced CSR initiatives due to varied perspectives and decision-making styles. Hafsi and Turgut (2013) demonstrated that gender diversity on boards positively influences CSR activities, citing women’s ethical orientation and stakeholder awareness. This finding aligns with Bear, Rahman, and Post (2010), who argued that boards with higher female representation demonstrate superior CSR performance due to their collaborative decision-making and focus on non-financial outcomes.

However, contrasting findings by Carter, D'Souza, Simkins, and Simpson (2010) suggest that board diversity's influence on CSR performance varies by industry and cultural context, emphasizing that the effects are not universally consistent. This highlights the need for nuanced analyses that consider contextual variables.

Executive compensation tied to CSR goals is pivotal for aligning managerial priorities with stakeholder interests. Ikram et al. (2019) established that performance-based compensation schemes enhance CSR outcomes by incentivizing long-term sustainability objectives. Similarly, Mahoney and Thorne (2005) found that firms integrating CSR metrics into compensation policies report higher CSR performance due to increased accountability.

In contrast, Berrone and Gomez-Mejia (2009) highlighted potential risks, such as executives prioritizing short-term CSR achievements over substantive long-term improvements. This discrepancy underscores the complexity of designing effective incentive structures and the importance of balancing short- and long-term CSR goals.

Effective stakeholder engagement mechanisms are critical for improving CSR outcomes. Freeman et al. (2020) posited that transparent reporting and regular stakeholder consultations foster accountability and trust, which enhance CSR initiatives. This view is supported by Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, and Ganapathi (2007), who argued that stakeholder pressure compels firms to adopt socially responsible practices.

However, Campbell (2007) noted that the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement depends on the firm's institutional environment, with stronger regulatory frameworks amplifying the impact of such practices. This suggests that the interplay between internal governance and external pressures significantly shapes CSR performance.

The integration of technology and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria into governance practices represents a critical emerging trend. Krause, Semadeni, and Cannella (2021) highlighted the role of artificial intelligence (AI) and big data in monitoring CSR metrics, enhancing transparency, and identifying improvement areas. These advancements enable firms to institutionalize CSR within governance structures effectively.

Similarly, Shaukat, Qiu, and Trojanowski (2016) observed a growing trend of sustainability committees within boards, which institutionalize CSR at a strategic level. This trend aligns with Ioannou and Serafeim's (2012) findings that ESG integration correlates with superior CSR performance, particularly in firms operating within robust institutional environments.

The impact of internal governance on CSR performance varies significantly across institutional and cultural contexts. Ioannou and Serafeim (2012) argued that firms in countries with stringent regulatory frameworks demonstrate higher CSR performance due to external pressures and incentives. Conversely, in less regulated environments, the onus falls on internal governance to drive CSR efforts voluntarily.

This context-specific dynamic is corroborated by Jamali, Safieddine, and Rabbath (2008), who noted that firms in emerging markets often rely on strong internal governance mechanisms to compensate for weak institutional frameworks. Such findings highlight the critical role of context in shaping governance-CSR relationships.

The insights derived from this literature review resonate with and expand upon prior research. Table 1 provides a comparative summary of eight key studies in this domain:

Study	**Focus**	**Key Findings**
Hafsi & Turgut (2013)	Board diversity and CSR	Positive correlation between gender diversity and CSR performance.
Bear et al. (2010)	Gender diversity and reputation	Diverse boards enhance CSR due to ethical and stakeholder-focused decision-making.
Carter et al. (2010)	Board diversity across industries	Board diversity's impact on CSR varies by industry and cultural context.
Ikram et al. (2019)	Compensation and CSR alignment	Performance-based compensation enhances CSR performance.
Berrone & Gomez-Mejia (2009)	Compensation risks	Short-term CSR incentives may undermine long-term goals.
Freeman et al. (2020)	Stakeholder engagement	Transparent engagement fosters accountability and trust, enhancing CSR.
Krause et al. (2021)	Technology in governance	AI and big data enable effective monitoring and transparency in CSR practices.
Jamali et al. (2008)	Governance in emerging markets	Strong internal governance compensates for weak institutional frameworks in driving CSR efforts.

The findings offer significant implications for both theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, this study reinforces the stakeholder and institutional theories, which posit that firms' CSR performance is shaped by internal governance structures and external pressures (Freeman, 1984; North, 1990). The interplay between these factors provides a robust framework for understanding the governance-CSR nexus.

Practically, the results suggest actionable strategies for firms to enhance CSR performance, such as: Increasing board diversity to leverage varied perspectives. Linking executive compensation to long-term CSR objectives. Institutionalizing stakeholder engagement through regular consultations and transparent reporting. Adopting advanced technologies for monitoring and reporting CSR metrics.

Despite significant advancements, several gaps remain in the literature. For instance, the role of informal governance mechanisms, such as organizational culture, in influencing CSR performance is underexplored. Additionally, further research is needed to examine the impact of emerging governance trends, such as ESG integration and AI adoption, on CSR practices.

The relationship between internal governance and CSR performance is complex, multifaceted, and influenced by diverse factors, including board composition, executive compensation, stakeholder engagement, and contextual variables. While significant progress has been made, ongoing research is essential to address existing gaps and explore emerging trends, thereby advancing the understanding of governance-CSR dynamics and informing effective practices.

6. CONCLUSION

This qualitative literature review highlights the intricate relationship between internal governance mechanisms and CSR performance. The findings indicate that robust internal governance structures, such as independent boards, ethical leadership, and stringent audit committees, play a pivotal role in driving CSR initiatives. Firms with stronger governance frameworks tend to exhibit higher CSR performance due to enhanced accountability, transparency, and alignment with stakeholder interests (Amran et al., 2021; Jamali et al., 2020). Moreover, emerging trends in governance, such as digital monitoring tools and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) integration, have further strengthened the synergy between governance and CSR activities, as discussed by Wang and Sarkis (2022).

Comparative analysis of prior studies revealed varying effects of governance attributes across industries and geographical contexts, reflecting the influence of cultural, regulatory, and institutional differences (Aluchna & Kuszewski, 2020; Li et al., 2019). Notably, governance mechanisms in developed economies emphasize compliance and shareholder value, while in emerging markets, the focus is more on relational governance and stakeholder engagement (Chen et al., 2022). These variations underscore the importance of context-specific governance strategies to optimize CSR outcomes.

In summary, the study confirms that internal governance is a crucial determinant of CSR performance. Organizations that prioritize governance innovations and align them with

CSR goals are better positioned to achieve sustainable development and long-term value creation.

7. LIMITATION

Despite the valuable insights provided by this review, several limitations must be acknowledged. Scope of Reviewed Literature: The study relied primarily on peer-reviewed journal articles and books published within the last decade, potentially overlooking relevant gray literature or older foundational studies that might have enriched the analysis (Tranfield et al., 2003). Contextual Variability: The findings reflect a broad spectrum of industries and regions, but the lack of a sector-specific or country-specific focus may dilute the understanding of localized governance-CSR dynamics (Jaggi et al., 2021).

Evolving Governance Trends: As governance frameworks and CSR expectations continue to evolve rapidly, some emerging trends, such as AI-driven ESG assessments, are underrepresented in the literature reviewed (Cheng et al., 2023). Qualitative Approach: The qualitative nature of this review, while offering rich insights, limits the ability to quantify the strength of governance-CSR linkages or establish causal relationships (Yin, 2018). Future studies could complement qualitative reviews with meta-analyses to provide empirical validation.

To address these limitations, future research should: Conduct meta-analyses to quantify governance-CSR linkages across different contexts. Explore emerging governance trends, such as the use of AI and blockchain, in CSR management. Examine the role of informal governance structures, such as organizational culture and values, in shaping CSR outcomes. Investigate the interplay between governance mechanisms and CSR performance in specific industries or regions to provide more granular insights.

By addressing these gaps, future research can build a more comprehensive understanding of how internal governance drives CSR performance, facilitating better strategies for sustainable development.

REFERENCES

Acharya, V. V., Myers, S. C., & Rajan, R. G. (2011). The internal governance of firms. Journal of Finance, 66(3), 689–720.

Adams, R. B., Hermalin, B. E., & Weisbach, M. S. (2010). The role of boards of directors in corporate governance: A conceptual framework and survey. Journal of Economic Literature, 48(1), 58–107.

Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 32(3), 836–863. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.25275678

Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. Journal of Business Ethics, 97(2), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0505-2

Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2010). Individual and corporate social responsibility. Economica, 77(305), 1–19.

Berrone, P., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2009). Environmental performance and executive compensation: An integrated agency-institutional perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 52(1), 103–126. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.36461950

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bu, L., Chan, K. C., Choi, A., & Zhou, G. (2021). Talented inside directors and corporate social responsibility: A tale of two roles. Journal of Corporate Finance, 70, 102044.

Byrd, J. W., & Hickman, K. A. (1992). Do outside directors monitor managers? Evidence from tender offer bids. Journal of Financial Economics, 32(2), 195–221.

Carter, D. A., D'Souza, F., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2010). The gender and ethnic diversity of US boards and board committees and firm financial performance. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 18(5), 396–414. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2010.00809.x

Chen, W. T., Zhang, J. J., & Zhou, G. (2024). Internal governance and corporate social responsibility performance. Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, 51(7–8), 2201–2238. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbfa.12783

Cheng, B., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and access to finance. Strategic Management Journal, 35(1), 1–23.

Cheng, Q., Lee, J., & Shevlin, T. J. (2016). Internal governance and real earnings management. The Accounting Review, 91(4), 1051–1085.

Chin, M. K., Hambrick, D. C., & Treviño, L. K. (2013). Political ideologies of CEOs: The influence of executives' values on corporate social responsibility. Administrative Science Quarterly, 58(2), 197–232.

Davidson, R. H., Dey, A., & Smith, A. J. (2019). CEO materialism and corporate social responsibility. The Accounting Review, 94(1), 101–126.

Deckop, J. R., Merriman, K. K., & Gupta, S. (2006). The effects of CEO pay structure on corporate social performance. Journal of Management, 32(3), 329–342.

Djap, W., Hermawati, O., Irawan, D., & Mustikasiwi, A. (2022). The role of transformational leadership, human capital, and job satisfaction in influencing organizational citizenship behavior of volunteers at the Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation. Religi: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama, 18(2). https://doi.org/10.14421/rejusta.2022.1802-04

Dyck, A., Lins, K. V., Roth, L., & Wagner, H. F. (2019). Do institutional investors drive corporate social responsibility? International evidence. Journal of Financial Economics, 131(3), 693–714.

El Ghoul, S., Guedhami, O., Kwok, C. C., & Mishra, D. R. (2011). Does corporate social responsibility affect the cost of capital? Journal of Banking & Finance, 35(9), 2388–2406.

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983a). Separation of ownership and control. The Journal of Law and Economics, 26(2), 301–325.

Ferrell, A., Liang, H., & Renneboog, L. (2016). Socially responsible firms. Journal of Financial Economics, 122(3), 585–606.

Flammer, C. (2015). Does product market competition foster corporate social responsibility? Evidence from trade liberalization. Strategic Management Journal, 36(10), 1469–1485.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.

Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Wicks, A. C. (2020). Managing for stakeholders: Survival, reputation, and success. Yale University Press.

Hafsi, T., & Turgut, G. (2013). Boardroom diversity and its effect on social performance: Conceptualization and empirical evidence. Journal of Business Ethics, 112(3), 463–479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1272-z