

NALCO's CSR towards Project affected People: A Study of Gotamara, Angul District, Odisha

Chandrakanta Sahoo

D.Litt. Research Scholar, P.G. Department of Sociology, Sambalpur University, Odisha, India.

CITATION: Sahoo, Chandrakanta (2018), "NALCO's CSR towards Project affected People: A Study of Gotamara, Angul District, Odisha", *MERC Global's International Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 37-46.

ARTICLE HISTORY: Submitted: December 19, 2017, Revision received: March 26, 2018, Accepted: April 02, 2018

ARTICLE TYPE: Research paper

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present research is to find out socio-economic changes took place in the lives of project affected people of the Gotamara Village by the establishment of a manufacturing giant like National Aluminium Company (NALCO). The study uses primary and secondary methods for data collection. The researchers review the relevant literature, company reports, and village data from the secondary sources. They also use a survey questionnaire and focus group discussion to assess the socio-economic changes emerging due to Nalco operation. The studies found that Nalco has brought about positive changes among the Project Affected People (PAP) and the majority of them are changing their lifestyles. However, the company has made economic development in the region as a trade-off to environmental degradation which threatens sustainable ecosystems. There is a need to maintain an eco-system which should lead to economic development while protecting the environment. The company should adopt a triple bottom line approach- People, Planet and Profit while incorporating technology into the model. There is a need to conduct research in this direction.

KEYWORDS: Customer social responsibility, Community, Socio-economic changes, NALCO.

REFERENCES

1. Ackerman, R. W. (1973), "How Companies Respond to Social Demands", *Harvard University Review*, Vol. 51, Issue 4, pp. 88-98.
2. Agle, B. R. and R. K. Mitchell (1999), "Who Matters to CEOs? An Investigation of Stakeholder Attributes and Salience, Corporate Performance and CEO Values", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, Issue 5, pp. 507-526.
3. Alford, H. and Naughton, M. (2002), "Beyond the Shareholder Model of the Firm: Working toward the Common Good of a Business", in S. A. Cortright and M. Naughton (eds.), *Rethinking the Purpose of Business. Interdisciplinary Essays from the Catholic Social Tradition* (Notre Dame University Press, Notre Dame), pp. 27-47.
4. Andriof and McIntosh, M. (eds.), *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship*, Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK, pp. 200-212.
5. Brundtland Report (1987), "Our Common Future", United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), Oxford University Press.
6. Carroll, A. B. (1979), "A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4, pp. 497-505.
7. Carroll, A. B. (1991), "The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organisational stakeholders", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 34, pp. 39-48.
8. Davis, K. (1960), "Can Business Afford to Ignore Corporate Social Responsibilities?", *California Management Review*, Vo. 2, pp. 70-76.
9. Davis, K. (1967), "Understanding the Social Responsibility Puzzle", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 10, Issue 4, pp. 45-51.
10. Donaldson, T. and Dunfee, T. W. (1994), "Towards a Unified Conception of Business Ethics: Integrative Social Contracts Theory", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 19, pp. 252-284.

11. Donaldson, T. and Dunfee, T. W. (1999), *Ties That Bind: A Social Contracts Approach to Business Ethics*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
12. Donaldson, T. and Preston, L. E. (1995), "The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, Issue 1, pp. 65-91.
13. Evan, W. M. and Freeman, R. E. (1988), "A Stakeholder Theory of the Modern Corporation: Kantian Capitalism", in T. Beauchamp and N. Bowie (eds.), *Ethical Theory and Business*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, pp. 75-93.
14. Freeman, R. E. (1984), *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Pitman, Boston.
15. Freeman, R. E. and Phillips, R. A. (2002), "Stakeholder Theory: A Libertarian Defence", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 12, Issue 3, pp. 331-349.
16. Friedman, M. (1970), "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits", *New York Times Magazine*, September 13, pp. 32-33, 122, 126.
17. Gladwin, T. N. and Kennelly, J. J. (1995), "Shifting Paradigms for Sustainable Development: Implications for Management Theory and Research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, Issue 4, pp. 874-904.
18. Global Sullivan Principles (1999), [http:// globalsullivanprinciples.org](http://globalsullivanprinciples.org) (September 2003).
19. Hart, S. L. (1995), "A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, Issue 4, pp. 986-1012.
20. Hart, S. L. and Christensen. C. M. (2002), "The Great Leap: Driving Innovation from the Base of the Pyramid", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 44, Issue 1, pp. 51-57.
21. Jones, T. M. (1980), "Corporate Social Responsibility Revisited, Redefined", *California Management Review*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, pp. 59-67.
22. Kaku, R. (1997), "The Path of Kyosei", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 75, Issue 4, pp. 55-62.
23. Kaur, Manmeet and Singh, Rajpal (2016), "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Step towards Fashion or Future?", *MERC Global's International Journal of Management*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 01-05.
24. Litz, R. A. (1996), "A Resourced-Based-View of the Socially Responsible Firm: Stakeholder Interdependence, Ethical Awareness, and Issue Responsiveness as Strategic Assets", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 15, pp. 1355-1363.
25. Mele, D. (2002), *Not only Stakeholder Interests. The Firm Oriented toward the Common Good*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
26. Mitchell, R. K.; Agle, B. R. and Wood, D. J. (1997), "Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp. 853-886.
27. Murray, K. B. and Montanari, J. R. (1986), "Strategic Management of the Socially Responsible Firm: Integrating Management and Marketing Theory", *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 11, Issue 4, pp. 815-82.
28. Parsons, T. (1961), "An Outline of the Social System", in T. Parsons, E. A. Shils, K. D. Naegle and J. R. Pitts (eds.), *Theories of Society*, Free Press, New York.
29. Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2002), "The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 80, Issue 12, pp. 56-69.
30. Prahalad, C. K. (2002), "Strategies for the Bottom of the Economic Pyramid: India as a Source of Innovation", *Reflections: The SOL Journal*, Vol. 3, Issue 4, pp. 6-18.
31. Prahalad, C. K. and Hammond, A. (2002), "Serving the World's Poor, Profitably", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 80, Issue 9, pp. 48-58.
32. Preston, L. E. and Post, J. E. (1975), *Private Management and Public Policy: The Principle of Public Responsibility*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
33. Preston, L. E. and Post, J. E. (1981), "Private Management and Public Policy", *California Management Review*, Vol. 23, Issue 3, pp. 56-63.
34. Rowley, T. J. (1997), "Moving Beyond Dyadic Ties: A Network Theory of Stakeholder Influences", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp. 887-911.
35. Sethi, S. P. (1975), "Dimensions of Corporate Social Performance: An Analytical Framework", *California Management Review*, Vol. 17, Issue 3, pp. 58-65.
36. Swanson, D. L. (1995), "Addressing a Theoretical Problem by Reorienting the Corporate Social Performance Model", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, Issue 1, pp. 43-64.
37. United Nations (1999), Global Compact, www.unglobalcompact.org.
38. Varadarajan, P. R. and Menon, A. (1988), "Cause-Related Marketing: A Coalignment of Marketing Strategy and Corporate Philanthropy", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52, Issue 3, pp. 58-58.
39. Vogel, D. (1986), "The Study of Social Issues in Management: A Critical Appraisal", *California Management Review*, Vol. 28, Issue 2, pp. 142-152.
40. Votaw, D. (1972), "Genius Became Rare: A Comment on the Doctrine of Social Responsibility", *California Management Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 25-31.
41. Wartick and Mahon (1994), "Towards a Substantive Definition of the Corporate Issue Construct: A Review and Synthesis of Literature", *Business and Society*, Vol. 33, Issue 3, pp. 293-311.