The world has undergone a tremendous change with the advent and proliferation of information and communication technologies (ICT) such as the internet, email and wireless communication, whose impact (both positive and negative) is perceived in every sector of society and every corner of the globe. In this new era of knowledge society that has emerged in the course of human history role of corporations are extremely crucial in complementing government’s efforts.

This is because people can no longer either underestimate or overestimate the potential role that digital divide could play. In this globalised economy, the role played by corporations engaged in such enterprise could reduce the asymmetries created by the digital divide within and amongst countries by utilizing the immense potential of ICT to the advantage of society per se the world over.

It is for businesses, large and small, public or private, that their actions affect a large number of stakeholders, employees, suppliers and society in general. With growing scrutiny of business operations, organizations are increasingly being driven to satisfy the expectations of opinion formers, government and customers in order to thrive. In spirit, businesses adopting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) principles believe that by operating ethically and responsibility, they have a greater chance of success. Such businesses while demonstrating that well managed corporate social responsibility actually supports business objectives, especially amongst large corporate where improved compliance, reputation and relationships has been shown to increase shareholder value and responsibility.
The term “social”, in CSR, is often taken to refer to the content of the responsibility. It identifies a field which, in the narrow sense, encompasses companies’ duties to their employees and workers (and often also to the employees of their suppliers, and even those of the entire supply chain) and, in the broad sense, their duties to society as a whole, sometimes excluding economic responsibilities (to shareholders, customers, suppliers, competitors, consumers, etc.) and environmental responsibilities.

Taken thus, the term “social” specifies the scope or content, but not the nature of CSR. However, this restriction on the meaning of CSR seems inappropriate, because the scope of corporate responsibility is, in fact, much broader. It obviously includes economic and environmental responsibilities, and probably others, too. That is why some authors prefer to talk about “corporate responsibility”, leaving out the “social”. On the other hand, it could also be argued that the term “social” is used to emphasize the fact that companies are not just economic entities, but something larger: an institution of society. In that case, however, the adjective “social” would once again fall short.

Together with social responsibility, people occasionally talk of a “political” responsibility. However, this seems better considered part of social responsibility, as exercised in particular areas and toward particular authorities. There has also been mention of “historical” responsibility, when it is assumed that “history will judge”; yet this is more a political metaphor than a genuine responsibility.
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