*The Sankalpa: International Journal of Management Decisions*
*ISSN: 2454-7425*
*Volume 12, Issue 1 (January - June 2026)*

# CSR to CSV Transformation: Literature Insights and Sectoral Experiences in Sustainable Institutional Legitimacy

**Rim Guennoun**[1]
University of Ouargla (Algeria), guennoune.rim@univ-ouargla.dz
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0145-926X
**Abdelhak Guennoun**[2]
University of Tamanrasset (Algeria), abdelhak.guennoun@univ-tam.dz
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2056-130X
**Belkacem Korichi**[3]
University of Tamanrasset (Algeria), belkacem.korichi@univ-tam.dz
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0507-9585

Submission date 10.11.2025 Acceptance - 12.01.2026 Publication - 18.02.2026

**Abstract:**

This study critically examines the strategic transition in management thought from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to Creating Shared Value (CSV), positioning the latter as a dynamic framework for sustainable institutional performance. Through an analytical review of literature and sectoral experiences across food, pharmaceuticals, banking, tourism, energy, and waste management, the research clarifies conceptual boundaries and highlights CSV's potential to transform societal challenges into sources of innovation and competitive advantage. The findings reveal that CSV thrives when embedded within "value ecosystems" supported by industrial clusters, human capital, and enabling technologies such as Artificial Intelligence. However, the study also identifies critical limitations, including societal selectivity, measurement difficulties, and risks of soft privatization of public responsibilities. By integrating theoretical insights with empirical evidence, the research contributes to bridging conceptual confusion between CSR and CSV, while offering a roadmap for policymakers and academics to reform governance models, adopt hybrid performance metrics, and design legislative frameworks that balance shareholder interests with societal rights. Ultimately, the study argues that sustainable competitiveness and institutional legitimacy depend on embedding social purpose into the innovation architecture of business models, thereby advancing the humanization of the economy and fostering resilient institutions capable of achieving shared prosperity.

**Keywords:** Creating Shared Value (CSV); Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR); Sustainable Institutional Performance; Industrial Clusters; Social Innovation; Responsible Artificial Intelligence; Hybrid Governance Models; Humanizing the Economy.

## I. Introduction

Contemporary management theory is experiencing a decisive shift: the historical separation between firms' profit objectives and society's developmental needs is increasingly untenable.

Recurrent global crises—climate change, widening inequality, and systemic shocks to supply chains—have exposed the limits of business models focused solely on short-term shareholder returns. In response, the Creating Shared Value (CSV) framework reframes social challenges as strategic opportunities: social impact becomes a source of innovation and sustainable competitive advantage when embedded in core strategy and operations (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

CSV aligns with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by moving firms beyond harm-minimization toward proactive value creation (United Nations, 2015). The CSV premise is simple but consequential: corporate success and societal well-being are interdependent. Firms prosper when the communities and systems on which they rely are healthy and productive; therefore, re-engineering products, markets, and value chains to address social needs can reveal previously invisible growth opportunities(Kramer & Porter, 2006; Porter & Kramer, 2011).

Despite its promise, CSV raises substantive theoretical and practical questions. Critics highlight social selectivity—the tendency to prioritize social problems that yield clear financial returns—measurement challenges, and the risk of shifting public responsibilities to private actors without adequate governance safeguards(Crane et al., 2015). A central managerial problem remains: how can organizations move from peripheral Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities to CSV strategies that permeate governance, resource allocation, and performance metrics, particularly in developing institutional contexts?

Digital transformation and artificial intelligence introduce both enabling capabilities and new constraints for CSV. Big Data and AI can improve needs diagnosis, target interventions, and strengthen transparency in impact measurement; however, they also raise concerns about data governance, equity of access, and the distribution of technological rents. Thus, research must examine not only the strategic logic of CSV but also the technological, institutional, and human-capital conditions that enable or constrain its realization (Camilleri et al., 2023).

This article pursues three interrelated objectives. First, it clarifies the conceptual boundary between CSR and CSV and provides a coherent theoretical grounding to reduce terminological confusion. Second, it synthesizes sectoral evidence—across food, pharmaceuticals, banking, tourism, energy, and waste management—to show how CSV can be operationalized and where it has demonstrably improved both social outcomes and firm performance. Third, it highlights the role of human capital, industrial clusters, and enabling technologies in building the "value ecosystems" necessary for CSV to scale, while identifying governance, measurement, and ethical challenges that require policy and managerial responses.

By integrating theoretical analysis with empirical cases, the study aims to offer academics and policymakers a practical roadmap for embedding shared value into institutional strategy—thereby contributing to the humanization of the economy and to resilient institutions that deliver both profit and public good.

### II. Conceptual Framework and Theoretical Grounding

The concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV) represents a fundamental turning point in contemporary management literature, serving as a critical and structural response to the deficiencies inherent in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) models. From a theoretical perspective, the initial foundation of this thought relied on the propositions of (Carroll, 1979, 1991), who classified corporate responsibilities within a hierarchy starting with economic and ending with philanthropic. However, subsequent developments in strategic thinking led by (Kramer & Porter, 2006)and (Porter & Kramer, 2011) argued that this separation between profit and society is a "strategic fallacy." Consequently, Shared Value was defined not as a marginal activity, but as operational policies aimed at enhancing an organization's competitive advantage by addressing social and environmental challenges as core business opportunities. This vision intersects with studies by (Al-dawi, 2009), which analyzed the theoretical foundations of performance, asserting that modern performance is no longer measured solely by pure financial metrics, but by the extent of an institution's ability to create sustainable value for stakeholders.

Studies by (Asemah et al., 2013) highlight the commercial advantages of social practices; however, the critique directed by (Crane et al., 2015) subjects Shared Value to scientific scrutiny, viewing it as an attempt to "rationalize" social demands and transform them into financial assets. This opens a debate regarding the depth of change this concept has introduced compared to traditional CSR. This shift derives its legitimacy from the Stakeholder Theory referenced by (Freeman, 2010), where CSV is employed as a tool to integrate societal interests into the core of production processes. This integration is clearly evident in service sectors, as shown in the study by (Belguacemi et al., 2022), where the societal role transitions from mere philanthropic spending to a pillar of institutional sustainability and competitiveness.

Creating Shared Value is closely linked to the Resource-Based View (RBV), where knowledge and human capital are considered essential assets enabling an organization to achieve social innovation. Studies by (boudissa & achoui, 2018) and (Bouchrite & Benzeghda, 2023) confirmed that value is not created in a vacuum but is the result of the interaction between human resource competencies and a strategic orientation toward solving societal problems. This cognitive dimension is reinforced when moving to the level of "Industrial Clusters" an idea emphasized by Porter and applied in numerous studies including experiences in Austria, Italy, and Catalonia (Mailani et al., 2024), where institutions contribute to building a local ecosystem that increases the efficiency of the shared value chain and reduces collective resource waste. Thus, an organization's interaction with its surroundings within industrial clusters makes human capital a strategic resource extended at the regional level (Lizama & Royo-Vela, 2024), where knowledge and competencies are translated into shared solutions that enhance the sustainability of both economic and social competitive advantage simultaneously (Hassani & Farhati, 2016)**.**

From a measurement and modeling perspective, modern trends in previous literature, such as (Trieu et al., 2023) and (Hair, 2009), point to the necessity of using advanced statistical tools like SmartPLS to measure the impact of these practices on institutional performance. Shared Value is no longer merely a theoretical discourse; it has become a measurable variable linked to organizational resilience and crisis management capabilities through causal paths linking it to innovation practices, CSR, and crisis management (As'ad et al., 2024). The strategic vision for technological innovation crystallizes in the adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) notably platforms like ChatGPT as a fundamental mediating variable that reshapes the dynamics of value creation within modern organizations (Camilleri, 2024). In service and tourism contexts (Bui et al., 2025) , these technologies contribute to maximizing social impact and operational efficiency by improving knowledge flow and highly personalizing stakeholder experiences. In terms of structural modeling, these smart tools are represented as a Mediator linking innovation strategies and CSR with the final outcomes of perceived value, enabling organizations to realize value and use technology to achieve sustainable competitive advantage and tangible social impact with extreme efficiency.

The concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV) represents the stage of strategic maturity in the organic relationship between an organization and its environment. It has brought about a fundamental shift from the traditional Stakeholder Theory philosophy—as proposed by (Freeman, 2010) to a model characterized by a balance between sustainable financial performance and deep social impact. Furthermore, contemporary literature, particularly the studies of (Fellague et al., 2017) and (Sebkhaoui, 2024), confirms that competitive advantage in today's business environment has become dependent on the organization's skill in investing in the intersection points between material success and societal well-being. This raises a critical question regarding the extent to which companies in developing economies can absorb this shift and adapt it to their institutional and socio-economic specificities (Bednarski, 2019; Kherchi et al., 2019). This reveals a research gap that necessitates studying the responsiveness of these environments to global models to ensure management sustainability amidst rapid economic transformations.

## III. Comparative Studies Between Creating Shared Value (CSV) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Distinguishing between CSR and CSV reflects a profound shift in organizational philosophy—moving from a logic of "Protection," which treats the social dimension as an insurance shield, to a logic of "Creation," which integrates social value into the very core of the profit-making model. This conceptual transition demonstrates that the debate between CSR and CSV is not merely linguistic but concerns the simultaneous definition of the institution's economic and social essence(Hoek, 2020).

Reviewing studies on financial performance and reputation reveals that CSR is often categorized under "protection-oriented" activities. For instance, (Asemah et al., 2013) argue that companies adopt CSR as a tool to build a reservoir of public trust, serving as a safety valve during crises. This type of value is "insurable," aiming not necessarily to increase operational efficiency but to ensure social license to operate. In contrast, proponents of Shared Value argue that their model is "creation-oriented"; here, value is not redistributed after profits are realized but is created during the profit-generation process itself.

CSR can be viewed as an "insurable" approach focusing on absorbing shocks to legitimacy and reputation, whereas Shared Value represents a "creational" model that re-engineers the business model around social issues as sources of profit and competitive advantage (Godfrey et al., 2009). This fundamental difference in the logic of value renders the CSR-CSV discussion a debate over the future of corporate capitalism rather than a mere preference for one term over another.

The "Nestlé" case study epitomizes the fundamental shift from the traditional CSR logic of "philanthropic spending" to the CSV model of "value chain investment." This contrast is evident when analyzing the nature of social intervention; while CSR might limit itself to reputation enhancement through donations (activities representing cash outflows without direct returns), Nestlé's strategy in regions like India focused on developing milk supply chains by investing in veterinary education and cooling infrastructure (Biswas & Biswas-Tortajada, 2016).

The core difference lies in the structural position of the activity within the organization's financial model. CSR is typically charged to "operational costs" to bolster legitimacy and reputation, whereas Shared Value is treated as a "strategic investment," through which the supply chain is redesigned. Consequently, profit-making evolves from a pure financial goal into a systemic mechanism that produces simultaneous and sustainable economic and social value.

Turning to the banking sector, studies on **"Banking on Shared Value"** (Bockstette et al., 2014) and the experience of **Bank of Alexandria** (Belguacemi et al., 2022) indicate that the comparison intensifies regarding **"corporate purpose."** Banks limited to CSR might fund cultural or sports activities, but those adopting CSV re-engineer their products to include "financial inclusion" for unbanked segments. This shift does not only serve society but opens new markets and a vast, previously excluded customer base. This is supported by (boussahoua, 2024) in the Algerian telecommunications sector, where providing internet services in remote areas transcends "national duty" to become a "market opportunity" creating shared value for both citizens and the institution.

The shift from funding peripheral social initiatives to re-engineering products and services around financial and digital inclusion turns the corporate purpose itself into a tool for CSV, where profit is achieved by expanding market boundaries to include marginalized or unconnected populations.

Studies focusing on "competitive performance," such as (Sebkhaoui, 2021) in Algeria, provide fertile ground for comparison. The research proves that the CSV approach acts as a mechanism to boost competitiveness through innovation in generic medicines that meet urgent health needs at affordable prices. Here, the institution does not merely comply with ethical standards (CSR) but transforms these standards into a competitive advantage to capture a larger market share. This intersects with (Porter & Kramer, 2011), who assert that companies failing to see the intersection between societal needs and their business leave massive opportunities for competitors who embrace the Shared Value mindset.

However, this trend is not without critical challenges identified by (Crane et al., 2015). Critiques of Shared Value focus on the risk of "social selectivity" where companies may only address profitable social problems while ignoring deeper issues like labor rights or social justice that might increase costs. Hence, researchers argue that CSR remains an indispensable "ethical platform" that sets the boundaries corporations must not cross in their pursuit of profit, even if that profit stems from shared value.

Regarding studies using modern measurement tools like SmartPLS and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (Camilleri, 2024; Hair, 2009), there is a serious attempt to model the relationship between these two variables. Preliminary findings suggest that CSV has a stronger "direct effect" on strategic financial performance, while CSR has a "mediating effect" that improves customer loyalty and corporate image, leading to long-term financial success. This implies that the superior institution is one that uses CSR as a foundation for building "legitimacy" and CSV as a driving force for "growth."

From a "human capital" perspective, studies such as (boudissa & achoui, 2018) and (Bouchrite & Benzeghda, 2023) emphasize that the transition from CSR to CSV requires a different type of employee. CSR requires employees with "ethical awareness," whereas CSV demands those with a "social entrepreneurial mindset" capable of identifying opportunities within societal challenges. This cognitive link clarifies that CSV is a process of continuous "organizational learning," where environmental and social pressures are transformed into catalysts for technical and managerial innovation.

The comparative debate between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and creating shared value (CSV) signifies a substantive reconfiguration of corporate purpose—from a protection-oriented logic that treats social engagement as reputational insurance to a creation-oriented logic that embeds social objectives within the firm's core value-generating activities. Empirical and conceptual work indicates that CSR remains indispensable as an ethical baseline that constrains corporate conduct, while CSV operationalizes social commitments as strategic investments that can generate both competitive advantage and societal benefit. Realizing the promise of this integration requires precise operational definitions, standardized measurement instruments, and governance mechanisms that prevent selective engagement with only profitable social problems. Future research should therefore prioritize the development and empirical testing of integrative models that combine legitimacy-building (CSR) with opportunity-driven value creation (CSV), employing comparative designs and robust indicators to assess economic, social and environmental outcomes across institutional and geographic contexts.

## IV. Empirical Studies of Creating Shared Value: A Review of Sectoral Experiences

The theoretical and comparative framework of Creating Shared Value (CSV) remains incomplete without demonstrating how this "management philosophy" translates into tangible operational practices across diverse economic sectors. A comprehensive survey of the literature reveals a significant diversity in application models; the concept is no longer exclusive to large industrial firms but has expanded to include services, food, pharmaceuticals, and even waste management. This reflects the model's flexibility and adaptability across different geographical and economic contexts.

**1. Food and Agricultural Industry (Nestlé and Almarai Model)**

The food industry serves as a pioneering laboratory for the maturity of the CSV concept, transitioning from traditional philanthropic approaches to a **participatory investment** model aimed at ensuring supply chain sustainability. Studies show that re-engineering relationships with farmers—through investment in infrastructure and technical training—was not merely an ethical commitment but a financial strategy to reduce logistical costs and secure input quality, achieving a "dual return" (economic and social). Regionally, the study by (Trima & Metarref, 2023) reinforces this trend through the experience of Almarai, demonstrating that moving beyond CSR toward localizing supporting industries and enhancing food security has become a primary driver of competitive advantage. Thus, these experiences confirm that the food sector has successfully integrated social spending into the logic of profitability, transforming it from "donated costs" into "strategic investments."

**2. Pharmaceutical and Chemical Sector (Saidal Group and BASF)**

In vital sectors like pharmaceuticals, shared value acquires a dual human and economic dimension. The study of the Saidal Group (Sebkhaoui, 2021) in Algeria provides strong evidence that adopting a CSV approach can leverage competitive performance. By focusing on the production of Generic Medicines that serve low-income segments at affordable prices, the institution combined its economic goal (profitability and market share acquisition) with its social goal (improving public health). This type of "Social Innovation" is also highlighted in **BASF's** case studies in Brazil (Spitzeck & Chapman, 2012), where less toxic and more efficient agrochemical products were developed, helping farmers increase productivity while protecting the environment—embodying the second pillar of CSV: redefining productivity in the value chain.

**3. Banking and Financial Services (Financial Inclusion)**

Modern banking literature shows a structural shift toward adopting CSV through "Responsible Finance" mechanisms and Financial Inclusion, moving beyond the traditional frameworks of elite banking. The Bank of Alexandria Sustainability Report (ALEXBANK, 2022) serves as an empirical model for this transformation; SME financing and digital solutions were shifted from social initiatives to profitable business platforms that open new markets and expand the customer portfolio (Strategic Market Expansion). Internationally, experiences in Indonesia(Kadir et al., 2025; Maheswari & Rudito, 2023), Bangladesh (Touhidul, 2022), and studies on developing nations (Kumar & Jie, 2023) demonstrate that integrating low-income groups into the financial system is not just a poverty-reduction tool, but an exploration of "Blue Ocean Markets" virgin markets characterized by low competitive intensity and high growth potential. Financial inclusion emerges as a strategic link achieving sustainable returns by diversifying revenue sources while enhancing local socio-economic stability.

**4. Tourism and Hospitality Services**

Contemporary empirical studies in the hospitality sector prove that CSV strategies transcend traditional CSR to become an integrated management model linking profitability to environmental and societal sustainability. Empirical evidence, particularly studies on Spanish hotels and international chains (Fernández-Gámez et al., 2019; Ruiz-Fernández et al., 2025), reveals that hotels redesigning their value chains—by optimizing resources and relying on local suppliers—achieve superior financial performance. This impact is clearly visible through E-reputation on booking platforms (Fernández-Gámez et al., 2020); guest perception of CSV practices acts as a mediating channel transforming environmental and social impact into economic value, manifested in increased booking intentions and enhanced loyalty (Shekhar & Das, 2026). The modern traveler no longer views environmental initiatives as secondary activities but as cognitive differentiation criteria that raise Revenue Per Available Room (RevPAR) and overall profitability.

**5. Environment and Waste Management Sector**

Waste valuation within the context of the Circular Economy represents a fundamental shift in managerial and financial thought. The traditional linear model (take-make-waste) is replaced by a "Closed-Loop" model that redefines waste as "secondary resources" with latent economic value. Scientifically, this shift rests on the principle of Value Chain Integration, where recycling and processing reduce dependence on virgin resources, subsequently lowering input costs and carbon emissions (Leder et al., 2020). Thus, waste valuation is a financial strategy aimed at maximizing operational efficiency and creating new markets through the conversion of "cost centers" associated with waste disposal into "profit centers" based on asset recovery (World Customs Organization, 2023).

CSV in waste management is manifested by transforming urgent environmental challenges into strategic opportunities for generating "Green Jobs" and achieving social inclusion. Contemporary literature reveals that building circular value chains—from source-sorting to remanufacturing technologies creates an entrepreneurial ecosystem capable of absorbing local labor and developing technical skills, transforming the burden of social spending into an "Investment in Human Capital" (Aiguobarueghian et al., 2024). This link between corporate profitability and societal welfare enhances organizational resilience and grants it institutional legitimacy beyond traditional philanthropy.

The success of waste-valuation business models depends primarily on an Entrepreneurial Mindset capable of innovating technical solutions and effective Public-Private Partnership (PPP) models (Mahmud et al., 2021). By viewing waste as continuous "resource flows" rather than final residues, organizations can redesign product lifecycles to ensure end-of-service asset recovery(Ferreira et al., 2024). This approach fosters innovation in eco-friendly technologies and creates collaborative networks that localize supporting industries and mitigate financial risks associated with raw material price volatility.

**6. The Role of Industrial Clusters in Enhancing Value**

Scientific studies on industrial clusters in regions such as Italy, Austria, and Catalonia confirm that "Creating Shared Value" is closely linked to the geographical surroundings and the presence of a **"Value Ecosystem"** based on cooperation between local actors (Martinidis et al., 2021). Academic reports indicate that productivity and innovation in these clusters stem from collective infrastructure involving suppliers and research centers rather than isolated corporate efforts (Martinidis et al., 2019). Geographical proximity and "University-Industry-Government" collaboration build **"Agglomeration Economies"** that enhance co-innovation and cost reduction, moving sustainability from isolated initiatives to a regional level through shared laboratories, logistics, and data platforms, as concluded in studies of Italian food clusters (Alberti & Belfanti, 2019; Cerciello, 2021).

Scientific literature classifies CSV as a flexible strategy whose features are shaped by sectoral nature and regional characteristics while maintaining a core essence: aligning economic profitability with social needs(Yang & Yan, 2020)**.** While this concept manifests in banking through financial inclusion, it focuses on technical innovation and resource efficiency in industry and energy. Both theoretical and empirical research agree that long-term financial success is now conditional on the ability to address real issues, such as food waste or carbon emissions, making the successful business model an integral part of the solution to broader societal problems.

**V. Critical Perspective and Challenges in Implementing Shared Value: An In-depth Analytical Review**

Despite the significant promises offered by the Creating Shared Value (CSV) model as a revolutionary framework for reshaping capitalism, it has not escaped radical critical readings. These critiques place the concept under academic scrutiny to define the limits of its utility and clarify instances of potential failure, thereby enhancing the scientific value of the model without undermining its importance.

**1. Critique of Social "Cherry-picking"**

Critical readings of the CSV model point to a fundamental flaw regarding "selectivity." The model is accused of focusing excessively on issues with direct economic returns while marginalizing more complex and less profitable social dilemmas. Business ethics theorists, such as (Crane et al., 2014), argue that this framework assumes a perpetual alignment between economic and social goals. This pushes companies to select problems that translate quickly into profits or cost reductions—such as energy efficiency—while systemic issues like social justice, inequality, and labor rights in distant supply chains remain overlooked due to the lack of clear short-term financial gains(Crane et al., 2014; Koo et al., 2019).

Critical studies comparing CSV with traditional Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) emphasize that the Shared Value model remains governed by the logic of profit maximization. This differs from advanced normative versions of CSR, which impose an ethical obligation on companies that transcends financial feasibility toward what is humanly and legally "right"

(Dembek et al., 2016). Some researchers suggest that CSV is not a comprehensive ethical alternative but rather a "repackaging" of Strategic CSR, as it lacks genuine guidance when a conflict arises between profitability and addressing environmental or social harm (Menghwar & Daood, 2021).

**2. The Trade-off Dilemma**

Critiques of CSV center on its "claim of overcoming trade-offs." Proponents promote its ability to consistently find "win-win" solutions that unite profit and society (Ferrarini, 2023; Hasbu et al., 2021). However, research by (Crane et al., 2014) asserts that this claim ignores the practical reality of numerous cases where a trade-off between financial performance and social impact is unavoidable. An exclusive focus on success stories aligned with profitability masks core issues requiring a genuine sacrifice of profits or the assumption of additional costs without immediate returns.

Furthermore, research on corporate governance and shareholder pressure indicates a structural gap preventing a deep shift toward Shared Value; incentive systems and financial evaluations remain tied to short-term profitability. This leads companies in unstable economic environments to scale back long-term social investments in favor of projects with immediate financial impact (Iliemena-Ifeanyi & Amedu, 2025). Researchers conclude that CSV may remain a "strategic slogan" in annual reports unless accompanied by radical reforms in governance models that balance shareholder expectations with social obligations (Moon et al., 2011).

**3. Measurement and Verification Challenges**

The "measurement challenge" is among the most complex structural hurdles in applying the CSV model. Scientific literature currently lacks unified global standards for measuring Social Return on Investment (SROI), unlike financial returns governed by precise accounting rules. Studies confirm that this methodological absence makes comparing initiatives difficult and contradictory (Djeffal & Haddad, 2024). Most companies track social and economic indicators separately without proving a causal relationship, which grants them space to employ ethical discourse without tangible evidence (Porter, 2012).

The weakness of measurement and disclosure tools facilitates "Greenwashing," where institutions exaggerate their positive impact to mask negative practices elsewhere. Field research indicates that the transformation of CSV into a public relations tool weakens trust and widens the information gap (Menghwar & Daood, 2021). This necessitates the adoption of "Hybrid Metrics" that clearly link social impact indicators to shareholder value (Cuevas Lizama & Royo-Vela, 2023).

**4. Cultural and Operational Barriers in Developing Environments**

Scientific studies on CSV implementation indicate that internal cultural and structural barriers represent the greatest challenge. Application often clashes with traditional managerial mindsets that view social issues as additional costs or peripheral burdens rather than strategic pillars (Akundwe & Salahagic, 2018; Bergengren & Präauer, 2016). Transitioning from a logic of "donations" to "strategic partnership" requires a radical shift in organizational culture and incentive systems (Masood et al., 2021).

From an external perspective, a lack of trust between companies and the public remains a major obstacle, as corporate social engagement is often perceived as a marketing polish (Somwethee et al., 2025; Zhao, 2020). Literature on "Open Innovation Systems" clarifies that achieving deep Shared Value depends on the existence of Industrial Clusters and collaborative structures linking companies with universities and the public sector (McPhillips, 2020).

**5. Legal Threats and the Retreat of the State**

Critical perspectives warn that the expansion of the CSV discourse may lead to a form of "Soft Privatization" of social problem-solving, where structural issues like health and education are converted into "business opportunities" (Hasbu et al., 2021). Literature on the privatization of services warns of the emergence of a "Shadow Welfare State" where citizens rely on volatile corporate strategies rather than guaranteed legal rights (Nyberg, 2021).

Researchers in "Political Corporate Social Responsibility" point out that society's reliance on corporations for basic services grants these institutions political and symbolic influence beyond their democratic size, raising questions about accountability and representation (Nyberg, 2021). In the absence of a legal framework for hybrid social-purpose enterprises, the risk falls entirely on the initiating companies (Kong & Majhi, 2025). Thus, critical reviews stress that CSV should not be a substitute for the state but part of a public policy system subject to regulatory frameworks (OECD, 2023).

## VI. Conclusion

This study represents a rigorous scientific endeavor to deconstruct the radical shifts in contemporary management thought, elucidating the transition from Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as an ethical burden to Creating Shared Value (CSV) as a strategic necessity. The findings indicate that redefining the social contract between the organization and its environment is no longer a discretionary luxury; rather, it has become a benchmark for institutional legitimacy within a global economy characterized by complexity and uncertainty. The pivotal conclusion of this research suggests that sustainable competitiveness is now contingent upon the organization’s success in integrating societal developmental needs into the "innovation code" of its core business model, thereby transforming traditional cost centers into drivers for simultaneous growth in profitability and societal impact.

The study’s contribution highlights that Shared Value is not a "static" model but a flexible strategy shaped by sectoral characteristics. From engineering supply chains in the food sector to "financial inclusion" in banking, and the "circular economy" in waste valuation, the results prove that long-term financial success is conditioned upon addressing real issues such as resource waste and digital inequality. From a critical perspective, the study delineated clear boundaries for this strategic optimism, warning against "societal selectivity" which may marginalize deep-seated, non-profitable social issues and the risk of "soft privatization" of public responsibilities, which could grant corporations political influence beyond democratic accountability.

The final recommendation of this research advocates for the construction of a "Value Ecosystem" that transcends individual corporate boundaries to include industrial clusters and local actors. This must be supported by hybrid legislative frameworks and clear tax incentives that balance shareholder interests with societal rights. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the importance of developing rigorous "hybrid metrics" that integrate social impact into financial reporting systems to prevent "greenwashing" practices. The future belongs to institutions that recognize that "humanizing the economy" through the deployment of technology and Artificial Intelligence is not merely a slogan; in this paradigm, competitive excellence becomes synonymous with comprehensive human progress and shared prosperity that withstands the test of time.

**VII. Prospects and Recommendations**

Despite the analytical depth of this study, it faced certain methodological limitations that must be considered. The review relied on diverse literature and sectoral reports with varying disclosure standards, which invites future expansion through comparative quantitative studies using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to measure the long-term impact of CSV practices, specifically within developing economies.

The study further recommends that future researchers focus on the role of "Responsible AI" in bridging the information gap between corporations and local communities. Additionally, it calls for exploring the hybrid legal and fiscal formulas that governments could adopt to support institutions that place "social purpose" at the heart of their core charters. Ultimately, the goal is to build a global model that achieves shared prosperity without compromising human rights or environmental sustainability.

**References:**

1. Aiguobarueghian, I., Adanma, U. M., Ogunbiyi, E. O., & Solomon, N. O. (2024). Waste management and circular economy: A review of sustainable practices and economic benefits. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *22*(2), 1708–1719. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.22.2.1517
2. Akundwe, R., & Salahagic, V. (2018). *CSR and CSV: The Managerial Interpretation of a Blurry Line*. https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-354906
3. Alberti, F. G., & Belfanti, F. (2019). Creating shared value and clusters: The case of an Italian cluster initiative in food waste prevention. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal*, *29*(1, January 2019), 39–60. https://doi.org/10.1108/CR-01-2017-0008
4. Al-dawi, el-shikhe. (2009). Analyzing the Theoretical Basis of the Performance Concept. *El-Bahith Review*, *7*(1), 217–227.
5. ALEXBANK. (2022). *Enabling ESG transition for an inclusive future* (ALEXBANK's Sixth Sustainability Report 2022 No. 6th; ALEXBANK's Sustainability Report).

ALEXBANK. https://www.alexbank.com/en/dam/jcr:8d5ed653-29a7-4216-9388-df45a05d6815/May%2029%20AB%20EN%20SR'22.pdf

6. As'ad, A., Brasit, N., Muis, M., & Umar, F. (2024). Unveiling the antecedents of sustainable performance: Insights from hospitality industry managers. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *22*(4), 299–309. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(4).2024.23
7. Asemah, E. S., Okpanachi, R. A., & Edegoh, L. O. (2013). Business advantages of corporate social responsibility practice: A critical review. *New Media and Mass Communication*, *18*(0), 45–54.
8. Bednarski, D. J. (2019). *Can shared value achieve competitive advantage within the private sector? An Australian Study* [Other, Victoria University]. http://vuir.vu.edu.au/
9. Belguacemi, F., Benyoucef, A., & Fellague, M. (2022). The smart orientation towards adopting shared value creation as a pillar for the sustainability of economic institutions - Evaluation of the experience of Alexandria Bank in Egypt-. *Social Sciences Journal*, *16*(1), 373–393.
10. Bergengren, K., & Präauer, G. (2016). *Creating Shared Value in Sweden: A study about factors influencing implementation of the concept*. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:944940
11. Biswas, A., & Biswas-Tortajada, A. (2016). *Creating shared value: How Nestlé achieved it in Moga, India*.
12. Bockstette, V., Pfitzer, M., Smith, D., Bhavaraju, N., Priestley, C., & Bhatt, A. (2014, June 1). Banking on Shared Value. *FSG*. https://www.fsg.org/resource/banking-shared-value/
13. Bouchrite, feyrouz, & Benzeghda, habiba. (2023). The role of human capital knowledge in creating shared value in the enterprise—Case study of the Sanitary Ceramics enterprise in El Melia, Jijel -. *Revue Organisation et Travail*, *11*(4), 07–19.
14. boudissa, mohamed, & achoui, naser-eddine. (2018). Human Capital and the Problematic of Value Creation in the Enterprise: An Intellectual Approach. *Al-Bashaer Economic Journal*, *4*(1), 87–103.
15. boussahoua, nadir. (2024). The reality of the development of the telecommunications services sector in Algeria for the period (2010-2022). *Journal of Excellence for Economics and Management Research*, *7*(2), 105–120.
16. Bui, H. T., Filimonau, V., & Sezerel, H. (2025). Exploring value co-creation and co-destruction between consumers & generative artificial intelligence (GAI) in travel. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *58*, 101392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2025.101392
17. Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Factors affecting performance expectancy and intentions to use ChatGPT: Using SmartPLS to advance an information technology acceptance framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *201*, 123247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123247
18. Camilleri, M. A., Troise, C., Strazzullo, S., & Bresciani, S. (2023). Creating shared value through open innovation approaches: Opportunities and challenges for corporate

sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *32*(7), 4485–4502. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3377

19. Carroll, A. B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *4*(4), 497–505. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1979.4498296
20. Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, *34*(4), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G
21. Cerciello, M. (2021). Spatial patterns in food waste at the local level. A preliminary analysis for Italian data. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, *13*(1), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12259
22. Crane, A., Graham, C., & Himick, D. (2015). Financializing Stakeholder Claims. *Journal of Management Studies*, *52*(7), 878–906. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12147
23. Crane, A., Palazzo, G., Spence, L. J., & Matten, D. (2014). Contesting the Value of "Creating Shared Value." *California Management Review*, *56*(2), 130–153. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.2.130
24. Cuevas Lizama, J., & Royo-Vela, M. (2023). Implementation and measurement of shared value creation strategies: Proposal of a conceptual model. *Business Strategy & Development*, *6*(4), 598–609. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsd2.265
25. Dembek, K., Singh, P., & Bhakoo, V. (2016). Literature Review of Shared Value: A Theoretical Concept or a Management Buzzword? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *137*(2), 231–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2554-z
26. Djeffal, K., & Haddad, N. E. H. (2024). Quantifying Sustainability: A Critical Analysis of ESG Measurement Models in Accounting. *Journal of Economic and Financial Research*, *11*(1), 561–586.
27. Fellague, M., Khorchi, I., & Haddo, S. ahlem. (2017). The Contribution of Algerian Economic Enterprises in Achieving Economic Value and Creating Social Utility: An Analytical Field Study. *Roa Iktissadia Review*, *7*(2), 127–147.
28. Fernández-Gámez, M. Á., Gutiérrez-Ruiz, A. M., Becerra-Vicario, R., & Ruiz-Palomo, D. (2020). The impact of creating shared value on hotels online reputation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *27*(5), 2201–2211. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1958
29. Fernández-Gámez, M. Á., Gutiérrez-Ruiz, A. M., Becerra-Vicario, R., Ruiz-Palomo, D., Fernández-Gámez, M. Á., Gutiérrez-Ruiz, A. M., Becerra-Vicario, R., & Ruiz-Palomo, D. (2019). The Effects of Creating Shared Value on the Hotel Performance. *Sustainability*, *11*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061784
30. Ferrarini, G. (2023). *Firm Value versus Social Value: Dealing with the Trade-offs* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 4376480). Social Science Research Network. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4376480

31. Ferreira, N., Echevarria, N., Volken, N., Amorim, W., Andrade Guerra, J. B., & Teixeira Dias, F. (2024, May 10). *The role of waste valorization in the transition to the circular economy* [Letter]. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33808.42242
32. Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge university press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=NpmA_qEiOpkC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Freeman,+R.E.+(1984)+Strategic+Management:+A+Stakeholder+Approach.+Pitman,+Boston.&ots=62hmH6L5QN&sig=P-uGpPXs2qUGnISzu70y56hGvx8
33. Godfrey, P. C., Merrill, C. B., & Hansen, J. M. (2009). The relationship between corporate social responsibility and shareholder value: An empirical test of the risk management hypothesis. *Strategic Management Journal*, *30*(4), 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.750
34. Hair, J. (2009). Multivariate Data Analysis. *Faculty Articles*. https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/facpubs/2925
35. Hasbu, W. Y., Zarkasyi, W., & Suharman, H. (2021). Does Creating Shared Value Has an Implication on Corporate Performance. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *21*(1), 1–110.
36. Hassani, R., & Farhati, louiza. (2016). (VRIO) Resources and their role in achieving competitive advantages based on the resource-based theory. *Journal of business and finance economy*, *1*(2), 51–60.
37. Hoek, M. (2020, July 14). *CSR v CSV: The Difference and Why It Matters*. Sustainable Brands. https://sustainablebrands.com/read/csr-v-csv-the-difference-and-why-it-matters
38. Iliemena-Ifeanyi, R. O., & Amedu, M. J. (2025). Implementation of sustainable business practices for long-term value creation: Challenges and advancement. *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, *9*(3), em0291. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejosdr/16333
39. Kadir, R. D., Tri Wahyudi, S., Maski, G., & Devia Sagita Sumantri, V. (2025). The role of financial inclusion in reducing household poverty: Insights from Eastern Indonesia. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, *13*(1), 2588925. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2025.2588925
40. Kherchi, I., Mohamed, F., & Ahlem, H. S. (2019). Can Corporate Social Strategy Create Shared Value Toward Creative Business? “Volvo Social Strategy Model.” *ECONOMICS*, *7*(2), 109–124. https://doi.org/10.2478/eoik-2019-0016
41. Kong, D., & Majhi, M. (2025). Integrating Social Responsibility into Business Strategy: A Roadmap for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, *5*(5), e06596–e06596. https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v5.n05.pe06596
42. Koo, J., Baek, S., & Kim, S. (2019). The Effect of Personal Value on CSV (Creating Shared Value). *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *5*(2), 34. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc5020034
43. Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. E. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, *84*(12), 78–92.

44. Kumar, S. S., & Jie, Q. (2023). Exploring the role of financial inclusion in poverty reduction: An empirical study. *World Development Sustainability*, *3*, 100103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2023.100103
45. Leder, N., Kumar, M., & Rodrigues, V. S. (2020). Influential factors for value creation within the Circular Economy: Framework for Waste Valorisation. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *158*, 104804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104804
46. Lizama, J. C., & Royo-Vela, M. (2024). Clústeres de innovación tecnológica y creación de valor compartido: Un análisis exploratorio. *Revista Galega de Economía*, *33*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.15304/rge.33.1.8933
47. Maheswari, A. H. S., & Rudito, B. (2023). Improving Corporate Shared Value to Reach Competitive Advantage in Banking Industry. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, *06*(12). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V6-i12-93
48. Mahmud, A. Z., King, S., Pontillo, J., & dfitzgerald. (2021, August 5). Advancing the Circular Economy through Shared Value. *FSG*. https://www.fsg.org/blog/advancing-circular-economy-through-shared-value/
49. Mailani, D., Hulu, M. Z. T., Simamora, M. R., & Kesuma, S. A. (2024). Resource-Based View Theory to Achieve a Sustainable Competitive Advantage of the Firm: Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies*, *4*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.31098/ijeass.v4i1.200
50. Martinidis, G., Adamseged, M. E., Dyjakon, A., Fallas, Y., Foutri, A., Grundmann, P., Hamann, K., Minta, S., Ntavos, N., Råberg, T., Russo, S., Viaggi, D., Martinidis, G., Adamseged, M. E., Dyjakon, A., Fallas, Y., Foutri, A., Grundmann, P., Hamann, K., … Viaggi, D. (2021). How Clusters Create Shared Value in Rural Areas: An Examination of Six Case Studies. *Sustainability*, *13*(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084578
51. Martinidis, G., Fallas, Y., Foutri, Ntavos, Kalimeri, & Spanidou. (2019). *The role of clusters and multi-actor networks in the creation of shared value in rural areas* (Rubizmo). the European Union's Horizon. https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/documents/downloadPublic?documentIds=080166e5c8d0b334&appId=PPGMS
52. Masood, G., Alam, A., & Alam, J. (2021). An Empirical Study of the Perceptions on Creating Shared Value Strategy's Competitive Advantage over CSR-the case of India. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, *27*(3), 1–530.
53. McPhillips, M. (2020). Innovation by proxy – clusters as ecosystems facilitating open innovation. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, *16*(3), 101–128. https://doi.org/10.7341/20201634
54. Menghwar, P. S., & Daood, A. (2021). Creating shared value: A systematic review, synthesis and integrative perspective. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *23*(4), 466–485. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12252

55. Moon, H.-C., Parc, J., Yim, S. H., & Park, N. (2011). An Extension of Porter and Kramer's Creating Shared Value (CSV): Reorienting Strategies and Seeking International Cooperation. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, *18*(2), 49–64.
56. Nyberg, D. (2021). Corporations, Politics, and Democracy: Corporate political activities as political corruption. *Organization Theory*, *2*(1), 2631787720982618. https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720982618
57. OECD. (2023). Policy Guide on Legal Frameworks for the Social and Solidarity Economy. *Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED)*. https://doi.org/10.1787/9c228f62-en
58. Porter, M. E. (2012). Measuring Shared Value. *How to Unlock Value by Lining Social and Business Results. FCG*. https://www.academia.edu/2917910/Measuring_Shared_Value
59. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, *89*(1–2). Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84906331429&partnerID=40&md5=b1772d771e16ada3a33524e767c740af
60. Ruiz-Fernández, L., Rienda, L., & Marco-Lajara, B. (2025). Hotel chains and sustainable development: Degree of internationalization, SDGs and dynamic capabilities as drivers of successful performance. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *27*(10), 25069–25085. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-024-04721-3
61. Sebkhaoui, A. (2021). *The Shared Value Approach as a Mechanism for Enhancing the Competitive Performance of Economic Enterprises in Algeria: A Field Study at Saidal Group* [Thesis, Université Kasdi Merbah Ouargla]. http://dspace.univ-ouargla.dz/jspui/handle/123456789/26915
62. Sebkhaoui, A. (2024). Shared Value Creation Model New Direction for Global Economic Companies to Achieve Sustainable Economic Development Field models for global companies. *Journal of Economic Papers*, *15*(2), 451–468.
63. Shekhar, & Das, D. (2026). Pathway to 'creating shared value' in destination management organizations: Insights from literature review. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *26*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584241276275
64. Somwethee, P., Ru-Zhue, J., Aujirapongpan, S., Chanthawong, A., & Usman, B. (2025). Developing social entrepreneurial capability in Thai community enterprises: The roles of intellectual capital, creating shared value, and organizational agility on sustainability. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *11*, 101269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.10126
65. Spitzeck, H., & Chapman, S. (2012). Creating shared value as a differentiation strategy – the example of BASF in Brazil. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, *12*(4), 499–513. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701211267838
66. Touhidul, A. K. (2022, March 21). *Journey towards financial inclusion in Bangladesh*. https://asianbankingandfinance.net/markets/commentary/journey-towards-financial-inclusion-in-bangladesh

67. Trieu, H. D. X., Nguyen, P. V., Nguyen, T. T. M., Vu, HaiT. M., & Tran, KhoaT. (2023). Information technology capabilities and organizational ambidexterity facilitating organizational resilience and firm performance of SMEs. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, *28*(4), 544–555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2023.03.004
68. Trima, I., & Metarref, A. (2023). The contribution of commitment to social responsibility in the embodiment of the concept of creating shared value—Almarai company as a model. *Contemporary Economic Researches*, *6*(2), 85–104.
69. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development | Department of Economic and Social Affairs*. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda
70. World Customs Organization. (2023). *Transition to a circular economy and implications for Customs administrations* [STUDY REPORT]. The World Customs Organization (WCO). https://www.wcoomd.org/-/media/wco/public/global/pdf/topics/research/report/circular-economy-report-en.pdf
71. Yang, T.-K., & Yan, M.-R. (2020). The Corporate Shared Value for Sustainable Development: An Ecosystem Perspective. *Sustainability*, *12*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/su12062348
72. Zhao, M. (2020). Capabilities for creating shared value: Optimizing social-business balance in Southeast and South Asian countries. *Annual Status Reports: Emerging Market Sustainability Status*. https://dr.ntu.edu.sg/handle/10356/143479