Public Relations Practice Journal
Vol. 1, Issue 1, 2026

Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 34-45, 2026

CSR Communication and Stakeholder Trust: Evaluating Reputation Management Practices Among Multinational Corporations in Asia

Mohammed Abdul*^1

^1 Graduate, Peking University
*Corresponding author: journals@isrnjournals.org

Abstract

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) communication provides multinational corporations with chances to clarify its social commitments, yet the extent of its contribution to stakeholder trust is based on the credibility of the practices under communication. This paper assesses that relationship by critically reviewing and analyzing a sample of corporate disclosures related to Asian operations and Asian based businesses. The analysis is guided by stakeholder theory, institutional perspectives, organizational trust, and legitimacy. The results point to five interrelated conditions of credible reputation management, namely substantive correspondence between promises and operations, verifiable disclosure, significant stakeholder engagement, responsiveness to institutional environment, and accessibility of accountability systems. The examples of Hindustan Unilever, Samsung Electronics, and Toyota demonstrate that communication practices can become more transparent, with corporate disclosures being only one of the ways to create confidence among stakeholders and demonstrate the effectiveness of implementation. The article claims that the quality of relationships and remedies and communication reach should be evaluated by reputation management. It suggests regionalized involvement, accurate reporting limits, impartial assessment, and longitudinal studies which encompass workers and communities along with consumers and investors.

Key words: *corporate social responsibility, stakeholder trust, reputation management, multinational corporations, Asia*

PDF Download | Cite this | Share

Article History

Received: 24 June 2026 | Revised: 28 July 2026 | Accepted: 7 September 2026

1. Introduction

Corporate social responsibility communication is an incidental aspect of explaining the position of multinational corporations in the society. Companies explain their commitments and solicit evaluations of their actions through sustainability reports, their corporate websites, their communication with employees, their community meetings, and through online platforms. This kind of communication enables responsible practices to be seen and stakeholders evaluate an organization. It also can reveal the gaps between the official promises and facts on the ground. It is then the question how communication leads to warranted trust and not the amount of favorable attention which a corporation receives. According to Du et al. (2010),

stakeholder awareness, and skepticism are also key factors when translating CSR initiatives into positive relations.

This is a question that is of great relevance especially in the case of multinational companies that are located in Asia. The region has various systems of political, employment, development, and corporate responsibility traditions. The same message regarding social contribution can, therefore, have varying interpretations in various places and among different stakeholders. A comparative study conducted by Chapple and Moon (2005) indicated that there was a significant difference in CSR reporting among seven countries in Asia and that the difference was related to national business systems. Its historical results cannot be regarded as a contemporary regional index, but it creates an ongoing analytical warning of portraying Asia as a single communication landscape.

Multinational corporation is used to refer to companies that have their headquarters in Asia and foreign headquartered companies that are operating with subsidiaries in Asia. These organizational structures pose different accountability questions. Localized community programs can be communicated by a subsidiary with global environmental commitments being published by its parent. On the other hand, a company that is based in Asia can present a global report, which will give minimal details regarding specific production locations. When considering communication, it is essential to consider the entity, geography, workforce, and period in which a claim was made. The current article focuses on a few examples of India, South Korea and Japan and builds on the broader research of the region such as studies of China. It does not boast of extensive coverage in Asia.

CSR in this case is seen as the concern regarding the social, environmental and ethical consequences of business decisions and relations outside of direct business transactions. Carroll (1991) framework assists in differentiating between the economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities. This difference is relevant since charitable contributions will not be sufficient to characterize how workers are treated, relationships with suppliers, or impact on the environment. The concentration of reputation management on publicizing donations and excluding core business conduct renders the management analytically incomplete. Responsibility communication should hence be evaluated concerning operations and community spending.

Trust and reputation are similar yet distinct outcomes. Trusting involves the readiness of a stakeholder to be vulnerable in terms of expectations of the behavior of an organization whereas reputation is the accumulated assessment of an organization (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Mayer et al., 1995). A company can be well-known among consumers yet employees are not eager to report fraud. Similarly, an organization can enhance grievance management prior to a broader reputation scale recording the enhancement. It is the stakeholders whom these possibilities demand specific analysis and care against viewing brand visibility, awards, and positive sentiment as immediate indicators of trust.

The article answers three questions: What are the communication practices that render CSR claims believable? What is the effect of institutional and stakeholder variations in Asian contexts on its interpretation? What facts will be required to determine the reinforcement of trust by reputation management? It argues that believable communication relates assertions to available evidence, influence of stakeholders, and responsible action. It is an evaluative synthesis contribution, buttressed by published research and a few documentary examples, which isolates communication activity and shown relational outcomes. This difference can be used as a practical ground to enhance corporate communication without presupposing that disclosure will necessarily generate social legitimacy.

Literature review

Stakeholder responsibility and organizational trust

The theory of stakeholders has questioned the notion of assessing corporate behavior in terms of shareholder earnings only. Donaldson and Preston (1995) differentiate descriptive, instrumental, and normative sides of the theory, which enables the interests of stakeholders to be viewed both as strategic and as claims that should be taken into account. In the case of CSR communication, this implies that an audience is not just a source of persuasion. The communicated decisions may have legitimate interests to workers, suppliers, customers, investors, and communities. Their evaluation can be based on the consideration of corporate processes that acknowledge those interests and give a chance to question management decisions.

The attention of the stakeholders is however not balanced. Mitchell et al. (1997) define the stakeholder salience as power, legitimacy and urgency. When applied to the operations of multinationals, this framework can be used to understand why investors and the well-known campaign groups can be given more communication resources compared to temporary workers or suppliers, which are spread out. It also pinpoints a normative issue: the low power of bargaining does not mean the weak claim to protection. Any reputation strategy that acts in response to the actors who can generate publicity risks conflating visibility and significance. Participation evaluation thus entails looking at who is able to impact decisions, and whom it is hard to listen to.

According to Mayer et al. (1995) the dimensions of perceived trustworthiness include ability, benevolence, and integrity. CSR communication may be evidence-based in each of the dimensions, namely operational competence, care about the affected stakeholders and alignment with the declared principles. It is not however, the same thing as communicating these qualities as having them. An effective environmental program can prove to be technically competent yet provide little sign of integrity where there are major negative effects that are not explained. Gillespie and Dietz (2009) also find the organizational trust repair in the organizational system changes which confirm the follow-up approach that ties messages to governance and remedial action.

Communication quality and stakeholder interpretation

Morsing and Schultz (2006) differentiate between stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. Corporate decisions are communicated through information; reactions are collected through response; involvement enables those interested to be involved in the creation of understandings and actions. This model is useful since so-called interactive communication may still be under managerial control of an identical agenda. When an organization clarifies the role of response in influencing priorities, a consultation survey, e.g., will have a stronger meaning. Reporting is not rendered unnecessary in the framework. Rather, it puts reporting into a relationship where stakeholders are able to challenge evidence and affect the further decision-making process.

There are also qualities of a message, which are identified by research. S. Kim and Ferguson (2018) highlight informativeness, endorsement by third parties, personal relevance, tone, consistency, and transparency. The study by S. Kim (2019) of consumers in the United States relates the properties of communication to the perception of CSR knowledge, trust, and reputation and finds differences related to consumer identification. These results provide practical ideas to the Asian research, however, the location of the study does not allow assuming the same effects on the Asian populations. H. Kim and Lee (2018) also experimentally investigate the issue of transparency and company–cause fit, which validates the importance of information presentation and interpretation instead of focusing on the exposure measure.

Corporate motives are also evaluated by stakeholders. Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) demonstrate why positive responses to CSR cannot be presumed among consumers and situations. Sen et al. (2006) go further to consider the relationship of several stakeholders, where they show the importance of consideration of

awareness and reactions other than direct purchasing. Collectively, these studies justify a conditional view of the benefits of CSR. The stakeholders might be grateful to an initiative and doubt its applicability, sufficiency or its purpose. More analytically defensible can be communication that recognizes commercial interests as opposed to claims of a corporation operating without any strategic motivation.

Lack of consistency brings about more problems. It is Wagner et al. (2009) who explore the concept of corporate hypocrisy due to conflicting information in CSR, and Skarmeas and Leonidou (2013) explore the development and implications of CSR skepticism. Delmas and Burbano (2011) describe greenwashing in two ways: organizational and external forces. These attitudes change the focus of attention on individual advertisements to the circumstances in which misleading representations are appealing. They also propose that effective promotional claims are likely to enhance exposure where the operational evidence is opposed. A suitable assessment will look at how claims are consistent over functions, localities and time as opposed to considering a campaign separately.

Institutional context and evidence from Asia

Institutional approaches provide the explanation as to why corporate responsibility varies in the settings. Matten and Moon (2008) differentiate between responsibility that is institutionalized in institutional set-ups and responsibility that is expressed by specific corporate policies and initiatives. The difference warns of the confusion of large scale promotional communication with higher responsibility. Jamali and Karam (2018) also point to the importance of creating contexts of developing countries in CSR research. But they should not be considered in their entirety to characterize the Asian economies. Institutional analysis entails investigating particular labour arrangements, regulatory anticipations, relationships in the civil societies and economic circumstances as opposed to the usage of a regional label as an elucidation.

Asian empirical studies contribute to this contextual argument. A survey of 244 employees working in two Indian companies (Dhanesh, 2014), revealed that perceived CSR associated positively with organization-employee relationships. Its limited survey and sample of organization limit its causal inferences. Dhanesh (2015) basing on interviews with business leaders and managers in India also finds moral and economic motivation in CSR interpretations. Such studies make it difficult to assume that stakeholders will always perceive strategic benefits as an indication of insincerity. They suggest that ethical and commercial reasons may co-exist yet they are accepted based on the manner in which responsibilities are exercised.

Tian et al. (2011) study the reaction of consumers towards CSR in China and establish the appropriateness of awareness, trust, and product category. Their study helps to distinguish between consumer settings, not considering a national population a single audience. In their paper, Tang and Li (2009) examine CSR communication by both Chinese and foreign corporations in China and focus on the interplay between corporate origin and host environment. More recently, Dong et al. (2024) conduct a review of 88 studies of CSR communication within the Chinese context and find the possibility to enhance conceptual and methodological development. The country specific scholarship thus questions the easy transfer of the models that have been developed elsewhere.

Research gap and analytical framework

The evidence has some critical limitations and there are a few mechanisms connecting CSR communication to trust that are supported in the literature. Reported perceptions are studied in communication studies and the organizational representations are documented in the corporate reporting. Neither shows necessarily that individuals who are exposed to material risks are more influential or get effective solutions. According to Crane and Glozer (2016), the field of research is diverse with various aspects of communication whose concepts need to be integrated carefully. In the case of multinational corporations, the extra problem is how to bridge between global obligation and local experience without ascribing global results to specific subsidiaries or communities.

The article combines stakeholder identification, credibility of the message, the institutional context and accountability in the organization into a single evaluation process. Another interpretive lens is legitimacy which is seen as the perceived appropriateness in a socially constructed system of values, expectations (Suchman, 1995). The framework posits, does communication render responsibility comprehensible, testable and challengeable. It also differentiates evidence of a policy, evidence of implementation and evidence of stakeholder trust. These categories are used to lead the analysis of the documentary and to avoid the fact that a corporate statement is considered as the validation of the result it is offering.

Methodology

Research design and source selection

The research employs a critical narrative literature review and its qualitative document analysis. The design best suits exploring concepts and publicly recorded practices in heterogeneous contexts without suggesting the use of a statistically representative sample. Bowen (2009) offers the methodological rationale of documents as a situated evidence to be interpreted. The study is secondary: it does not involve any original interviews or surveys, observation of corporate locations. Its results are interpretation themes and analysis of documentary, rather than an employee and community trust measure they gathered in this article.

Web searches were used to find sources, using key words CSR communication, stakeholder trust, reputation, and Asian corporate responsibility, followed by searches of specific studies and corporate disclosures. There was a preference of publisher pages, university repositories, journal records, and official company documents. Peer reviewed research was selected that was directly related to the conceptual framework, provided regional context, and that of corporate materials where the authorship and reporting date were identifiable. Basic scholarship was kept together with more recent contextual studies. This was not a comprehensive search of databases, but a deliberate retrieval; no claim of bibliometric completeness or systematic review plan.

The illustrations of the corporations include Business responsibilities and Sustainability Report 202324 by Hindustan Unilever, the announcement of the 2024 sustainability report by Samsung Electronics, and the 2024 Sustainability Data Book by Toyota. The documents were chosen to analyze various communication practices: outlined reporting limits and assurance, openness of grievance and supply chain policies, and written human rights governance. The fact that they are widely published during the same period facilitates a limited discussion of the disclosed practices. It does not directly compare the companies in terms of their performance or set that the materials outline their most recent arrangements in 2026.

Analysis and evidential safeguards

The analysis was based on a systematic thematic reading that was informed by Braun and Clarke (2006). Passages of interest were analysed in terms of stakeholders identification, specificity of claim, dialogue possibilities, checking and verifying, organizational responsibility, and demonstration of results. The comparison of the expectations based on the theoretical assumptions and what each document could prove led to the development of themes. A stated grievance policy was thus deemed as evidence of disclosed mechanism; it was not coded as successful resolution and stakeholder confidence. Examples are given of corporate illustratively, and no numerical scores or league table were developed on unequal disclosures.

The authority of the source was evaluated against the claim that was made. Corporate documents are the first pieces of evidence of what a company is saying, but interested narratives of the performance. Academic research presents independent analysis but the sampling, geography as well as the research design limits transferability. In cases where publisher abstracts were the available evidence, interpretation was limited to the findings they reported. The boundaries of reporting were not verified and comparison was not made before making any comparisons and the global commitments were not reflected as measured results in a

single Asian country. Lack of a particular in the chosen material was not taken as an indicator that a practice was not in existence.

The key limitations include selection bias to publicly visible companies, the availability of the English language, the lack of evidence on the implementation, and the lack of stakeholder testimony gathered independently to illustrate the corporate aspects. Causal comparison is also not possible due to differences in sector and reporting scope. These are material constraints: the analysis is able to find out which features can make communication more accountable, but not which corporation is the most trusted. It is the theoretically informed methodology which underpins recommendations and a research agenda on future fieldwork rather than the final estimates of the effects of CSR communication across Asia.

Findings

Substantive consistency is the foundation of credible communication

The former theme is congruence between the duty being promoted and the behavior in which the stakeholders are introduced to the corporation. The literature shows that positive communication reactions hinge on condition and perceived dependability, as opposed to being automatic out of the statement of a social endeavor (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Wagner et al., 2009). In the case of multinational companies, this means an analysis of procurement, employment, products and environmental practices as well as community activities. The donation of education alone will not respond to a grievance concerning working conditions. These problems entail the various commitments and can have different groups involved.

Such a difference alters the intent of reputation management. Evaluation should also question whether the program deals with a relevant responsibility, and whether it is undermined by other decisions of the corporation, rather than only asking whether stakeholders remember a program. An example of this is a supplier code which is more plausible when the purchasing arrangements permit suppliers to service the requirements. It is an analytical inference and not a result regarding the particular companies considered. The disparity between conveying expectations and making the resources and incentives to fulfill them follows. Responsibility communication, in turn, does presuppose liaison with operational managers.

The evidence of the employees above by Dhanesh (2014) should serve as a regional reminder that CSR is important in terms of internal relations. Employees are able to contrast outside claims with the daily experience in the organization and internal consistency is significant to credibility. But the positive relation in sampled Indian firms fails to set up the identical correlation between subcontracted employees or between other economies. The evaluation of reputation should thus be able to divide categories of employment and look at whether less visible workers in corporate reporting feel the promises made are being fulfilled. The inclusion of those views would place a stricter test on corporate claims.

Verifiable disclosure requires clear boundaries

The second theme is whether the readers are able to know what a claim is covering. The BRSR of Hindustan Unilever 2023 24 defines a consolidated reporting boundary with regard to wholly owned subsidiaries. It determines reasonable assurance of BRSR Core parameters as well as limited assurance of the remaining identified parameters as guides the readers to the assurance report coverage. It also includes complaints made by stakeholder group and differentiates between the complaints received and those that are pending at the end of the year (Hindustan Unilever Limited, 2024). These characteristics render the disclosure more evaluable than an un-differentiated measure of responsible conduct. They fail to build up stakeholder confidence or certainty of all narrative assertions.

The broader implication is that transparency needs information that can be interpreted. The global reduction figure of a multinational should not be accredited to a specific subsidiary of the Asian region without data. Equally, an intensity measure and an absolute environmental outcome are answers to different questions.

The indicator might work out better than production, whereas the overall effects take a different course. Baselines, reporting periods, organizational boundaries, and methodology change should be identified through communication to enable the readers to make valid comparisons. These are suggested evaluative prerequisites, rather than claims that the chosen corporations employ deceptive measures.

The assurance should also be explained. It is valued depending on the indicators analyzed, the criteria used and the degree of assurance. The stakeholders are not supposed to guess that a statement of verification is encompassing the whole company, all suppliers and effectiveness of community programs. The focus on informativeness and transparency provided by S. Kim and Ferguson (2018) helps to make these qualifications more accessible to presentation. A brief description connected with a thorough evidence may enhance usability without eliminating the required constraints. The applicable standard is the ability of the reader to test a material claim, rather than the report can be seen as comprehensive due to its lengthiness.

Participation becomes meaningful when it can change decisions

The third theme is the contrast between communication opportunities and influences opportunities. The framework by Morsing and Schultz (2006) explains the reasons why an organization can get an enormous amount of feedback and still maintain full control of what issues are counted. In the case of multinational corporations, an engaging narrative of engagement should clarify the method of selecting the participants, the concerns they presented, and the modification made by the company. It must also recognize the disagreement that was not resolved. A consultation process does not have to deliver a consensus in order to be valuable; recording a disputed decision can have more accountability than the reporting of attendance.

According to the 2024 report announcement by Samsung Electronics, the Global Grievance Resolution Policy had been implemented in April 2024 and includes the channels of communication (forums, surveys, visits to the sites). It also reports that in 2023, there were introductions of third party audits to selected second tier suppliers (Samsung Electronics, 2024). Such statements demonstrate the way a corporation publicly makes responsibility to be linked with communications and monitoring systems. They are unable to define on their own, as corporate representations, whether the participants felt safe or grievances were addressed satisfactorily or whether the chosen audits reflected the most severe risks.

A proper assessment would thus find out evidence of both participants and management. The following questions are relevant: Can workers communicate outside the supervisory channels, does it have local language support, and do complainants get explanations and the opportunity to appeal decisions? These questions need to be modified to suit the problem and the context instead of being made into a general cultural stereotype. The stakeholder salience theory assists in identifying the danger of not giving much consideration to weaker groups (Mitchell et al., 1997). It also implies that the access to communication should be evaluated in conjunction with the feasibility of implementing that access.

Institutional sensitivity must coexist with consistent responsibilities

The fourth theme is the conflict between local relevance and consistency among multinational operations. According to Chapple and Moon (2005), host environments lead to CSR profiles, and Tang and Li (2009) situate corporate communication in the Chinese context. These researches endorse the focus on the local institutions, but do not warrant the diminished accountability where scrutiny is frail. A company can localize words, mediums, and interaction models without altering the uniform commitments with regards to responsible behavior. Analytical issue is, what aspects should be localized and what should be kept similar in different places.

Practically, global report, subsidiary disclosure and community discussion are intended to serve varied purposes. Investors might need similar pointers, and a community that is impacted by production might demand easy access to local effects and reaction measures. No audience can be fully served by presuming that one report in English language is adequate in communication. Relevance and accessibility should be

used to determine local adaptation: can the affected audience comprehend the information and utilize it? Corporate origin in itself does not indicate whether this is met.

The regional study also deters generalization over an intrinsically trusting or collectivist Asian stakeholder. Tian et al. (2011) note a difference in consumer responses in China, whereas Dong et al. (2024) emphasize the significance of the contextualized research. These results justify the exploration of the differences between countries, industries, and sets of stakeholders. An employee, a shareholder and a consumer can judge the same company by various standards. Cross cultural research is most instrumental when it explores such differences empirically and not replacing national labels with evidence of specific people and relationships.

Accountability connects communication with organizational action

The fifth theme is that communication is more believable when it determines where to implement and channels of redress. The 2024 Sustainability Data Book by Toyota outlines the management of human rights violations, such as reporting them to the senior governing bodies. It also determines the channels of employees, consolidated subsidiaries, migrant workers, and dealers, and defines supplier related due diligence activities (Toyota Motor Corporation, 2024). This gives factual accounts of the way responsibilities and mechanisms are manifested. It is still inadequate to know how it was experienced by the users or whether solutions were undertaken to correct the damages that they complained.

The analytical lesson is that communication of grievances ought to elaborate about a process that can be adopted by the stakeholders. Important details to use can be eligibility, confidentiality, anticipated response phases, escalation, and retaliation protection. The next step should be evaluation to determine whether the process works as it is stated. The rates of closure are not sufficient since the administrative completion can be not an acceptable solution. Similarly, not many complaints may be demonstrating satisfactory conditions, lack of knowledge, or fear of reporting. These other explanations need to be independently investigated. The organizational trust repair model by Gillespie and Dietz (2009) facilitates the linkage of remedial communication to systems and behavior change.

The illustrations, taken collectively, show that there are various approaches to assessing responsibility, not a hierarchy of corporate trust. Hindustan Unilever supplies specified reporting and assurance boundaries; Samsung publicly describes grievance and monitoring developments; Toyota documents governance and channels. They have worth as a documentary because they render additional questions possible. The question as to whether such arrangements yield trust is an empirical one. The quality of disclosure and evidence of stakeholders affected should then be integrated with reputation management where relationships are given much consideration where people are at high risks and have little power to access redress.

Measuring trust requires evidence beyond visibility

One such cross cutting result is the necessity to decouple the communication product and the relationship product. Exposure is reflected in the number of website visits, campaign reach and report downloads. Comprehension measures are used to test the understandability of the claims by the stakeholders. Trust measures ought to look at belief in ability, care regarding stakeholder interests and reliability of actions and the questions ought to be suited to the relationship (Mayer et al., 1995). Reputation measures gauge larger evaluations. The way these are handled as substitutes covers the point of communication failure or success. A report that is readily available can enhance knowledge but not confidence in the situation where operational issues are left unresolved.

A more rigorous test would follow these measures over time and gather them without regard to campaign delivery. The community participants must be capable of sharing negative experiences without influencing the right to receive help, whereas the employees need to be safeguarded against being identified by their supervisors. Whenever possible, based on sample size, the findings should be disaggregated by stakeholder

group and location. The alterations, too, should be interpreted with care: the trust might be reactive to the quality of the products, hiring choices, financial state, or scandal in addition to CSR communications. The right objective is to test a possible contribution, which is backed by process evidence, and not to claim all positive changes as a consequence of a communication campaign.

Another implication is related to distributing benefits and burdens. The beneficiaries of a community initiative might not be the same as that of a production decision. These relationships can be merged together in one reputation index and the difference hidden. An assessment should then determine whose trust is being gauged and what is the responsibility to which it pertains. This is in line with normal normative difference in the stakeholder theory that acknowledges the legitimate interests, and their choice of the audience on the basis of strategic interest (Donaldson and Preston, 1995). In the case of a multinational corporation, a descriptive account of a harmed local relationship might be the most helpful output, despite the fact that the entire brand is still popular. It is these kinds of evidence that enable the managers to have a solid foundation of action compared to an overall positive rating.

Conclusion and recommendations

The communication of CSR can facilitate the trust of the stakeholders in such a way that responsible behavior becomes interpretable and verifiable. The reviewed literature has found the following conditions to be relevant: the quality of communication, perceived motives, institutional context, and organizational consistency. The corporate illustrations show how reporting and governance arrangements can be specified publicly but they do not establish that stakeholders are positively affected by the arrangements. The main conclusion of the article is thus conditional: reputation management helps to build trust in the case of communication tied to substantive behavior, influence opportunities, and plausible responsibility.

In the case of multinational companies in Asia, this conclusion necessitates consideration of both the international obligations and domestic ties. A shared company image may offer continuity, though not replace evidence concerning specific functioning. A homogenous regional model is also rejected in the analysis. Comparative Asian scholarship, along with research in India and China, suggests that certain institutional and stakeholder contexts are important. Simultaneously, local adaptation must enhance understanding and involvement without undermining the duties that a publicly-accepted corporation undertakes. The following recommendations are based on these principles.

To begin with, corporations ought to have a review of material CSR claims to be published. Communication teams must consult operation, sustainability, procurement, and human resources staff to find out the evidence of each claim, limit of its reporting, and limitation. Reflections on ambitions must be well differentiated with the achievement. Where promises are renegotiated or targets are not met, the reasons and consequences should be given but not justification by the previous statements. This will tackle the issues of consistency that have been noted in the studies of hypocrisy and greenwashing (Delmas and Burbano, 2011; Wagner et al., 2009).

Second, a documented feedback-decision route should be a part of stakeholder involvement. Affected groups should be identified by local teams, reach them via the right languages and channels, and make people who do not have reliable access to digital technology or organizational power participate. Participants should not be exposed in the public summaries that give the issues of concern, the management reaction, and any remaining disagreement. The costs of consultation should not be imposed on the already affected individuals of operations. This is aimed at establishing influence and responsiveness, which is in line with the approach of involvement invented by Morsing and Schultz (2006).

Third, corporations ought to enhance the relationship between remedy and promise to the people. Accessibility, confidentiality, procedural fairness and stakeholder experience should be independently assessed alongside communication about grievance procedures. It is better to provide boards with evidence

of problems and corrective actions that recur and not only summaries of positive publicity. The evaluation needs to differentiate between the cases closed and the resolution of underlying issues. Especially in organizations where complaints are similar in other subsidiaries or suppliers, organizational learning is paramount since recurring problems may signify incentives or managerial policies that may need a wider reformation.

Fourth, an equal balance of indicators should be applied in reputation evaluation. The reach of communication and awareness are not obsolete, yet they need to be complemented with stakeholder knowledge, measures of trust, evidence of participation, and confirmed operational progress. The conflicts of interest can be minimized with the help of independent researchers or evaluators on the condition that their scope and access are disclosed. Where applicable, results ought to differentiate employees, contractors, suppliers, communities, customers, and investors. A positive average should not cover the dwindling confidence of a group that is at risk of a lot of harm. These differences should be seen by the decision makers through evaluation.

Lastly, the proposed relationships should be tested in the future by utilizing longitudinal and comparative designs. Research might track the same groups of stakeholders prior to and following a well documented change in communication or accountability and study other occurrences that might result in trust. Comparisons must be made to similar sectors and institutional environments and not use corporate headquarters as a satisfactory explanatory variable. Consumer surveys and corporate reporting analysis would be supplemented with interviews with workers and communities. It should also look into instances where disclosure that is transparent decreases reputation in the short term by exposing issues, but helps in building longer-lasting trust because of correction afterward.

This research is an assessment scheme on how to measure the plausibility of CSR communication, not a rating of Asian multinationals performance. It has such weaknesses as biased documentation and the lack of any independent gathering of accounts of the stakeholders of the corporate illustrations. The evidence is consistent with a practical way in those boundaries: claims by corporations must be testable, participation by corporations must be consequential, and remedies by corporations must be available. In its turn, reputation is the result that should be explored in terms of relationships and behavior as opposed to being a premise associated with the release of a sustainability report.

References

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

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

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

Chapple, W., & Moon, J. (2005). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A seven-country study of CSR web site reporting. *Business & Society, 44*(4), 415–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650305281658

Crane, A., & Glozer, S. (2016). Researching corporate social responsibility communication: Themes, opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Management Studies, 53*(7), 1223–1252. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12196

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review, 54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Dhanesh, G. S. (2014). CSR as organization–employee relationship management strategy: A case study of socially responsible information technology companies in India. *Management Communication Quarterly, 28*(1), 130–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318913517238

Dhanesh, G. S. (2015). Why corporate social responsibility? An analysis of drivers of CSR in India. *Management Communication Quarterly, 29*(1), 114–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914545496

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 65–91. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9503271992

Dong, C., Song, B., Cheng, Y., & Zheng, Q. (2024). Tracking CSR communication research within the Chinese context: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Business Communication, 61*(2), 385–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884231156508

Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 12*(1), 8–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00276.x

Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(2), 233–258. https://doi.org/10.2307/256324

Gillespie, N., & Dietz, G. (2009). Trust repair after an organization-level failure. *Academy of Management Review, 34*(1), 127–145. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.35713319

Hindustan Unilever Limited. (2024). *Business responsibility and sustainability report: FY 2023–24*. https://hul-performance-highlights.hul.co.in/performance-highlights-fy-2023-2024/brsr/

Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 20*(1), 32–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12112

Kim, H., & Lee, T. H. (2018). Strategic CSR communication: A moderating role of transparency in trust building. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 12*(2), 107–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2018.1425692

Kim, S. (2019). The process model of corporate social responsibility (CSR) communication: CSR communication and its relationship with consumers' CSR knowledge, trust, and corporate reputation perception. *Journal of Business Ethics, 154*(4), 1143–1159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3433-6

Kim, S., & Ferguson, M. A. T. (2018). Dimensions of effective CSR communication based on public expectations. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 24*(6), 549–567. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2015.1118143

Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). "Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(2), 404–424. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.31193458

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & 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, 22*(4), 853–886. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9711022105

Morsing, M., & Schultz, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility communication: Stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 15*(4), 323–338. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2006.00460.x

Samsung Electronics. (2024, July 1). *Samsung Electronics releases 2024 sustainability report*. Samsung Newsroom. https://news.samsung.com/us/samsung-electronics-releases-2024-sustainability-report/

Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(2), 225–243. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838

Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 34*(2), 158–166. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070305284978

Skarmeas, D., & Leonidou, C. N. (2013). When consumers doubt, watch out! The role of CSR skepticism. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(10), 1831–1838. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.004

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Tang, L., & Li, H. (2009). Corporate social responsibility communication of Chinese and global corporations in China. *Public Relations Review, 35*(3), 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.016

Tian, Z., Wang, R., & Yang, W. (2011). Consumer responses to corporate social responsibility (CSR) in China. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*(2), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0716-6

Toyota Motor Corporation. (2024). *Sustainability data book*. https://global.toyota/pages/global_toyota/sustainability/report/sdb/sdb24_en.pdf

Wagner, T., Lutz, R. J., & Weitz, B. A. (2009). Corporate hypocrisy: Overcoming the threat of inconsistent corporate social responsibility perceptions. *Journal of Marketing, 73*(6), 77–91. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.6.77