

UDC 330.8:061.23

JEL Classification: B 25; D 62; M 14.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32317/2221-1055.202002093>

N.L. NOVIKOVA, doctor of economic sciences, professor
L.V. OVCHARENKO, candidate of economic sciences,
associate professor (docent)
T.S. OZHELEVSKAYA, candidate of economic sciences,
associate professor (docent)

Social responsibility of business: institutional approach

The purpose of the article is to evaluate the nature and implications of implementing social responsibility of business (SRB) in practice of manufacturing companies.

Research methods. In the process of research mainly were used method of institutional economics for interpretation of SRB essence and consequences of implementation of its concept in practical activity of market economy subjects, monographic method for analysis of scientific achievements of domestic and foreign scientists, empirical method for study of the impact of some of the world's leading companies in the Global CSR 100 ranking, abstract and logical methods for generalization and formulation of conclusions.

Research results. Using an institutional approach to the analysis of corporate social responsibility, in particular the existence of opportunistic behavior among companies-producers, political rent seeking both from manufacturing companies lobbying their interests in the legislature and from the bureaucracy charged with overseeing the activities of manufacturing companies, the negative externalities of the majority of companies' SRB practice, the absence of generally accepted international practice of defining corporate social responsibility, a rigid system of control and punishment for its non-compliance, the authors emphasize that the existing system of implementation of corporate social responsibility brings more harm to society than benefits. The authors substantiate the absence of the institute of social responsibility of business, propose their definition of the category "social responsibility of business" and highlight the problems of creating an effective institute of social responsibility of business.

Elements of scientific novelty. The imperfection of the existing SRB concept as well as the absence of the institute of "social responsibility of business" are proved. The very negative consequences of the implementation of the existing CRB concept in the practical activity of market economy entities for the world community are outlined. The author's vision of the essence of SRB is formulated on the basis of the institutional approach.

Practical significance. It is possible to use the proposed approach in the institutionalization of SRB. Refs.: 33.

Keywords: social responsibility of business; corporate social responsibility; institutional theory; political rent seeking; opportunistic behavior; methodological individualism.

Novikova Nataliia Leonidivna - doctor of economic sciences, professor, head of the department of public administration, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics (19, Kioto str., Kyiv)

E-mail: nazichka4021@gmail.com

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5219-9494>

Ovcharenko Lesya Valerianivna - candidate of economic sciences, associate professor (docent), associate professor (docent) of the department of financial law and fiscal administration, National Academy of Internal Affairs (1, Solomjanska Sq., Kyiv)

E-mail: ovch_lesya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9492-114X>

Ozhelevskaya Tatyana Stanislavivna - candidate of economic sciences, associate professor (docent), associate professor (docent) of the department of economics and competition policy, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics (19, Kioto str., Kyiv).

E-mail: ozhelevskaya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8985-5149>

Scientific problem. The environmental and social disasters that are increasing on our

planet require national and global producers to seek ways to maintain legitimacy within society and increase business resilience by adhering to the principles of social responsibility of business (SRB).

© N.L. Novikova, L.V. Ovcharenko,
T.S. Ozhelevskaya, 2020

Ukrainian scientists are confidently promoting the idea of introducing a global SRB trend into the economy without analyzing the negative practices of its implementation in the world. But in the world there is also an increase in public resistance among the active population of the world (for example, the website "Anti Corporate Social Responsibility"), and among scientists [6, 7, 12], who see threats from the implementation of the SRB in a state that it currently exists in. While Indian farmers shutting down Coca Cola bottling plants [6] because they had breached the conditions of its operating licence and medical science recognizes the harm of Coca Cola consumption for the human body [23], Coca Cola company continues to report annually on its corporate social responsibility. European integration vector of Ukrainian development and corresponding orientation of domestic business to European programs and standards, exacerbation of social and environmental problems that are constantly occurring in the country, creating social tension in society and environmental threat to the nation, increase the relevance of the SRB issue.

Increasing environmental and social crisis in the world against the backdrop of an increase in the number of companies who issue corporate social responsibility (CSR) reports and the rapid development of theoretical and practical experience in the world scientific community on the need for implementation and the positive effects of SRB are evidence of gaps in the chosen methodology for the study of SRB problems.

Economic theory already had the experience of world crises that could not be explained and predicted using the orthodox mainstream methodology of the modern economic science, and only after turning to the methodology of institutionalism, has found the answers to the vast majority of questions, for which many institutionalists were noted by the Nobel Prize for their research.

It is well known that when choosing the wrong input, one cannot count on the correctness of the final results of the study. Thus, the problem arises of identifying false approaches to theoretical development and implementation of SRB in the organization activities.

In our opinion, the above-mentioned problem of SRB implementation should be re-

searched from the perspective of the institutional approach.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. Until recently, the category "social responsibility" was in the subject plane of exclusively philosophical and ethical academic discourse, the content of which was non-legal responsibility to humanity, conscience, history, God. The idea of SRB in scientific thought began to spread from the 1950s.

Most foreign researchers of the XXI century consider SRB as the source of institutional pressure [15]. Their institutional analysis of SRB is based on the application of the institutional isomorphism proposed by American neo-institutionalists, which is as follows: to acquire the necessary legitimacy to operate successfully within society, organizations must respond to and/or reflect the values and expectations resulting from institutions by internally incorporating elements of the institution in such things as their products, policies, programs and language. In doing this, many organizations recreate already accepted practices and mimic socially legitimate ideas resulting in a decreasing heterogeneity of responses to the institution known as isomorphism... Isomorphism can be created by three types of pressures: coercive, mimetic and normative. Coercive isomorphism results from both formal and informal pressures on organizations to reflect the social and ecological expectations of the society of which they are a part and of the organizations on which they depend. Mimetic isomorphism results when organizations model themselves on other organizations due to uncertainties in their operating environment (i.e. the practices of competitors) [1]. Normative isomorphism results primarily from the conscious formation of social responsibility through education. While the three types of isomorphic pressures often intermingle, they may lead to different outcomes adoption of different approaches to CSR [15].

Unfortunately, in the SRB studies done by Ukrainian scientists isomorphism and its forms were mentioned in only one publication [32] and have not been properly developed in subsequent publications.

Institutional approach to analysis of SRB is quite widespread in the research of the international scientific community. For example, Sanket & Mishra uses institutional theory as a lens to explain CSR activities of organizations. They, in particular, focuses on three specific

areas in CSR: CSR as a substitute for institutional mechanisms, CSR focus of multinational corporations and CSR reporting [16]. Bondy explores the existence of an institution of CSR, providing conceptual and empirical evidence that this institution in fact exists, and that it can be identified through the practices that are associated with it [1]. Martínez et al. presented a review on the main contributions of authors and institutions in relation to the promotion of social responsibility, focusing on two complementary trends that have gained prominence as theoretical support: institutional theory and stakeholder approach [13].

In our opinion, research that criticize SRB deserve special attention. Levitt's article «The Dangers of Social Responsibility» was the beginning of social responsibility criticism. In particular, he emphasized that business attention to the development of schools, hospitals and social services is nothing more than a "new orthodoxy", a "new feudalism", a concept that leads to the destruction of capitalism. Scientist stressed that a business is more likely to survive if it abandons SRB, that is, if long-term profit maximization remains the only goal in theory and in practice [12]. The follower of this thought was the Nobel Prize winner Friedman M., who believed that SRB was to increase companies' profits under fair and open competition, without resorting to fraud. The search for funds for social needs should be addressed by society, government and the citizens themselves [7].

There is still no consensus among researchers on the link between SRB and financial performance. Some, having analyzed many researches in Malaysia, Australia, UK, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Nigerian, and Jordan, claim that regression analysis documents significant evidence to support a positive relationship between CSR performance and profitability [11]. Some scholars and practitioners argue, that due to the fact that the main objective of the organization is to generate profits for shareholders, the payoff for investment in CSR is still in doubt [26]. As Smith & Langford note, allocating attention and resources to CSR may not be as advantageous as investing in the improvement of core human resource practices, when the goal is to improve employee engagement [18]. Although the companies should take advantage of every opportunity to apply socially responsible practices, by behaving in an altruistic way, they can worsen the results

of their financial performance, and stock market mechanisms can react to this [26].

In recent years, SRB research has increasingly attracted the attention of Ukrainian scientists, especially those in microeconomic management. The works devoted to SRB development are written by Ukrainian scientist: Yu. O. Lupenko, P. T. Sabluk, A.M. Kolot, V.P. Zvonar, O.A. Hrishnova, T.O. Zinchuk, N.M. Sirenko, O.B. Mnykh, L.M. Matrosova, M. Saprykina, A. Zinchenko, L.M. Levkivska, T.V.Shvets, A.V. Burkovska, Ye.V. Levkivskiy and other.

Prominent agricultural scientists M. Y. Malik, V. A. Mamchur, O. H. Shpykuliak made a significant contribution to the implementation of CSR in Ukraine. They scientifically and analytically evaluate modern practices of ensuring of social responsibility of agrarian entrepreneurship subjects, in particular, large integrated agribusinesses in projection of valuation of their social responsibility level in society [31], Also, M.M. Ihnatenko, who researched theoretical basis for determining the entity, directions, forms and volumes of CSR agricultural and food enterprises is outlined [27], а також substantiate the selection and implementation of tools and means of enhancing the social responsibility of subjects of agribusiness environmental component, including on basis of prudent use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and development of manufacture of organic products related to food security in general [28].

Researchers of Ptoukha Institute for Demography and Social Studies of the NAS of Ukraine explored methodological background for the research of the social responsibility, its historical transformation, its genesis and the patterns of formation of its modern economic content. The role and functions of the institutes for social responsibility in the system of social relations, including the state and local level, are revealed [30]. But the Ukrainian researchers and the vast majority of foreign ones, in our opinion, do not take in consideration an invaluable discovery, which is a model of a person with opportunistic behavior, developed by O. Williamson, which involves the pursuit of the individual's interests, including fraudulently, meaning obvious forms of deception, such as lies, theft, fraud, but hardly limited to them [24]. Such important concepts of institutionalism as "seek-

ing political rent" and "externalities" remained outside the attention of researchers.

Analysis of recent researches and publications of foreign and Ukrainian scholars have proven that the methodology for investigating the problem of effective implementation of SRB in companies' activities requires a deep and comprehensive institutional approach, as it is the most applied school of economic theory, and whose researchers have been repeatedly recognized by the Nobel Prize.

Therefore, methodological individualism will be used to analyze SRB, a principle according to which society is regarded as the sum of individuals. Namely, the research will be based on the following institutional postulates:

1. The rationality of the individual in the institutional economic theory means that everyone - from the average citizen of the country to the president - is guided in their activities primarily by economic principle, that is, comparing marginal benefits and marginal costs.

2. A person in his actions always strives to maximize his gain and, in pursuit of his own interests, is ready to use deceit, violation of the law or norms of morality, that is, to use opportunistic behavior. In order to reduce the consequences of such behavior, a state apparatus of violence is needed, which should monitor the actions of individuals and, in the detection of harmful behavior, punish them.

3. Transactional costs of compliance monitor and penalties for violations are required to expose opportunistic behavior of members of society.

4. To expose the opportunistic behavior of members of society, transaction costs are required to compliance and punish them in the event of their violation.

5. The state is not an impersonal substance, but individuals in positions of legislative and executive power that may have personal interests that conflict with the public and behave opportunistically.

6. Political and economic methods are used to analyze political decision-making by which people use governmental institutions in their own interests (public choice theory).

7. Political rent is revenue that is the source of special government benefits, subsidies, and other privileges. Its main means of obtaining: lobbying firms with regulations and legislation, as well as corruption. The effort of a particular individual, firm or association of firms to obtain benefits through manipula-

tion of the economic and regulatory environment rather than their own economic activities; In this way, the desire for rent differs from the economic rent, which is connected with the fulfillment of rent of certain economic functions in the field of production (for example, land rent is impossible without conducting agrarian production). At present, the desire to rent is most often associated with state regulation of the economy and the use of state power by private players. Since the desire for rent is not related to economic activity, but only to redistribution, it can result in economic losses to society.

8. The evolutionary nature of the economy. The driving force of the economy along with material factors are spiritual, moral, legal and other elements in historical development.

9. The formation of the individual and even his needs are influenced by institutions - according to Douglas North's definition it's the "rules of the game" in society, the mechanisms that ensure their fulfillment, and the norms of behavior that structure repeated interactions between people.

The purpose of the article is to evaluate the nature and implications of implementing social responsibility of business (SRB) in practice of manufacturing companies.

Research results. The SRB concept development is associated with Bowen who defined CSR as a social obligation. SRB meaning is viewed from different sides as: obligation, volunteerism, altruism, managerial control, sustainable development, wealth creation balancing interests, ethical behavior, business strategy, orientation to values, moral standards, supply-demand ratio, morality, transparency, coordination of interests to ensure harmony, citizenship, private initiative, sense of community, capitalism transformation, environmental protection and social issues, and responsibilities in different aspects of performance [26], source of institutional pressure, strategy to avoid regulations and costly repercussion, such as fines, lawsuits, consumer boycotts and decrease in sales [15] etc. In a span of only 10 years the European Commission has changed the meaning of social responsibility from "Initiative": "Corporate social responsibility is essentially a concept whereby companies decide voluntarily to contribute to a better society and a cleaner environment" [4] to "Integrating processes": Implementing social responsibility, companies need processes integrating social,

environmental, ethical, human rights, into education, training and research and consumer issues into business operations [5]. Analyzing the importance of corporate social responsibility to the organization, often the aspects of marketing, competition, profit, influence on consumers' decisions are emphasized [26]. The lack of internationally accepted definition of CSB and CSR and the various interpretations of their meaning create conditions for the unjustified positioning of business entities as socially responsible, misleading stakeholders regarding their goodwill.

Institutional theory is an extremely useful lens for CSR research, as it is considered in its business context. Theories that are commonly used in this field, such as the theory of stakeholders or social contract theory, consider CSR largely isolated from the rest of the business and therefore tend to have one of the following two effects: 1. either it ignores or minimizes the very real imperatives and responsibilities associated with the dominant business institution - the traditional business model - which creates a strong tension for those who want to adopt a more responsible business model, or only 2. for the instrumental aspects (business case) that support a single imperative of fiduciary duty in the traditional business model. There is a clear need to use other theories to expand and enrich our understanding of CSR [1].

One cannot agree with the statement by Roszkowska-Menkes and Aluchna: "... despite the underlying assumption of the voluntariness of CSR on the operational level it is well developed both with respect to institutional guidelines and requirements as well as corporate practice. This institutionalization is understood as norms and guidelines for different policies and procedures such as assuring respect for human rights, anti-corruption, antidiscrimination, product and work safety, environmental protection. Additionally, institutionalization is provided by internationally recognized standards for reporting (GRI, IIRC)" [15]. Institutionalization of CSR is possible only when there are clearly defined rules (regulations) and rigid mechanisms for monitoring their implementation. These authors contradict themselves by continuing their research stating that "... a number of shortcomings, such as lack of universally accepted definition, principles and scope and abuses related mostly to companies' hypocrisy accompanying CSR activities..." [15].

With this thesis, they argue for unformed state of CSR as an institution.

Orientation selectivity often noticeable in companies' CSR practice (e.g., only to the environment protection, only to philanthropy, etc.) shows lack of valuable CSR maturity [26]. But this has extremely negative consequences for society. Spending a million dollars, for example, on charity, the company positions itself as socially responsible and creates products whose production is detrimental to society (whether through environmental pollution, or harm as a result of its product consumption, etc.). As a result, while society spends billions of dollars on the treatment or / and purification of the polluted environment, the so-called "companies' CSR practice" get billions in revenue.

This is evidenced by the consequences of the activities of the most famous "companies' CSR practice". For example, at a time when Google was penalized (not for the first time) by EU Commission on record \$ 5,06 billion for an abuse of a dominant position [22], the same year Reputation Institute has released its annual Global CSR RepTrak®100, which highlights the companies that have the best reputations for CSR... Google tops the ranking for the second year in a row, with a significant lead over all other companies in the ranking [21]. It is also well known that one of the leaders in this rating Microsoft got caught in a series of Sexism and Harassment scandals [25].

Another striking example. Monsanto company, which was rated by Corporate Responsibility Magazine (CR Magazine) number 25 in 2018 among the most socially responsible American companies [14] and which Ukrainian scientist Koval L.P. in his publication takes as the model of a highly socially responsible company that plans to allocate about 400 thousand UAH for social projects in 2019 [29], loses the courts to ordinary American citizens who prove that its products caused cancer [2]. However, despite the fact that the EU Commission in December drew criticism for renewing the license for glyphosate, Germany and France have meanwhile taken steps to phase out use of the weedkiller [2], aggressive lobbying behavior led Monsanto to the decisions it needed - extension of glyphosate licence by 5 years by EU Commission sparking mass protests across the continent [3]. Sadly, Bayer company with CSR, which in 2018 absorbed the world's largest

producer of GMO products Monsanto, not only did not destroy socially irresponsible behavior of Monsanto, but itself began to show signs of such behavior. For example, Bayer said it would not introduce genetically modified crops in Europe after its gigantic takeover of US seed and pesticide producer Monsanto [10], thus positioning itself as a socially responsible company only within the European territory. In 2019 p., despite the promise made to European countries, French, German farmers found genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in seeds sold by the Bayer company [19].

Corporations like Monsanto have limitless resources to buy political power through lobbying. Not only are they represented by numerous lobbying associations at every level from local to global, they also have an army of hired-gun lobbyists, fund scientists to act as their mouthpiece, and participate in 'green-washing' projects. EU institutions and the US government often actively solicit corporations to lobby them, giving corporations privileged access to decision-making. This perverse symbiosis allows corporations to capture decision-making, but leads to hollowed out democracy, environmental disaster, and grave social injustice. There are roughly three fields of industry lobbying: directly targeting decision-makers; PR and propaganda; and undermining science. Broadly three types of actors exist: those giving the orders, those following them, and those who are accomplices to these attempts [9]. CSR is based on the values that focus on the need for changes in the current business model to reflect broader social issues that protect the future of the planet [1].

We cannot agree on a clear statement by Tkachenko & Seliverstova, that "... SRB is a necessity both for owners of enterprises and for workers, consumers of goods and services, business partners, state institutions and society as a whole. The combination of the interests of all these parties reflects the need for CSR, which is aimed at achieving social harmony... Introducing CSR strategies at the enterprises provides them with specific benefits, in particular, improvement of management through risk prevention; improvement of reputation management; increase in sales volumes and market share; motivation of employees; optimization of operational processes and cost reduction; loyalty of investors; improvement of financial performance indicators; establishing relations with the public

sector and society, etc." [20]. If it were all so clear, there would be no problems with the implementation of CRB and the negative consequences of the activities of the so-called "socially responsible" organizations.

The use of an institutional approach to content, the practice of applying SRB to manufacturing companies and its negative effects, suggests that the lack of internationally accepted definition of SRB and CSR and the various interpretations of their meaning create conditions for the unjustified positioning of business entities as socially responsible, misleading stakeholders regarding their goodwill.

Thus, we support the opinion of Friedman [7] about the negative aspects of CRB, who argued that if managers spend corporate funds on projects that do not aim to maximize profits, then the effectiveness of the market mechanism will be undermined and resources will be inefficiently distributed in the economy. In his work «Capitalism and Freedom» [8] Friedman calls CRB idea a disruptive doctrine in a free society, emphasizing that CRB comes down to a single thing, namely the use of available resources and the pursuit of activities aimed at increasing their profits in an open and free competition environment without fraud.

Friedman's idea is supported by Ukrainian scientists MI Malik, VA Mamchur and OG Shpikulyak, who believe that "... it is the level of profit that determines the level of social responsibility" of the enterprise [32, p. 11].

If we approach this problem from the standpoint of neo-institutionalism, then we must compare the costs for society to eliminate the negative externalities of the company and the benefits that society receives from the production of this product, taking into account the charitable costs of the company. If we approach business analysis from this point of view, in our opinion, most companies would be eliminated from the list of companies' with CSR practice.

But it should be noted here that the neo-institutional theory of social choice warns: representatives of government bodies charged with analyzing public expenditures and benefits belong to a bureaucracy that is always aimed at getting a "political rent" by colluding with companies and receiving bribes and providing inaccurate results from analyzing the impact of companies.

As a rule, "organizations merely reflect the expectations of society with no interest in changing the operations practices of the organization (called decoupled responses)" [1]. Scientists, who base their research on the orthodox methodology of economic theory, which relies on the model of "economic man" (*"homo economicus"*) are sure, that if they prove significant positive correlation between SRB and commercial benefits, then all organizations will knowingly, without any institutional pressure from the stake holders, begin to operate in accordance with the SRB principles. Therefore, the vast majority of SRB researchers attempt to prove this theorem. But institutional theory, based on the opportunistic behavior of individuals, evidences that companies have any incentive to conduct their business socially responsible. They will (and indeed do) look for ways to advertise themselves as socially responsible, but in reality, only imitate this activity. Therefore, in this case, the state should define a clear legal scope for SRB, as well as create strict control both by state bodies and by the media and non-profit organizations. Violations should be punished with the removal of the company from the list of companies with CSR practice.

We fully agree with the conclusions of Roszkowska-Menkes & Aluchna: Charitable CSR activities are not related to the core business strategy - they focus on "altruistic" giving back to the society or compensating negative impacts, but do not include any attempts to minimize those impacts. CSR is understood as a way in which the company redistributes value, rather than generates it... what has come to be called corporate social responsibility has become a key marketing and branding tool for most large and medium-sized companies. In this promotional mode CSR is used as a PR... CSR programs, rarely related to the core business strategy, are usually created by marketing or PR units, and are limited to cosmetic actions, the centerpiece of which are often glossy CSR reports. Still the main objective is to generate as much profit as possible no matter what impact it might have on society and environment. If the impact turns out to be negative, then managers decide to donate some portion of the profits for social causes, making sure that their generosity attracts appropriate media attention [15].

Social and environmental programs are also harnessed in order to reduce political costs,

such as taxes and fees and may also help company to obtain certain benefits from the government and justify their profits. While concentrating on shareholder value maximization, firm does the least that is required either by law or by social expectations and its CSR activities are limited to ad hoc programs aimed at keeping the civil pressure down and often accompanied by company's hypocrisy [15]. In our opinion, an organization whose activities are detrimental to human health cannot position itself as a socially responsible manufacturer, so we propose such a definition of SRB - an activity of organizations that does not have negative consequences for both the individual and society as a whole.

According to U.S. data, since the mid 80-ies of the last century, i.e. from the time of the peak of corporate philanthropy, the share of donations in income of affiliates decreased by nearly half. Now on philanthropy in the United States spent approximately 1.5% of the profits of the companies in the UK about 0.4%, and in Ukraine - about 11,0% [27, p. 82]. According to results of the research the majority of Ukrainian companies (83%) implement corporate social responsibility policy. Among the most widespread areas of CSR implementation there is also a policy for development and improvement of conditions for staff (76%) and assistance to ATO warriors and residents of the ATO zone (30%) [33, p. 47]. However, M.M. Ignatenko states, "... even at the leading domestic agricultural enterprises, its level does not reach international standards " [28, p. 58].

One problem that hinders the effective implementation of SRB not only in Ukraine but also in the world is the use of different approaches and analytical tools for evaluating SRB. Some elements of this toolkit are used solely at the enterprise level, while others pay attention to the positioning of business in society as a whole. There are also known approaches that set only directions for evaluating company performance. Creating a clear system of quantitative evaluation of measures for implementation of the principles of social responsibility and control over their compliance in all areas in their business structure will allow to unify information about its social orientation.

Thus, an analysis of the development of the theory and practice of SRB implementation in developed countries of the world has

shown the lack of development of this concept, which is used by dishonest players in the world market to enhance the image of their company. In Ukraine, there are no objective prerequisites for introducing social responsibility into domestic business. The state should take over the resolutions of social and environmental problems that arise or may arise as a result of Ukrainian business activities.

Conclusions. The analysis of the meaning and the negative consequences of the implementation of CRB in the practical activities of business organizations, allows to draw conclusions unpopular for the scientific, especially Ukrainian, community:

1. No CRB institution has been established at the national or world levels at this time, as there are no certain features of the CRB: a clear and unambiguous definition of the CRB, the obligation to execute and a system of penalties for non-compliance, leading to socially irresponsible actions by business entities, who position themselves as "socially responsible", causing irreparable harm to individual nations and to humanity as a whole. Institutionalism does not recognize the existence of a non-performing institution (this applies to both formal and informal institutions).

2. At present, the consciousness of mankind, its moral and spiritual values, especially those of business, are not ready at this historical stage of civilization for the introduction

of an informal CRB institution, so the creation of a formal CRB institution is, in our view, the only way to form an effective CRB system.

3. The idea of CRB, which was to stop the development of environmental and social crises, has become only a powerful marketing tool that has allowed billions of profits (at least a few million, for example, in social projects) to position the organization as "socially responsible". At the same time, its core activities continued to deepen the environmental and / or social global crises. Therefore, the existing CRB implementation system does more harm to society than benefits.

4. The state should not delegate the functions of meeting the social and environmental needs to the businesses, since they are not peculiar to it and contradict its main purpose - profit maximization.

5. Without prejudice to the need of implementation of CRB in the activities of business organizations, it is necessary to review the mechanisms for its practical implementation, especially regarding the legal definition of its meaning, mechanisms of rigid state control and an effective system of punishment for its non-compliance.

The authors see a further direction of their research in the deep analysis of the practice of isomorphism in CRB, as well as in the study of the peculiarities of the implementation of CRB in a highly corrupt economy.

Список бібліографічних посилань

1. *Bondy K.* Isomorphism in the Practice of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence of an Institution and its Decline. *University of Bath School of Management Working Paper Series*, 2009. № 10. P. 1-43. URL : <http://www.bath.ac.uk/management/research/pdf/2009-10.pdf>.
2. *Burger L.* Roundup cancer verdict sends Bayer shares sliding. *Reuters*. 2018. August 13. URL : <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-monsanto-cancer-lawsuit-bayer/bayer-shares-slide-after-monsantos-roundup-cancer-trial-idUSKBN1KY0M5>.
3. *Cox D.* The Roundup row: is the world's most popular weedkiller carcinogenic? *The Guardian*. 2019, 9 March. URL : <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/mar/09/spray-is-roundup-carcinogenic-monsanto-farmers-suing>.
4. European Commission Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility. 2001, 18 July. DOC/01/9. URL : http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_DOC-01-9_en.htm.
5. European Commission. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions a Renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility. 2011, 25 October. URL : <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ae5ada03-0dc3-48f8-9a32-0460e65ba7ed/language-en>.
6. *Fauset C.* What's wrong with corporate social responsibility? 2017. URL : <https://corporatereport.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/KCBreport.pdf>.

References

1. *Bondy, K.* (2009). Isomorphism in the Practice of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence of an Institution and its Decline. *University of Bath School of Management Working Paper Series*, 10, pp. 1-43. URL : <http://www.bath.ac.uk/management/research/pdf/2009-10.pdf>. [In English].
2. *Burger, L.* (2018). Roundup cancer verdict sends Bayer shares sliding. *Reuters*. August 13. URL : <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-monsanto-cancer-lawsuit-bayer/bayer-shares-slide-after-monsantos-roundup-cancer-trial-idUSKBN1KY0M5> [In English].
3. *Cox, D.* (2019). The Roundup row: is the world's most popular weedkiller carcinogenic? *The Guardian*, 9 March. URL : <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/mar/09/spray-is-roundup-carcinogenic-monsanto-farmers-suing> [In English].
4. European Commission Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility. 2001, 18 July. DOC/01/9. URL : http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_DOC-01-9_en.htm [In English].
5. European Commission. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions a Renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility. 2011, 25 October. URL : <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ae5ada03-0dc3-48f8-9a32-0460e65ba7ed/language-en> [In English].
6. *Fauset, C.* (2017). What's wrong with corporate social responsibility? URL : <https://corporatereport.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/KCBreport.pdf> [In English].

7. Friedman M. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, 1970. Sept. 13. URL : https://is.muni.cz/el/1456/podzim2016/MPH_AMA2/um/58872690/The_Social_Responsibility_of_Business_is_to_Increase_its_Profits.pdf.
8. Friedman M. Capitalism and Freedom. *The Best of the OLL*, 17. 1961. URL : http://lf-oll.s3.amazonaws.com/titles/2492/Friedman_CapitalismFreedom1961.pdf.
9. Holland N. & Sourice B. Monsanto lobbying: an attack on us, our planet and democracy. 2016. URL : https://corporateeurope.org/sites/default/files/attachments/m Monsanto_v09_web.pdf.
10. Jabri P. Bayer chief promises no Monsanto GM crops in Europe. *Business Recorder*. 2016, 10 October. URL : <https://www.brecorder.com/2016/10/10/322438/bayer-chief-promises-no-monsanto-gm-crops-in-europe/>.
11. Khudhair A.A., Khalid A.A., Norwani N.M., Aljajawy, T.M. The Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance of Iraqi Corporations: A Literature Review. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*, 2019. № 15/1. P. 28-33. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331035470_The_Relationship_between_Corporate_Social_Responsibility_and_Financial_Performance_of_Iraqi_Corporations_A_Literature_Review.
12. Levitt T. The Dangers of Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*. 1958. № 36. P. 41-50. URL : [https://www.scrip.org/\(S\(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffcz55\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1209105](https://www.scrip.org/(S(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffcz55))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1209105).
13. Martínez J. B., Fernández M. L., Fernández R. P. M. Corporate social responsibility: Evolution through institutional and stakeholder perspectives. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*. 2016. N 25. Pp 8-14. URL : <https://www.elsevier.es/en-revista-european-journal-management-business-economics-487-articulo-corporate-social-responsibility-evolution-through-S1019683815000591>.
14. 100 Best Corporate Citizens 2018 / 3BL Corporate Responsibility Magazine's. URL : https://www.3blassociation.com/files/exV4MF/CR_Summer%2018_100%20Best_revised.pdf.
15. Roszkowska-Menkes M., Aluchna M. Institutional isomorphism and corporate social responsibility: towards a conceptual model. *Journal of Positive Management*. 2017. N 8(2). P. 3-16. URL : <http://doi.org/10.12775/JPM.2017.007>.
16. Sanket, Sunand Dash & Mishra, Nidhi. Institutional theory as a driver of KCB: an integrative framework. *The Sankalpa: International Journal of Management Decisions*. 2017. N 31-2. P. 69-82. URL : <https://www.thesankalpa.org/pdf/Institutional%20theory.pdf>.
17. Schmeltz L. Consumer-oriented KCB communication: Focusing on ability or morality? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. 2012. N17(1). P. 29-49. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239781505_Consumer-oriented_KCB_communication_Focusing_on_ability_or_morality.
18. Smith V., Langford P. Responsible or redundant? Engaging the workforce through corporate social responsibility. *Australian Journal of Management*. 2011. N 36(3). P. 425-447. URL : <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0312896211415459>.
19. Sybille de La Hamaide. French, German farmers destroy crops after GMOs found in Bayer seeds. *Reuters*. 2019, 6 February. URL : <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-france-gmo-bayer/french-german-farmers-destroy-crops-after-gmos-found-in-bayer-seeds-idUKKCN1PV1RJ>.
20. Tkachenko N., Seliverstova L. Formation of corporate social responsibility. *Проблеми і перспективи економіки та управління*. 2018. № 3 (15). С. 49-54. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331735170_FORMATION_OF_CORPORATE_SOCIAL_RESPONSIBILITY.
21. 2018 Global KCB 100 RepTrak Webinar. URL : <https://www.reputationinstitute.com/research/2018-global-KCB-100-reprtrak-webinar>.
22. Warren T. Google fined a record \$5 billion by the EU for Android antitrust violations. *The Verge*. 2018, 18 July. URL : <https://www.theverge.com/2018/7/18/17580694/google-android-eu-fine-antitrust>.
23. Whiteman H. How Coca-Cola affects your body when you drink it. *Medical News Today*. 2015, 15 August. URL : <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/297600.php>.
7. Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 13. URL : https://is.muni.cz/el/1456/podzim2016/MPH_AMA2/um/58872690/The_Social_Responsibility_of_Business_is_to_Increase_its_Profits.pdf [In English].
8. Friedman, M. (1961). Capitalism and Freedom. *The Best of the OLL*, 226 p. URL : http://lf-oll.s3.amazonaws.com/titles/2492/Friedman_CapitalismFreedom1961.pdf.
9. Holland, N. & Sourice, B. (2016). Monsanto lobbying: an attack on us, our planet and democracy. URL : https://corporateeurope.org/sites/default/files/attachments/m Monsanto_v09_web.pdf [In English].
10. Jabri, P. (2016). Bayer chief promises no Monsanto GM crops in Europe. *Business Recorder*, 10 October. URL : <https://www.brecorder.com/2016/10/10/322438/bayer-chief-promises-no-monsanto-gm-crops-in-europe/> [In English].
11. Khudhair, A.A., Khalid, A.A., Norwani, N.M., Aljajawy, T.M. (2019). The Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance of Iraqi Corporations: A Literature Review. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*, 15/1, pp. 28-33. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331035470_The_Relationship_between_Corporate_Social_Responsibility_and_Financial_Performance_of_Iraqi_Corporations_A_Literature_Review [In English].
12. Levitt, T. (1958). The Dangers of Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 36, pp. 41-50. URL : [https://www.scrip.org/\(S\(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffcz55\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1209105](https://www.scrip.org/(S(vtj3fa45qm1ean45vvffcz55))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1209105). [In English].
13. Martínez, J. B., Fernández, M. L., Fernández, R. P. M. (2016) Corporate social responsibility: Evolution through institutional and stakeholder perspectives. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 25, pp. 8-14. URL : <https://www.elsevier.es/en-revista-european-journal-management-business-economics-487-articulo-corporate-social-responsibility-evolution-through-S1019683815000591> [In English].
14. 100 Best Corporate Citizens 2018 / 3BL Corporate Responsibility Magazine's. URL : https://www.3blassociation.com/files/exV4MF/CR_Summer%2018_100%20Best_revised.pdf.
15. Roszkowska-Menkes, M., Aluchna, M. (2017). Institutional isomorphism and corporate social responsibility: towards a conceptual model. *Journal of Positive Management*, 8(2), pp. 3-16. URL : <http://doi.org/10.12775/JPM.2017.007> [In English].
16. Sanket, Sunand Dash & Mishra, Nidhi. (2017). Institutional theory as a driver of KCB: an integrative framework. *The Sankalpa: International Journal of Management Decisions*, 31-2, pp. 69-82. URL : <https://www.thesankalpa.org/pdf/Institutional%20theory.pdf> [In English].
17. Schmeltz, L. (2012). Consumer-oriented KCB communication: Focusing on ability or morality? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 17(1), pp. 29-49. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239781505_Consumer-oriented_KCB_communication_Focusing_on_ability_or_morality [In English].
18. Smith V., Langford, P. (2011). Responsible or redundant? Engaging the workforce through corporate social responsibility. *Australian Journal of Management*, 36(3), pp. 425-447. URL : <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0312896211415459> [In English].
19. Sybille de La Hamaide (2019). French, German farmers destroy crops after GMOs found in Bayer seeds. *Reuters*, 6 February. URL : <https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-france-gmo-bayer/french-german-farmers-destroy-crops-after-gmos-found-in-bayer-seeds-idUKKCN1PV1RJ> [In English].
20. Tkachenko, N., Seliverstova, L. (2018). Formation of corporate social responsibility. *Проблеми і перспективи економіки та управління*, 3 (15), pp. 49-54. URL : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331735170_FORMATION_OF_CORPORATE_SOCIAL_RESPONSIBILITY [In English].
21. 2018 Global KCB 100 RepTrak Webinar. URL : <https://www.reputationinstitute.com/research/2018-global-KCB-100-reprtrak-webinar> [In English].
22. Warren, T. (2018). Google fined a record \$5 billion by the EU for Android antitrust violations. *The Verge*, 18 July. URL : <https://www.theverge.com/2018/7/18/17580694/google-android-eu-fine-antitrust> [In English].

24. Williamson O. E. Behavioral Assumptions. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. 1985. P. 44-52.

25. Wong J. C. Microsoft employees confront CEO over company's treatment of women. *The Guardian*. 2019, 4 April. URL : <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/microsoft>.

26. Žukauskas P., Vveinhardt J., Andriukaitienė R. Corporate Social Responsibility as the Organization's Commitment against Stakeholders. *IntechOpen*. 2018. P. 43-62. URL : <https://www.intechopen.com/books/management-culture-and-corporate-social-responsibility/corporate-social-responsibility-as-the-organization-s-commitment-against-stakeholders>.

27. Ізнатенко М. М. Теоретичні засади та практичні напрями формування корпоративної соціальної відповідальності аграрних і харчових підприємств. *Економіка АПК*. 2015. № 1. С. 78-83.

28. Ізнатенко М. М. Екологічні складники та інструменти здійснення соціальної відповідальності підприємствами агробізнесу. *Економіка АПК*. 2019. № 9. С. 52 -61.

29. Коваль Л. П., Мельник В. В. Соціальна відповідальність бізнесу в контексті кризових явищ у виробничій сфері. *Економіка і суспільство*. 2018. № 19. С. 417-421. URL : http://economyandsociety.in.ua/journal/19_ukr/63.pdf.

30. Людський розвиток в Україні: інституційне підґрунтя соціальної відповідальності: кол. моногр. / за ред. Е. М. Лібанової; відпов. за випуск О. В. Макарова, О. М. Хмелевська ; Ін-т демографії та соціальних досліджень імені М. В. Птухи НАН України. Київ, 2017. 368 с. URL : https://www.idss.org.ua/monografii/2017_lud_rozvytok_kolektyvna.pdf.

31. Малік М. Й., Мамчур В. А., Шпикуняк О. Г. Інституційне середовище та формування соціальної відповідальності аграрних підприємств. *Економіка АПК*. 2017. № 12. С. 5-13.

32. Пан Л. В. Середовище функціонування організації як основна категорія стратегічного управління. *Наукові записки Національного університету "Києво-Могилянська Академія". Економічні науки*. 2002. № 20. С. 37-45. URL : http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/9056/Pan_Seredovyshe_funktsionuvannya_orhanizatsiyi.pdf.

33. Розвиток КСВ в Україні: 2010-2018. Укладачі: Зінченко А., Саприкіна М. К.: Видавництво «Юстон», 2017. 52 с. URL : http://csr-ua.info/csr-ukraine/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CSR_2017_research-1.pdf.

23. Whiteman, H. (2015). How Coca-Cola affects your body when you drink it. *Medical News Today*, 15 August. URL : <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/297600.php> [In English].

24. Williamson, O. E. (1985). Behavioral Assumptions. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*, pp. 44-52 [In English].

25. Wong J. C. (2019). Microsoft employees confront CEO over company's treatment of women. *The Guardian*, 4 April. URL : <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/microsoft> [In English].

26. Žukauskas P., Vveinhardt J., Andriukaitienė R. (2018). Corporate Social Responsibility as the Organization's Commitment against Stakeholders. *IntechOpen*, pp. 43-62. URL : <https://www.intechopen.com/books/management-culture-and-corporate-social-responsibility/corporate-social-responsibility-as-the-organization-s-commitment-against-stakeholders> [In English].

27. Ізнатенко, М. М. (2015). Теоретичні засади та практичні напрями формування корпоративної соціальної відповідальності аграрних і харчових підприємств. *Економіка АПК*, 1, pp. 78-83 [In Ukrainian].

28. Ізнатенко, М.М. (2019). Екологічні складники та інструменти здійснення соціальної відповідальності підприємствами агробізнесу. *Економіка АПК*, 9, pp. 52 -61 [In Ukrainian].

29. Koval, L. P., Melnyk, V. V. (2018). Sotsialna vidpovidalnist biznesu v konteksti kryzovykh yavlyshch u vyrobnychii sferi. *Ekonomika i suspilstvo*, 19, pp. 417-421. URL : http://economyandsociety.in.ua/journal/19_ukr/63.pdf [In Ukrainian].

30. Liudskyi rozvytok v Ukraini: instytutsiine pidgruntia sotsialnoi vidpovidalnosti: kol. monohr. / za red. E. M. Libanovoї; vidpov. za vypusk O. V. Makarova, O. M. Khmelevska ; In-t demohrafii ta sotsialnykh doslidzhen imeni M. V. Ptukhy NAN Ukrainy. Kyiv, 2017. 368 s. URL : https://www.idss.org.ua/monografii/2017_lud_rozvytok_kolektyvna.pdf [In Ukrainian].

31. Malik, M. Y., Mamchur, V. A., Shpykuliak, O. H. (2017). Instytutsionalne seredovyshe ta formuvannya sotsialnoi vidpovidalnosti ahrarynykh pidpryemstv. *Ekonomika APK*, 12, pp. 5-13 [In Ukrainian].

32. Pan, L. V. (2002). Seredovyshe funktsionuvannya orhanizatsii yak osnovna katehoriia stratehichnoho upravlinnia. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Kyievo-Mohylianska Akademiia". Ekonomichni nauky*. 20, pp. 37-45. URL : http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/9056/Pan_Seredovyshe_funktsionuvannya_orhanizatsiyi.pdf [In Ukrainian].

33. Rozvytok KSV v Ukraini: 2010-2018. Ukladachi: Zinchenko A., Saprykina M. K.: Vydavnytstvo «Iuston», 2017. 52 p. URL : http://csr-ua.info/csr-ukraine/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CSR_2017_research-1.pdf [In Ukrainian].

Новікова Н.Л., Овчаренко Л.В., Ожелевська Т.С. Соціальна відповідальність бізнесу: інституціональний підхід

Мета статті - оцінити природу та наслідки впровадження соціальної відповідальності бізнесу (СВБ) у практичну діяльність суб'єктів господарювання.

Методика дослідження. У процесі дослідження використано основний метод інституціоналізму - методологічний індивідуалізм (тлумачення сутності СВБ та наслідків впровадження її концепції у практичну діяльність суб'єктів ринкової економіки), а також монографічний (аналіз наукових здобутків українських та закордонних учених), емпіричний (дослідження негативних наслідків діяльності деяких світових компаній, що займають провідні місця у рейтингу Global CSR 100), та абстрактно-логічний (узагальнення та формулювання висновків) методи.

Результати дослідження. Використовуючи інституціональний підхід до аналізу СВБ, зокрема наявність опортуністичної поведінки компаній-виробників, політичної ренти (як з боку компаній-виробників, лобіюючих свої інтереси у законодавчих органах, так і з боку бюрократії, якій доручено контроль за діяльністю компаній-виробників), негативних зовнішніх ефектів від діяльності більшості так званих "соціально відповідальних" корпорацій, відсутність загальноприйнятого в міжнародній практиці визначення СВБ, жорсткої системи контролю та покарання за її недотримання, наголошується, що наявна система впровадження СВБ приносить суспільству більше шкоди, аніж вигод.

Обґрунтовано відсутність інституту СВБ, запропоновано авторське визначення категорії "соціальна відповідальність бізнесу" та виокремлено проблеми створення ефективного інституту СВБ.

Елементи наукової новизни. Доведено недосконалість існуючої концепції СВБ, а також відсутність інституту "соціальна відповідальність бізнесу". Окреслені вкрай негативні наслідки для світової спільноти від впровадження існуючої концепції СВБ у практичну діяльність суб'єктів ринкової економіки. На основі інституціонального підходу сформульоване авторське бачення сутності цього інституту.

Практична значущість. Полягає у можливості використання запропонованого підходу при інституціоналізації СВБ. *Бібліогр.:* 33.

Ключові слова: соціальна відповідальність бізнесу; корпоративна соціальна відповідальність; інституціональна теорія; пошук політичної ренти; опортуністична поведінка; методологічний індивідуалізм.

Новікова Наталія Леонідівна - доктор економічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри публічного управління та адміністрування, Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет (м. Київ, вул. Кіото, 19)

E-mail: nazichka4021@gmail.com

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5219-9494>

Овчаренко Леся Валеріанівна - кандидат економічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри фінансового права та фіскального адміністрування, Національна академія внутрішніх справ (м. Київ, Солом'янська пл., 1)

E-mail: ovch_lesya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9492-114X>

Ожелевська Тетяна Станіславівна - кандидат економічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри економічної теорії та конкурентної політики, Київський національний торговельно-економічний університет (м. Київ, вул. Кіото, 19)

E-mail: ozhelevskaya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8985-5149>

Новикова Н.Л., Овчаренко Л.В., Ожелевская Т.С. Социальная ответственность бизнеса: институциональный подход

Цель статьи - оценить природу и последствия внедрения социальной ответственности бизнеса (СОБ) в практическую деятельность субъектов хозяйствования.

Методика исследования. В процессе исследования использованы основной метод институционализма - методологический индивидуализм (толкование сущности СОБ и последствий внедрения её концепции в практическую деятельность субъектов рыночной экономики), а также монографический (анализ научных достижений украинских и зарубежных ученых), эмпирический (исследование негативных последствий деятельности некоторых мировых компаний, занимающих ведущие места в рейтинге Global CSR 100) и абстрактно-логический (обобщение и формулировка выводов) методы.

Результаты исследования. Используя институциональный подход к анализу СОБ, в частности наличие опортунитического поведения компаний-производителей, политической ренты (как со стороны компаний-производителей, лоббирующих свои интересы в законодательных органах, так и со стороны бюрократии, которой поручен контроль за деятельностью компаний-производителей), негативных внешних эффектов от деятельности большинства так называемых "социально ответственных" корпораций, отсутствие общепринятого в международной практике определения СОБ, жесткой системы контроля и наказания за её несоблюдение, подчёркивается, что существующая система внедрения СОБ приносит обществу больше вреда, чем выгоды.

Обосновано отсутствие института СОБ, предложено авторское определение категории "социальная ответственность бизнеса" и выделяются проблемы создания эффективного института СОБ.

Элементы научной новизны. Доказано несовершенство существующей концепции СОБ, а также отсутствие института "социальная ответственность бизнеса". Очерчены крайне негативные последствия для мирового сообщества от внедрения существующей концепции СОБ в практическую деятельность субъектов рыночной экономики. На основе институционального подхода сформулировано авторское видение сущности этого института.

Практическая значимость. Состоит в возможности использования предложенного подхода при институционализации СОБ. Библиогр.: 33.

Ключевые слова: социальная ответственность бизнеса; корпоративная социальная ответственность; институциональная теория; поиск политической ренты; опортунитическое поведение; методологический индивидуализм.

Новикова Наталья Леонидовна - доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой публичного управления и администрирования, Киевский национальный торгово-экономический университет (г. Киев, ул. Кіото, 19)

E-mail: nazichka4021@gmail.com

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5219-9494>

Овчаренко Леся Валеріанівна - кандидат экономических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры финансового права и фискального администрирования, Национальная академия внутренних дел (г. Киев, Соломенская пл., 1)

E-mail: ovch_lesya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9492-114X>

Ожелевська Тетяна Станіславівна - кандидат экономических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры экономической теории и конкурентной политики, Киевский национальный торгово-экономический университет (г. Киев, ул. Кіото, 19)

E-mail: ozhelevskaya@ukr.net

ORCID iD <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8985-5149>

The article has been received 03.02.2020

Revision: 14.02.2020

Бібліографічний опис для цитування:

Novikova N. L. , Ovcharenko L. V., Ozhelevskaya T. S. Social responsibility of business: institutional approach. *Економіка АПК*. 2020. № 2. С. 93 – 103. <https://doi.org/10.32317/2221-1055.202002093>

Novikova, N. L. , Ovcharenko, L. V. & Ozhelevskaya, T. S. (2020). Social responsibility of business: institutional approach. *Економіка АПК*, 2, pp. 93 – 103. [In English]. <https://doi.org/10.32317/2221-1055.202002093>

* * *