

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a Bridge to the Sustainable Development Goals

Amb. Nnordee Bariagara King David, Ph.D¹ & Dr. Nwala Felix Ifeanyi²

¹Registrar General. Awedu Institute of Business Management and Leadership.

²Department of Business Management Management, University of Uyo.

*Corresponding Author: Amb. Nnordee Bariagara King David, Ph.D

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22067733>

Article History	Abstract
Original Research Article	
Received: 20-06-2026	
Accepted: 26-07-2026	
Published: 23-08-2026	
Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.	
Citation: Dr. Nnordee Bariagara King David, & Dr. Ndukauba Johnnie Emenike. (2026). Green entrepreneurship and the circular economy: A new framework for sustainable business development. UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 2(8), 239-248.	<i>Employee well-being has become an important concern within the South African healthcare sector, where demanding working conditions, workforce pressures, ethical challenges, and organisational constraints may adversely affect healthcare professionals. This study proposes to examine the relationship between ethical leadership, organisational culture, and employee well-being among healthcare professionals in selected public and private healthcare institutions in South Africa. Specifically, the study will determine whether ethical leadership is associated with employee well-being and whether organisational culture mediates this relationship. The study will adopt a quantitative research design. Data will be collected from 350 healthcare professionals using a structured self-administered questionnaire incorporating measures of ethical leadership, organisational culture, and employee well-being. A stratified random sampling strategy will be used to obtain representation across public and private healthcare institutions and selected geographical areas. Data will be analysed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques, including mediation analysis. The study is expected to contribute to the literature by providing context-specific evidence on the interaction between ethical leadership, organisational culture, and employee well-being within the South African healthcare environment. Practically, the findings may assist healthcare leaders, human resource practitioners, and policymakers in developing ethical leadership practices and supportive organisational cultures that promote employee well-being and contribute to more sustainable healthcare workplaces.</i> Keywords: Ethical Leadership, Organisational Culture, Employee Well-Being, Healthcare Professionals, South Africa, Healthcare Sector.

Introduction

The adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development marked a historic global commitment to eradicating poverty, protecting the planet, and ensuring prosperity for all. Yet, as the 2030 deadline approaches, the urgency of this agenda has never been more pronounced, largely due to a persistent and staggering financing gap that undermines progress across the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (Shulla & Leal-Filho, 2023). This financial shortfall is compounded by the cascading effects of climate change, geopolitical instability, and the lingering economic disruptions from global health crises, which have collectively slowed momentum. The ambitious nature of the SDGs requires unprecedented levels of investment,

innovation, and collective action, far exceeding the current capacities of public sector budgets and traditional aid mechanisms. Without a significant acceleration in resource mobilization and implementation, the transformative promise of the 2030 Agenda risks remaining an unfulfilled aspiration for billions of people worldwide. Compounding this financial challenge is the structural reality that governments and non-governmental organizations, despite their critical roles, simply cannot achieve the seventeen goals in isolation. Banerjee, Murphy, and Walsh (2020) highlight that the complexity and scale of the SDGs demand collaborative frameworks that extend beyond the public sector, requiring active participation from diverse non-state

actors to fill critical implementation voids. Furthermore, scholars have critiqued the traditional development paradigm, arguing that NGOs often operate within neoliberal constraints that limit their capacity to drive the systemic transformation necessary for genuine social justice (McCloskey, 2019). The public sector struggles with bureaucratic inertia and limited fiscal space, while civil society organizations frequently face resource dependencies that curtail their reach and influence. Consequently, there exists a profound implementation gap between the lofty global rhetoric of the SDGs and the on-the-ground realities of communities awaiting tangible change, a gap that the private sector is uniquely positioned to address. In this context, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) emerges as the strategic operational mechanism that translates the aspirational targets of the SDGs into concrete corporate actions, effectively bridging the divide between international policy frameworks and localized impact. Jain (2025) emphasizes that CSR provides a vital pathway for localizing sustainable development, enabling businesses to align their core operations with community-specific needs while contributing to broader national and global objectives. Moreover, strategic alignment with the SDGs requires corporations to navigate complex intellectual and practical challenges, yet it offers a robust framework for integrating sustainability into competitive business strategies (van Tulder, 2026). CSR moves beyond the notion of mere philanthropy to become a dynamic instrument for innovation, risk management, and value creation, converting corporate resources, expertise, and distribution networks into vehicles for developmental progress. By embedding the SDGs into their business models, companies can ensure that sustainability is not an add-on but a fundamental driver of how they operate, thereby transforming global commitments into measurable local outcomes. This article is structured to systematically explore the role of CSR as a bridge to the Sustainable Development Goals. Following this introduction, the second section deconstructs the SDGs as a practical framework for corporate action, while the third section traces the evolution of CSR from philanthropy to strategic value creation. The fourth section examines the strategic alignment of specific business operations with corresponding SDG targets, and the fifth section outlines practical mechanisms for implementation and impact measurement. Subsequently, the sixth section builds the business case for this alignment, the seventh section addresses the inherent challenges and pitfalls, and the eighth section concludes with a forward-looking perspective on the future of CSR-driven sustainability.

A Framework for Corporate Action

The 2030 Agenda's 5 Ps, People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnership, form the basis of the Sustainable

Development Goals. Rahm, Cookson, and Azcona (2025) note that this organising principle balances theoretical depth with practical governance considerations to explain sustainable development's interconnectedness. The "People" pillar promotes health, education, gender equality, and poverty and hunger eradication to ensure no one is left behind. Thoyyibah (2024) adds that the 5 Ps framework promotes multidisciplinary solutions to social issues by breaking down environmental, social, and economic silos. The "Planet" dimension addresses climate action, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable resource management, while "Prosperity" addresses economic growth, decent work, and innovation. While "Peace" emphasises justice, strong institutions, and conflict resolution, "Partnership" emphasises the collaborative spirit needed to mobilise resources and expertise across sectors. These five pillars provide corporations with a comprehensive map for determining where their contributions can have the greatest developmental impact.

SDGs as a business risk-management and opportunity map is a paradigm shift from sustainability as a philanthropic checklist. Sharma and Soederberg (2020) argue that global risk management frameworks have made sustainability a strategic necessity by putting the private sector at the center of systemic issues. This perspective helps corporations see the SDGs as internal drivers of resilience and long-term viability. Jones and colleagues (2025) argue that international businesses are shifting from reactive to deeply responsible and proactive strategies that anticipate societal expectations and regulatory changes. Companies can identify supply chain vulnerabilities, anticipate resource scarcity, and respond to consumer demand for sustainable products by integrating SDG-related risks and opportunities into core decision-making processes. This reframing turns the SDGs into a strategic guide for investment, product development, and market expansion, turning global challenges into competitive advantages. Businesses that adopt this proactive approach can better manage uncertainty and contribute to development.

The SDG Compass helps businesses identify which goals matter most to their industry and operations. Subramaniam and colleagues (2020) examine how companies, particularly those listed on the ASX150, utilize measurement and disclosure frameworks to prioritize SDG targets that align with their core business activities and stakeholder expectations. This prioritization process is essential because no single enterprise can address all seventeen goals equally; instead, strategic focus requires rigorous assessment of where the company's impact is greatest. Biloslavo and Edgar (2024) emphasize that integrating the SDGs into business models demands a systematic evaluation of materiality, wherein firms

determine the environmental, social, and governance issues that are most relevant to their value creation processes. For instance, manufacturing multinational enterprises typically find SDG 12, which addresses responsible consumption and production, to be highly material due to their significant resource utilization and waste generation (Dissanayaka & Bandara, 2025). Similarly, energy sector companies prioritize SDG 7, which focuses on affordable and clean energy, as their operations directly influence energy access, efficiency, and the transition to renewable sources.

The Evolution of CSR

The trajectory of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has evolved from peripheral charity to a central strategic function. Kandpal, Jaswal, Santibanez Gonzalez, and Agarwal (2024) trace three phases: philanthropy (discretionary giving disconnected from core operations), risk management (reactive policies to mitigate harm), and value creation (CSR embedded in the business model as a driver of innovation and competitive differentiation). This contemporary approach integrates ESG considerations into strategic decision-making, positioning corporations as active agents of positive change.

Central to this evolution is the "sweet spot" where corporate competencies intersect with societal needs—a principle articulated as Creating Shared Value. Schwartz (2024) critically examines this framework, arguing it requires normative extension to ensure ethical considerations and stakeholder rights are not compromised. The sweet spot is a powerful heuristic for aligning capabilities with social challenges, but Henriksen (2024) shows that finding it involves complex negotiations among stakeholders with competing interests and power asymmetries. For example, a food company might leverage supply chain expertise to address malnutrition while securing stable sourcing and brand loyalty. However, this alignment demands genuine commitment, transparent governance, and adaptive business practices.

Despite rhetorical appeal, traditional CSR approaches often fail as bridges to the SDGs unless strategically embedded in core business strategy. ElAlfy, Palaschuk, El-Bassiouny, Wilson, and Weber (2020) conducted a scoping review concluding that many initiatives remain superficial, fragmented, and insufficiently scaled. These conventional approaches treat CSR as an ancillary function, funded through discretionary budgets vulnerable to economic shifts. Sarkar and Singh (2019) advocate for a scorecard approach, urging companies to systematically map activities to specific SDG targets and measure contributions with the same rigor as financial performance. This strategic integration requires that sustainability inform product design, supply chain management, talent development, and

capital allocation, rather than being relegated to annual reports with limited influence on behavior.

ElAlfy (2020) further contends that redefining strategic CSR in the SDGs era demands a fundamental reconceptualization of the firm's purpose, moving beyond shareholder primacy toward a stakeholder-inclusive model that recognizes interdependence between business success and societal well-being. Without such embeddedness, CSR initiatives risk becoming performative gestures that generate positive publicity but fail to deliver meaningful progress toward the 2030 Agenda. Ultimately, the maturation of CSR depends on whether companies treat sustainability as a genuine driver of strategic choices rather than a supplementary activity, ensuring that their efforts are evidence-based, outcome-oriented, and collaboratively designed with stakeholders. This transition reflects a broader recognition that corporate prosperity and societal health are inextricably linked, and that durable business success in the 21st century requires active contribution to the systemic transformations that the SDGs demand.

Strategic Alignment: Mapping Business Operations to Specific SDGs

One of the biggest areas where corporate operations and sustainable development intersect is the supply chain, especially in light of SDG 8's promotion of decent work and economic growth and SDG 12's responsible consumption and production. Karim, Roshid, and Waaje (2024) combine circular economy ideas with supply chain sustainability to argue that enterprises must abandon linear take-make-dispose models and adopt closed-loop systems that reduce waste and maximize resource efficiency. This transformation extends sustainability commitments beyond the firm's borders by ethically obtaining raw materials from suppliers who respect labor rights, environmental standards, and community well-being. A comprehensive analysis of green supply chain management research trends by Raman and colleagues (2023) found a growing alignment between academic inquiry and SDG operational demands, particularly in carbon footprint reduction, waste minimization, and reverse logistics. Companies can reduce their environmental impact and increase resilience to resource price volatility and regulatory pressures by redesigning supply chains to prioritize circularity. Transparent supply chain practises allow consumers and investors to verify sustainability claims, fostering trust and accountability in an era of increased corporate environmental and social scrutiny.

The workforce is another important domain for strategic SDG alignment, especially for SDG 5 on gender equality, SDG 8 on decent work, and SDG 10 on inequality reduction. Reichel and Claes (2025) argue that organizations must move beyond tokenistic diversity

initiatives to systemic changes that address structural barriers to women's participation, advancement, and leadership across all levels of employment. This comprehensive approach includes pay equity, flexible working arrangements, strong anti-discrimination policies, and targeted mentorship programs to create inclusive workplaces. Song and Bayou (2026) examine how income levels, inflation, and economic policy uncertainty affect women's employment patterns in G7 countries, highlighting the complex relationship between economic conditions and gender equality. Beyond gender, meaningful alignment with SDG 8 and SDG 10 demands that companies commit to living wages, safe working conditions, and respect for collective bargaining rights, ensuring that economic growth translates into tangible improvements in workers' quality of life. Organizations that prioritize workforce sustainability not only contribute to social progress but also benefit from enhanced employee engagement, reduced turnover, and improved productivity, creating a virtuous cycle that reinforces both business performance and developmental outcomes.

Environmental sustainability remains perhaps the most visible and urgent dimension of SDG alignment, encompassing SDG 6 on clean water and sanitation, SDG 7 on affordable and clean energy, SDG 13 on climate action, SDG 14 on life below water, and SDG 15 on life on land. Singh and colleagues (2026) articulate the concept and significance of carbon neutrality within the broader context of environmental sustainability, emphasizing that achieving net-zero emissions requires comprehensive strategies spanning energy efficiency, renewable energy adoption, and carbon offsetting mechanisms. Schapper, Hoffmann, and Lee (2022) examine procedural rights for nature as a pathway to sustainable decarbonisation, arguing that legal and governance frameworks must evolve to recognize the intrinsic value of ecosystems and their role in climate regulation. This perspective encourages businesses to adopt stewardship models that protect biodiversity and ecosystem services while reducing emissions. Bhatt (2023) shows that integrated biodiversity conservation and greenhouse gas mitigation improve climate stability and ecological integrity by linking green energy deployment and forest cover maintenance to global SDGs. Companies operating in resource-intensive sectors must therefore adopt comprehensive environmental management systems that address water stewardship, waste reduction, habitat protection, and pollution prevention, recognizing that ecological degradation poses direct risks to their operational continuity and social license to operate.

Innovation, particularly through SDG 9, which promotes industry, innovation, and infrastructure, serves as the engine that drives sustainable product development and

green technology deployment, especially in emerging markets where developmental needs are most acute. Islam (2023) explores newly developed green technology innovations in business, demonstrating that sustainability-oriented innovation not only addresses environmental challenges but also unlocks new market opportunities and enhances competitive positioning in increasingly eco-conscious economies. Guo and colleagues (2020) develop a classification framework for green technologies, distinguishing among various categories of sustainable innovations to guide investment decisions and policy interventions that accelerate the transition toward a low-carbon economy. This classification enables businesses to identify which technological pathways align most closely with their strategic objectives and operational capabilities, facilitating targeted research and development investments. Borah and colleagues (2023) further examine the determinants of new product success, finding that green market orientation, green innovation capability, green knowledge acquisition, and green brand positioning collectively contribute to the commercial viability of sustainable products. For emerging markets, these innovations are particularly transformative, as leapfrogging technologies enable developing countries to bypass carbon-intensive development pathways and adopt cleaner, more efficient solutions from the outset.

Practical Mechanisms for Bridging the Gap

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) metrics into corporate strategy is a key mechanism for translating Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) ambitions into measurable action. Vijaya and colleagues (2025) propose an ontology-based framework that aligns ESG factors with SDG indicators, enabling organizations to move from fragmented efforts toward coherent strategies. This approach helps identify material issues, facilitating targeted progress toward the 2030 Agenda. Similarly, Finatto et al. (2024) highlight how universities can act as living laboratories for sustainability, preparing future leaders to navigate the intersection of business and societal well-being. The convergence of ESG and SDG frameworks offers a common language and metrics for investors, regulators, and civil society to assess corporate contributions consistently. Embedding ESG into capital allocation, risk management, and executive pay ensures sustainability drives strategic decisions, enhancing transparency and accountability.

A critical shift in corporate practice is moving from activity metrics (inputs like spending) to outcome metrics (actual changes in social and environmental conditions). Outcome metrics—such as emissions reduced or lives improved—provide tangible evidence of impact, though they require robust monitoring to establish causal links. Frameworks

like the Impact Management Project and Social Return on Investment help standardize this approach, encouraging continuous improvement and evidence-based strategies that justify resource allocation.

Multi-stakeholder partnerships, recognized under SDG 17, are essential for scaling impact and achieving systemic transformation. Eweje et al. (2021) find that such collaborations enable resource pooling and knowledge sharing, leveraging complementary strengths from businesses, governments, and civil society. Stott (2022) emphasizes the importance of power dynamics, governance, and mutual accountability for partnership success. Hai (2023) notes that NGOs often act as critical intermediaries, grounding partnerships in local needs. Well-designed partnerships enable companies to achieve scale and legitimacy while building collaborative capacity to address interconnected challenges in an interdependent world.

Why the Bridge is Worth Building

Risk mitigation drives corporate SDG engagement because enterprises need proactive sustainability plans to future-proof against legislative changes, resource constraints, and changing public expectations. Ranchordás (2019) claims that anticipating regulatory change allows firms to adjust proactively, decreasing compliance costs and competitive disadvantages from rapid policy changes. As governments worldwide set carbon price systems, emissions laws, and transparency requirements that affect corporate operations and financial performance, this forward-looking strategy is crucial. Holmes (2022) highlights that sustainable growth in the European capital markets union requires structural reforms that align financial flows with long-term environmental and social goals rather than short-term profit maximisation. Most firms face operational risks from water stress, raw material depletion, and biodiversity loss that threaten supply chain continuity and cost structures. In ocean sustainability, Mustafa, Estim, and Shapawi (2020) emphasise future-proofing because marine resource depletion threatens food security, livelihoods, and corporations that depend on fisheries and coastal ecosystems. To ensure long-term survival and strengthen operating systems, companies can link their strategy with SDG targets and anticipate and respond to emerging threats. Impact investing has raised investor demand for SDG-aligned portfolios since financial markets route funds to companies that contribute to sustainable development and offer competitive returns. Paetzold, Busch, Utz, and Kellers (2022) find that many private investors will trade financial success for social and environmental consequences, changing traditional investor preferences for profit maximisation. Growing awareness that sustainability issues pose systemic hazards to asset classes makes SDG-aligned

investing ethical and financially sensible over time. Eichler and Schwab (2025) examine impact investment behaviour in relation to the SDGs and find significant variation in how different investor groups prefer sustainability objectives over financial measures. Complex ESG grading systems, green bonds, and sustainability-linked loans have been developed to channel funds to companies with credible sustainability plans and transparent impact reporting to meet SDG-aligned investment needs. Kellers (2023) investigates sustainable finance dynamics and argues that mobilising capital for impact needs overcoming structural barriers like inadequate standardised measurements, insufficient investable projects, and misaligned financial intermediary incentive structures. As institutional, sovereign wealth, and retail investors increasingly consider sustainability criteria when allocating capital, companies that demonstrate genuine SDG alignment receive preferential access to capital at favourable terms, creating a powerful financial incentive to bridge CSR and sustainable development. As Generation Z and Millennials seek purpose-driven companies that share their social justice and environmental sustainability values, SDG involvement is also important for talent acquisition and retention. Studies reveal that millennials and Gen Z choose jobs based on meaningful employment, ethical corporate practices, and environmental commitment. Joseph (2026) discusses Gen Z, Millennials, Gen X, and Baby Boomers' expectations and motivators, concentrating on the youngest cohorts' growing attention on purpose and social effect, in his thorough literature assessment of generational workforce dynamics. A qualitative study by Pettersson Helbro and Petersson (2025) of Generation Z's early career talent management attitudes indicates that transparency, development opportunities, and personal-organizational alignment are more important than compensation and job stability. Hafid and Baltes (2023) find that Gen Z's job choice favours companies with genuine CSR and SDG commitments. In competitive global markets, companies that lack sustainability leadership risk losing younger workers' skills, inventiveness, and digital fluency. In contrast, authentically incorporating SDG commitments into business identity and workplace culture can inspire and motivate employees to innovate, produce, and succeed. Finally, in emerging economies with the "Base of the Pyramid"—a vast, underserved consumer base with tremendous growth potential—SDG-aligned CSR efforts open new markets and innovation prospects. Muthuri and Farhoud (2020) demonstrate how affordable, sustainable firms may profit and reduce poverty, enhance health, and safeguard the environment in African base-of-the-pyramid markets. In low-income markets with limited purchasing power, business model innovations that reduce costs, adapt to local conditions, and build trust thru community participation

and equitable distribution methods are essential. Dzimba and van der Poll (2022) analyse disruptive innovation at the base of the pyramid, noting infrastructure issues, regulatory uncertainty, and inadequate funding and distribution networks as market entrance and expansion constraints. Successfully negotiating these challenges can give companies first-mover advantages in quickly expanding economies and build brand loyalty among consumers who remember which companies supported their communities during important development. Resource constraints and affordability in base-of-the-pyramid countries stimulate innovation that competes in developed markets, creating reverse innovation opportunities that increase global competitiveness. The SDGs may be used as blueprints for market expansion and innovation to change sustainability from a cost center into a growth engine, proving that CSR and sustainable development are ethical and economic.

Pitfalls on the Bridge

CSR's SDG bridge is most threatened by greenwashing, as corporations claim sustainability without creating environmental or social progress. Kaur and Munjal (2026) present frameworks for finding, measuring, and conveying genuine environmental pledges that can withstand stakeholder scrutiny and regulatory monitoring to separate greenwashing from sustainability marketing. Deception wastes impression management and PR resources, hurting business sustainability claims, customer confidence, and successful action. According to Ragazou and colleagues (2025), misleading language, regulatory gaps, and poor enforcement make companies appear more sustainable than they are. Greenwashing, which gives a false sense of accomplishment and delays development, is especially dangerous to SDGs. When sustainability leaders look like shallow reporters, true action loses its competitive advantage, reducing enterprises' SDG alignment investments. Regulatory frameworks, transparency requirements, independent verification methods, and stakeholder education must be improved to help investors, consumers, and civil society distinguish between performative gestures and substantial reform. The trade-off conundrum occurs when firms must reconcile shareholder returns with stakeholder interests, especially when sustainability efforts involve short-term expenses that conflict with quarterly profit expectations. Bartlett and Bubb (2024) state that legal and institutional frameworks affect how firms prioritise stakeholder interests without violating shareholder fiduciary duties. Sustainable operations require large capital investments in hard-to-abate businesses, which may hurt short-term financial performance. Ikonnikova and Bonini (2026) demonstrate how low-carbon hydrogen uptake affects businesses' sustainability goals and competitiveness. Many view the

trade-off dilemma as a choice between profit and purpose, but sustainability investments reduce risk, improve operational efficiency, foster innovation, and strengthen stakeholder relationships, improving long-term financial performance. Shareholders want rapid returns, while environmental advocates want to address intergenerational issues, complicating governance. This tension can be resolved by using sophisticated communication tactics to educate investors about sustainability investments' long-term value creation potential and governance frameworks that reward patient capital and strategic thinking over short-termism. Data gaps and the difficulties of standardising impact measures across global supply chains make it harder for enterprises to evaluate, verify, and compare sustainability performance across varied operational settings and geographic locations, hindering SDG alignment Crenna, Marques, La Notte, and Sala (2020) examine biodiversity evaluation of value chains and show that even well-intentioned corporations struggle to estimate environmental consequences across complicated, multi-tiered supply networks. Performance measures and benchmarking against industry peers are difficult due to data availability, quality, and comparability differences across countries and industries. Stakeholder sustainability evaluations are complicated by selective reporting by firms, which accentuate positive statistics and hide bad ones due to lack of measuring standards. Due to global supply chain complexity, organisations rarely notice lower-tier suppliers' environmental and social behaviours, where the highest dangers exist. Digital monitoring, supplier capacity building, and industry collaboration can create universal measurement standards and reporting systems to close these data gaps. Without such investments, firms cannot manage what they cannot measure and stakeholders cannot reward what they cannot verify, weakening the CSR-SDG bridge. The "S" in ESG and the social SDGs attract less attention and investment than environmental goals due to measurement concerns and less immediate regulatory pressure, one of the most challenging challenges. From Brundtland to the SDGs, Hajian and Kashani (2021) argue that environmental sustainability has unambiguous measurements and scientific consensus, whereas social sustainability is conceptually diffuse and methodologically challenging to operationalise. SDG 5's gender equality needs considerable cultural, institutional, and behavioural changes that are challenging to evaluate. Lau and colleagues (2021) show that gender-blind views diminish climate policy and practise gender equality and sustainability intervention efficacy and equity. The activation of SDGs and regenerative sustainability in higher education is problematic, according to Sonetti, Brown, and Naboni (2019). Institutions have prioritised economic and environmental factors. Cultural norms, political dynamics,

and historical disparities vary by community and country, affecting social outcomes. Companies also struggle to claim direct credit or causal attribution since social progress sometimes demands systemic changes beyond individual corporate action. Methodological innovation, more investment in social data collecting and analysis, and participatory approaches that emphasise affected communities' viewpoints and experiences in defining and monitoring SDG social development are needed to address this difficulty.

Conclusion

Corporate Social Responsibility has gone from a side project to a key way businesses can support the Sustainable Development Goals. Instead of writing checks and issuing sustainability reports, businesses must embed SDG alignment into their core strategies, operations, and value propositions due to the 2030 Agenda's scale and complexity. Companies must realise that profit and purpose are increasingly intertwined in a world where stakeholders want accountability, transparency, and impact. Sustainability cannot be a publicity stunt for an unchanged business model. The 2030 Agenda's transformative change requires private sector engagement to close the SDG financing gap. Governments and NGOs cannot do it alone. In an age of climate urgency, social inequality, and changing expectations, companies that accept this responsibility become global development partners, while those that don't risk obsolescence.

CSR must become an organisational culture that permeates every decision, process, and relationship, not a departmental function. Sustainability affects hiring, supply chain management, product development, marketing, and capital allocation when it becomes a cultural attribute rather than a program, integrating SDG considerations into the enterprise's DNA rather than just reporting cycles. Top-level leadership, employee engagement across all functions, and governance structures that reward long-term sustainability over short-term financial metrics are needed to transform culture. In pursuit of ambitious goals, organisations must embrace transparency, humility, and continuous learning, realising that sustainable growth is iterative and mistakes and failures are inevitable. Successful companies will foster innovation, collaboration, and accountability, empowering employees at all levels to improve sustainability and challenge harmful practices.

CSR drives private sector action toward the SDGs' more just, prosperous, and sustainable world. These frameworks have been linked by decades of changing practice, expectations, and recognition of the interdependence of business success and social well-being. Yet this bridge requires continuous maintenance, vigilant oversight, and a collective willingness to walk it together across sectors,

borders, and generations. The challenges of greenwashing, measurement gaps, trade-off dilemmas, and social goal neglect demand ongoing attention, innovation, and collaboration to ensure that the bridge remains structurally sound and capable of bearing the weight of global ambitions. Ultimately, the success of the 2030 Agenda depends not on any single actor or intervention but on the cumulative efforts of countless businesses, governments, civil society organizations, and communities working in concert toward common objectives. This presents both a great responsibility and an incredible opportunity for corporations to redefine their role in society, showing that business can be a powerful force for good when guided by purpose, accountability, and a genuine commitment to leaving no one behind.

Recommendations

1. The Church should strengthen moral education, discipleship, and character formation programmes at all levels. Regular teachings on integrity, accountability, justice, responsible citizenship, and stewardship should be incorporated into sermons, Bible studies, youth programmes, and leadership training.
2. Church leaders should demonstrate transparency, integrity, and accountability in the management of Church resources and the exercise of authority. Appropriate internal accountability mechanisms, financial controls, leadership codes of conduct, and periodic reviews should be established to ensure that the Church models the standards of ethical leadership it advocates in society.
3. The Church should adopt a stronger prophetic voice against corruption, injustice, abuse of power, and other social vices. Rather than limiting its response to preaching and prayer, churches should engage constructively with public institutions, civil society, educational bodies, and communities to promote responsible governance, civic awareness, social justice, and protection of vulnerable groups.
4. Churches should deliberately prepare and support Christians who occupy or aspire to public leadership positions through ethical leadership formation, civic education, and mentoring. Such individuals should be encouraged to demonstrate integrity, accountability, fairness, and commitment to the common good.

References

1. Banerjee, A., Murphy, E., & Walsh, P. P. (2020). Perceptions of multistakeholder partnerships for

- the sustainable development goals: A case study of Irish non-state actors. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 8872.
2. Bartlett III, R. P., & Bubb, R. (2024). Corporate social responsibility through shareholder governance. *S. Cal. L. Rev.*, 97, 417.
 3. Bhatt, R. P. (2023). Achievement of SDGS globally in biodiversity conservation and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by using green energy and maintaining forest cover. *GSC Adv. Res. Rev*, 17(3), 1-21
 4. Biloslavo, R., & Edgar, D. (2024). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS IN BUSINESS MODELS. *The Routledge Handbook of Accounting for the Sustainable Development Goals*, 152.
 5. Borah, P. S., Dogbe, C. S. K., Pomegbe, W. W. K., Bamfo, B. A., & Hornuvo, L. K. (2023). Green market orientation, green innovation capability, green knowledge acquisition and green brand positioning as determinants of new product success. *European journal of innovation management*, 26(2), 364-385.)
 6. Cao, K., Liu, Y., Meng, G., & Sun, Q. (2020). An overview on edge computing research. *IEEE access*, 8, 85714-85728
 7. Dissanayaka, I. I. K., & Bandara, M. N. G. K. (2025). Strategic Integration of Sustainable Development Goals in Manufacturing Multinational Enterprises in Sweden.: A Qualitative Case study on Swedish Multinational Enterprises.
 8. Doyle, L. M., & Wang, M. Z. (2019). Overview of extracellular vesicles, their origin, composition, purpose, and methods for exosome isolation and analysis. *Cells*, 8(7), 727.
 9. Dzimba, E., & van der Poll, J. A. (2022). Disruptive innovation at the base-of-the-pyramid: Negotiating the missing links. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(4), 171.)
 10. Eichler, K. S., & Schwab, E. (2025). Do Investors Follow Their Values? Impact Investment Behavior and Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Accounting & Finance* (2158-3625), 25(3).
 11. ElAlfy, A. (2020). Redefining strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the sustainable development goals (SDGs) world.
 12. ElAlfy, A., Palaschuk, N., El-Bassiouny, D., Wilson, J., & Weber, O. (2020). Scoping the evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR) research in the sustainable development goals (SDGs) era. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 5544.
 13. Eweje, G., Sajjad, A., Nath, S. D., & Kobayashi, K. (2021). Multi-stakeholder partnerships: A catalyst to achieve sustainable development goals. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 39(2), 186-212.
 14. Finatto, C. P., Fuchs, P. G., Aguiar Dutra, A. R., & Guerra, J. B. S. D. A. (2024). Environmental, social, governance and sustainable development goals: promoting sustainability in universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 25(6), 1121-1136.)
 15. Guo, R., Lv, S., Liao, T., Xi, F., Zhang, J., Zuo, X., ... & Zhang, Y. (2020). Classifying green technologies for sustainable innovation and investment. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 153, 104580.
 16. H., & Munjal, G. (2026). Greenwashing versus genuine sustainability marketing: Identifying, measuring, and communicating authentic environmental commitments. In *Ethical marketing and consumer trust in digital and sustainable markets* (pp. 219-254). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
 17. Hafid, H., & Baltes, A. (2023). The Impact of Sustainability and Purpose on Gen Z's Choice of Employer.
 18. Hajian, M., & Kashani, S. J. (2021). Evolution of the concept of sustainability. From Brundtland Report to sustainable development goals. In *Sustainable resource management* (pp. 1-24). Elsevier.
 19. Holmes, I. (2022). *Future-Proofing the Eu Capital Markets Union: Driving Sustainable Growth*. E3g.
 20. Ikonnikova, S. A., & Bonini, T. (2026). Balancing environmental and financial performance in hard-to-abate industries: Pathways for low-carbon hydrogen adoption. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 26(6), 1411-1428.)
 21. Islam, M. T. (2023). Newly developed green technology innovations in business: paving the

way toward sustainability. *Technological Sustainability*, 2(3), 295-319.

22. Jain, M. S. (2025). ROLE OF CSR IN LOCALIZING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGS). *Localizing SDGs in Gram Panchayats: Pathway to Rural Development*, 79.
23. Jones, G. G., Lopes, T. D. S., Pananond, P., van Tulder, R., Sinkovics, N., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2025). Transitioning from responsible and reactive to deeply responsible and proactive international business. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 21(2), 196-225.
24. Joseph, E. R. (2026). Generational Workforce Dynamics: A Literature Review of Characteristics, Expectations, and Motivators Across Gen Z, Millennials, Gen X, and Boomers. *Managing Cultural Disruption in Business: Hybrid Work, Generational Shifts, and Inclusive Practice*, 163-200.
25. Kandpal, V., Jaswal, A., Santibanez Gonzalez, E. D., & Agarwal, N. (2024). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and ESG reporting: Redefining business in the twenty-first century. In *Sustainable energy transition: Circular economy and sustainable financing for environmental, social and governance (ESG) practices* (pp. 239-272). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
26. Karim, R., Roshid, M., & Waaje, A. (2024). Circular economy and supply chain sustainability. In *Strategic innovations for dynamic supply chains* (pp. 1-30). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
27. Lau, J. D., Kleiber, D., Lawless, S., & Cohen, P. J. (2021). Gender equality in climate policy and practice hindered by assumptions. *Nature climate change*, 11(3), 186-192.
28. McCloskey, S. (2019). The sustainable development goals, neoliberalism and NGOs: It's time to pursue a transformative path to social justice. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, (29).
29. Mustafa, S., Estim, A., & Shapawi, R. (2020). Future-proofing oceans for food security and poverty alleviation. In *Decent Work and Economic Growth* (pp. 462-472). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
30. Muthuri, J. N., & Farhoud, M. (2020). The Base of the Pyramid markets in Africa: Opportunities and challenges. *Base of the pyramid markets in Africa*, 1, 3-22.
31. Paetzold, F., Busch, T., Utz, S., & Kellers, A. (2022). Between impact and returns: Private investors and the sustainable development goals. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(7), 3182-3197.
32. Pettersson Helbro, S., & Petersson, T. (2025). Managing and Motivating the Incoming Workforce: A Qualitative Study of Generation Z's Views on Talent Management in the Early Career Stage.
33. Ragazou, K., Zopounidis, C., Galariotis, E., Sariannidis, N., & Zournatzidou, G. (2025). Greenwashing: The Misleading Strategies Underlying Environmental Claims. In *Transparency and Corporate Washing in the Age of Sustainability: An Operational Research Agenda to Evaluate Corporate Sustainability Disclosure* (pp. 1-35) Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland
34. Rahm, L., Cookson, T. P., & Azcona, G. (2025). People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, Partnerships (5 Ps). *This meticulously organized AZ guide arrives at a crucial moment in our global pursuit of sustainable development. It strikes an excellent balance between theoretical depth and practical application. What sets this book apart is its accessibility and clear focus on governance and implementation challenges, making it an invaluable resource for students, policymakers, and sustainability practitioners alike*, 113.
35. Raman, R., Sreenivasan, A., Ma, S., Patwardhan, A., & Nedungadi, P. (2023). Green supply chain management research trends and linkages to UN sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 15 (22), 15848.)
36. Ranchordás, S. (2019). Future-proofing legislation for the digital age. *Time, Law, and Change (Hart, 2020, Forthcoming)*, University of Groningen Faculty of Law Research Paper, (36).
37. Reichel, A., & Claes, M. T. (2025). "Gender equality"(SDG 5) and HRM. In *The Elgar Companion to Human Resource Management Beyond the Sustainable Development Goals* (pp. 60-72). Edward Elgar Publishing.
38. Royo, M. G., Diep, L., Mulligan, J., Mukanga, P., & Parikh, P. (2022). Linking the UN Sustainable

Development Goals and African Agenda 2063: Understanding overlaps and gaps between the global goals and continental priorities for Africa. *World Development Sustainability*, 1, 100010.

39. Sarkar, S., & Singh, P. (2019). Strategising CSR in addressing sustainable development goals using a scorecard approach. *World Review of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, 15(4), 313-329.
40. Schapper, A., Hoffmann, C., & Lee, P. (2022). Procedural rights for nature—a pathway to sustainable decarbonisation?. *Third World Quarterly*, 43(5), 1197-1216.
41. Schwartz, M. S. (2024). “Creating shared value”: Time for a normative extension?. *Business and society review*, 129(2), 185-209.
- Henriksen, S. E. (2024). Finding the “sweet spot”: The politics of alignment in cross-sector partnerships for refugees. *Business & Society*, 63(1), 145-184.)
42. Sharma, S., & Soederberg, S. (2020). Redesigning the business of development: the case of the World Economic Forum and global risk management. *Review of International Political Economy*, 27(4), 828-854.
43. Shulla, K., & Leal-Filho, W. (2023). Achieving the UN Agenda 2030: Overall actions for the successful implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals before and after the 2030 deadline. *European Union Parliament*, 64.
44. Singh, H., Shah, S., Giri, K., Pal, R., & Roy, T. (2026). Carbon neutrality and environmental sustainability: concept and significance. In *Forestry for a Carbon-Neutral and Sustainable Future: A Scientific Perspective* (pp. 1-25). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
45. Sonetti, G., Brown, M., & Naboni, E. (2019). About the triggering of UN sustainable development goals and regenerative sustainability in higher education. *Sustainability*, 11(1), 254.)
46. Song, Y., & Bayou, C. (2026). Toward SDG 5 and SDG 8: How Income, Inflation, and Economic Policy Uncertainty Shape Women's Employment Across G7 Countries. *Sustainable Development*.)
47. Stott, L. (2022). Partnership and transformation: The promise of multi-stakeholder collaboration in context.
48. Subramaniam, N., Mori Junior, R., Akbar, S., Ji, H., & Situ, H. (2020). SDG Measurement and Disclosure 2.0 A study of ASX150 companies.
49. Taylor & Francis. Hai, T. C. (2023). Collaboration with NGOs to achieve sustainable development goal 17.
50. Thoyyibah, M. (2024). Sustainable development disciplines for society: Breaking down the 5Ps—people, planet, prosperity, peace, and partnerships: edited by Shujiro Urata, Ken-Ichi Akao and Ayu Washizu, Singapore, Springer, 2023, XXVII+ 254 pp., £ 24.99 (hardcover), ISBN 9789811951459.
51. van Tulder, R. (2026). Mind the gaps! Navigating multiple intellectual challenges to boost strategic alignment with the SDGs. In *The Elgar Companion to International Business and the Sustainable Development Goals* (pp. 12-38). Edward Elgar Publishing.
52. Vijaya, A., Qadri, F. D., Angreani, L. S., & Wicaksono, H. (2025). ESGOnt: An ontology-based framework for Enhancing Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) assessments and aligning with Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). *Resources, Environment and Sustainability*, 100262.