

УДК 005.35:338.24

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.218.42-50>**Ivanisov Oleg**

PhD in Economic Sc.

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Іванісов О.В.

кандидат економічних наук

Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5757-824X>**Kasmin Denys**

PhD in Economic Sc.

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Касьмін Д.С.

кандидат економічних наук

Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3687-4688>

SECTORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTERPRISES

The article examines sectoral differences in corporate social responsibility of private, state-owned and municipal enterprises. The study aims to identify the factors shaping these differences and to develop a differentiated approach to CSR formation. The research applies analysis and synthesis, a systems approach, systematization and generalization, comparative analysis, and structural-logical analysis. The results identify common CSR components and sector-specific priorities related to ownership, objectives, stakeholders, social obligations, financing and public accountability. A differentiated approach is proposed that preserves common CSR principles while adapting priorities and implementation mechanisms to sectoral conditions. The practical value lies in supporting enterprises and public authorities in setting CSR priorities, improving implementation and assessing social outcomes.

Keywords: social responsibility, corporate social responsibility, sectoral specifics, private sector, public sector, municipal sector, stakeholders, differentiated approach, public accountability.

JEL Classification: M14, L32, H83.

СЕКТОРАЛЬНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНОСТІ ПІДПРИЄМСТВ

Стаття присвячена дослідженню секторальної специфіки соціальної відповідальності підприємств у сучасних умовах, коли вимоги до відповідального ведення господарської діяльності охоплюють не лише дотримання законодавства, а й ширше врахування суспільних інтересів. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена необхідністю врахування відмінностей між підприємствами приватного, державного та комунального секторів під час формування їх соціальних пріоритетів, оскільки уніфікований підхід не повною мірою відображає відмінності їх суспільного призначення, умов функціонування та характеру взаємодії зі стейкхолдерами. Метою статті є визначення та систематизація секторальних особливостей соціальної відповідальності підприємств і формування підходу до її диференціації відповідно до специфіки секторів.

Методичну основу дослідження становлять аналіз і синтез, системний підхід, систематизація та узагальнення, порівняльний метод і структурно-логічний аналіз. Їх поєднання забезпечило розгляд соціальної відповідальності як цілісної системи та дозволило зіставити особливості її формування у підприємств різних секторів за визначеними критеріями.

Результати дослідження полягають у систематизації основних складових соціальної відповідальності та визначенні чинників, які зумовлюють їх різну пріоритетність у приватному, державному та комунальному секторах. Запропоновано розглядати секторальну специфіку через взаємозв'язок форми власності, цілей діяльності, характеру соціальних зобов'язань, складу стейкхолдерів, джерел фінансування та рівня публічної підзвітності. Окреслено відмінності у змісті соціальної відповідальності: для приватного сектору визначальним є узгодження економічних інтересів із соціальними очікуваннями, для державного сектору посилюється суспільна та публічна

ISSN друкованої версії: 2224-6282

ISSN електронної версії: 2224-6290

© Іванісов О.В., Касьмін Д.С., 2026

складова, а для комунального сектору пріоритет набуває задоволення потреб територіальної громади. На цій основі сформовано диференційований підхід, що передбачає збереження спільних базових компонентів соціальної відповідальності та адаптацію її пріоритетів і механізмів реалізації до секторальних умов.

Практична цінність результатів полягає у можливості використання запропонованого підходу підприємствами та органами управління для визначення пріоритетних напрямів соціальної відповідальності, удосконалення механізмів її реалізації, оцінювання соціальних результатів і підвищення ефективності взаємодії з основними стейкхолдерами. Подальше застосування такого підходу може стати основою для розроблення критеріїв оцінювання соціальної відповідальності підприємств з урахуванням їх секторальної належності.

Ключові слова: соціальна відповідальність, корпоративна соціальна відповідальність, секторальна специфіка, приватний сектор, державний сектор, комунальний сектор, стейкхолдери, диференційований підхід, публічна підзвітність.

Problem Statement. Under current conditions, corporate social responsibility is becoming increasingly important as an integral component of enterprises' business activities and their interaction with society. Changes in the economic environment, growing attention to the social and environmental aspects of business activities, the increasing role of stakeholders, and the need to ensure sustainable development are expanding the scope of corporate social responsibility. It is no longer limited to voluntary social initiatives, charitable activities, or individual corporate projects but encompasses a set of responsible commitments to employees, consumers, local communities, the state, business partners, and other stakeholders. Thus, corporate social responsibility is gradually becoming an integral component of an enterprise's operations and its interaction with both the external and internal environment.

At the same time, the relevance of studying corporate social responsibility is reinforced by the need to consider the specific characteristics of enterprises operating in different sectors of the economy. A uniform approach to the development and implementation of corporate social responsibility cannot fully reflect the differences between private, state-owned, and municipal enterprises. Differences in ownership structures, business objectives, the nature of social commitments, the composition and priorities of stakeholders, sources of financing, accountability mechanisms, and societal expectations determine the distinct content and priorities of corporate social responsibility across different sectors.

The problem lies in the need to move from a unified understanding of corporate social responsibility toward a differentiated approach that takes into account the sector-specific characteristics of enterprises. This necessitates systematizing the common and specific components of corporate social responsibility in the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors, identifying the factors that shape these differences, and substantiating appropriate directions for its implementation.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. Contemporary research on corporate social responsibility develops along several interrelated directions. The stakeholder approach views corporate social responsibility as a system of interaction between an enterprise and its employees, consumers, owners, the state, communities, and other stakeholders. Dmytriiev S. D., Freeman R. E., Hörisch J., and Zárate-Rueda R., Bautista-Zárate J. S., Beltrán-Villamizar Y. I. substantiate the relationship between stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility,

emphasizing the need to take into account diverse societal interests in enterprise activities [11; 19]. Velte P. systematizes contemporary research on CSR and its key determinants, while Gillan S. L., Koch A., and Starks L. T. examine social responsibility in relation to corporate governance and the financial characteristics of enterprises [14; 18].

In Ukrainian research, corporate social responsibility is primarily examined in the context of sustainable development, corporate governance, and practical mechanisms for its implementation. Zvarych R., Homotiuk V., Rivilis I., and Deineka Yu. define social responsibility as an instrument of corporate management, whereas Reshmilova S. L., Hutsalo P., Poperechnyi M., and Bailo V. investigate its relationship with sustainable enterprise development [1-3; 6]. Another important area is the development of tools for assessing and disclosing information on social responsibility. Umantsiv H. and Poliovyk Ye. focus on sustainability reporting and non-financial reporting as instruments for ensuring transparency of socially responsible activities of enterprises [5; 9].

A separate research area comprises studies that link social responsibility to ownership structure and corporate governance characteristics. Ervits I. conducts a comparative analysis of CSR reporting by private and state-owned enterprises, demonstrating the presence of both common and distinctive characteristics of their social activities [13]. Zhang T., Gu L., and Wang J. J. examine the impact of state capital on the social responsibility of private enterprises, while Kim J. and Jo H. link CSR to the type of controlling owner and state participation [15; 20]. Liu T. and Sun Y. also establish a relationship between ownership structure and enterprises' investments in social responsibility [16].

The specifics of the public sector are addressed in the studies by Nicolo' G. and Andrades-Peña F. J., who examine ESG disclosure practices of state-owned enterprises, and by Oliinyk M. V., who links the social responsibility of state-owned enterprises to ensuring the country's economic security [4; 17]. For the private sector, the findings of Duan W., Khurshid A., Rauf A., and Călin A. C. are important, as they demonstrate the impact of government support on the social responsibility of private enterprises [12].

Thus, the contemporary academic literature has developed a substantial theoretical and methodological foundation in the field of corporate social responsibility. At the same time, most studies focus on individual determinants, such as stakeholders, sustainable development, corporate governance, reporting, or ownership structure. Sectoral

differences in corporate social responsibility based on a unified system of criteria remain insufficiently systematized. In particular, further research is needed into differences in the objectives, priority areas, stakeholder composition, nature of social commitments, and mechanisms for implementing corporate social responsibility in enterprises operating in the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors. This research problem determines the focus of the subsequent study.

Purpose of the Article. The purpose of the article is to identify and systematize the sectoral characteristics of corporate social responsibility of enterprises, particularly by identifying differences in its objectives, priority areas, stakeholder composition, nature of social commitments, and implementation mechanisms in the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors.

Research Methods. To achieve the purpose of the study, a combination of general scientific and specialized research methods was employed. The methods of analysis and synthesis were used to examine the essence of corporate social responsibility, identify its main components, and generalize contemporary scientific approaches to its interpretation. The systems approach was applied to consider corporate social responsibility as an integral characteristic of an enterprise's activities encompassing interconnected economic, social, environmental, and ethical aspects. The methods of systematization and generalization were used to identify the factors determining the sector-specific characteristics of corporate social responsibility, as well as to group its main areas and implementation mechanisms. The comparative method was applied to identify common and distinctive characteristics of corporate social responsibility in private, state-owned, and municipal enterprises according to unified criteria. The method of structural and logical analysis was used to establish the relationship between ownership structure, the social purpose of an enterprise, stakeholder composition, and corporate social responsibility priorities.

Presentation of the Main Research Results. Corporate social responsibility should be considered as a systemic characteristic of an enterprise's activities that reflects the voluntary and socially and institutionally driven consideration of the economic, social, environmental, and ethical interests of key stakeholders. This approach goes beyond the traditional understanding of business responsibility toward owners and employees and involves taking into account a broader range of stakeholders. Dmytriyev S. D., Freeman R. E., and Hörisch J. emphasize the close relationship between corporate social responsibility and the stakeholder approach, according to which an enterprise's activities should take into account the interests of various groups associated with its operations [11]. A systematic review by Zárate-Rueda R., Bautista-Zárate J. S., and Beltrán-Villamizar Y. I., as well as the study by Awa H. O., Etim W., and Ogbonda E., also confirms the central role of stakeholders in shaping the content of corporate social responsibility [10; 19].

Based on a generalization of contemporary approaches, corporate social responsibility can be presented as a set of interrelated components characterizing an enterprise's

responsibility toward its main stakeholder groups. These include employees, consumers, owners, the state, local communities, partners, and the environment. Such a structure makes it possible to move from a general interpretation of corporate social responsibility to its specification through the main areas of interaction between an enterprise and society.

Responsibility toward employees encompasses the provision of appropriate working conditions, decent remuneration, social guarantees, professional development, non-discrimination, safety, and opportunities for professional fulfillment. Employees are one of the key internal stakeholder groups; therefore, an enterprise's treatment of its workforce directly characterizes the level of its social orientation. Under current conditions, this component is becoming particularly important, as corporate social responsibility is increasingly integrated into the strategic management system of an enterprise [14].

Responsibility toward consumers involves ensuring the quality and safety of products and services, providing accurate information, respecting consumer rights, and pursuing responsible pricing. For an enterprise, this component is not only an ethical obligation but also an important element in building trust and long-term relationships with the market. Responsibility toward owners is associated with ensuring management transparency, efficient use of resources, adherence to corporate principles, and consideration of the long-term interests of owners. At the same time, corporate social responsibility is not opposed to the economic performance of an enterprise but is increasingly viewed as a component of its long-term sustainability [18].

Responsibility toward the state is primarily manifested in compliance with legislation, timely payment of taxes, fulfillment of regulatory requirements, transparency of activities, and participation in addressing socially significant issues. For state-owned enterprises, this component is of particular importance because their activities are associated not only with economic outcomes but also with the performance of public functions. Oliinyk M. V. links the social responsibility of state-owned enterprises, in particular, to ensuring economic security and performing socially significant tasks [4].

Responsibility toward the local community encompasses an enterprise's participation in the socio-economic development of the territory, support for local initiatives, job creation, implementation of social projects, and interaction with local stakeholders. Sazonova T. O. and Sharlai M. V. consider social projects at the enterprise level as one of the practical mechanisms for implementing corporate social responsibility [7]. For municipal enterprises, responsibility toward the community is of particular importance because their operations are directly related to meeting the needs of the population of the respective territory.

Responsibility toward partners involves compliance with contractual obligations, good faith in business relations, transparency, prevention of corrupt practices, and the development of long-term partnerships. At the same time, responsibility toward the environment encompasses the rational use of resources, reduction of negative

environmental impacts, implementation of environmentally friendly technologies, and consideration of environmental risks in managerial decision-making. In contemporary research, the environmental component is increasingly integrated with social and governance components within the ESG approach [14].

An important instrument for ensuring the systematic nature and transparency of corporate social responsibility is non-financial and sustainability reporting. Umantsiv H. considers sustainability reporting an important element of corporate social responsibility that facilitates communication between an enterprise and its stakeholders [9]. Poliovyk Ye. emphasizes the role of non-financial reporting in confirming the responsible nature of an enterprise's activities [5]. Thus, corporate social responsibility involves not only the implementation of relevant measures but also transparent communication with stakeholders regarding their results.

At the same time, the identified components do not have equal importance for enterprises operating in different sectors. Contemporary studies demonstrate that corporate social responsibility depends on ownership structure and the nature of corporate governance. Ervits I., based on a comparison of private and state-owned enterprises, identifies differences in corporate social responsibility practices and their disclosure [13]. Zhang T., Gu L., and Wang J. J. establish the influence of state capital on the social responsibility of private enterprises [20], while Kim J. and Jo H. relate its characteristics to the type of controlling owner [15]. Liu T. and Sun Y. also confirm the relationship between ownership structure and enterprises' investments in corporate social responsibility [16].

The identified components of corporate social responsibility acquire different content and priorities depending on the sector in which an enterprise operates. The corporate social responsibility of private, state-owned, and municipal enterprises cannot be identical because their activities are carried out under different institutional, economic, and managerial conditions. What is common to enterprises in all sectors is the consideration of the interests of employees, consumers, owners, the state, the community, partners, and the environment; however, the relative importance of these components and the mechanisms for their implementation differ substantially [10-11; 19].

First and foremost, sector-specific characteristics are determined by ownership structure. For a private enterprise, corporate social responsibility is largely shaped by the interests of owners, economic performance, and the expectations of key stakeholders. For a state-owned enterprise, greater importance is attached to performing socially significant functions and ensuring the efficient use of public resources. In the municipal sector, particular importance is given to responsibility toward the local community because the activities of such enterprises are directly related to meeting the needs of the population of the respective territory. Differences in the corporate social responsibility of private and state-owned enterprises are confirmed, in particular, by the comparative study conducted by Ervits I. [13].

Differences in the objectives of activities are equally

important. A private enterprise is primarily oriented toward creating economic value and generating profit, a state-owned enterprise combines economic objectives with the performance of public functions, while a municipal enterprise is largely focused on meeting the essential needs of the local community. Therefore, for example, responsibility toward owners may have greater priority in the private sector, whereas responsibility toward the state and the community becomes more significant in the state-owned and municipal sectors. Oliynyk M. V. relates the social responsibility of state-owned enterprises specifically to their public role and ensuring the country's economic security [4].

Significant differences are also determined by sources of financing. Private enterprises implement social initiatives mainly through their own resources and revenues generated in the course of their activities, whereas state-owned and municipal enterprises may use budgetary funds and other forms of public support. Accordingly, for the latter, corporate social responsibility is complemented by responsibility for the efficient and transparent use of public resources. The study by Duan W., Khurshid A., Rauf A., and Călin A. C. confirms the importance of government support for shaping socially responsible behavior among private enterprises [12].

The nature of social commitments also differs. In the private sector, a significant proportion of social initiatives may be implemented on a voluntary basis, including social projects, employee support, community initiatives, and charitable programs [7]. For state-owned and municipal enterprises, some social functions directly derive from their purpose and legally defined tasks. Therefore, the balance between mandatory and voluntary components of corporate social responsibility differs across sectors.

The composition of key stakeholders and the level of state regulation also differ. For a private enterprise, key stakeholders may include owners, employees, consumers, partners, and investors. For a state-owned enterprise, government authorities and society acquire greater importance, while for a municipal enterprise, the local community is the central stakeholder. At the same time, state-owned and municipal enterprises are characterized by a higher level of public accountability, which affects requirements for transparency and information disclosure. Accordingly, sustainability reporting and non-financial reporting are important not only as communication tools but also as mechanisms for enterprise accountability to stakeholders [5; 9].

In the private sector, these characteristics acquire a specific meaning because an enterprise operates under conditions of market competition and independently determines the priorities of its activities. Accordingly, the corporate social responsibility of a private enterprise is formed as a combination of the economic interests of owners and the need to take into account the expectations of employees, consumers, partners, the community, and other stakeholders. It can be viewed not only as a set of social initiatives but also as a component of enterprise management that affects its reputation, stakeholder trust, and long-term sustainability [3; 14].

An important characteristic of the private sector is that

a significant proportion of socially responsible activities are formed on a voluntary basis. Enterprises independently determine the areas of their social programs depending on their own resources, strategic priorities, and stakeholder expectations. Such areas may include employee development, ensuring appropriate working conditions, supporting social and charitable projects, participating in local community development, environmental protection, and responsible treatment of consumers [7]. At the same time, the voluntary nature of certain initiatives does not imply the absence of mandatory components of corporate social responsibility associated with compliance with labor, tax, environmental, and other legislation.

The specificity of the private sector is also manifested in the relationship between social and economic responsibility. Social measures require the use of enterprise resources, so their implementation should be consistent with the enterprise's financial capabilities and strategic objectives. At the same time, socially responsible behavior can generate economic effects through increased employee loyalty, consumer trust, enterprise reputation, and the sustainability of business partnerships. The relationship between social and economic outcomes is one of the areas of contemporary research on corporate social responsibility [14; 18].

Owners and ownership structure play an important role in shaping the social responsibility of private enterprises. Zhang T., Gu L., and Wang J. J. establish the influence of state capital on the social responsibility of private enterprises, indicating that social behavior depends not only on market incentives but also on the nature of ownership [20]. Kim J. and Jo H. also relate CSR characteristics to the type of controlling owner [15]. At the same time, Liu T. and Sun Y. demonstrate the importance of ownership structure for the scale of enterprises' investments in social responsibility [16]. Thus, even within the private sector, corporate social responsibility can differ substantially depending on ownership structure and the corporate governance system.

Another specific feature is the influence of the state on the socially responsible behavior of private businesses. Despite their private ownership, enterprises operate within a regulatory and institutional environment established by the state. Duan W., Khurshid A., Rauf A., and Călin A. C. demonstrate that government subsidies can influence the level of social responsibility of private enterprises [12]. This means that corporate social responsibility in the private sector is shaped not only by the internal motivation of an enterprise but also by external incentives and societal expectations.

Unlike the private sector, the social responsibility of state-owned and municipal enterprises is largely determined by the public significance of their activities. Such enterprises operate not only to achieve economic results but also to perform tasks related to meeting public needs. Therefore, corporate social responsibility in the state-owned and municipal sectors is more closely integrated into the functional purpose of an enterprise and is associated with the provision of public services, employment, access to essential goods and services, appropriate working conditions, and consideration of the interests of local

communities.

For state-owned enterprises, a decisive factor in corporate social responsibility is the combination of business activities with the performance of socially significant functions. A state-owned enterprise is influenced by the state as its owner, and its activities are associated with a broader range of public interests than those of a private enterprise. This necessitates consideration not only of the interests of employees, consumers, and partners but also of the interests of the state and society as a whole. Accordingly, the social responsibility of state-owned enterprises encompasses employment provision, compliance with labor and social guarantees, proper performance of socially important functions, responsible use of state property and resources, and transparency of activities [4; 13].

An important characteristic of the state-owned sector is a higher level of public accountability. Whereas in the private sector the main mechanisms for monitoring enterprise activities are owners and the market environment, state-owned enterprises are additionally accountable to the state and society. This increases the importance of management transparency, disclosure of information about enterprise activities, compliance with established procedures, and control over resource use. Studies of ESG disclosure practices by state-owned enterprises also demonstrate the importance of corporate governance in shaping responsible behavior among enterprises with state participation [17].

Another characteristic is that the social responsibility of state-owned enterprises may be less voluntary in nature compared with the private sector. Some social functions directly derive from the nature of the enterprise's activities, government decisions, regulatory requirements, and the need to meet public needs. Therefore, corporate social responsibility in this sector is formed as a combination of legally established obligations, the functional tasks of the enterprise, and voluntary social initiatives.

This specificity distinguishes state-owned enterprises from private businesses, where a significant proportion of additional social measures is determined by strategic decisions of owners and management.

Municipal enterprises have a similar public orientation, but their social responsibility is primarily formed at the level of the local community. Their activities are directly related to meeting the needs of the population of a specific territory, which gives the community a particular position among key stakeholders. Depending on their area of activity, municipal enterprises may provide housing and communal services, public amenities, transportation services, water supply, heat supply, waste management, and other socially significant services. Therefore, their social responsibility is directly related to the accessibility, quality, and continuity of the respective services.

The specificity of the municipal sector is also manifested in the close relationship between an enterprise and the local community.

Unlike a private enterprise, for which the community may be one of several external stakeholders, a municipal enterprise effectively performs functions directly aimed at meeting the needs of that community. Therefore, its social responsibility should include not only its treatment of

employees and consumers but also ensuring access to services for the population, taking into account the social needs of particular groups of citizens, maintaining local infrastructure in an appropriate condition, and participating in addressing socially significant problems within the territory.

At the same time, the social responsibility of municipal enterprises cannot be considered solely as the performance of a social function without taking economic results into account. An enterprise must ensure the rational use of financial and material resources, maintain an appropriate level of efficiency, and ensure the sustainability of its activities.

Therefore, as in the state-owned sector, the social responsibility of municipal enterprises is formed at the intersection of economic, social, and public interests. Of particular importance is the balance between the economic capacity of an enterprise and the accessibility of services for the population.

Thus, state-owned and municipal enterprises share a common feature that fundamentally distinguishes them from the private sector: their social responsibility is associated not only with the voluntary choice of an enterprise but also with its public purpose.

At the same time, there are significant differences between them. For state-owned enterprises, the dominant aspects are interaction with the state, performance of nationwide or strategically important functions, and public accountability. For municipal enterprises, the central importance lies in the needs of the local community, the accessibility and quality of local services, employment, and the development of local infrastructure.

The identified characteristics of corporate social responsibility make it possible to compare enterprises according to key criteria that characterize the differences between the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors (Table 1).

Table 1

Comparative Characteristics of Corporate Social Responsibility of Enterprises in Different Sectors

Criterion	Private sector	State-owned sector	Municipal sector
Main focus	Economic efficiency and competitiveness, taking into account stakeholder interests	Combination of economic activity with social and public functions	Meeting the needs of the local community
Main social priorities	Employees, consumers, partners, community, environment	Employees, society, consumers, state, environment	Community members, employees, local infrastructure, environment
Nature of obligations	Legal requirements and voluntary social initiatives	Legal requirements, public functions and social obligations	Legal requirements, functional responsibilities and community needs
Key stakeholders	Owners, employees, consumers, partners, community	State, employees, consumers, citizens, communities	Local community, consumers, employees, local self-government bodies
Implementation mechanisms	Social programmes, employee development, charity, non-financial reporting	Social guarantees, public reporting, social programmes, corporate governance	Provision of public services, local programmes, community engagement, social projects
Main emphasis	Combining economic interests and social expectations	Social significance and public accountability	Service accessibility and meeting community needs

Source: compiled by the authors based on [3-4; 7; 13-14; 17].

The comparison results presented in Table 1 indicate that the common basis of corporate social responsibility across all sectors is the consideration of the interests of employees, consumers, partners, the community, and the environment. At the same time, the nature and priority of these components are determined by sector-specific characteristics.

For the private sector, the key feature is the combination of the economic interests of owners with the social expectations of stakeholders. The state-owned sector is characterized by a stronger public dimension and public accountability, as corporate social responsibility is associated with the performance of socially significant functions. The municipal sector is primarily characterized by an orientation toward directly meeting the needs of the local community, particularly by ensuring the accessibility and quality of socially significant services.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that the formation of corporate social responsibility should be based on a differentiated approach that takes into account ownership structure, business objectives, stakeholder

composition, the nature of public commitments, and the level of public accountability. This approach involves preserving the common basic components of corporate social responsibility while simultaneously establishing different priorities and implementation mechanisms for the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors.

For the private sector, the basis for developing corporate social responsibility should be the integration of social objectives into the enterprise strategy. The appropriate priority areas include employee development, ensuring decent working conditions, responsible treatment of consumers, environmental responsibility, community support, and the development of partnership relations. An important mechanism is the combination of voluntary social initiatives with economic incentives, particularly through the development of reputational capital, increased employee and consumer loyalty, and strengthened long-term enterprise sustainability [3; 14; 18].

For the state-owned sector, a differentiated approach should involve strengthening the public dimension of corporate social responsibility and integrating it into the

corporate governance system. The main areas should include ensuring social and labor guarantees, performing socially significant functions, responsible use of public resources, transparency of activities, and public reporting. Of particular importance is the assessment of the social outcomes of enterprise activities alongside economic indicators, which corresponds to the specifics of state ownership [4; 17].

For the municipal sector, a differentiated approach should be based on orienting corporate social responsibility toward the needs of the local community. Key areas should include the accessibility and quality of socially significant services, employment provision, proper maintenance of local infrastructure, environmental safety, and consideration of the needs of socially vulnerable population groups. Direct interaction between the enterprise, the community, and local self-government bodies is an important mechanism for developing corporate social responsibility.

Thus, a differentiated approach does not imply the development of three separate models of corporate social responsibility but rather the adaptation of a unified system of its basic components to the specific characteristics of each sector. For private enterprises, the key aspect is the combination of economic efficiency with the social interests of stakeholders; for state-owned enterprises, the focus is on ensuring public interests and public accountability; and for municipal enterprises, on meeting the needs of the local community and ensuring access to socially significant services.

Conclusions. Corporate social responsibility is a

systemic characteristic of an enterprise's activities, the content of which depends on the enterprise's public purpose and operating conditions. Its sector-specific characteristics are shaped by ownership structure, business objectives, the nature of social commitments, stakeholder composition, and the level of public accountability.

For the private, state-owned, and municipal sectors, the common principle remains the consideration of the interests of key stakeholders; however, their corporate social responsibility priorities differ. In the private sector, these priorities are associated with combining social and economic interests; in the state-owned sector, with public significance and public accountability; and in the municipal sector, with meeting the needs of the local community.

Therefore, corporate social responsibility should be developed on the basis of a differentiated approach whereby common principles and basic components are adapted to the specific characteristics of the respective sector. This ensures that an enterprise's social activities correspond to its public role and provides a basis for more effective interaction with key stakeholders.

Declaration on the Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools. During the preparation of the article, generative artificial intelligence tools (ChatGPT-4, OpenAI, 2023) were used for the purposes of searching for and summarizing literature and improving the structure and logic of the article. No text generated using artificial intelligence was used without critical editing. The authors bear full responsibility for the scholarly quality, accuracy, and integrity of the content.

References:

1. Bailo, V. (2024). Korporativna sotsialna vidpovidalnist: Zaporizka staloho rozvytku biznesu [Corporate social responsibility: A prerequisite for sustainable business development]. *Visnyk Khmelnytskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Seriya: Ekonomichni nauky*, 326(1), 327–334. <https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2024-326-51> [in Ukrainian].
2. Hutsalo, P., & Poperechnyi, M. (2025). Sotsialna vidpovidalnist biznesu yak osnova staloho rozvytku pidpriemstv [Social responsibility of business as a basis for sustainable development of enterprises]. *Naukovyi visnyk Polissia*, 2(29), 295–307. [https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2024-2\(29\)-295-307](https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2024-2(29)-295-307) [in Ukrainian].
3. Zvarych, R., Homotiuk, V., Rivilis, I., & Deineka, Yu. (2022). Sotsialna vidpovidalnist biznesu yak instrument mizhnarodnoho korporativnoho menedzhmentu v umovakh kryzy [Social responsibility of business as an instrument of international corporate management in times of crisis]. *Visnyk Ekonomiky*, (2), 142–156. <https://doi.org/10.35774/visnyk2022.02.142> [in Ukrainian].
4. Oliynyk, M. V. (2024). Sotsialna vidpovidalnist derzhavnykh pidpriemstv u ploshchyni zabezpechennia ekonomichnoi bezpeky krainy [Social responsibility of state-owned enterprises in the context of ensuring the country's economic security]. *Ekonomika ta pidpriemnytstvo*, (53), 199–209. <https://doi.org/10.33111/EE.2024.53.OliynykM> [in Ukrainian].
5. Poliovyk, Ye. (2023). Nefinansova zvitnist yak harantiia korporativnoi sotsialnoi vidpovidalnosti [Non-financial reporting as a guarantee of corporate social responsibility]. *Scientia fructuosa*, 149(3), 72–82. [https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023\(149\)06](https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023(149)06) [in Ukrainian].
6. Reshmidilova, S. L. (2025). Sotsialna vidpovidalnist biznesu u kontseptsii staloho rozvytku sotsialno-ekonomichnykh system [Social responsibility of business in the concept of sustainable development of socio-economic systems]. *Rynkova ekonomika: Suchasna teoriia i praktyka upravlinnia*, 24(1(59)). [https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.1\(59\).333223](https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.1(59).333223) [in Ukrainian].
7. Sazonova, T. O., & Sharlai, M. V. (2023). Sotsialni proiekti na rivni pidpriemstva v suchasnykh umovakh [Social projects at the enterprise level in modern conditions]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, (50). <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-50-10> [in Ukrainian].
8. Tarlopov, I. (2023). Metod analizu iierarkhii u systemi pryiniattia rishen korporativnoi sotsialnoi vidpovidalnosti [The analytic hierarchy process in the corporate social responsibility decision-making system]. *Ekonomika i rehion*, 4(91). [https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2023.4\(91\).3210](https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2023.4(91).3210) [in Ukrainian].
9. Umantsiv, H. (2023). Zvitnist pro stalyy rozvytok u vymiri korporativnoi sotsialnoi vidpovidalnosti

[Sustainability reporting in the context of corporate social responsibility]. *Scientia fructuosa*, 149(3), 59–71. [https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023\(149\)05](https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023(149)05) [in Ukrainian].

10. Awa, H. O., Etim, W., & Ogbonda, E. (2024). Stakeholders, stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility (CSR). *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, (9), Art. 11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-024-00094-y>

11. Dmytriiev, S. D., Freeman, R. E., & Hörisch, J. (2021). The relationship between stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility: Differences, similarities, and implications for social issues in management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(6), 1441–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12684>

12. Duan, W., Khurshid, A., Rauf, A., & Călin, A. C. (2022). Government subsidies' influence on corporate social responsibility of private firms in a competitive environment. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 7(2), Art. 100189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100189>

13. Ervits, I. (2023). CSR reporting in China's private and state-owned enterprises: A mixed methods comparative analysis. *Asian Business & Management*, (22), 55–83. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-021-00147-1>

14. Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, (66), Art. 101889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889>

15. Kim, J., & Jo, H. (2022). Controlling owner type, state capitalism, and corporate social responsibility in Africa. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 30(6), 765–782. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12404>

16. Liu, T., & Sun, Y. (2025). Impact of ownership structure on corporate social responsibility investment: The mediating role of analyst coverage. *Finance Research Letters*, (78), Art. 107050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.107050>

17. Nicolo', G., & Andrades-Peña, F. J. (2024). Does corporate governance influence environmental, social and governance disclosure practices of state-owned enterprises? An international study. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(5), 4715–4731. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2824>

18. Velte, P. (2022). Meta-analyses on corporate social responsibility (CSR): A literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, (72), 627–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00211-2>

19. Zárate-Rueda, R., Bautista-Zárate, J. S., & Beltrán-Villamizar, Y. I. (2021). Stakeholders within the framework of corporate social responsibility: A systematic review. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 37(160), 460–471. <https://doi.org/10.18046/j.estger.2021.160.3974>

20. Zhang, T., Gu, L., & Wang, J. J. (2023). State-owned capital and corporate social responsibility of private-holding companies: Evidence from China. *Accounting & Finance*, (63), 1101–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12931>

Список використаних джерел:

1. Байло В. Корпоративна соціальна відповідальність: запорука сталого розвитку бізнесу. Вісник Хмельницького національного університету. Серія: Економічні науки. 2024. Т. 326, № 1. С. 327–334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2024-326-51>

2. Гуцало П., Поперечний М. Соціальна відповідальність бізнесу як основа сталого розвитку підприємств. Науковий вісник Полісся. 2025. № 2(29). С. 295–307. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2024-2\(29\)-295-307](https://doi.org/10.25140/2410-9576-2024-2(29)-295-307)

3. Зварич Р., Гомотюк В., Рівіліс І., Дейнека Ю. Соціальна відповідальність бізнесу як інструмент міжнародного корпоративного менеджменту в умовах кризи. Вісник Економіки. 2022. № 2. С. 142–156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35774/visnyk2022.02.142>

4. Олійник М. В. Соціальна відповідальність державних підприємств у площині забезпечення економічної безпеки країни. Економіка та підприємництво. 2024. № 53. С. 199–209. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33111/EE.2024.53.OliynykM>

5. Польовик Є. Нефінансова звітність як гарантія корпоративної соціальної відповідальності. *Scientia fructuosa*. 2023. Т. 149, № 3. С. 72–82. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023\(149\)06](https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023(149)06)

6. Решміділова С. Л. Соціальна відповідальність бізнесу у концепції сталого розвитку соціально-економічних систем. Ринкова економіка: сучасна теорія і практика управління. 2025. Т. 24, № 1(59). DOI: [https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.1\(59\).333223](https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.1(59).333223)

7. Сазонова Т. О., Шарлай М. В. Соціальні проекти на рівні підприємства в сучасних умовах. Економіка та суспільство. 2023. № 50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-50-10>

8. Тарлопов І. Метод аналізу ієрархій у системі прийняття рішень корпоративної соціальної відповідальності. Економіка і регіон. 2023. № 4(91). DOI: [https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2023.4\(91\).3210](https://doi.org/10.26906/EiR.2023.4(91).3210)

9. Уманців Г. Звітність про сталий розвиток у вимірі корпоративної соціальної відповідальності. *Scientia fructuosa*. 2023. Т. 149, № 3. С. 59–71. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023\(149\)05](https://doi.org/10.31617/1.2023(149)05)

10. Awa H. O., Etim W., Ogbonda E. Stakeholders, stakeholder theory and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*. 2024. Vol. 9. Art. 11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-024-00094-y>

11. Dmytriiev S. D., Freeman R. E., Hörisch J. The Relationship between Stakeholder Theory and Corporate Social Responsibility: Differences, Similarities, and Implications for Social Issues in Management. *Journal of*

Management Studies. 2021. Vol. 58, Iss. 6. Pp. 1441–1470. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12684>

12. Duan W., Khurshid A., Rauf A., Călin A. C. Government subsidies' influence on corporate social responsibility of private firms in a competitive environment. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*. 2022. Vol. 7, Iss. 2. Art. 100189. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100189>

13. Ervits I. CSR reporting in China's private and state-owned enterprises: A mixed methods comparative analysis. *Asian Business & Management*. 2023. Vol. 22. Pp. 55–83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-021-00147-1>

14. Gillan S. L., Koch A., Starks L. T. Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 2021. Vol. 66. Art. 101889. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889>

15. Kim J., Jo H. Controlling owner type, state capitalism, and corporate social responsibility in Africa. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 2022. Vol. 30, Iss. 6. Pp. 765–782. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12404>

16. Liu T., Sun Y. Impact of ownership structure on corporate social responsibility investment: The mediating role of analyst coverage. *Finance Research Letters*. 2025. Vol. 78. Art. 107050. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2025.107050>

17. Nicolo' G., Andrades-Peña F. J. Does corporate governance influence environmental, social and governance disclosure practices of state-owned enterprises? An international study. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2024. Vol. 31, Iss. 5. Pp. 4715–4731. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2824>

18. Velte P. Meta-analyses on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): a literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*. 2022. Vol. 72. Pp. 627–675. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00211-2>

19. Zárate-Rueda R., Bautista-Zárate J. S., Beltrán-Villamizar Y. I. Stakeholders within the framework of Corporate Social Responsibility: A systematic review. *Estudios Gerenciales*. 2021. Vol. 37, No. 160. Pp. 460–471. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18046/j.estger.2021.160.3974>

20. Zhang T., Gu L., Wang J. J. State-owned capital and corporate social responsibility of private-holding companies: evidence from China. *Accounting & Finance*. 2023. Pp. 1101–1120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12931>

Дата надходження статті: 27.08.2026 р.

Дата прийняття статті до друку: 12.10.2026 р.

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 26.10.2026 р.

Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії Creative Commons Attribution License International CC-BY.