International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management
Volume 8, Issue 1, pp. 34-45. 2026
ISSN: 2735-9220
www.ijilpm.com.ng

IMPACT OF BUSINESS LEADERSHIP TYPES ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN KATSINA STATE

Sunday IGOCHE
Business Administration Department
School of Business and Management Science
Federal Polytechnic Daura
igochesunday2017@fedpolydaura.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Business leaders play a crucial role in driving corporate social responsibility (CSR) by setting strategic priorities, allocating resources, and ensuring that corporate social responsibility efforts are effective and sustainable, ultimately benefiting both society and the bottom line. The study examined business leadership and corporate social responsibility. Business leadership and CSR are some of the most widely studied topics, generating an extensive literature. Nowadays, leaders are facing economic, social and environmental challenges. Unfortunately, today trust in business is low. The study adopted a correlational research method; multiple regressions with relevant interaction terms were tested. To enhance the interpretation of the regression coefficients in moderated regression models, the study mean-centered all continuous independent variables. The study found out that transformational leadership are more likely to engage in institutional CSR practices, whereas transactional leadership is not associated with such practices. More so, stakeholder-oriented marketing reinforces the positive link between transformational leadership and institutional CSR practices. Finally, transformational leadership enhances, whereas transactional leadership diminishes, the positive relationship between institutional CSR practices and organizational outcomes. This research highlighted the differential roles that transformational and transactional leadership styles play for an organization's institutional CSR practices and has significant implications for theory and practice.

Keywords: Business Leaders, Corporate Social Responsibility, stakeholder-oriented marketing, transformational leadership.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Igoche, S. (2026). Impact of business leadership types on corporate social responsibility in Katsina State. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management, 8*(1), 34-45. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18671782.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) are some of the most widely studied topics, generating an extensive literature (Gorski, 2017). Business leaders play a crucial role in driving corporate social responsibility (CSR) by setting strategic priorities, allocating resources, and ensuring that Corporate Social Responsibility efforts are effective and sustainable, ultimately benefiting both society and the bottom line. Even though Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not a new concept, in quite a number of countries, too many business enterprises strive to understand its significance and implement its principles in their daily business operations (including the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that often constitute a backbone of the economy (for example, in the EU, SMEs constitute 99% of all businesses and employ around 100 million people (European Commission, 2023).

The main reason why SMEs struggle with CSR is the perception that it is only relevant for large corporations (Ahmad et al., 2021). Many SMEs believe that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a luxury that they cannot afford, as they are more focused on short-term survival and profitability (Giousmpasoglou et al., 2021). However, this view is gradually changing as SMEs realize that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can be a source of competitive advantage and long-term sustainability.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of regulatory and stakeholder pressure, corporate social responsibility (CSR) outcomes vary widely. Although CSR has gained prominence, inconsistent CSR outcomes across firms suggest leadership differences may explain variations in performance. Limited empirical research directly links leadership styles to measurable CSR outcomes. Therefore, this study sought to explore how business leadership styles influence the implementation and effectiveness of CSR initiatives within organizations to highlight different ways leaders shape CSR.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

This study is aimed to investigate the impact of business leadership types on corporate social responsibility in Katsina State. Specifically, the study's objectives are:

- To examine how leadership types influence Corporate Social Responsibility practices.
- To analyze how Stakeholder-oriented marketing positively moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices.
- To determine how Transactional leadership positively moderates the relationship between institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices and organizational outcomes.

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses guided the study and were tested at .05 significant level:

- Leadership styles positively associated with Corporate Social Responsibility practices.
- Stakeholder-oriented marketing positively moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices.
- Transactional leadership positively moderates the relationship between institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices and organizational outcomes.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Stakeholder Theory

The Stakeholder Theory (ST) was systematically articulated by R. Edward Freeman in his seminal work, Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (1984). This theory is a normative and management framework that illuminated how organizations create value by recognizing and balancing the interests of multiple stakeholders rather than focusing exclusively on shareholders. Freeman defined stakeholders as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives. This broad definition has in several ways expanded the traditional shareholder-centered view of an organization and repositioned organizations as rooted within a network of relationships of the employees, customers, suppliers, communities, governments and financiers.

According to Donaldson and Preston (1995), stakeholder theory rests on three major dimensions: descriptive, instrumental and normative. The descriptive dimension explains how institutions or organizations actually operate by managing relationships with diverse stakeholder groups. The instrumental dimension posited that effective stakeholder management leads to improved organizational performance, competitiveness and long-term sustainability. The normative dimension asserted that stakeholders possess intrinsic value and that managers have ethical obligations to consider their interests, regardless of economic consequences. Put together, the dimensions presented here revealed that stakeholders' management are both morally justified and strategically beneficial.

Freeman (1984) further argued that long-term success depends on the satisfaction of key stakeholders whose support is essential for organizational survival. This perspective sees to align with contemporary views of corporate governance that emphasize accountability, transparency, and social responsibility (Ololube, 2024).

Stakeholder Theory also provides the foundational framework in the understanding of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by recognizing that businesses operate within broader social systems. ST supports the integration of ethical, environmental and social considerations into strategic decision-making. Thus, organizations that engages responsibly with employees through fair labor practices, with communities through development initiatives and with the environment through sustainable operations is more likely to build legitimacy and trust. Such practices have the potential to enhance organizational reputation and resilience, particularly in complex institutional environments.

Critics of ST argued that it may create ambiguity in management decision-making because balancing diverse stakeholder interests has the ability to lead to conflicting precedence (Ololube, 2024). In addition, some scholars question how leaders determine which stakeholders deserve greater attention. However, subsequent developments, like stakeholder salience theory (Mitchell et al., 1997), have provided criteria like power, legitimacy and urgency to help managers' handle stakeholder claims.

In contemporary management research, ST remains influential across disciplines like strategic management, marketing, leadership and sustainability studies. ST underpins stakeholder-oriented marketing, ethical leadership models and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) frameworks. Globalization and societal expectations have continued to evolve, therefore organizations are not only evaluated on financial performance but also on how responsibly they manage stakeholder relationships.

The relevance of ST in this study is that it offers a comprehensive lens for understanding organizational behavior in a socially interconnected environment by advocating the inclusive value creation and ethical accountability. The theory provided a moral foundation and a strategic rationale for sustainable organizational success.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a common practice in today's business world. CSR is an inevitable priority for organisations in every country and across all industries. Indeed, the world needs the involvement of today's managers and future generations of business leaders in social and environmental challenges to become a responsible social citizen and run a profitable business.

CSR is defined as having four components supporting the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary (philanthropic) expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time. Other definitions of CSR refer to society's expectations: always with the caveat that such expectations are dynamic, constantly changing. Lantos (2002) mentioned that CSR is composed of three types (ethical, altruistic and strategic). Ethical Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) involves organizations fulfilling their ethical responsibilities so as to avoid harm to society (Lantos, 2002). For example, organizations may recall defective products that are harmful to customers. Altruistic CSR involves organizations donating money to remedy society problems even though such donation does not result in any benefits to their stockholders or may even minimize the organization's profitability (Lantos, 2002). Strategic CSR involves organizations making contributions to society because it is the right thing to do and also they believe that such contribution would enhance long-term financial performance.

CSR is composed of five dimensions including economic, environmental, social, stakeholder and voluntariness (Dahlsrud, 2008). Vilanova et al. (2009) propose that CSR consists of five constructs, including vision (e.g. high intrinsic value of the organisation), community relations (e.g. partnerships with different stakeholders such as customers and suppliers), workplace (e.g. human rights and labour practices within the organisation), accountability (transparency in communication and financial reporting) and marketplace (e.g. relationship between CSR and core business processes such as sales and purchasing).

Leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility

Effective leadership is essential for driving Corporate Social Responsibility initiatives and embedding a culture of responsibility and sustainability within organizations. Leaders set the tone at the top, articulating a clear vision and values that prioritize ethical conduct, social impact, and environmental stewardship. Leaders inspire employees, engage stakeholders, and foster a sense of purpose and alignment with organizational goals by championing CSR efforts.

The 21st century world is shaped by leaders. Keith Grint considers that "Leadership, or the lack of it, seems to be responsible for just about everything these days (Grint, 2005). Leadership is a very complex concept. Over time, many definitions have been developed and there is no consensus on a universally agreed definition. There are "almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who attempted to define the concept (Stogdill, 1974). In order to build a sustainable world, intersection of leadership and ethics is a must. Leadership has a vital role in promoting an ethical and moral behaviour. Moreover, leaders should be models for the followers and should aim to shape organizations by their own values and characteristics. Employees rely on their leaders for guidance when faced with ethical dilemmas Treviño, 1986). Leaders' behaviour should be "visible and consistently ethical, both internally and externally to the organization (Knowles, 2006). Moreover, "excellent companies do more than talk ethics, they take positive steps to address ethical issues and apply the practical tools of ethics in their management practice (Pastin, 1986). Ethics has "a central role in the practice of leadership (Ciulla, 2006). Nowadays, there is a higher need for ethical leaders and transparency in business processes.

The role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is to restore one of the most critical resources for businesses' sustainability: trust." Companies choose to incorporate CSR into their businesses for different reasons. It is important to "distinguish between activities for gaining popularity and those which gain trust" (Mostovicz & Kakabadse, 2011). Trust, ethics, CSR and leadership are interlinked. Nowadays, "too often, executives have viewed corporate social responsibility (CSR) as just another source of pressure or passing fad (Keys, Malnight & van der Graaf, 2009). Corporate Social responsibility is an ethical framework. Leaders and organizations engaged in CSR act for the benefit of their stakeholders: employees, customers, suppliers, community and society at large. CSR requires the use of non-coercive influence and "soft power" which again are specific to leadership (Strand, 2013). Leaders have a crucially significant role in adopting and practicing CSR in their organizations (Waldman & Siegel, 2008).

Although the topic of corporate sustainability and accountability is still evolving, debates between academic commentators are slowly but surely raising awareness about responsible management practices, as well as the skills and expertise needed to achieve strategic outcomes that generate value for businesses, society, and the environment (Suriyankietkaew et al., 2022). Business owners and leaders with the right organizational skills possess the savvy to make strategic decisions about sustainability that are good for business, their employees as well as their customers. These business leaders need to learn how to celebrate sustainable leaders within their organizations and speak up about the value they are creating for their organizations and the wider community. Lowering the company's costs, having a more innovative strategy, a better reputation, and having more new customers that appreciate sustainability are all things that can add up to the amount of money that any sustainable company makes.

Stakeholder-oriented Marketing in Transformational Leadership and Institutional Corporate Social Responsibility Practices

Stakeholder-oriented marketing plays a critical moderating role in the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices. Transformational leadership is characterized by inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation and idealized influence. It encourages leaders to transcend self-interest and commit to broader social and ethical goals (Du et al., 2013). This leadership style do not only guides organizational vision and culture toward higher ethical standards but also highlights long-term value creation for a wide array of stakeholders. Stakeholders in the context of the study do not only include customers and shareholders but also includes employees, communities, suppliers and environmental entities whose varies interests influence and are affected by organizational activities (Freeman, 1984).

In the context of CSR, transformational leaders inherently recognise the interdependence between the firm and its diverse stakeholders. Through the encouragement of employees' empowerment, shared goals and ethical conduct, transformational leaders align organizational practices with societal expectations and sustainability imperatives (Ololube, 2025). Research indicates that institutions exhibiting strong transformational leadership tend to invest in institutional CSR practices that go beyond compliance to generate meaningful social outcomes (Du et al., 2013). These practices often encompass community development, environmental stewardship, ethical labour policies, and philanthropic initiatives, which are central to strengthening organizational legitimacy and stakeholder trust.

Stakeholder-oriented marketing functions as a critical complement to transformational leadership in amplifying CSR outcomes. Unlike traditional customer-oriented marketing that focuses primarily on consumer needs, stakeholder-oriented marketing expands the focus to involve the interests, values and concerns of all relevant stakeholder groups (Bhattacharya & Korschun, 2008; Lindgreen et al., 2009). This broader marketing orientation encourages organizations to conduct environmental scanning, stakeholder communication and cross-functional collaboration to better understand and respond to societal issues. Through these processes, institutional leaders gain deeper insights into stakeholder expectations and are better positioned to design CSR strategies that are genuinely responsive to stakeholder needs. Significantly, stakeholder-oriented marketing can enhance the effectiveness of transformational leadership by ensuring that CSR initiatives are grounded in empirical stakeholder data and reflective of real societal challenges (Du et al., 2013; Kotler & Lee, 2005).

Empirical evidence suggests that stakeholder-oriented marketing positively moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional CSR practices. In other words, when an organization adopts a marketing approach that actively engages stakeholders and incorporates their interests into strategic decision-making, transformational leaders are more capable of implementing robust CSR initiatives (Du et al., 2013; Lindgreen et al., 2009). This occurs because stakeholder-oriented marketing sensitizes organizational members to the multifaceted expectations of stakeholders, which creates an internal culture that informs social accountability and ethical responsibility.

The interplay here aligns with contemporary stakeholder theory, which posited that sustainable organizational success depends on recognizing and reconciling the interests of multiple stakeholder groups rather than focusing narrowly on shareholder wealth (Freeman, 1984). Bridging leadership, marketing and responsibility, stakeholder-oriented marketing transforms CSR from a marginal compliance activity into strategic organizational fundamentals, which acts as enablers in transformational leadership and mobilizes organizational resources more effectively toward socially beneficial ends, yielding greater stakeholder value and institutional legitimacy.

Transactional Leadership in Institutional CSR Practices and Organizational Outcomes

Transactional leadership is a managerial approach grounded in dependent reward and corrective feedback mechanisms. This is a situation where leaders guide followers by setting clear expectations, establishing goals and providing rewards or sanctions based on performance (Bass & Avolio, as cited in Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). In contrast to transformational leadership, which motivates followers through vision and intrinsic inspiration, transactional leadership concentrates on short-term transactions that align distinct performance with institutional goals. While transformational leadership has been frequently linked to institutional corporate social responsibility (CSR), however, Ololube (2025) proved how transactional leadership also plays a meaningful role in CSR practices and organizational outcomes.

Institutional CSR practices refer to structured, long-term commitments by organizations to integrate social, environmental, and ethical considerations into their core operating activities and stakeholder engagements. Rather than minor philanthropic activities, institutional CSR involves systematic policies and procedures that shape organizational behavior and culture toward sustainable impact (Du et al., 2013). In this context, transactional leadership impacts CSR by promoting clarity, consistency and accountability on how CSR goals are pursued within organizations or institutions.

A key finding in the literature reveals that transactional leadership does not necessarily drive greater CSR engagement per se, but it significantly enhances the effectiveness of CSR practices in producing positive organizational outcomes. For instance, large-scale survey research by Du et al. (2013) found that while transactional leadership was not statistically associated with the adoption of institutional CSR practices, it enhanced the relationship between CSR practices and desirable organizational outcomes such as performance, legitimacy, and stakeholder trust. In other words, transactional leadership strengthens how CSR initiatives translate into measurable benefits for the organization by ensuring consistent execution and compliance with established CSR objectives (Du et al., 2013).

Transactional leaders typically use contingent rewards and management by exception to reinforce CSR compliance. These leaders ensure that employees understand the CSR objectives and receive clear feedback on their contributions, which increases accountability for socially responsible performance. According to Sadeghi and Pihie (2012), transactional leadership reward mechanism promotes a performance-based culture in which employees are incentivized to meet CSR targets as part of their evaluative criteria. This structured approach is particularly effective in environments with strong regulatory demands or competitive pressures that require rigorous compliance (Ololube, 2024).

Further, according to Ololube and Wome (2025), transactional leadership contributes to organizational outcomes by reducing ambiguity and aligning individual contributions with CSR priorities. Clear performance expectations and reward systems help integrate CSR into daily operational processes, which promotes predictability and stability, which is are important factors for CSR success in complex institutional settings. Structured CSR practices under transactional leadership have been linked to improved organizational performance metrics such as stakeholder trust, legitimacy, operational efficiency and market competitiveness. Similarly, Ololube (2024) noted that when employees understand exactly what is expected regarding social and ethical performance, they execute CSR tasks more effectively, leading to measurable improvements in organizational reputation and CSR impact.

In addition, however, transactional leadership’s focus on external rewards and short-term objectives introduces limitations. It may not inherently inspire innovative or value-driven CSR behavior beyond what is contractually defined (Ololube, 2024). Comparing this to transformational leadership, transactional leadership is less effective in cultivating intrinsic motivation for CSR ideals. However, transactional leadership greatest value lies in reinforcing CSR operationalization rather than in initiating broad CSR strategy or vision.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a correlational research design to examine the relationships among the key variables under investigation. This design was considered appropriate because it enabled the researchers to determine the direction and strength of the associations between leadership styles and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practices without manipulating any variables. To achieve the study's objectives, multiple regression analysis was conducted, which incorporated relevant interaction terms to test the moderating effects within the model. The use of regression techniques allowed the researcher explore a more comprehensive assessment of the predictive influence of the different leadership styles under study and their outcomes on CSR, while controlling for potential confounding variables.

In addition, moderated regression analysis was employed to explore whether the interaction effects significantly influenced the relationship between leadership styles and CSR. In order to improve the clarity and interpretability of the regression coefficients, particularly in models involving interaction terms, the study applied mean-centering to all continuous independent variables. Mean-centering reduces the multiple linearity between the main effects and the interaction terms to enhance the statistical stability of the estimates to facilitate more accurate interpretation of the findings. Largely, the analysis provided a rigorous framework for examining the causal linkages between leadership styles and institutional CSR practices.

RESULTS

Hypothesis One: Leadership styles positively associated with Corporate Social Responsibility practices.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations

S/N	Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Transformational leadership	3.68	.86	.96				
2.	Transactional leadership	3.05	.99	.27	.87			
3.	Stakeholder-oriented marketing	3.33	.95	.46	.28	.91		
4.	Institutional CSR	4.67	1.43	.60	.19	.44	.95	
5.	Organizational outcomes	3.45	.75	.42	.19	.39	.48	.80

Notes: n = 440. Reliability coefficients are reported on the diagonal. All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.

Table I contains the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients of the key variables, as well as correlations among them. The study tested H1 using a moderated regression model: institutional CSR = f (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, stakeholder-oriented marketing, transformational leadership and stakeholder-oriented marketing, transactional leadership and stakeholder-oriented marketing, organization type). The study predicted that transformational leadership is positively associated with institutional CSR. As expected, the coefficient for transformational leadership is positive and significant ($b = .90$, $p < .01$), whereas the coefficient for transactional leadership is not significant ($b = -.01$, NS), in support of hypothesis one. Also as expected, the coefficient for stakeholder-oriented marketing is positive and significant (b = .29, p < .01), so stakeholder-oriented marketing relates positively to institutional CSR practices.

Hypothesis Two: Stakeholder-oriented marketing positively moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices

Table 2: Antecedents of institutional Corporate Social Responsibility: unstandardized regression coefficients

Leadership styles	**Institutional CSR**
Stakeholder-oriented marketing	$.28^{**}$
Transformational leadership	$.91^{**}$
Transactional leadership	-.01
Transformational leadership × stakeholder-oriented marketing	$.16^{**}$
Transactional leadership × stakeholder-oriented marketing	-.02
Organizational type	$.18^{+}$
Size	$.29^{**}$
Adjusted R^2	.41
F value	43.99^{**}

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $^{+}$ $p < .10$.

In line with hypothesis two, the study found a positive interaction between stakeholder-oriented marketing and transformational leadership (b = .16, p < .01), indicating that stakeholder-oriented marketing amplifies the positive link between transformational leadership and institutional CSR practices. To clarify the nature of this interaction, the study performed a simple slope analysis by looking at the transformational leadership-institutional CSR link when the moderator variable, stakeholder-oriented marketing, was one standard deviation above and below the mean. With high stakeholder-oriented marketing (i.e., one standard deviation above the mean), the coefficient for the simple slope of transformational leadership on institutional CSR practices is b = 1.06 (t = 10.54, p < .01). With low stakeholder-oriented marketing (i.e., one standard deviation below the mean), the coefficient for the simple slope of transformational leadership on institutional CSR practices is b = .76 (t = 9.05, p < .01). These result suggested that the relationship between transformational leadership and institutional CSR practices are stronger when stakeholder-oriented marketing is high and significantly, weaker when stakeholder-oriented marketing is low. Therefore, hypothesis two is supported by our data.

Hypothesis Three: Transactional leadership positively moderates the relationship between institutional CSR practices and organizational outcomes.

Table 2: Organizational outcomes of institutional CSR: unstandardized regression coefficients

	Organizational outcomes
Institutional CSR	$.14^{**}$
Transformational leadership	$.15^{**}$
Transactional leadership	.04
Institutional CSR x transformational leadership	$-.04^{+}$
Institutional CSR x transactional leadership	$.05^{*}$
Stakeholder-oriented marketing	$.15^{**}$
Organizational type	$.18^{**}$
Size	$.14^{*}$

Adjusted R^2	.32
F	22.88^{**}

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $^{+}$ $p < .10$.

In line with leadership literature, the analysis revealed that transformational leadership is positively associated with organizational outcomes (b = .15, p < .01), whereas transactional leadership is not (b = .04, NS). Stakeholder-oriented marketing is positively associated with organizational outcomes (b = .15, p < .01). In line with hypothesis three, the analysis sgowed that institutional CSR practices do not only have a positive effect (b = .14, p < .01) on organizational outcomes but that the positive link is greater with higher transactional leadership (i.e., positive interaction between institutional CSR practices and transactional leadership: b = .05, p < .05). Simple slope analysis indicates that, with transformational leadership at the mean level, when transactional leadership is high (i.e., one standard deviation above the mean), the simple slope of institutional CSR practices on organizational outcomes is b = .19 (t = 5.35, p < .01). Also with transformational leadership being at the mean level, when transactional leadership is low (i.e., one standard deviation below the mean), the simple slope of institutional CSR practices on organizational outcome is b = .09 (t = 2.57, p < .05). These results suggest that, all else being equal, transactional leadership amplifies the positive relationship between institutional CSR practices and organizational outcomes, in support of hypothesis three.

The study also notice a negative interaction between institutional CSR practices and transformational leadership (b = -.04, p < .10), indicating that transformational leadership reduces the positive relationship between institutional CSR practices and organizational outcomes. Simple slope analysis indicates that, with transactional leadership at the mean level, when transformational leadership is high (one standard deviation above the mean), the simple slope of institutional CSR practices on organizational outcomes is b = .10 (t = 2.80, p < .01). With transactional leadership at the mean level, when transformational leadership is low (i.e., one standard deviation below the mean), the simple slope of institutional CSR practices on organizational outcomes is b = .18 (t = 5.04, p < .01). These results thus suggest that all things being equal, transformational leadership diminishes the positive relationship between institutional CSR practices and organizational outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Despite the prominent place corporate social responsibility has on the global corporate agenda, the understanding of micro-level organizational dynamics about Corporate Social Responsibility, such as the interface between leadership styles and corporate social responsibility, remains incipient. This study shed light on the ways in which transformational and transactional leadership styles affect institutional corporate social responsibility practices, as well as the organizational outcomes of corporate social responsibility. Specifically the study show how transformational (but not transactional) leadership affects institutional Corporate Social Responsibility practices, how stakeholder-oriented marketing influences the transformational leadership-institutional corporate social responsibility link, and how leadership styles influence the relationship between institutional corporate social responsibility and organizational outcomes. Organizations with greater transformational leadership are more likely to engage in institutional corporate social responsibility practices, but transactional leadership is not associated with these corporate social responsibility practices.

Furthermore, stakeholder-oriented marketing reinforces the positive link between transformational leadership and institutional corporate social responsibility practices. Finally, our results show that transactional leadership enhances, whereas transformational leadership diminishes, the positive relationship between institutional corporate social responsibility practices and organizational outcomes. Transformational and transactional leadership styles play a significant role in a firm's institutional corporate social responsibility practices.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations are made:

- In the age of responsibility, organizational leaders should understand that companies are being part of the society and social issues have an important relevance for their business.
- Leaders should both volunteer and encourage employees to volunteer for community and make charitable donations.
- Ethical issues and community engagement should be more associated with long term business success. Taking into account the growing interest for a sustainable society, a new type of leadership that promotes the corporate social responsibility's ideals is needed.

REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2008). *Stakeholder marketing: Beyond the four Ps and the customer*. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 27*(1), 113-116.

Ciulla J. B. (2006). Ethics: the heart of leadership. In T . Maak & N. M. Pless (Eds.), *Responsible Leadership* (pp. 17-32), Routledge

Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 15*(1), 1-13.

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 65-91.

Du, S., Swaen, V., Lindgreen, A., & Sen, S. (2013). The roles of leadership styles in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *114*(1), 155-169.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman.

Gorski, H. (2017). Leadership and corporate social responsibility. *International Conference Knowledge-Based Organization, 23*(1), 372-277.

Grint K. (2005). *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities (Management, Work and Organizations)*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Keys, T., & Malnight Th. W., & van der Graaf K. (2009). *Making the most of corporate social Model*. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*, 601-617.

Knowles R. N. (2006). Self-organising leadership: Transparency and Trust. In J. Jonker & N. de Witte (Eds.). *Management Models for Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 134-139). Springer.

Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause*. Wiley.

Lantos, G. P. (2002). The ethicality of altruistic corporate social responsibility. *Journal of*

Consumer Marketing, 19(3), 205-230.
Lindgreen, A., Maon, F., & Swaen, V. (2009). Designing and implementing corporate social responsibility: An integrative framework grounded in theory and practice. Journal of Business Ethics, *87*(1), 71-89.
Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886.
Mostovicz, E. I., & Kakabadse, N. K. (2011). Between Trust and CSR: The Role of Leadership. In S. O.Idowu & C. Louche (Eds.), *Theory and Practice of Corporate Social. Responsibility* (pp. 159-178). Heidelberg.
Ololube, N. P. (2024). *Institutional leadership: Laying the foundation for success*. Pearl Publications.
Ololube, N. P. (2025). Public-private partnership dynamics for economic development of Nigeria. In N. Baporikar (Ed.), *Public Private Partnership Dynamics for Economic Development* (pp. 105-130). Information Science Reference (an Imprint of IGI Global). DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-9153-2.ch006.
Ololube, N. P., & Wome, M. O. E. (2025). *Principles of green human resource management: Theory and practice.* Pearl Publishers.
Pastin, M. (1986). *The Hard Problems of Management: Gaining the Ethics Edge*. Jossey-Bass.
responsibility, McKinsey Quarterly.
Reynolds, M., & Yuthas, K. (2008). Moral discourse and corporate social responsibility reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics, 78*, 47-64.
Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2012). Transactional and transformational leadership and their effect on organisational outcomes. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(7), 186-197.
Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. Free Press.
Strand, R. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility and leadership. In E. R. G. Pedersen (Ed.), *Corporate social responsibility* (pp. 39-71). SAGE.
Treviño, L. K., (1986). *Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist*
Vilanova, M., Lozano, J., & Arenas, D. (2009). Exploring the nature of the relationship between CSR and competitiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*, 57-69.
Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. S. (2008). *Theoretical and practitioner letters: Defining the socially responsible leader*. *Leadership Quarterly, 19,* 117-131.