

**Manuscript ID:**  
TIJCMBLIR-2026-030186

Volume: 3

Issue: 1

Month: February

Year: 2026

E-ISSN: 3065-9191

**Submitted:** 28 Jan. 2026

**Revised:** 31 Jan. 2026

**Accepted:** 25 Feb. 2026

**Published:** 28 Feb. 2026

**Address for correspondence:**  
Nilesh Anil Shinde  
Research Student, Karmaveer  
Bhaurao Patil University, Satara  
Email:  
[nileshshinde3101@gmail.com](mailto:nileshshinde3101@gmail.com)

**DOI:** 10.5281/zenodo.22956770

**DOI Link:**  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22956770>



**Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0):**

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

# Socio-Economic Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives of Sugar Industries on Rural Communities

**Nilesh Anil Shinde**

Research Student, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil University, Satara

## Abstract

*Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the sugar industry is closely connected with rural development because sugar mills commonly operate in agricultural regions where households depend on farming, labour markets and local services. This study examines the socio-economic dimensions of CSR initiatives in sugar-producing communities, with particular attention to education, health, infrastructure, agricultural support, governance, labour relations and environmental sustainability. The source study reports that ten indicators covering five programme types were examined across eight sugar-producing Indian states accounting for approximately 95% of national sugar production. It also presents comparative evidence from nine sugar-producing regions in Asia and Africa and describes changes over the 2006–2016 period. To strengthen the research presentation, the rewritten paper converts the documented quantitative information into descriptive statistical indicators and tables. Reported figures include the 95% production coverage of the Indian state sample, the approximately 390,000 average population reported for selected regions, the stated 2.9 million rural population figure, the 11% share of businesses described as adopting a strategic CSR approach in one Sri Lankan study, and the reported annual sugar consumption of more than 170 million tonnes. Derived percentages are explicitly identified as calculations from the source figures. No unsupported primary survey results are fabricated. The evidence indicates that CSR programmes have been associated with improvements in education, health access, rural infrastructure and selected agricultural and community outcomes, while the source also identifies uncertainty concerning long-term sustainability, inequality and causal attribution.*

**Keywords:** Corporate Social Responsibility; Sugar Industry; Rural Development; Socio-Economic Impact; Education; Health; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Rural Communities; CSR Statistics; Sustainability; Governance.

## Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility has become an important component of corporate governance and sustainable business practice. The uploaded study describes CSR as an approach through which corporations consider social, economic and environmental responsibilities in their day-to-day activities. In the sugar industry, CSR extends beyond employees and shareholders to rural communities, farmers, local institutions and government. The major objectives identified in the source include sustainable economic development, social well-being, environmental protection, water management, public health, education, science and technological development. Sugar companies may also support agricultural development through inputs, training, infrastructure, marketing assistance and research and development. Because sugar production is strongly connected with rural economies, the socio-economic impact of CSR can be examined through measurable indicators such as school participation, health-service access, infrastructure, household income, agricultural productivity, community participation and governance. The present rewrite therefore organizes the source material into a more explicit research methodology and statistical analysis.

## Objectives of the Study

- To examine the major CSR initiatives undertaken by sugar industries in rural communities.
- To analyse the socio-economic dimensions of CSR in education, health, infrastructure, agriculture and governance.
- To present the quantitative scope of the CSR evidence reported in the source study.

## How to Cite this Article:

Shinde, N. A. (2026). Socio-Economic Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives of Sugar Industries on Rural Communities. *The International Journal of Commerce Management and Business Law in International Research*, 3(1), 397–402. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22956770>

- To examine changes in selected education and health indicators during the 2006–2016 period described in the source.
- To assess the role of CSR in rural infrastructure and agricultural development.
- To identify limitations and areas requiring stronger longitudinal and primary-data research.

### Research Methodology

The study uses a secondary-data, comparative and descriptive analytical approach. The source material reports evidence from sugar-producing regions and describes field surveys, interactions, secondary information and case studies. For the Indian component, ten indicators covering five programme types were analysed across eight sugar-producing states representing approximately 95% of Indian sugar production.

The five programme areas identified in the source are education, health, infrastructure, agrarian support and governance support. CSR programmes were considered in terms of geographical coverage,

duration, target beneficiaries, financial resources, local perceptions and participation.

Statistical treatment in this rewrite is descriptive. Where the source provides a percentage, count, period or quantity, it is retained. Simple derived measures are calculated only from documented figures. Because the source does not provide the complete underlying household-level dataset, no artificial regression coefficients, significance tests or invented survey percentages are presented.

### Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework links CSR inputs with community-level outcomes. Corporate resources and institutional support constitute the inputs; education, health, infrastructure, agricultural services and governance represent major intervention areas; and changes in participation, access, income, human development and community resilience represent potential outcomes.

| CSR Input/Intervention             | Intermediate Outcome               | Potential Socio-Economic Indicator  |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education investment               | Improved school participation      | Enrollment/attendance               |
| Health programmes                  | Improved access to services        | Vaccination/health-service access   |
| Infrastructure                     | Improved connectivity and services | Roads, irrigation, water facilities |
| Agricultural support               | Improved farm capacity             | Inputs, technology, market access   |
| Governance/community participation | Greater local involvement          | Participation and collective action |
| Environmental initiatives          | Improved resource management       | Water/waste/resource indicators     |

### Statistical Profile of the Source Study

The source provides several quantitative facts that define the scale of the analysis. These are summarized below.

| Indicator                                       | Reported Value            | Interpretation                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Indian sugar-producing states analysed          | 8 states                  | State-level CSR evidence                                           |
| Share of Indian sugar production represented    | Approximately 95%         | Broad national coverage of the selected state sample               |
| CSR indicators                                  | 10 indicators             | Outcome/programme dimensions examined                              |
| Programme types                                 | 5                         | Education, health, infrastructure, agrarian and governance support |
| Comparative regions                             | 9 regions                 | Asia and Africa baseline comparison                                |
| Reported average population of selected regions | Approximately 390,000     | Regional demographic baseline                                      |
| Reported rural population figure                | Approximately 2.9 million | Aggregate rural population stated in source                        |
| Education/health observation period             | 2006–2016                 | Longitudinal period discussed for selected indicators              |

**Note:** The source separately reports an average population of approximately 390,000 across selected regions and a rural population figure of approximately 2.9 million. Because the underlying regional table is not reproduced in the supplied document, these figures are retained as reported rather than mathematically reconciled.

### CSR Programme Coverage and Quantitative Interpretation

The eight-state Indian sample accounts for approximately 95% of national sugar production according to the source. Therefore, the portion outside the selected state sample is approximately 5%. This is a direct complement calculation and should be interpreted as the production share not represented by the selected eight-state sample.

| Measure                                                                       | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Sugar production represented by selected 8-state sample                       | 95%        |
| Sugar production outside selected sample (derived)                            | 5%         |
| Number of CSR programme types                                                 | 5          |
| Number of indicators                                                          | 10         |
| Indicators per programme type if evenly distributed (descriptive calculation) | 2          |

The final row is only a mathematical average (10 indicators ÷ 5 programme types = 2) and does not imply that the source assigned exactly two indicators to every programme type.

#### Demographic and Economic Baseline

The source describes nine sugar-producing regions in Asia and Africa and provides a comparative baseline

covering population, income distribution, employment, land tenure, health and education. It reports an average population of approximately 390,000 and states that the rural population across the selected regions was approximately 2.9 million.

| Demographic Measure                              | Reported Figure |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Number of selected sugar-producing regions       | 9               |
| Average population per region                    | ≈390,000        |
| Reported rural population                        | ≈2.9 million    |
| Implied population if 390,000 is multiplied by 9 | ≈3.51 million   |

The implied 3.51 million figure is a mathematical multiplication of the reported average by nine and is included only as a statistical check. It should not replace the source's separately stated 2.9 million rural-population figure because the source does not provide the underlying regional population table or define the two quantities identically.

#### Education Outcomes

Educational CSR initiatives in the source primarily target school participation and literacy, with attention to disadvantaged groups. The source reports changes

in enrollment between 2006 and 2016 and describes an upward trajectory in targeted sugar-producing villages, including female enrollment and non-scheduled caste and non-scheduled tribe enrollment. Because the numerical values from the source's referenced Table 3 are not reproduced in the supplied document, this rewrite does not invent percentages or enrollment counts. The appropriate statistical measures for the complete dataset would include absolute change, percentage change, annualized change and subgroup comparisons.

| Recommended Education Indicator | Statistical Measure                           |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Enrollment rate                 | Percentage and percentage-point change        |
| Female enrollment               | Percentage-point change and relative change   |
| Attendance                      | Mean/median and trend over time               |
| SC/ST participation             | Group-specific percentage change              |
| School access                   | Proportion of households/children with access |

#### Health Outcomes

The health analysis described in the source covers vaccination and health assistance. Children under seven years were considered using auxiliary 2011

census micro-data and household information from three waves of sugar-sector impact surveys. Vaccination categories were classified as full, part and no vaccination.

| Health Variable           | Categories/Unit Reported in Source | Suggested Statistical Analysis |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Vaccination status        | Full / Part / No                   | Percentage distribution        |
| Age group                 | Individuals below 7 years          | Age-specific rates             |
| Health assistance         | Household/community service        | Coverage percentage            |
| Maternal and child health | Survey observations                | Pre/post or group comparison   |
| Sanitation/access         | Household/service indicators       | Coverage and gap analysis      |

The source associates CSR-supported health activities with improved access to health and sanitation infrastructure. However, because exact vaccination percentages are not reproduced in the uploaded document, no numerical vaccination effect is asserted here.

### Infrastructure and Agricultural Support

The source identifies infrastructure as an area where CSR can generate relatively immediate effects. Reported activities include irrigation canals, ponds, small dams and rural roads. Agricultural CSR includes awareness of farming techniques, agricultural inputs, post-harvest services, market connections, farmer groups, technology, university linkages and sugarcane development.

| Area                 | Examples of CSR Activity              | Potential Quantitative Indicator   |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Irrigation           | Canals, ponds, small dams             | Hectares/households served         |
| Roads                | Rural road construction/maintenance   | Kilometres constructed or improved |
| Farm inputs          | Seeds, fertilizers, equipment         | Farmers/households reached         |
| Training             | New farming techniques                | Participants and adoption rate     |
| Market support       | Market linkages/post-harvest services | Farmers accessing markets          |
| Farmer organizations | Cooperatives/groups                   | Membership and participation       |

### Environmental Sustainability and Resource Management

The source connects CSR with environmental and resource-management responsibilities. It cites a Sri Lankan study in which most businesses primarily used

CSR for charitable purposes and only 11% adopted a strategic approach. This implies, as a direct complement, that approximately 89% did not fall into the strategic category in that study.

| CSR Orientation in Cited Sri Lankan Study           | Share |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Strategic CSR approach                              | 11%   |
| Other/non-strategic approaches (derived complement) | 89%   |
| Total                                               | 100%  |

The 89% figure is a mathematical complement of 11% and should be understood only within the cited study's population and definitions. It should not be generalized to all sugar companies or all countries.

### Labour Practices, Community Relations and Governance

CSR also involves labour conditions, workplace safety, community engagement and participatory governance. The source emphasizes local perceptions and participation as important for the long-term success of CSR. Governance-oriented CSR can create mechanisms for interaction among companies, farmers, local communities and public institutions.

Quantitative evaluation can examine participation rates, number of community meetings, beneficiary coverage, grievance resolution, representation of disadvantaged groups and continuity of community programmes.

### Case Studies and CSR Typology

The source discusses sugar-sector CSR across eight major-producing countries spanning four continents. It identifies three broad CSR categories: social-responsibility mandates, philanthropy-related investments, and agricultural support for smallholders.

| CSR Category                    | Typical Activities                              | Potential Outcome                      |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Social responsibility mandates  | Labour conditions, safety, community engagement | Compliance and community relations     |
| Philanthropic/social investment | Health, education, infrastructure               | Service access and human development   |
| Agricultural support            | Seeds, fertilizers, equipment, advice           | Farm capacity and market participation |

### Comparative Perspective with Other Agrarian Sectors

The source compares sugar with rice, cereals, horticulture and other agrarian sectors. It notes that

sugar can be distinctive because irrigated production, mill-linked cooperatives, inputs, credit, technical advice and relatively stable procurement arrangements

can create a stronger institutional relationship between companies and farmers.

The source also identifies seven CSR types in its broader comparative discussion, while emphasizing that sectoral comparisons must consider different policy, market and production environments.

#### Long-Term Socio-Economic Implications

The source reports evidence from sugar-producing regions of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka and discusses possible changes in income, poverty, schooling, health and community resilience. It describes increases in

household income and per-capita consumption among some groups and reductions in poverty, while also noting persistent inequalities and fragile access to services.

The long-term interpretation requires caution. The source itself notes that the persistence of positive outcomes remains an open question and that factors such as public investment, education quality, nutrition, sanitation and service availability influence rural outcomes.

#### Statistical Framework for Future CSR Impact Evaluation

| Indicator             | Formula/Measure                                               | Purpose                         |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mean household income | $\Sigma \text{ income} / n$                                   | Average economic status         |
| Income change         | Post – Pre                                                    | Absolute economic change        |
| Income growth         | $(\text{Post} - \text{Pre}) / \text{Pre} \times 100$          | Relative economic change        |
| Poverty rate          | $\text{Poor households} / \text{total} \times 100$            | Poverty prevalence              |
| School enrollment     | $\text{Enrolled} / \text{eligible} \times 100$                | Education participation         |
| Health coverage       | $\text{Beneficiaries} / \text{eligible} \times 100$           | Service access                  |
| CSR coverage          | $\text{Beneficiaries} / \text{target population} \times 100$  | Programme reach                 |
| Infrastructure access | $\text{Households with access} / \text{total} \times 100$     | Service/infrastructure coverage |
| Participation rate    | $\text{Participants} / \text{eligible population} \times 100$ | Community engagement            |

Future empirical studies should additionally report confidence intervals and, where the research design permits, regression or quasi-experimental estimates. Longitudinal data are particularly important because the source identifies cross-sectional design as a limitation for causal interpretation.

#### Policy Implications and Recommendations

- Develop CSR plans using measurable baseline and endline indicators.
- Prioritize community consultation and participatory identification of local needs.
- Maintain systematic records of CSR expenditure, beneficiaries, duration and geographical coverage.
- Link education and health investments with monitoring indicators rather than expenditure alone.
- Strengthen agricultural support through training, market access, technology and farmer organizations.
- Coordinate CSR programmes with government, NGOs, academic institutions and local communities.
- Use longitudinal monitoring to distinguish temporary improvements from sustained socio-economic change.
- Publish transparent CSR impact reports using standardized indicators.
- Protect privacy and ethical standards when household and beneficiary data are collected.

#### Limitations

- The source identifies internal-validity limitations arising from cross-sectional analysis.

- External validity is limited because findings may not apply to all sugar-producing or agrarian regions.
- The source does not quantify every long-term CSR effect, particularly the persistence of social transformation and economic development.
- Several case studies are based substantially on secondary information and require validation through primary data.
- Some numerical tables referenced in the source are not reproduced in the supplied document; therefore, this rewrite does not invent missing values.

#### Conclusion

The socio-economic role of CSR in the sugar industry extends across education, health, infrastructure, agriculture, labour relations, governance and environmental management. The source study reports that eight Indian sugar-producing states representing approximately 95% of national sugar production were examined through ten indicators and five programme types. It also describes comparative evidence from nine sugar-producing regions in Asia and Africa and examines changes over the 2006–2016 period.

The statistical presentation demonstrates that CSR research can be strengthened by clearly reporting programme coverage, beneficiary numbers, baseline and endline indicators, percentage changes and long-term trends. The cited 11% strategic-CSR figure in the Sri Lankan study, the approximately 390,000 reported average population, the stated 2.9 million rural population, and the 95% production coverage provide measurable context, while the absence of complete underlying tables limits more advanced statistical testing.

Overall, the evidence presented in the source associates sugar-industry CSR with improvements in education, health, rural infrastructure and selected agricultural and community outcomes. At the same time, the source calls for caution about causal attribution, sustainability and inequality. Future research should therefore combine primary household surveys with longitudinal administrative data, transparent CSR expenditure records and robust statistical impact-evaluation methods.

#### **Acknowledgement**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who contributed directly or indirectly to the successful completion of this research paper, “Socio-Economic Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives of Sugar Industries on Rural Communities.”

#### **Financial support and sponsorship**

Nil.

#### **Conflicts of interest**

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

#### **References**

1. Shodiq Askandar, N., Junaidi, J., & Machfudz, M. (2018). Developing Sustainable Corporate Social Responsibility Based on Islamic Perspective.
2. Rath, J. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation: Exploring the Williamson Framework and Government Policy Drivers.
3. Yong Gun Fie, D., & Medis, A. (2016). Social Antecedents and Sustainability of Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives: Developing Country Perspectives.
4. R. Pillai, L., Kane-Potaka, J., & Dixit, S. (2019). Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems: Channeling CSR Investments to Promote Science-Backed Development in Agriculture Sector.
5. R. Gonzaga, N., B. Gonzaga Jr., A., C. Cimagala, K., G. Alcantara, C., J. Torayno, E., & A. Quirino, R. (2015). Public Perception on Corporate Social Responsibilities of Various Agricultural Industries in Claveria, Misamis Oriental, Philippines.
6. Hussain Husain, A., & Ur Rehman Khattak, N. (2011). Economic Analysis of Sugarcane Crop in District Charsadda.