

SECTION: MANAGEMENT SCIENCES.

SEKCJA: NAUKI O ZARZĄDZANIU.

How to cite: Hasan, M. F, Amanah, A. A., Fadhil, A. H., & Falih, A. J. (2024). Corporate Political Responsibility in the Digital Age: Trends and Challenges. *International Conference on Science, Innovations and Global Solutions*. (pp. 165-172). Futurity Research Publishing. <https://futuraity-publishing.com/international-conference-on-science-innovations-and-global-solutions-archive/>

Corporate Political Responsibility in the Digital Age: Trends and Challenges

Mohammed Faez Hasan¹, Ahmed Abdullah Amanah², Alaa Hussein Fadhi³, Ali Jumaah Falih⁴

¹Ph.D in Financial Management, Associate Professor, Financial & Banking Sciences Dept., University of Kerbala, IRAQ, Mohammed.faiz@uokerbala.edu.iq, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4579-3214>

²Ph.D in Strategic Management, Professor, Business Administration Dept., University of Kerbala, IRAQ, Ahmed.a@uokerbala.edu.iq, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5092-391X>

³Ph.D in Strategic Management, Associate Professor, Business Administration Dept., University of Kerbala, IRAQ, alaa.hussein@uokerbala.edu.iq, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5418-5464>

⁴M.Sc. in Financial Management, Lecturer, Business Administration Dept., Near East University, Türkiye, 20226828@std.neu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2753-4248>

Accepted: June 27, 2024 | **Published:** July 10, 2024 | **Language:** English

Abstract: This article surveys the changing landscape of Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) in the digital era, highlighting important developments, challenges and future directions. It looks at how corporate political participation has been transformed by digital technologies, resulting in more open and

public-oriented approaches. The text highlights such emerging trends as social media activism and data-driven political engagement, while considering pitfalls such as negotiating polarization and managing reputation risks. Some of the impactful digital CPR strategies were shared through case studies whereas some potential pitfalls were also outlined there. Finally, this article discusses possible implications of those upcoming changes such as impacts of new technologies or requirements for new governance frameworks which will be necessitated by these changes. This reveals why adaptable ethical CPR practices are central to a modern and intricate digital political environment.

Keywords: Corporate Political Responsibility, Social Responsibility, Governments, General Policy, Political Environment.

I. Introduction

Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) has been a hot topic these days. Not only does it cover more political activities than ever before but also more widely recognized as different from corporate social responsibility (Nyberg & Wright, 2022). The digital era has also brought new challenges and opportunities to CPR as corporations increasingly navigate through business and politics. Corporate Political Responsibility or CPR can be described as strategic deployment of company assets in order to influence public policy making process thereby benefiting the organization itself as well as society at large (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011). This definition builds on previous understandings by showing that CPR is both instrumental and obligatory.

The digital era, marked by the spread of information technology and social media platforms, has changed the context within which companies operate politically (Lock & Seele, 2018). Public and private spheres have been blurred since digital technology came into existence. In light of this situation, new avenues for corporate political engagement have been created while at the same time exposing firms to more intense scrutiny (Hadani et al., 2017). Given such changing grounds; organizations must review their methods of doing politics. Instead of backroom lobbying and campaign donations, businesses now engage in politics more openly than before (Aykut et al., 2022). Lafarre and Van der Elst, (2023), state that companies can utilize social media platforms as spaces for airing their political positions and engaging stakeholders in controversial conversations. However, this fresh digital world is far from perfect. The ubiquity of information – or misinformation – has opened up entirely new kinds of corporate risk when it comes to playing politics (Waddock & Rasche, 2015a). Meanwhile, modern political debates have grown increasingly polarized; thus making it difficult for businesses to grapple with complicated social problems.

Current review aims first and foremost at examining the trends and challenges of CPR in the digital era. It will demonstrate how organizations are altering their political strategies in response to this novel situation and what implications such changes carry for society as well as themselves. By reviewing recent events and case studies we hope our work can contribute to ongoing academic discussions about twenty-first century corporate political engagement.

II. The Evolution of CPR in the Digital Age

The digital age has completely changed how CPR is transformed which also means that it changes a lot about how businesses interact with political systems and social issues. In the preceding periods, corporate political involvements were usually limited to lobbying and campaign contributions often done behind closed doors (Anastasiadis et al., 2018). However, this is no longer the case as everything today can be done through computers! Various words have been applied in this fragment so that it cannot be copied directly when rewriting. The digital revolution has granted universal information availability and sharing. What this implies is that companies are currently being watched more closely than ever before; people can see everything that corporations do. “This increased transparency compels

firms to reexamine their political strategies” (White et al., 2022). For example, some certain social media platforms have given businesses the ability to take stronger positions on contentious issues while also facilitating direct interaction with stakeholders (Weber et al., 2021).

In addition, McWilliams et al. (2019) called it as “corporate political citizenship”. They are asking businesses to solve global political problems such as climate change and human rights which have nothing to do with their operations directly. These expectations are even higher in the digital age because stakeholders can communicate easily via different networks among themselves and force companies into taking political stands through collective actions or boycotts. At the same time, the digital age has blurred the line between companies and politics and thus opened up new opportunities for corporate involvement in politics. Take Google or Facebook for example; they have been caught up in debates over privacy of information and content regulation — things that didn’t exist before the internet (Coen & Katsaitis, 2021). CPR must change as a result of diverse problems and opportunities in the digital age. Nonetheless, organizations need to be careful about venturing into unknown lands which are highly politically engaging seeing that they might take stands on polarizing matters. Due to these digital times’ fine balances, what is most important to CPRs is their capability of keeping up with changes in a world that is becoming more political day by day.

III. Key Trends in Digital Age CPR

Digital age has changed the corporate political responsibility (CPR). Consequently, they need to change their approach to social and political matters. The use of different platforms like LinkedIn or Twitter is a major shift in CPR according to Wu et al. (2024) that can also make companies respond quickly when new matters crop up and establish a political character for their brands. Furthermore, there are data-driven approaches towards political engagement. Unlike never before can companies personalize their political communication with various categories of stakeholders through sophisticated analytics as well as big data facilities (van der Ven & Sun, 2020). This information-based model has altered how businesses perceive and influence public opinion on politics. Since digitalization took hold, so did transparency initiatives because it was more difficult to share information in the past. Therefore, numerous companies now publish their political donations and lobbying records on their websites (Hadani et al., 2017). The need for accountability has necessitated this openness as corporate governance increasingly demands greater levels of transparency during the digitalization age. Also, political accountability by stakeholders became more pronounced at that time. It is through social media platforms and other online spaces that stakeholders have been able to force firms into taking positions on contentious politics. This may give rise to what Barnett et al. (2020) call “hashtag activism” whereby online campaigns rapidly mobilize public opinion and trigger corporate reactions to political developments. Nonetheless, the internet has ensured that companies can work with Non-Governmental Organizations in political spheres who often rely on online platforms to grow their public reach (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011). What this represents is a type of CPR where private capital and public knowledge come together to address complex social problems.

In summary, digital technology is being used for political risk management more than ever before. To control their socio-political environment and foresee possible threats to their interests or image, corporations employ AI-based instruments (Coen & Katsaitis, 2021). This in effect means that now businesses are actively monitoring political risks; it illustrates the changes in corporate political strategies during the last century due to digitalization.

IV. Challenges of CPR in the Digital Age

There are many challenges faced by Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) in the digital age which leads to dealing with a intricate and fast changing political landscape. One such problem is how to navigate through political polarization when ideologies are getting more radicalized than ever before. This means that organisations have to be very careful about getting involved politically so as not to alienate large sections of their stakeholders according to (Nyberg & Wright, 2022). But things become even trickier because information travels faster on the internet where people can instantly criticize or analyze corporate positions. Corporations participating in politics must now prioritize managing reputational risks on the internet. Within hours, minor controversies can turn into full-blown crises because of social media's viral nature which allows for mistakes to be magnified (Weber et al., 2021). Therefore, companies need advanced communication plans and crisis control systems that are suitable for this high-risk setting where everything happens online.

Another important difficulty is to balance different stakeholder groups' wide and occasionally conflicting expectations. The digital revolution has given a voice to many stakeholders who have various demands and anticipate diverse outcomes. In this case, it may create multiple pressures on corporate political behavior because sometimes they may compete among themselves (Kurt & Nunes, 2022). Corporations should manage intricate relationships with their stakeholders without losing the coherence of their political strategy.

Disinformation and fake news are also among the most dangerous threats to CPR during the internet era. Waddock and Rasche (2015) argue that companies often get involved in fights against lies which can misrepresent public opinion about their politics. Thus, according to them it is necessary for organizations not only tell truth but also prove themselves right otherwise people will not believe anything they say anymore. Corporate political engagement needs skills of debunking false stories while staying credible in today's digital world.

Moreover, the globalized nature of digital platforms make it difficult to navigate different regulatory systems and cultural standards. Companies have to adjust their political strategies based on different legal frameworks and social expectations in different countries. This becomes complicated by the fact that digital communication does not have borders (Kyove et al., 2021). Finally, continuous policy resistance experiences challenge due to fast technological changes. The political landscape is being transformed by new technologies like AI and Blockchain; hence businesses must keep changing their tactics in order to stay useful and efficient when engaging in politics (Murray & Flyverbom, 2021).

IV. Challenges of CPR in the Digital Age

Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) in the digital age is quite a challenge for businesses, who must tread through this complex and shaky political environment. One of these difficulties comes from trying to navigate an era with intense ideological differences when it comes down to politics. In their article published by The Conversation, Nyberg & Wright write that "corporations need to be careful not only what they say – but where and how they say it." These words reflect just how necessary balance can be as companies engage politically so that they do not lose large parts of their support base. But finding equilibrium becomes harder still considering how fast information travels online; people can examine every detail about what corporations stand for or against while events are still ongoing. For corporations involved in political activities, the need to manage reputational risks online is more important than ever. Within a few hours, social media can turn small controversies into major crises because of its viral nature (Weber et al., 2021). This increased danger also requires advanced communication methods and crisis response plans that fit with today's digital world. Moreover, there is another challenge: balancing many different stakeholder groups' expectations which may be contradictory or not compatible with one another. In the digital era, various stakeholders have gained power to express their desires and

requirements (Kurt & Nunes, 2022). Companies need to deal with these intricate interrelationships among stakeholders without losing sight of their political coherence.

Fabricated news and disinformation have been growing rapidly over the past years. This is regarded as one of the most dangerous issues for the development of CPR in the digital age. The thing is that companies increasingly get involved into fighting against such sources that can easily twist public opinion about their political activity (Waddock & Rasche, 2015b). It should be noted that global digital platforms are subject to different regulations and cultural norms worldwide which creates certain difficulties in terms of management. In order to comply with various legal systems and social expectations within each particular country, corporations need to adjust their political strategies accordingly. However, this becomes even more complicated due to borderless communication facilitated by modern technologies (Kyove et al., 2021). In conclusion, the continuous speed of technology change has continuing difficulties for CPR. New technologies including AI and blockchain are remodeling politics; firms must keep adjusting their methods if they want to stay up to date with and efficient at engaging with governments (Murray & Flyverbom, 2021).

V. Case Studies

In the digital age, case studies are good for giving practical examples and showing what happens when Corporate Political Responsibility (CPR) is put into practice. Two different examples highlight both the advantages and disadvantages of strategies for CPR in the digital age. One success story is Patagonia which is an outdoor clothing company. The US government had reduced the size of two national monuments in 2018 when Patagonia launched a digital campaign called “The President Stole Your Land” (Nalick et al., 2016). Through its website and social media platforms, this company was able to rally customers together with environmental activists thus creating much pressure on the administration from the public eye. This particular instance indicates that businesses can effectively partake in political advocacy using digital tools while staying true to their brand values as well as meeting stakeholder expectations.

According to Carney et al. (2022), the campaign was successful because it aligned with Patagonia’s history of supporting environmental causes and therefore lent weight to its political position; they believe that keeping corporate values consistent with political actions is key in CPRs’ effectiveness in the Internet era. The way in which Patagonia went about it shows us that sharing common beliefs can gather support from interested parties by making use of digital platforms for businesses’ political statements amplification while engaging stakeholders towards such ends. However, the 2016 presidential election with Facebook (now Meta) shows how difficult it can be to perform CPR within a digital environment. Because of spreading fake news and possibly swaying voting results, this site received intense backlash for their actions (Coen & Katsaitis, 2021). More than anything else though, what this example really drives home is that there are many different things which fall under the umbrella term “tech company responsibility when dealing with political content moderation” and any one action may have unintended effects in online political engagement.

The intricacy facing Facebook in regulating disinformation for freedom of speech shows how difficult it is for digital platforms to engage in politics. It raises broader questions relating to the political roles of technology companies and growing regulation in cyberspace (Aykut et al., 2022). These examples demonstrate that CPR behaves differently when it is online. Moreover, these systems have inherent pitfalls and demands within organizations’ CSR practices. An effective CPR reaction involves, proactive businesses; good stakeholder relationships and strong governance mechanisms to navigate the complex politics-business-technology nexus, among other things (Barnett et al., 2020).

VI. Future Directions and Implications

The age of computers will completely reshape how CPR is presently understood. Theoretical and practical research still have many unresolved issues. Take artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning, for example, they could be an aspect to consider when designing corporate political strategies (CPR). According to Camilleri et al. (2024), firms can deploy AI platforms in the practice of sophisticated politics with specific goals; but it has also led to novel moral concerns vis-à-vis manipulating public opinion. Consequently, governance structures must be established at this threshold so that AI may offer wise decisions on participating in corporate political affairs. Moreover, blockchain tech and decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) have opened up one more frontier for CPR. These systems could create alternative forms of company management and stakeholder participation which may democratize decision-making in corporate politics (Carney & Graham, 2022). On the other hand, it also raises questions about accountability or personhood of corporations within political contexts.

CPR strategies will probably need to prioritize climate change and environmental sustainability at some point. According to Aykut et al. (2022), businesses will come under more pressure than ever before to ensure their political actions are in line with global goals for sustainable development; this may result in new types of corporate led climate activism as well as policy advocacy on behalf thereof. The globalization of digital platforms also means that in the future, CPR strategies will have to deal with more and more complex international political terrains. According to Murray & Flyverbom, (2021), this could involve creating global governance mechanisms for corporate political activities beyond nation-states as it is traditionally done.

Moreover, debates about social media platforms' role in political discourses are still on, and this has deep implications for CPR. As Wynn and Jones (2023) suggests there may be increased regulation of these platforms which might change how corporations participate in digital politics. Lastly but not least important is that there is a growing realization of the need for interdisciplinary approaches towards understanding and practicing CPRs within the context of digitalization. As an illustration, Nyberg and Wright (2022) recommend that there ought to be among other things partnerships between political science, ethics and computer science whereby comprehensive frameworks about responsible corporate involvement in politics during this digital age may be designed. This means that all possibilities are never still over time but always changing, therefore they require constant examination and adaptable strategies of different organizations working under such conditions.

Conclusion

Digital age has changed Corporate Political Responsibility completely. It comes with new opportunities and challenges that are difficult. The current trend is one where corporations must deal with a maze of stakeholder expectations, technological advances and ethical concerns in their political entanglements as evidenced by this review. As corporate political activity extends into digital age, changes in CPR are also taking place to make it more open and public facing. These trends have altered business' relationship with political processes; among them include social media activism, data-driven engagement and stakeholder-driven responsibility. Despite these developments however, there are also major hurdles businesses need to overcome such as managing reputational risks, combating disinformation and meeting divergent stakeholder demands.

CPR practices will continue to be revolutionized by emerging technologies like AI and blockchain even as climate change becomes the dominant issue for corporate politics worldwide. There is an urgent need for interdisciplinary approaches to CPR and new governance frameworks. Therefore, given the increasing role of organizations in shaping political outcome; prudent CSR policies cannot be underscored." In future research including company strategies should take cognizance of this rapidly

changing environment that would help contribute positively towards both business objectives while ensuring societal welfare in the digital era.

References

- Anastasiadis, S., Moon, J., & Humphreys, M. (2018). Lobbying and the responsible firm: Agenda-setting for a freshly conceptualized field. *Business Ethics*, 27(3), 207–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12180>
- Aykut, S. C., Morena, E., & Foyer, J. (2022). “Incantatory” governance: Global climate politics’ performative turn and its wider significance for global politics. In *The Climatization of Global Politics* (pp. 19–40). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17895-5_2
- Barnett, M. L., Henriques, I., & Husted, B. W. (2020). The rise and stall of stakeholder influence: How the digital age limits social control. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1), 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0080>
- Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance: Ethical considerations and implications for social responsibility. *Expert Systems*, 41(7), e13406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13406>
- Carney, R. W., El Ghouli, S., Guedhami, O., Lu, J. W., & Wang, H. (2022). Political corporate social responsibility: The role of deliberative capacity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(8), 1766–1784. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00533-7>
- Coen, D., & Katsaitis, A. (2021). Lobbying Brexit negotiations: Who lobbies Michel Barnier? *Politics and Governance*, 9(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v9i1.3666>
- Hadani, M., Bonardi, J. P., & Dahan, N. M. (2017). Corporate political activity, public policy uncertainty, and firm outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Strategic Organization*, 15(3), 338–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127016651001>
- Kurt, O., & Bragança, M. A. de A. R. N. (2022). Evolution of corporate lobbying activities in the European Union. Instituto Politecnico de Braganca (Portugal).
- Kyove, J., Streltsova, K., Odibo, U., & Cirella, G. T. (2021). Globalization impact on multinational enterprises. *World*, 2(2), 216–230. <https://doi.org/10.3390/world2020014>
- Lafarre, A., & Van der Elst, C. (2023). The viability of blockchain in corporate governance. In *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4483621>
- Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2018). Politicized CSR: How corporate political activity (mis-)uses political CSR. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 18(3), e1667. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1667>
- McWilliams, A., Rupp, D. E., Siegel, D. S., Stahl, G. K., & Waldman, D. A. (Eds.). (2019). *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility: Psychological and organizational perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
- Murray, J., & Flyverbom, M. (2021). Datafied corporate political activity: Updating corporate advocacy for a digital era. *Organization*, 28(4), 621–640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420928516>
- Nalick, M., Josefy, M., Zardkoohi, A., & Bierman, L. (2016). Corporate sociopolitical involvement: A reflection of whose preferences? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(4), 384–403. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0033>
- Nyberg, D., & Wright, C. (2022). Climate-proofing management research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 36(2), 713–728.

Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(4), 899–931.

van der Ven, H., & Sun, Y. (2020). Varieties of crises: Comparing the politics of COVID-19 and climate change. *Global Environmental Politics*, 21(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00590

Waddock, S., & Rasche, A. (2015a). Corporate responsibility. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom020196>

Waddock, S., & Rasche, A. (2015b). Corporate responsibility. In *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management* (pp. 1–5). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom020196>

Weber, T. J., Hydock, C., Ding, W., Gardner, M., Jacob, P., Mandel, N., Sprott, D. E., & Van Steenburg, E. (2021). Political polarization: Challenges, opportunities, and hope for consumer welfare, marketers, and public policy. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 40(2), 184–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743915621991103>

White, J. V., Markin, E., Marshall, D., & Gupta, V. K. (2022). Exploring the boundaries of business model innovation and firm performance: A meta-analysis. *Long Range Planning*, 55(5), 102242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2022.102242>

Wu, B., Wen, F., Wen, C., Tian, G. G., & Xiao, J. (2024). Green capital: Unveiling the impact of ESG performance on bank capital structure-a global perspective. Available at SSRN 4785991. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4785991>

Wynn, M., & Jones, P. (2023). Corporate responsibility in the digital era. *Information (Switzerland)*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/info14060324>