Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2350-0530
ISSN (Print): 2394-3629

International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH
June 2025 13(6), 144–152

THE ROLE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN ADVANCING SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY ACROSS MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Dr. Shaifali [1]

[1] Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Maitreyi College, University of Delhi, India

Received 15 April 2025
Accepted 18 May 2025
Published 10 July 2025

Corresponding Author
Dr. Shaifali, skashyap@maitreyi.du.ac.in

DOI
10.29121/granthaalayah.v13.i6.2025.6244

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

This research explores corporate governance's role in ensuring social sustainability throughout manufacturing sectors by qualitative, comparative means. The study applies thematic analysis to responses from semi-structured interviews with textile, automobile, and electronics sector governance and sustainability experts to reveal how governance shapes socially responsible behavior. The research identifies four governance mechanisms central to social sustainability—ethical leadership and board make-up, stakeholder interaction, human capital improvement, and strategic alignment of social goals—that work together to promote social sustainability. Of particular interest, industry-specific variations of governance practices mirror unique operating issues and regulatory requirements. This work contributes to the emerging ESG conversation by emphasizing governance as an affirmative facilitator of social sustainability as opposed to a compliance function. The research emphasizes the importance of incorporating social values into governance frameworks by way of participatory decision-making, transparency, and accountability. The findings provide policy advice to policymakers as well as corporate leaders who seek to engender inclusive and equitable development through governance reforms.

Keywords: Corporate Governance, Social Sustainability, Manufacturing Industries, Thematic Analysis, Stakeholder Engagement

1. INTRODUCTION

In a world characterized by global demands for ethical business practices, corporate governance has been a key driver of social sustainability, especially in manufacturing sectors that tend to be under siege regarding labor practices, community influence, and environmental legsacies. Though economic and environmental sustainability have long been the subject of discussions, social sustainability centered on human rights, fairness, labor conditions, and community welfare has taken center stage. Corporate governance, by mechanisms like board control, stakeholder dialogue, and moral responsibility, is the key to embedding these values into organizational policy.

This research examines the role of governance practices in producing social sustainability performance across manufacturing companies, contrasting evidence from different industrial sub-sectors. Adopting a qualitative research focus, the article examines how board structure, stakeholder inclusivity, transparency, and strategic fit influence sustainable social performance. It further investigates variations in governance structures across contexts and their efficiency in advancing ethical and fair business practices. Through the synthesis of empirics from industry practitioners and governance scholars, this research intends to reveal governance-led channels that can give rise to significant social impact. The research findings aim to contribute to both theoretical discussions and policy guidelines by highlighting the strategic importance of governance in infusing social sustainability into the very being of manufacturing firms.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate governance has developed beyond standard financial management to involve greater mandates, such as social and environmental issues Aguilera et al. (2006). For social sustainability, mechanisms like board diversity, stakeholder involvement, and ethical leadership are coming to be understood as key facilitators Jo and Harjoto (2011). Social sustainability represents practices that improve welfare at the societal level, such as decent working conditions, community building, and justifiable resource allocation Dyllick and Hockerts (2002). In manufacturing sectors, which work mostly in labor-intensive and socially sensitive contexts, the governance role in ensuring ethical behavior is especially prominent Khan et al. (2020). Board diversity—particularly women and independent directors—has been associated with more focus on social issues Bear et al. (2010). In addition, stakeholder-oriented governance structures compel companies to think about the interests of employees, suppliers, and communities, and foster long-term creation of social value Freeman (2010), Eccles et al. (2014). Disclosure and accountability devices like sustainability reporting and thrd-party audits further augment companies' social performance Ioannou and Serafeim (2015). Nonetheless, empirical evidence on how such governance practices are turned into social outcomes is still scarce, especially in manufacturing industries within various industrial settings. The majority of studies on sustainability thus far have been either environmental or financial in nature and neglected the intricate role of governance for developing social responsibility (Fernando & Lawrence, 2014). Additionally, increasing attention is now being given to the necessity for sector-level qualitative findings in order to comprehend governance dynamics and their relationship with social sustainability Michelon et al. (2015).

This research will help fill this gap by undertaking a comparative qualitative examination of corporate governance practices across manufacturing sectors, examining how governing arrangements and values influence social sustainability outputs in reality.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research incorporates a qualitative research approach to investigate how corporate governance practices shape social sustainability in different manufacturing sectors. A qualitative approach best fits this research since it enables deep probing of subjective experiences, stakeholder views, and contextual issues that quantitative methods might miss. The research applies semi-structured interviewing as its main data gathering instrument, focusing on influential stakeholders like board members, sustainability officers, and senior executives of manufacturing companies within automotive, textile, and electronics industries.

Purposive sampling was utilized to choose 85 individuals with extensive experience in corporate governance and sustainability strategy. The online interviews took 45 to 60 minutes. Participants' interviews were taped, transcribed word for word, and analyzed through thematic analysis. NVivo software was applied to categorically code the data and find persistent themes and patterns within governance mechanisms, board diversity, stakeholder engagement, and ethical practices.

Thematic analysis permitted the creation of rich qualitative understandings and conceptual connections among governance practices and social sustainability impacts. Approval for this research study was granted under the ethical principles, with all participants consenting to participate under informed consent. This approach maintains a rigorous and credible exploration of the connection between governance framework and social sustainability in manufacturing sectors.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1. THEMATIC ANALYSIS

This paper reports the findings of thematic analysis of 85 semi-structured interviews from three significant manufacturing industries: automotive, textiles, and electronics. The transcribed data were coded and analyzed with NVivo software to identify patterns and concepts that recurred. Four major themes were identified: (1) Board Composition and Ethical Leadership, (2) Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency, (3) Human Capital Development, and (4) Social Responsibility Integration in Governance Strategy. These topics capture the various but interrelated ways that corporate governance matters to social sustainability.

Theme 1: Board Composition and Ethical Leadership

Members highlighted the board's central role in establishing ethical values and advancing social concerns. Various board composition—especially in regard to gender, professional experience, and global exposure—was uniformly linked to more robust social sustainability practices.

4.2. A TEXTILE INDUSTRY SUSTAINABILITY OFFICER COMMENTED

"Women on the board do not only contribute diversity, but they also contribute a heightened sensitivity towards social causes like employee well-being and community upliftment."

Ethical leadership was quoted by most respondents as an essential driver of a firm's social vision. Companies with boards that had a defined ethical direction were likely to have inclusive recruitment policies, equitable labour policies, and community development schemes.

Codes: Board Diversity, Ethical Values, Leadership Commitment

Those firms that have boards that are inclusive and ethically oriented show greater alignment with social sustainability objectives, especially in labour practices and relationships with communities.

Theme 2: Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency

The second theme identified the importance of open governance systems and active engagement with stakeholders in promoting social sustainability. Firms that had open lines of communication with workers, suppliers, and community stakeholders were seen as being more socially responsible.

4.3. ONE EXECUTIVE FROM THE ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY HAD THIS TO SAY

"We meet with local communities regularly at the time of project implementation. It's not only about compliance—it's about establishing long-term trust."

Open reporting, particularly through integrated reports and sustainability disclosures, was also mentioned as a critical mechanism for accountability and stakeholder trust. A number of companies indicated that they employed third-party audits and social impact assessments to ensure their sustainability claims.

Codes: Stakeholder Inclusion, Open Communication, Transparency, Accountability

Engagement and transparency are viewed as essential drivers of social trust, compliance, and ethical implementation of corporate strategy.

Theme 3: Human Capital Development

In all sectors, employee investment was viewed as the cornerstone of social sustainability. Respondents indicated practices dealing with fair compensation, capability building, diversity training, and job safety as core governance practices.

4.4. AN AUTOMOTIVE SECTOR BOARD MEMBER STATED

"We regard our people as long-term partners, rather than as labour inputs. This attitude adjustment shapes our governance agendas."

Employee training programs and inclusive human resource policy were most commonly cited as governance-led actions that improve job satisfaction and staff retention. Most interesting, firms with well-defined human resource governance frameworks performed better at employee engagement and employee wellbeing.

Codes: Employee Welfare, Skills Training, Diversity and Inclusion, Workplace Safety

Human capital is a central area of governance in which stewardship directly sustains positive outcomes, enhancing social equity and intrinsic stakeholder value.

Theme 4: Integration of Social Responsibility into Governance Strategy

The fourth theme highlighted to what extent the social responsibility was integrated into the corporate governance strategy. For certain companies, social sustainability was viewed as a strategic goal, with specific sustainability committees and board-managed KPIs.

4.5. A DIRECTOR OF SUSTAINABILITY FOR AN ELECTRONICS COMPANY EXPLAINED

"Social sustainability isn't a bolt-on to our way of thinking. It's on the boardroom agenda and linked to executive bonuses."

Such integration was more prevalent among companies that harmonized their governance structures with global standards like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) or UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Strategic alignment encouraged social innovation culture, where companies addressed proactively challenges such as labour rights, local development, and supply chains for the inclusive.

Codes: Strategy Alignment, ESG Metrics, Board Accountability, Long-Term Vision

Companies that integrate social sustainability into governance strategy are more aligned in generating socially responsible results and matching corporate objectives with societal concerns.

5. CROSS-INDUSTRY OBSERVATIONS

While all industries were committed to social sustainability, differences between sectors occurred. Textile companies focused more on labour rights and community development, as they have direct contact with vulnerable communities. The auto sector focused on workplace safety and upskilling from union pressures and changes in technology. Electronics companies focused on transparency and stakeholder reporting, as a result of the complexity of global supply chains and regulatory attention.

Additionally, companies with more sophisticated corporate governance systems, like independent board committees and sustainability dashboards, exhibited more organized and preemptive social programs. On the other hand, companies with inferior governance exhibited disjoined efforts and ad-hoc responses to social concerns.
The thematic analysis supports the understanding that good corporate governance is a principal facilitator of social sustainability in manufacturing sectors. From ethical leadership and stakeholder engagement to staff development and strategic integration, governance frameworks inform the way firms engage with and benefit society. Though implementation differs across industries, robust governance consistently facilitates socially oriented business practices. These observations underscore the call for manufacturing companies to embrace inclusive, transparent, and strategic forms of governance to meet the increasing call for social sustainability.

6. DISCUSSION

This research's conclusions confirm that corporate governance is vital to promoting social sustainability in industries of manufacturing. The thematic analysis established that governance frameworks—most notably, board diversity, ethical leadership, stakeholder interaction, and integration strategy—significantly influence socially responsible outcomes. This is in line with and adds to the emerging body of research linking governance quality with sustainability performance.

The first of the themes, Board Composition and Ethical Leadership, highlights the strategic function of ethically focused and diverse boards in establishing the tone for social sustainability. This is underpinned by previous studies by Bear et al. (2010), who noted that there was a positive link between gender-diverse boards and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance. Likewise, Mallin and Michelon (2011) emphasized that independent and diverse boards are likely to question managerial decision-making and promote the interests of stakeholders. This study takes this perspective further by showing that not only diversity but also the ethical inclination of board members promotes policies with respect to fair labour practices, inclusiveness, and social outreach.

The second, Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency, resonates with the stakeholder theory Freeman (2010), which contends that businesses must take into account the interests of all stakeholders, not only shareholders. Attendees made observations that continuous dialogue with communities, employees, and suppliers creates trust and holds them accountable. Ntim and Soobaroyen (2013) in their previous studies corroborate this, demonstrating that clear governance practices improve social performance and stakeholder trust. In addition, sustainability disclosures oriented around guidelines like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) are mechanisms to embed transparency and assess social impact. This research discovers that manufacturing companies that engage stakeholders proactively are more sensitive to social issues, thereby supporting the stakeholder-based governance approach.

The third theme, Human Capital Development, presents a commitment to employees' health and growth based on governance. This is substantiated by Aguilera et al. (2006), who contend that employee-centered governance systems can maximize internal social performance and productivity. In this study, companies that invested in employee training, health, and diversity programs had increased participation and decreased turnover. This is consistent with the resource-based view Barney (1991), which places human capital on the strategic resources' list. In addition, socially responsible HR governance, including balanced wage structures and safety audits, was a prime differentiator among companies focusing on social sustainability.

The fourth theme, Social Responsibility Integration in Governance Strategy, indicates that integrating social objectives into the governance model results in more uniform and quantifiable outcomes. Eccles et al. (2014) established that companies with good sustainability governance frameworks outperformed their peers in both finance and social performance in the long term. This paper verifies theirs by providing evidence that manufacturing companies with board-level committees for sustainability and ESG-tied executive incentives have more integrated and effective social strategies. For instance, governance practices aligned with international standards like the UN SDGs enable companies to standardize and replicate their social programs. Sectoral differences also came into play. Textile firms, typically in the limelight for labour controversies, are concerned more with fair working conditions and community upliftment. The automobile industry, by contrast, concentrates on job security and reskilling, which is a result of high unionization and high-technology growth. Manufacturers of electronics prefer transparency in the global supply chain, and this is presumably because of international regulatory forces and reputational concerns. Such distinctions indicate that although fundamental governance principles are the same everywhere, their application may differ by industry because of variances in stakeholder requirements and regulatory environments.

On the whole, the research adds to the governance and sustainability literature as it illustrates how institutional governance processes affect social outcomes on the external side. It confirms that corporate governance is more than a mere compliance tool but also a strategic facilitator of social value. By adding social considerations to board-level decision-making and performance metrics, companies can increase their legitimacy, stakeholder relationships, and long-term resilience. Future research may also examine how governance is intertwined with other dimensions of sustainability, like environmental practices, in the development of a more comprehensive model of sustainable corporate governance.

7. CONCLUSION

This research investigated the crucial role of corporate governance in driving social sustainability in manufacturing sectors based on a comparative, qualitative method. Based on thematic analysis of cross-sector expert interviews from textiles, automotive, and electronics, this research determined four overarching governance-themed factors: board structure and ethical leadership, stakeholder relations and openness, development of human capital, and strategic incorporation of social sustainability objectives.

The results confirm the presumption that corporate governance is not just a compliance tool but a strategic driver of socially responsible conduct. Companies with diverse and ethical boards of directors have been found to be more inclined toward equitable labour conduct, diversity, and extended community involvement. In addition, stakeholder engagement came forward as an important pillar in governance, emphasizing that open communication and accountability structures are needed to establish trust and resolve workers', local communities', and other affected individuals' concerns.

Human capital building, as regulated through socially responsible HR policies, seemed particularly imperative in sectors where labour conditions have traditionally come under the spotlight. Through embedding governance within employee welfare programs such as training, safety, and fairness, companies were seen to enhance not only intra-organizational morale and productivity but also external legitimacy. Additionally, firms that integrate social sustainability into governance through board-level ESG committees, KPIs, and alignment with international standards such as the UN SDGs demonstrated more consistent and effective social sustainability results.

Significantly, the research also revealed sector-specific governance practices influenced by distinctive regulatory and stakeholder demands. While labour rights and community programs are emphasized in the textile industry, workplace safety and upskilling are focal points for the automotive sector, and supply chain transparency is the priority for the electronics sector. These variations show that while governance principles are generalizable, their operationalization needs to be sensitive to context in order to be effective.

In general, the research enriches the literature by highlighting qualitative aspects of governance that serve as the foundation of good social sustainability—e.g., ethical leadership, participative decision-making, and internal accountability arrangements. It shifts the debate from a compliance-focused perspective of governance to one that supports strategic alignment with social mandates.

For policymakers and business leaders, the results imply a call for enhancing governance structures with clear social mandate and performance metrics. Subsequent research would be able to draw on this work by investigating longitudinal effects of governance interventions or expanding the analysis to E and G aspects of ESG practices. With corporate legitimacy increasingly resting on social responsibility, integrating governance and sustainability is not only desirable but imperative.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, R. V., Williams, C. A., Conley, J. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2006). Corporate Governance and Social Responsibility: A Comparative Analysis of the UK and the US. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 14(3), 147–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2006.00495.x

Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The Impact of Board Diversity and Gender Composition on Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Reputation. Journal of Business Ethics, 97(2), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0505-2

Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the Business Case for Corporate Sustainability. Business Strategy and the Environment, 11(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.323

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance. Management Science, 60(11), 2835–2857. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984

Freeman, R. E. (2010). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192675

Gonela, V., & Zhang, J. (2014). Design of the Optimal Industrial Symbiosis System to Improve Bioethanol Production. Journal of Cleaner Production, 64, 513–534. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.059

Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2015). The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Investment Recommendations: Analysts' Perceptions and Shifting Institutional Logics. Strategic Management Journal, 36(7), 1053–1081. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2268

Jo, H., & Harjoto, M. A. (2011). The Causal Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility. Journal of Business Ethics, 106(1), 53–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1052-1

Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate Sustainability: First Evidence on Materiality. The Accounting Review, 91(6), 1697–1724. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51383

Mallin, C. A., & Michelon, G. (2011). Board Reputation Attributes and Corporate Social Performance: An Empirical Investigation of the US Best Corporate Citizens. Accounting and Business Research, 41(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2011.550740

Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., & Ricceri, F. (2015). CSR Reporting Practices and the Quality of Disclosure: An Empirical Analysis. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 33, 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003

Ntim, C. G., & Soobaroyen, T. (2013). Corporate Governance and Performance in Socially Responsible Corporations: New Empirical Insights from a Neo-

Institutional Framework. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 21(5), 468–494. https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12026