



Cause Promotion and Social Marketing as Corporate Social Responsibility Strategies: An Integrative Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Edralene M. Toñacao¹, Anik Yuesti², Joel Arante Alve^{3*}

¹Master in Business Administration, University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos, Negros Occidental, Philippines

²Associate Professor of Accounting, Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

³University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos, Negros Occidental, Philippines

*Email: joelalvoar@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) increasingly requires firms to align social contributions with credible stakeholder engagement and measurable outcomes. This integrative literature review examines cause promotion and social marketing as marketing-related CSR strategies while clarifying their distinction from cause-related marketing (CRM). Cause promotion primarily builds awareness, participation, fundraising, and volunteer support; CRM links corporate contributions to consumer transactions; and corporate social marketing applies marketing principles to encourage voluntary behavior change. Synthesizing foundational theory, empirical studies, reviews, meta-analytic evidence, and recent sustainability communication research, the study identifies distinct mechanisms, outcomes, and boundary conditions. Cause promotion is most effective for generating attention and engagement, whereas social marketing is better suited to converting awareness into behavioral outcomes. Effectiveness depends on authenticity, cause-company fit, transparency, credibility, stakeholder involvement, contextual fit, and behavioral accessibility. The paper proposes an integrative CSR pathway to guide the selection, sequencing, and evaluation of marketing-related CSR initiatives for sustainable societal impact.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, cause promotion, social marketing, sustainability



©2026 The Author(s). Published by IJASSD. Licensed under CC BY 4.0.

INTRODUCTION

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has moved from a peripheral philanthropic activity toward a strategic domain in which firms are expected to account for economic, social, and environmental consequences while maintaining organizational viability. Management and marketing research consequently treats CSR not only as a question of corporate conduct but also as a stakeholder relationship process in which firms identify

salient expectations, design responses, and communicate those responses credibly (Maignan & Ferrell, 2004; Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Marketing is particularly relevant because many CSR initiatives depend on awareness, stakeholder participation, value alignment, communication, and behavior change. Recent reviews likewise show that CSR-related marketing research has expanded substantially and increasingly intersects with sustainability communication and responsible consumption (Quezado *et al.*, 2022; Braga *et al.*, 2024).

Within this broad domain, cause promotion and social marketing are frequently discussed as practical routes through which firms can support social causes. Cause promotion uses corporate resources to increase awareness and concern for a cause or to support fundraising, participation, or volunteer recruitment (Ásványi, 2021; Kotler & Lee, 2005a). Social marketing, in contrast, uses marketing concepts and tools to influence voluntary behaviors that improve personal or societal welfare (Andreasen, 1994; Basil, 2019). When a corporation sponsors or implements such a behavior-change program, the activity is commonly described as corporate social marketing (Kotler & Lee, 2005a; Inoue & Kent, 2014). These strategies can therefore contribute to CSR through different mechanisms: one primarily builds attention and engagement, while the other focuses on behavioral outcomes.

A major conceptual difficulty in the existing manuscript and in parts of the broader applied literature is the tendency to use cause promotion, cause marketing, and cause-related marketing (CRM) interchangeably. This conflation weakens construct validity. Kotler and Lee (2005a) explicitly distinguish cause promotion from CRM and corporate social marketing. CRM is transaction-linked: the firm commits a contribution to a designated cause when consumers engage in revenue-generating exchanges. This core feature is also central to the classic definition of CRM (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988) and to contemporary systematic and meta-analytic research (Bhatti *et al.*, 2023; Schamp *et al.*, 2023). By contrast, cause promotion does not require a purchase-linked donation, and social marketing does not require a donation at all. It requires a behavioral objective.

Clarifying these boundaries matters strategically. Firms can create awareness without producing behavior change, and they can generate a positive brand response without demonstrating social impact. Conversely, a well-designed behavior-change intervention may produce social benefits but fail to earn stakeholder trust when corporate motives appear opportunistic or communication lacks transparency. Research on CSR communication, CRM, and perceived authenticity shows that stakeholder attributions, credibility, cause fit, and communication design can determine whether social initiatives produce support or skepticism (Baghi *et al.*, 2009; Du *et al.*, 2010; Jeon & An, 2019; Schamp *et al.*, 2023). Thus, an effective CSR strategy requires both construct clarity and an explicit theory of how communication, participation, and behavioral intervention connect to outcomes.

The issue is also increasingly relevant in emerging-market and Philippine business contexts, where CSR communication is occurring alongside stronger sustainability disclosure expectations. In the Philippines, the Securities and Exchange Commission has

moved toward internationally aligned sustainability disclosure requirements through SEC Memorandum Circular No. 16, Series of 2025, adopting PFRS S1 and PFRS S2 on a phased basis. Although sustainability reporting is not the same as cause promotion or social marketing, this institutional development raises the importance of transparency, materiality, and demonstrable outcomes in corporate responsibility initiatives. For businesses operating in national and subnational contexts such as Negros Island, the implication is that CSR initiatives must be locally relevant while remaining consistent with corporate-level commitments and credible reporting.

Against this background, this review addresses three questions: (1) How should cause promotion, cause-related marketing, and corporate social marketing be conceptually distinguished within CSR? (2) Through what mechanisms and boundary conditions do cause promotion and social marketing generate corporate and societal outcomes? and (3) How can the two strategies be integrated without reducing CSR to promotional activity? The article contributes by correcting construct ambiguity, synthesizing evidence on mechanisms and moderators, developing a staged integration framework, and identifying a research agenda for business organizations in global, national, and local contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

CSR, Stakeholders, and Marketing-Related Social Initiatives

CSR is inherently multi-stakeholder. Firms respond not only to consumers but also to employees, communities, governments, investors, civil society, and other groups that can affect or are affected by corporate conduct. Maignan and Ferrell (2004) position marketing as a mechanism for identifying stakeholder norms and developing organizational responses, while Peloza and Shang (2011) show that CSR can create different forms of value for different stakeholder groups. This perspective cautions against evaluating CSR only through purchase intention or brand attitude. A socially oriented initiative may be strategically useful when it strengthens trust, legitimacy, employee engagement, community cooperation, or long-term stakeholder relationships even when immediate sales effects are limited.

Communication nevertheless remains necessary because stakeholders cannot respond to CSR activities they do not recognize or understand. Du et al. (2010) identify low awareness and unfavorable attributions as major barriers to realizing business returns from CSR communication. Ihlen et al. (2011) similarly emphasize that CSR communication is not a neutral transmission process: message credibility, stakeholder interpretation, corporate history, and the perceived relationship between claims and conduct affect legitimacy. Braga et al. (2024) extend this logic to sustainability communication, showing that the field increasingly links reporting, advertising, consumer response, and pro-sustainable behavior. Cause promotion and social marketing are therefore best viewed as distinct tools located within a wider architecture of responsible business practice and stakeholder communication.

Distinguishing Cause Promotion, Cause-Related Marketing, and Corporate Social Marketing

The distinction among the three initiatives is foundational to the present review. Kotler and Lee's (2005a) typology separates marketing-related corporate social initiatives by their primary objective and operating mechanism. The definitions below also align with later empirical work that directly differentiates social marketing and CRM (Pharr & Lough, 2012) and compares cause promotion with CRM (Jeon & An, 2019).

Table 1. Construct Boundaries Among Three Marketing-Related CSR Initiatives

Initiative	Primary Objective	Core Mechanism	Required Consumer Transaction?	Typical Proximal Outcome	Illustrative Evaluation Metrics
Cause promotion	Increase awareness, concern, participation, fundraising, or volunteer support	Corporate communication and resource support for a cause	No	Awareness, salience, participation, resource mobilization	Reach, awareness, engagement, participation, funds/resources mobilized
Cause-related marketing (CRM)	Support a cause while linking contribution to market exchange	A donation/contribution is triggered by sales or another revenue-producing transaction	Yes, by definition	Consumer response plus cause contribution	Campaign response, sales-linked contribution, attitude, purchase behavior, cause fit, transparency
Corporate social marketing	Influence a specific voluntary behavior that improves welfare	Behavioral diagnosis and marketing intervention, including value proposition, access, communication, and exchange	No	Behavior adoption, cessation, maintenance, or switching	Behavioral uptake, persistence, barriers reduced, social/health/environmental outcomes

Cause promotion is therefore not a synonym for CRM. Ásványi (2021) describes cause promotion as the use of corporate resources to raise awareness and participation around a cause. CRM, in contrast, emerged as a strategic alignment of marketing and philanthropy in which contributions are linked to consumer transactions (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988). Contemporary review evidence confirms that CRM has developed into a strategic CSR initiative but remains conceptually anchored in the transaction-linked contribution mechanism (Bhatti et al., 2023). Hanzae et al. (2019), Sheikh and Beise-Zee (2011), and Thomas and Kureshi (2017) further demonstrate that cause type, cause specificity, perceived fit, and consumer affinity can influence responses to cause-oriented marketing.

Social marketing differs more fundamentally because its focal outcome is behavior. Andreasen (1994) argues that social marketing should be defined by its behavioral

objective rather than by the simple use of promotional techniques for a social issue. Basil (2019) similarly treats audience research, exchange, segmentation, competition, and the marketing mix as elements of social marketing practice. Corporate social marketing applies this logic to company-supported initiatives. Inoue and Kent (2014) propose that such initiatives can generate both social and business benefits, but their effectiveness depends substantially on corporate credibility. Pharr and Lough (2012) likewise show empirically that social marketing and CRM can be distinguished based on their target, exchange, benefits, and marketing orientation.

Mechanisms Linking CSR Initiatives to Corporate and Societal Outcomes

Cause-oriented CSR initiatives can influence corporate outcomes through several pathways. First, visibility and awareness can make stakeholders more likely to recognize a firm's social engagement. Second, perceived value congruence can strengthen identification between stakeholders and the organization. Third, repeated credible conduct can contribute to trust, legitimacy, and relationship quality. These outcomes, however, are contingent rather than automatic. CSR communication can backfire when stakeholders infer self-serving motives, perceive inconsistency between a firm's core practices and its social claims, or cannot determine how resources are used (Baghi *et al.*, 2009; Du *et al.*, 2010).

CRM evidence illustrates this contingency clearly. Schamp *et al.* (2023), synthesizing 237 studies, report stronger average effects for attitudinal responses than for behavioral responses, with substantial heterogeneity across studies. Their findings emphasize transparency, sincerity cues, purchase context, and emotional attachment as important moderators. This distinction is central to the present article: favorable attitudes toward a campaign are not equivalent to durable social behavior or social impact. An organization that seeks measurable change should therefore avoid treating campaign exposure, likes, impressions, or donations as substitutes for behavioral indicators.

The behavior-change literature provides a complementary perspective. White *et al.* (2019) show that sustainable consumer behavior is shaped by social influence, habit formation, individual self-concept, feelings and cognition, and tangibility. Corporate social marketing can use these insights to diagnose why a desired behavior is not occurring and to redesign the behavioral environment, value proposition, access, incentives, social norms, or communication. Accordingly, the strategic advantage of integrating cause promotion with social marketing lies not in conducting more communication, but in using communication to create readiness for a subsequent behavior-focused intervention.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts an integrative literature review design rather than claiming a fully systematic review. Integrative reviews are appropriate when a research problem requires conceptual clarification and synthesis across theoretical, empirical, and methodological streams (Torraco, 2005; Snyder, 2019). This design is particularly suitable here because

the relevant literature spans CSR, marketing, social marketing, consumer behavior, stakeholder theory, sustainability communication, and cause-related marketing. The objective is analytical integration and framework development, not statistical aggregation or exhaustive bibliometric coverage.

The review proceeded in four stages. First, the problem was framed around construct boundaries and strategic integration. Core search concepts included combinations of “cause promotion,” “cause-related marketing,” “cause marketing,” “corporate social marketing,” “social marketing,” “corporate social responsibility,” “CSR communication,” “authenticity,” “stakeholder behavior,” and “sustainability communication.” Second, literature was retained when it contributed directly to at least one of four analytical functions: defining the constructs, explaining their mechanisms, providing empirical evidence on outcomes or moderators, or locating the strategies within broader CSR and sustainability practice. Foundational works were retained because construct definition is historically dependent, while recent review and meta-analytic studies were emphasized to update the evidence base.

Third, the sources were coded thematically according to (a) initiative type, (b) primary objective, (c) mechanism, (d) focal stakeholder outcome, (e) societal outcome, (f) moderators and risks, and (g) contextual level. Peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and authoritative regulatory material formed the primary evidentiary base. The practitioner-oriented source retained from the original reference list was used only as contextual material and not as decisive evidence for theoretical claims. Fourth, the coded literature was compared for convergence, conceptual disagreement, and missing links. The synthesis then generated a staged framework connecting awareness and mobilization to behavior change and impact measurement.

This review has two deliberate boundaries. First, it does not treat CRM evidence as direct evidence for cause promotion, even though the literatures overlap. CRM studies are used to illuminate adjacent mechanisms such as cause fit, authenticity, skepticism, and transaction-linked consumer response. Second, the discussion of global, Philippine, and local contexts is interpretive rather than a separate empirical comparison. The Philippines and Negros Island provide a managerial context for applying the framework, not a claim that the review identified a representative sample of local CSR campaigns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cause Promotion: Strongest at Awareness, Salience, and Mobilization

The literature supports a relatively consistent interpretation of cause promotion as an awareness- and participation-oriented CSR initiative. A company may provide funding, media space, distribution channels, employee involvement, sponsorship, or other resources to increase public concern or participation around a social issue (Ásványi, 2021; Kotler & Lee, 2005a). This function is strategically important because stakeholder awareness is a precondition for many downstream responses. Du et al. (2010) note that low CSR awareness is itself a barrier to stakeholder support. Cause promotion can

therefore create visibility for an issue, lower informational barriers, and signal that the organization is willing to allocate resources to a public concern.

However, the social value of awareness depends on what follows it. Reach, impressions, event attendance, and resource mobilization are legitimate proximal indicators, but they do not establish sustained behavior change. The practical risk is a “communication completion” bias in which the firm treats campaign visibility as the end point of CSR performance. This problem becomes more serious in sustainability contexts, where stakeholders increasingly expect credible evidence that communication corresponds with substantive organizational practices (Ihlen *et al.*, 2011; Braga *et al.*, 2024). Cause promotion is therefore most defensible when its objective is explicitly awareness or mobilization, or when it is designed as the first stage of a broader intervention.

Corporate social marketing: behavior change as the defining outcome

Corporate social marketing shifts the unit of success from message exposure to behavioral movement. The firm identifies a socially desirable target behavior, analyzes barriers and competing behaviors, develops an exchange proposition, and uses marketing tools to make the desired behavior more attractive and feasible (Basil, 2019; Kotler & Lee, 2005b). Examples may include reducing waste, increasing recycling, improving safety, adopting preventive health practices, conserving water or energy, or choosing more sustainable forms of consumption. The specific social issue is less important conceptually than the presence of a defined behavior and a strategy designed to influence it.

This distinction has management implications. A behavior-focused CSR intervention requires more than persuasive communication. If consumers are asked to segregate waste but appropriate bins are unavailable, if employees are encouraged to conserve energy but operating systems make conservation difficult, or if communities are asked to adopt a health practice without access to the required service, promotion alone cannot solve the behavioral constraint. Social marketing therefore directs managerial attention toward the full value exchange, including costs, convenience, social norms, perceived efficacy, access, and competing alternatives. White *et al.* (2019) reinforce this point by showing that sustainable behavior is affected by multiple psychological and contextual mechanisms.

Corporate credibility is also a boundary condition. Inoue and Kent (2014) argue that companies can generate social and business benefits through corporate social marketing when stakeholders consider the corporate source credible. Truong and Hall (2017), examining corporate social marketing in tourism, similarly raise ethical questions about the relationship between social objectives and corporate interests. These studies suggest that the legitimacy of corporate involvement depends on whether the organization’s broader conduct is compatible with the behavior it promotes.

CRM is Adjacent Evidence, Not a Substitute Construct

The reviewed CRM literature is extensive and useful, but it must be interpreted at the correct construct level. CRM links a corporate contribution to a consumer transaction (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988; Bhatti *et al.*, 2023). This mechanism gives CRM a direct commercial trigger that cause promotion does not require. Moharam and Elsamadicy (2020) emphasize this conceptual connection between marketing objectives and social causes, while Schamp *et al.* (2023) demonstrate that CRM produces moderate attitudinal effects on average but weaker behavioral effects. Thus, CRM can support CSR and cause financing, but positive consumer response should not be equated with social behavior change.

At the same time, CRM research provides relevant lessons for cause promotion and social marketing because all three initiatives are exposed to attributional risk. Baghi *et al.* (2009) describe a “dark side” of CRM communication when marketing design raises doubts about corporate motives or use of funds. Sheikh and Beise-Zee (2011) show that consumer cause affinity shapes response to cause-specific initiatives, and Thomas and Kureshi (2017) demonstrate that cause type and scope can influence preferences. Hanzaee *et al.* (2019) further compare cause marketing and CRM effects. These findings support a broader principle: CSR-related marketing should be designed around stakeholder relevance and credible fit rather than assuming that any socially desirable cause will produce favorable responses.

Authenticity, Transparency, and Fit Are Cross-Cutting Boundary Conditions

Authenticity is a recurring condition across the literature. Jeon and An (2019) show that perceived CSR motives influence authenticity and company attitudes, with differences between cause promotion and CRM. Value-driven and stakeholder-driven motives tend to support authenticity, whereas strongly egoistic attributions can undermine it. This finding helps explain why apparently similar CSR campaigns can generate different stakeholder reactions. The issue is not only what the company does but also whether stakeholders perceive continuity between the initiative, the firm’s values, its history, and its core business practices.

Transparency operates in parallel. Stakeholders are more likely to distrust a campaign when contribution rules are unclear, impact claims are vague, or communication emphasizes corporate virtue without verifiable outcomes. Meta-analytic CRM evidence identifies transparency and sincerity signals among important moderators (Schamp *et al.*, 2023), while CSR communication research emphasizes the role of message content, channels, and stakeholder characteristics (Du *et al.*, 2010). For managers, this means that campaign design should specify the problem addressed, the firm’s contribution, partner responsibilities, behavioral objective where applicable, and the metrics used to assess progress.

It should also be interpreted carefully. A strong cause–company connection can improve comprehensibility and credibility, but an overly self-serving fit may increase suspicions that the cause is merely instrumental. The relevant managerial standard is therefore not maximum similarity but defensible strategic coherence: the company should

be able to explain why the issue matters to its stakeholders, why it has legitimate capabilities or responsibilities in the area, and how the initiative connects to actual business practices.

An Integrated Pathway: From Awareness to Sustained Behavior and Social Impact

The synthesis supports a staged rather than substitutive relationship between cause promotion and social marketing. Cause promotion can create attention, issue salience, stakeholder recruitment, and resource mobilization. Social marketing can then translate this readiness into a defined behavioral intervention. The sequence is not mandatory for every CSR program, but it offers a useful logic when an organization seeks both visibility and measurable change.

Table 2. Proposed Integration Pathway for Cause Promotion and Social Marketing Within CSR

Stage	Strategic Question	Dominant CSR Mechanism	Primary Indicators	Key Failure Risk
1. Issue diagnosis	What social problem is material to stakeholders and legitimate for the firm to address?	Stakeholder analysis and CSR strategy	Materiality, stakeholder relevance, baseline conditions	Cause chosen mainly for promotional attractiveness
2. Awareness and mobilization	Do target stakeholders recognize the issue and know how to participate?	Cause promotion	Awareness, reach, engagement, volunteers, funds/resources	High visibility with weak relevance or credibility
3. Behavioral diagnosis	What specific behavior must change, and what prevents it?	Social marketing research	Behavioral baseline, barriers, competing behaviors, segment insight	Assuming information deficit is the only barrier
4. Intervention design	What value proposition and environment make the desired behavior feasible?	Corporate social marketing	Access, perceived value, participation, behavior adoption	Promotion without removing structural barriers
5. Outcome and credibility	Did behavior and social conditions improve, and can the firm substantiate the claim?	Impact evaluation and transparent CSR communication	Behavior persistence, social/environmental outcome, stakeholder trust	Reporting activity outputs as if they were social impact

This pathway clarifies the “logical bridge” between the two strategies. Cause promotion answers the awareness and mobilization problem; social marketing answers the behavior problem. The bridge is behavioral diagnosis. Without this intermediate step, organizations may jump directly from awareness messaging to a desired action and

assume that stakeholders will comply once informed. Social marketing theory rejects that assumption because behavior is also shaped by perceived costs, habits, access, norms, alternatives, and contextual constraints.

The framework also separates corporate outcomes from social outcomes. Brand attitude, reputation, trust, and stakeholder engagement are legitimate corporate indicators, while behavior adoption, sustained practice, health improvement, environmental performance, or community outcomes are social indicators. A robust CSR evaluation should report both when both are claimed. This dual-accountability principle reduces the risk that business benefits become the only evidence used to justify a socially framed initiative.

Global, National, and Local Application

At the global level, firms often select social issues that are broadly recognizable across markets, including climate action, public health, inclusion, or responsible consumption. The advantage is strategic coherence and scalability; the limitation is that the same message or behavioral intervention may not translate across cultural and institutional settings. Cross-market adaptation therefore requires more than translating communication. It requires reassessing stakeholder priorities, social norms, infrastructure, incentives, and the practical feasibility of the target behavior. Practitioner-oriented discussions of CSR globalization make a similar localization argument, although such sources should supplement rather than replace scholarly evidence (How, 2025).

At the national level, CSR operates within regulatory, policy, and cultural expectations. In the Philippines, the shift toward PFRS S1 and PFRS S2 sustainability disclosures increases pressure on covered companies to connect sustainability narratives with governance, risks, metrics, and decision-useful information (Securities and Exchange Commission Philippines, 2025). For cause promotion and social marketing, the implication is indirect but important: firms face a stronger institutional environment for substantiating sustainability-related claims and explaining how social initiatives connect to material business and stakeholder issues.

At the local level, community specificity becomes more important. For businesses in Negros Island, an analytically sound application would begin with stakeholder diagnosis rather than assuming that a global CSR theme is locally salient. A company might find that community priorities concern livelihood, disaster resilience, health, waste, education, or environmental stewardship, but the appropriate issue and target behavior should be established through local evidence and consultation. Local CSR is therefore not simply a smaller version of a global campaign. It requires adaptation of both the social problem definition and the intervention mechanism.

Managerial Implications

First, managers should select the CSR initiative by objective. If the objective is awareness, fundraising, volunteering, or public participation, cause promotion is appropriate. If the objective is transaction-linked giving, CRM is appropriate. If the

objective is a specific behavior change, corporate social marketing is the appropriate design logic. Combining labels without clarifying the mechanism makes evaluation difficult and can create misleading claims.

Second, firms should measure outputs and outcomes separately. Media reach, event participation, donated resources, and campaign engagement are outputs or proximal outcomes. They should not be reported as evidence of changed behavior or improved social conditions unless corresponding measures exist. This distinction is especially important when sustainability or public-health language is used.

Third, authenticity should be treated as a design requirement rather than a communication tactic. CSR campaigns should align with internal practices, disclose the role of partners and resources, avoid exaggerated impact claims, and provide stakeholders with a clear explanation of why the firm is involved. Credible partnerships with community organizations, public agencies, or expert institutions can strengthen capability and legitimacy but do not substitute for corporate accountability.

Fourth, managers should design for context. A campaign that is effective globally may be ineffective locally if the desired behavior is culturally inappropriate, too costly, inconvenient, or unsupported by infrastructure. Local stakeholder research is therefore necessary before scaling a social marketing intervention.

Research Agenda

The literature remains uneven across constructs and levels of analysis. CRM has a comparatively mature evidence base, including systematic reviews and meta-analysis, whereas direct comparative evidence on cause promotion and corporate social marketing remains more limited. Future research should therefore move beyond campaign attitude measures and examine how initiative design affects behavioral and societal outcomes over time.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that cause promotion, corporate social marketing, and cause-related marketing are distinct but complementary CSR strategies. Cause promotion primarily builds awareness and mobilizes stakeholder support, corporate social marketing facilitates voluntary behavior change, while cause-related marketing links corporate contributions to consumer transactions. Their effectiveness depends on selecting the strategy that best matches the social problem and intended outcome. When awareness and behavioral change are both required, a staged approach from awareness and engagement to behavioral intervention and impact evaluation provides a more coherent CSR pathway. Across these strategies, authenticity, transparency, corporate credibility, cause-company fit, stakeholder relevance, contextual adaptation, and behavioral feasibility remain critical determinants of effectiveness. Therefore, CSR performance should be assessed not only through campaign visibility or brand response, but also through measurable stakeholder actions, social outcomes, and responsible value creation.

This study is limited by its integrative review design, the absence of PRISMA-based screening and formal quality assessment, and the uneven volume of evidence across cause promotion, social marketing, and cause-related marketing. In addition, the Philippine and Negros contexts are used as contextual applications rather than representative empirical evidence. Future studies should employ systematic review procedures with explicit search and screening criteria, conduct field-based research in underexplored contexts, and empirically test how integrated CSR strategies influence stakeholder behavior, social impact, and long-term organizational value.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos for its academic and institutional support in the development of this study. The scholarly environment and research support provided by the University contributed to the completion and refinement of this manuscript.

Declaration Statement

Funding. The authors declare that no external funding was received for this research.

Data Availability. This study is based on secondary sources from published academic literature and publicly available documents. The information supporting the findings is available from the sources cited in the article.

Ethical Approval. Ethical approval was not required because this study is an integrative literature review based exclusively on publicly available secondary sources and did not involve human participants, animals, personal data, or experimental interventions.

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that they have no financial or non-financial competing interests that could have influenced the conduct, interpretation, or reporting of this research.

Generative AI Disclosure. Generative AI-assisted tools were used solely to support language refinement, readability, structural clarity, and formatting of the manuscript. The authors critically reviewed and verified the resulting content and remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, interpretation, citations, and integrity of the manuscript. Generative AI was not listed as an author or co-author and was not used to fabricate, manipulate, or falsify research data, results, evidence, images, or scientific conclusions..

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 932–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311436079>
- Andreasen, A. R. (1994). Social marketing: Its definition and domain. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 13(1), 108–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074391569401300109>

- Ásványi, K. (2021). Cause promotions. In S. O. Idowu, R. Schmidpeter, N. Capaldi, L. Zu, M. Del Baldo, & R. Abreu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sustainable management*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02006-4_1089-1
- Baghi, I., Rubaltelli, E., & Tedeschi, M. (2009). A strategy to communicate corporate social responsibility: Cause related marketing and its dark side. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 16(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.174>
- Basil, D. Z. (2019). The fundamentals of social marketing. In D. Z. Basil, G. Diaz-Meneses, & M. D. Basil (Eds.), *Social marketing in action: Cases from around the world* (pp. 23–44). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13020-6_2
- Basil, D. Z., Diaz-Meneses, G., & Basil, M. D. (Eds.). (2019). *Social marketing in action: Cases from around the world*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13020-6>
- Bhatti, H. Y., Galan-Ladero, M. M., & Galera-Casquet, C. (2023). Cause-related marketing: A systematic review of the literature. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 20, 25–64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-021-00326-y>
- Braga, L. D., Tardin, M. G., Perin, M. G., & Boaventura, P. (2024). Sustainability communication in marketing: A literature review. *RAUSP Management Journal*, 59(3), 293–311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-10-2023-0205>
- Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 8–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00276.x>
- Hanzaee, K. H., Sadeghian, M., Jalalian, S., & Nootash, M. (2019). Which can affect more? Cause marketing or cause related marketing. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 10(1), 304–322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-04-2016-0028>
- How, M. P. H. G. (2025). *Globalization: How to adapt your corporate social responsibility to different cultural and geographical contexts*. FasterCapital. <https://fastercapital.com/content/Globalization--How-to-Adapt-Your-Corporate-Social-Responsibility-to-Different-Cultural-and-Geographical-Contexts.html>
- Ihlen, Ø., Bartlett, J. L., & May, S. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of communication and corporate social responsibility*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118083246>
- Inoue, Y., & Kent, A. (2014). A conceptual framework for understanding the effects of corporate social marketing on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121(4), 621–633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1742-y>
- Jeon, M. A., & An, D. (2019). A study on the relationship between perceived CSR motives, authenticity and company attitudes: A comparative analysis of cause promotion and cause-related marketing. *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility*, 4, Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41180-019-0028-4>
- Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005a). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause*. Wiley.
- Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005b). Best of breed: When it comes to gaining a market edge while supporting a social cause, "corporate social marketing" leads the pack. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 11(3–4), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15245000500414480>

- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070303258971>
- Moharam, O., & Elsamadicy, A. (2020). Cause-related marketing: A conceptual and theoretical review. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 22(10), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2210051726>
- Peloza, J., & Shang, J. (2011). How can corporate social responsibility activities create value for stakeholders? A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0213-6>
- Pharr, J. R., & Lough, N. L. (2012). Differentiation of social marketing and cause-related marketing in US professional sport. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 21(2), 91–103.
- Quezado, T. C. C., Cavalcante, W. Q. F., Fortes, N., & Ramos, R. F. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: A bibliometric and visualization analysis of the literature between the years 1994 and 2020. *Sustainability*, 14(3), Article 1694. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031694>
- Schamp, C., Heitmann, M., Bijmolt, T. H. A., & Katzenstein, R. (2023). The effectiveness of cause-related marketing: A meta-analysis on consumer responses. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 60(1), 189–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222437221109782>
- Securities and Exchange Commission Philippines. (2025). *Memorandum Circular No. 16, Series of 2025: Adoption of Philippine Financial Reporting Standards (PFRS) on sustainability disclosures and issuance of reporting guidelines for publicly listed companies and large non-listed entities*.
- Sheikh, S.-u.-R., & Beise-Zee, R. (2011). Corporate social responsibility or cause-related marketing? The role of cause specificity of CSR. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363761111101921>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Thomas, S., & Kureshi, S. (2017). Exploring the interconnections of consumer preference between cause type and cause scope in a cause-related marketing activity: Evidence from Indian context. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 14(3), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJICBM.2017.083239>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Truong, V. D., & Hall, C. M. (2017). Corporate social marketing in tourism: To sleep or not to sleep with the enemy? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 884–902. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1201093>
- Varadarajan, P. R., & Menon, A. (1988). Cause-related marketing: A coalignment of marketing strategy and corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200306>
- White, K., Habib, R., & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to SHIFT consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(3), 22–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919825649>