SUPPLY CHAIN BASED ON THE CORE PROCESSES AND CORPORATE SOCIAL

Ahmed Muayad Younus
Postgraduate Centre, (PGC), LUTC University, Malaysia
Eng.Ahmed.muayad@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

   The article introduces the notion of supply chain, which is founded on two dimensions: the basic processes of a supply chain, and the concept of corporate social responsibility, which are both discussed in detail. It is proposed that a responsible supply chain is achieved through the manifestation of fundamental values by supply chain participants, as well as through their plans and tactics. A further discussion is included in this paper regarding the individual supply chain actors' responsibility for assuring that a responsible supply chain exists that is outside of their direct control. A conceptual model as well as a definition of a responsible supply chain are provided. We have developed a model that not only gives structure to the existing studies, but also produces new constructs and linkages that help to expand our understanding of the responsible supply chain. The work is based on an evaluation of research articles that were published between since years ago and contained parts of corporate social responsibility and supply chain procedures.

Keywords: **Supply Chain Management, Core Processes and Social, Corporate Strategy, supply chain management**

INTRODUCTION:

   As a result of increasing rivalry, multinational corporations (MNEs) in industrialized countries are increasingly looking to outsource to countries with lower labor costs (Lim & Phillips, 2007). By subcontracting some or all their production to producers in countries with lower labor costs, corporations can cut the cost of their final product while also increasing their competitiveness and increasing their profits. As a result, globalization and complexity are expanding in supply chains around the world. Companies and governments in nations with lower labor costs, such as Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa, are becoming increasingly reliant on globalization to maintain economic growth and prosperity. This tendency has emerged as a significant driver of corporate initiatives, with the potential to be beneficial to all parties involved. CSR and related concepts such as business ethics have been brought to the forefront by non-governmental organizations, governments, and multilateral institutions almost simultaneously because of a desire to limit the negative effects of corporations on society and the environment, as well as a concern about limiting the negative effects of corporations on society and the environment. Among other things, the United Nations has formed the "Global Compact," which is a collection of principles that are intended to achieve corporate social responsibility (UN, 2011). Nike, according to Smith (2007), is a good example of how scale of production leads to the usage of a big number of suppliers distributed across several nations whose policies Nike is unable to influence. Even though the company initially claimed that it could not be expected to influence the CSR practices of its suppliers, the company was eventually compelled to act, resulting in the

establishment of internal values, strategies, and a code of conduct with suppliers to ensure accountability. The instance of Nike demonstrates the ongoing issues that multinational enterprises (MNEs) are encountering as they increasingly globalize their supply chains to keep up with changing competition as well as to embrace rising emerging market opportunities (Lim & Phillips, 2008). The responsible supply chain can be explored through two sets of literature - the literature on corporate social responsibility and the literature on supply chain management.

The literature on corporate social responsibility (CSR) addresses a wide range of issues related to responsibility and can be classified into three streams. One feed is available at www.ccsenet.org/ijbm. The Canadian Center of Science and Education published the International Journal of Business and Management in its Vol. 7, No. 4 issue in February 2012. An intra-organizational focus on accountability is seen in 155 percent of CSR literature, for example, the importance of morals among buying executives (Ford et al., 2000). The responsibility of business-to-business transactions is dealt with in another stream (Millington et al., 2005), whereas a third stream is concerned with external stakeholder relationships (for example, the impact of code of conducts on labor standards), and a fourth stream is concerned with responsibility within a business-to-business context (for example, illicit payments in buyer-seller relations) (Yu, 2008). The literature on supply chain management (SCM) focuses on activities and decisions that are taken to ensure that supply chain partners remain competitive.

Some of these are concerned with the selection of business partners in the supply chain (e.g., Vaaland & Heide, 2005), others are concerned with the relational aspects of the interaction in the chain (e.g., Maignan et al., 2002; Worthington et al., 2008), and a third stream is concerned with the monitoring and follow-up of the performance in the chain and among partners in the chain (e.g., Vaaland & Heide, 2005 (e.g. Gonzales-Padron et al., 2008). Despite the developing interconnections between SCM and CSR, studies and models that integrate the two are still in their infancy (Pedersen, 2009; Ciliberti et al., 2008a). Amaeshi and colleagues (2008); Ciliberti and colleagues (2008); Faisal (2010) are some examples of studies in which corporate social responsibility (CSR) is examined in a supply chain environment. This paper aspires to contribute to this field of study.

The purpose of this article is to create a conceptual foundation for a responsible supply chain, in which the supply chain is impacted by corporate social responsibility rather than solely by shareholders' interests. This paper proposes that a conventional supply chain can be made more accountable by shifting the frame of reference from a focus on shareholders to a focus on an array of stakeholders. should be inserted here. Furthermore, the purpose of this paper is to organise existing research from the last decade and to give a framework for understanding the dimensions of responsibility in a supply chain. As a result of this framework, we can better understand the question: what values, strategies, tactics, and tools should businesses and supply chains hold and put into practice to establish a responsible supply chain? The framework is operationalized by examining the question: to what extent should the framework's implementation consider changes in firm size and complexity across different industries? Is there a difference between a responsible supply chain for a large and complicated MNE and a responsible supply chain for a small and medium sized firm (SME) when it comes to values, strategies, tools, and activity? This set of concerns has been raised as relevant by researchers such as Pedersen (2009), who investigated the features that

influence small and medium-sized enterprises' SMEs (Muayad, A., & Abumandil, M. 2021). CSR activity in the supply chain. According to Pedersen (2009), the study of corporate social responsibility has largely focused on multinational enterprises, and it is necessary to address the perspective of small and medium-sized enterprises. The remaining sections of the paper are divided into five categories. Following a brief definition of the concepts of supply chain management and corporate social responsibility, the procedure of selecting and analyzing articles is given. The following review of the literature is divided into three levels of complexity. After providing a conceptual foundation, the fourth section concludes with a few concluding notes. There are important constructs It is possible to define supply chain management (SCM) as "the management of all activities and resources (including information, knowledge, and financial resources) associated with the flow and transformation of goods and services up the supply chain from the raw materials supplier, component suppliers, and other suppliers in such a way that the expectations of the company's end users are met or exceeded" (Van Weele, 2010, p.11). Supply chains are defined as "…an interconnected network of enterprises (links) via which the successive stages of manufacturing of an economic product are carried out, from the primary producer to the ultimate customer" in this context (ibid: 411). In the context of global sourcing, the supply chain and its managerial challenges are inextricably linked to the concept of proactive integration and coordination of common items and materials, processes, design, technologies, and suppliers across worldwide purchasing, engineering, and operating locations (ibid: 405). In this perspective, the sourcing function must be seen as an integrated set of interconnected operations that span the entire value chain, from the primary producer to the end client. As a result of this viewpoint, actions to be carried out by suppliers and all levels of sub-suppliers further up the chain, as well as activities to be carried out by suppliers and all levels of sub-suppliers further down the chain, are viewed as "downstream" towards the end customer. A considerable risk exists in this perspective that a problem caused by incorrect sourcing decisions or developing at another point in the supply chain will propagate through the chain and have a negative impact on customers or other stakeholders in the society. As a result, supply chain management encompasses three major activities or functions: I am identifying, selecting, and contracting supply chain actors; (ii) managing and developing the relationships that exist within the chain; and (iii) monitoring and controlling the performance of the actors within the chain.In management discourse, the term "Corporate Social Responsibility" (CSR) has become a well-known concept that signifies different things to different individuals (Pettigrew, 2009). According to McWilliams et al. (2006), there are different definitions and dimensions of corporate social responsibility, which makes the development of theoretical frameworks and the assessment of CSR problematic. Dahlsrud's (2006) research of 37 definitions of CSR concluded that the various meanings are, to a considerable extent, compatible with one another. Our definition of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is the "managing of stakeholder concern for responsible and irresponsible activities related to environmental, ethical, and social phenomena in a way that generates business profit. are internal and external players who have an impact on the firm and have a vested interest in the company's success (ibid). External stakeholders should be divided into two categories in a supply chain context: those with whom the focal company has a direct relationship (i.e. business-to-business

interaction), and those with whom the focal company has a relationship with stakeholders of the broader society (i.e. business-to-society interaction).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The values of an organization reflect the organization's worldview and the way it will conduct. It is they who decide the content of strategy and the level of acceptability of that plan (Liedtka, 2000), and they often consist of a collection of organizational behaviors and core concepts to which employees should adhere (Thompson & Martin, 2010). Instead, values represent the fundamental concepts that determine an organization's strategic direction (Johnson et al., 2009). Both in terms of acceptability of the various CSR elements and in terms of the structure, development, management, and follow-up of inter-organizational interactions, corporate values are important considerations. It is they who make up a firm's identity, and they manifest themselves on a variety of levels, ranging from a personal level (such as employees and managers), to a corporate level, to an inter-organizational and supply chain level in which the company is entrenched. Individual values, i.e., the worldviews and value systems of individuals employed by the company, interact with and have an impact on organizational values in a variety of ways (Ford et al., 2000; Fischer, 2007). In the case of managers, their personal values can have an impact on how they see the repercussions of ethical versus unethical purchasing decisions (Cole et al., 2000; Park, 2005). Company values help them choose between opposing aims, such as whether shareholder values are more essential than supply chain profitability, or whether social concerns in the community are more important than shareholder values. Individual supply chain participants' corporate values have an impact on the type of interactionthat

they have with one another.Supply chain participants can foster the acceptance of value systems, and powerful purchasers can impose their responsible value systems on the rest of the chain (Lim & Phillips, 2008; Smith, 2007; Gonzalez-Padron et al., 2008; www.ccsenet.org/ijbm/index.html). In Canadian Center of Science and Education 157 and colleagues (2008) published a paper on this topic. To achieve CSR, powerful buyers have a responsibility to establish a climate that requires or encourages their suppliers to follow responsible practices (Amaeshi and colleagues, 2007). Powerful buyers should also accept increased responsibility for attaining CSR (Hsueh and colleagues, 2008). The reputation of ethical and honest buyers is enhanced, and they encourage suppliers to uphold the same standards of ethics and honesty (Bendixen & Abratt, 2007). Gift-giving and the use of incentives to maintain interorganizational connections are two topics that have been the subject of several research (Fisher, 2007; Millington et al., 2005). In addition, the relationship between personal and corporate values has an impact on how managers interpret and react to purchasing and sourcing decisions (Park 2005). Despite the fact that the values of powerful consumers from developed nations are important, the values of developing country suppliers in achieving CSR cannot be overlooked in the process. According to Lim and Phillips (2008), the supplier in a developing nation has the direct potential to improve its labour and environmental practises (as well as Locke and Romis 2007 and Mamic 2005). According to some research, the relationship between corporate values and the success of the supply chain is significant.An ethical supply chain, according to Lim & Phillips (2008) and Ni et al. (2010), has a number of issues, one of which is determining how benefits are distributed among the chain's members. Aiming to quantify the costs and profitability effects of

CSR expenditures in the supply chain, Hsueh and Chang (2008) as well as Cruz and Matsypura (2009) have attempted to do so.

Svensson and Baath (2008) study the long-term impact of reduced ethical standards on the supply chain, as well as the impact of the development and communication of ethical norms on worker stability, satisfaction, and loyalty (e.g. Svensson and Baath 2008). (e.g. Baker et al., 2006). Another line of research explores the values and goals of stakeholders outside of the focal supply chain influence, in contrast to the studies mentioned above, which focus on values and goals within and amongst supply chain participants. One group of studies examines phenomena related to the role of government, legal frameworks, and political institutions (e.g., Lawrence, 2007; Lillywhite, 2007; Barrientos, 2008; Aaronson, 2005). Another group of studies examines phenomena related to the role of the media (e.g., Lawrence, 2007; Lillywhite, 2007; Barrientos, 2008; Aaronson, 2005). Generally speaking, governments, legal frameworks, and political institutions are considered as providing the overarching institutional structure and standards for corporate social responsibility. Another group discusses the role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), labour unions, and international organisations (INGOs) in supply chain management, such as ensuring fair labour practises and working conditions among suppliers (e.g. Worthington et al., 2007).While the bulk of studies examine CSR from the standpoint of a Western corporation, others examine CSR from the perspective of developing nation authorities that are attempting to impose CSR in their own supplier industry (e.g. Tsoi, 2010). Some have called for institutional reforms to bring about change in supply chain behaviour in the direction of greater justice (e.g., Studer et al., 2008). Several studies, such as Smith (2009) and Locke & Romis (2007), have demonstrated

how CSR standards have evolved and how pressure from societal stakeholders has compelled powerful buyers to establish and execute responsible values throughout their supply chains. When looking at the findings of the studies that have focused on values, it is possible to determine the relationship between values and supply chain activities (for example, purchasing decisions and partner selection), as well as the relationship between values and various levels of responsibility (intra-organizational, business-to-business and business-to-society levels). Strategy can be defined as the long-term direction and scope of an organization's activities that enables it to create competitive advantage through the configuration of resources and competencies with the goal of meeting the expectations of stakeholders (Johnson et al., 2009). Strategic decisions are influenced by CSR content in the firm (e.g., ethics and business practises), as well as the selection and management of suppliers and other factors involved in the sourcing process, which in turn affects the content of CSR in the organisation. The literature on supply chain strategy is divided into three categories. The first is concerned with the way collaboration between the many participants in the chain takes place. It is also important to consider how the relationships between the actors are established and maintained, as well as the networking effect of collaborative efforts. For example, Carter and Jennings (2002) describe how better trust and collaboration can improve supplier performance, and how mutual relationships can help to overcome the hurdles to CSR in the supply chain (Carter and Jennings, 2002). (Faisal, 2010). The power of networking in developing countries as a countervailing force to global players with significant financial and political clout is the subject of other studies (Pangsapa & Smith, 2008). Several studies (e.g., Svensson & Baath, 2008; Jiang, 2009) have focused on networking between global

customers, local suppliers, and stakeholders in a developing nation with the goal of assuring corporate social responsibility. Another part of strategy is the purchasing techniques and price that are employed. Fearne et al. (2005) investigate the topic of fair purchasing and pricing methods employed by powerful purchasers, and they conclude that fair purchasing and pricing strategies are the most beneficial to all members of the supply chain (Younus, A. M., & Younis, H. 2021). The nature of supply chain tactics, for example, building direct ties from retailers to producers, allows them to exert influence over suppliers in either a positive or negative way, depending on the strategy (Hale & Opondo, 2005). Rode and colleagues (2008) discovered that consumers were prepared to pay a premium for ethical items, and as a result, ethical manufacturers were able to recoup their higher production costs. Welford and colleagues (2003) investigated fair trade policies and norms, as well as the ways in which they could improve the competitiveness of businesses and their supply networks. In other studies, researchers have attempted to create normative sourcing and purchasing techniques, stakeholder influence (Maignan et al., 2002; Maignan & McAlister, 2003), and supplier variety (Worthington et al., 2007). It has been proposed that some strategies be developed in order to provide responsibility in the link between a powerful buyer and a weaker supplier who is usually located in a developing country. For example, Hale and Opondo (2005) and Jiang (2009) have addressed the implications of strategies preventing the abuse of workers' rights and "irresponsible" hiring practises. According to Drake and Schlachter (2008), a third aspect of strategy in the supply chain context relates to the organisation of production, the danger of non-cooperative "power driven" market governance (Drake and Schlachter 2008), and the importance of taking

a holistic view of the supply chain (Locke and Romis 2007). (Ciliberti et al. 2008a; Petrovic-Lazarevic, 2008). Certain CSR phenomena discussed on a strategic level can be related to an intra-organizational level, as when Boyd et al. (2006) and Roberts (2003) discuss strategies for developing ethical sourcing within an individual company, or when Ciliberti et al. (2008b) discuss a company's social responsibility in logistics. Although the distinctions are not clear, several research shift focus away from intra-organizational to inter-organizational components of CSR. For instance, studies of ethical trade and inter-actor fairness (e.g., Welford et al., 2003; Hughes, 2005; Maignan et al., 2002) are examples. The expectations for CSR from many societal stakeholders are increasingly affecting powerful consumers and MNEs from developed countries. These actors include non-governmental organisations (NGOs), multilateral organisations, and local institutions, and their actions address business-to-society concerns (B2S). On a B2S level, examples of CSR issues include the issue of local suppliers who violate local social and environmental norms (e.g. Pangsapa & Smith, 2008) and strategies for how powerful global players can achieve higher ethical standards among suppliers in developing countries (Svensson & Baath, 2008; Setthasakko, 2007). One method for accomplishing this is demonstrated in the case study by Lim and Phillips (2007), which demonstrates how external pressure led Nike to progressively act and alter a significant portion of its supply chain tactics in order to comply with CSR. On a strategic level, numerous supply chain strategies are discussed, including collaboration between players, supplier selection and organisation, and supply chain performance assurance measures. Additionally, the literature in this area discusses accountability in terms of three dimensions of

corporate social responsibility (CSR): intra-organizational, business-to-business, and business-to-society. Tactical measures Tactics are the exact activities that carry out and implement strategies in order to accomplish goals and accomplish the purpose. They are temporary and can be replaced frequently as needed (Thompson & Martin, 2010). Tactics are frequently manifested in short-term plans or programmes, which can be thought of as specific activities resulting from strategies (Lynch 2009). Sustaining interaction with local communities and evaluating supplier performance exemplify the link between CSR and sourcing at the tactical level of a business and its supply chain.A subset of research focuses on the company's standard operating procedures for its supply chain and suppliers. These practises are frequently outlined in codes of conduct. Aspects of codes of conduct include their aim and practical function (e.g. Bendixen & Abratt, 2007; Mamic, 2005), as well as the motivations for its adoption (e.g. Lim & Phillips, 2007). Certain articles discuss the difficulties inherent in designing codes, such as balancing the collaborative subcontracting systems they imply with profit maximisation and competitive reality (Locke & Romis, 2007; Yu, 2008). Others (Oehmen et al., 2010; Lillywhite, 2007) concentrate on implementation challenges and the constraints of codes (e.g. Nadvi, 2008). A second group is concerned with the auditing and monitoring of performance. The issues addressed include the difficulties inherent in monitoring performance (e.g. Egels-Zandén, 2007; Boyd et al., 2006), the effects of monitoring and auditing (Nadvi, 2008; Locke et al., 2007), and the organisation and development of effective monitoring (Christmann & Taylor, 2006; Hughes, 2005). These studies illustrate tactical approaches to ensuring a responsible supply chain from the supply chain participants' perspective. Other studies take a broader B2S perspective, arguing

that stakeholders such as governments, NGOs, consumer groups, and civil society should pressure multinational corporations to adhere to human and labour rights (Lim & Phillips, 2007; Worthington et al., 2007), a position Hale & Opondo (2005a), Muayad, A. (2021). refer to as a multi-stakeholder approach. The reporting of CSR and the manner in which it is communicated to society are also reviewed in a B2S environment (e.g. Tate et al., 2010). On a tactical level, we observe at least two critical supply chain issues: monitoring and controlling, and that CSR dimensions encompass the individual organisation, the buyer-seller relationship, the supply chain, and external stakeholders (Younus, A. M., & Younus, K. M. 2021)..

METHOD

The study involves a review of articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals in the English language. The article search was conducted using two distinct sets of search criteria within the ISI web database. One criterion relates to supply networks and encompasses the following: suppliers, purchasing, supply chain, procurement, purchase, vendor, and contractor. The second category encompasses standards for corporate social responsibility, corporate citizenship, ethics, sustainability, and code of conduct. Articles that had at least one item from each of the two categories in the abstract, title, or keywords were included. The purpose of employing two distinct sets of search parameters is to narrow the field of publications to those that address CSR in connection to the supply chain. The investigation includes only articles published in order to discover the most recent knowledge claims. There were a total of 106 items identified. After reviewing the articles, were deleted, leaving; consequently, publications with a broad focus on CSR issues were omitted,

as suppliers/supply chain were only one of multiple stakeholder groups. Additionally, the study excludes papers focusing on consumers and consumer behavior, as well as those focusing exclusively on environmental issues. The selection criteria permitted an eclectic approach to publications, with a diverse variety of journals and research streams included. This was critical, given the phenomena is still in its infancy. Beyond business and management researchers, the phenomenon of responsible supply chains has broad appeal. The academic focus areas of the journals range significantly from general marketing and management journals to those devoted to other social sciences (e.g., the Journal of Contemporary Asia); political science (e.g., Human Rights Quarterly); geography (e.g., Geographical Research); ecology (e.g., World Ecology); and specific industries (e.g., World Ecology) (e.g. British Food Journal). Globalization of the supply chain and CSR research are relatively new fields of study, but they are increasing rapidly. As a result, we believe that the time period used to choose articles was sufficient to capture prior research and serve as a foundation for additional conceptualization. The first phase in the research was to classify the articles according to their primary findings and focus, and then divide them into two categories: supply chain management (SCM) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) (CSR). The writers investigated each publication independently and then cross-checked their findings to arrive at a consensus. The conceptual underpinnings of the proposed framework were determined through a review of the available literature. Appendices contain a comprehensive list of periodicals and papers contained in the literature base.

FINDING AND DICTATION:

The analysis of the literature found that CSR is associated with a broad variety of SCM

concerns. These challenges are examined at a variety of levels, beginning with business ideals, through to the strategies that seek those values, and finally to the tactical level where the plans are operationalized. Even though prior literature contains a variety of Published by the Canadian. Science and Education Center 159 components of a responsible supply chain, a framework is required that conceptually connects CSR to SCM procedures. The proposed paradigm is predicated on two fundamental assumptions gleaned through the evaluation process: To begin, CSR can be conceptualized and measured in terms of at least three dimensions: intra-organizational, business-to-business (B2B), and business-to-society (B2S). Second, SCM is composed of three interconnected processes or aspects. Partner selection is the process through which company buyers and suppliers identify and contract supply chain actors. Through various marketing and management operations, relationship building is the process of maintaining and creating relationships between buyers, suppliers, and other supply chain actors. Supply chain actors engage in monitoring and regulating activities to set specifications and assure compliance with applicable standards and quality standards. These three fundamental operations are interconnected with internal considerations and relationships with direct business partners, but also with the supply chain. On the path to developing a framework for a responsible supply chain, one critical question arises: Should all three CSR dimensions and all three SCM dimensions be included in the definition of a responsible supply chain, and if so, how? The underlying premise is that a responsible supply chain should be characterized by values, strategies, and tactics. We suggest that each of these should incorporate CSR components across all dimensions, from internal management control to how business partners interact, to how

supply chain partners connect with society and external stakeholders. Additionally, we suggest that no fundamental SCM action should be overlooked, which means that partner selection, relationship development, and follow-up should all be integrated and linked to CSR. According to our thesis, a responsible supply chain (RSC) is a network of business players that collaboratively adopt, implement, and coordinate values, strategies, and tactics to integrate all levels of corporate social responsibility to the chain's business activities. This notion represents a shared (common) responsibility for the long-term sustainability of a responsible supply chain. However, the talents and resources, opportunities and power of individual actors in a supply chain might vary dramatically. As a result, the impact on RSC is dictated not only by attitudes and beliefs, but also by the capacity to execute and enforce these principles. As a result, we argue that a responsible supply chain does not need all actors to adopt all three dimensions of CSR and SCM equally, even while each actor retains the obligation to do their best given their resources and position in the chain. We suggest a pattern of supply chain responsibility in the following conceptual model. This indicates that there is a minimum level of "responsibility" for supply chain actors. The threshold indicates that each actor in the RSC has set minimal CSR standards internally and is able to avoid doing business with "irresponsible" actors. However, the RSC cannot be reached if all actors in the chain are only present at this threshold level. At least one actor must be capable of connecting the three CSR dimensions with supply chain dimensions via values, strategies, and tactics. The following framework depicts the two fundamental elements that must be addressed by values, strategies, and tactics to achieve an RSC. Additionally, the framework implies a connection between the supply chain and CSR dimensions. The more supply chain activities

that are integrated, the more critical it is to incorporate the business-to-business (B2B) dimension of CSR.the CSR component, which can be manifested at the intra-organizational level (at the very least), as well as at the B2B and B2S levels. The horizontal axis depicts the CSR dimension, which includes the CSR-related fundamental processes. Values and methods for "responsible" partner selection are minimal but might be supplemented by proactive creation of inter-organizational connections and actions aimed at ensuring CSR manifestation through chain monitoring and control.

CONCLUSION:

The study analyzed articles published between 2000 and 2010 in the fields of supply chain management and corporate social responsibility. The papers chosen covered both domains and served as conceptual building blocks for a framework for discussing and analysing the constituents of a responsible supply chain (RSC). We contended that an RSC entails that all significant supply chain activities (i.e. business processes) are connected to all levels of CSR. The supply chain activities included in the SCM dimension include partner selection, relationship development, and monitoring and controlling. CSR has been classified into three levels: intra-organizational, business-to-business, and business-to-society. This link between SCM and CSR has been made possible by a focus on values, strategies, and tactical efforts.

As a result, we provided the following definition of a responsible supply chain: "a chain of business actors that adopts, implements, and coordinates values, strategies, and tactics in order to integrate all levels of corporate social responsibility to the chain's business activities."The contribution of individual players to achieving and maintaining the completeness of an RSC varies according to corporate factors. The distinction between a

small and insignificant SME and a large and powerful MNE is whether these issues are limited to the organization's internal operations or extend beyond corporate boundaries to the behaviour of the entire supply chain. Thus, we show that a small store with very limited control over the behaviour of other chain actors, and thus the chain's whole responsibility, can nonetheless be considered accountable. However, as a member of a responsible supply chain, the SME is required to go beyond the three dimensions to effect changes within its own sphere of influence, at the very least.

Canadian of Science and Education publishes its own publications. A MNE or a more influential smaller company violates the responsible supply chain if, in addition to evaluating the chain for irresponsibility, they do not take advantage of their great power t effect suitable changes in business practises throughout the supply chain. Achieving a responsible supply chain is difficult. The chain's complexity and number of actors are great, competition and cost pressure are intense, cultural differences in a global network are difficult to manage, and an infinite number of demanding stakeholders make responsible supply chain management a dynamic and occasionally confusing assignment. Nonetheless, it is critical to continue researching novel approaches and instruments for incorporating corporate social responsibility into supply chain operations.

REFERENCES:
1) Baker, T. L., Hunt, T. G., & Andrews, M. C. (2006). Promoting ethical behavior and organizational citizenship behaviors: the influence of corporate ethical values. Journal of Business Research, 59, 849-857.
2) Barrientos, S. (2008). Contract labour: the 'Achilles heel' of corporate codes in commercial value chains. Development and Change, 39(6), 977-990.
3) Bendixen, M., & Abratt, R. (2007). Corporate identity, ethics and reputation in supplier-buyer relationships. Journal of Business Ethics, 76, 69-82.
4) Besser, T. L., Miller, N., & Perkins, R. K. (2006). For the greater good: business networks and business social responsibility to communities. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 18(July), 321-339.
5) Blowfield, M. (2000). Ethical sourcing: a contribution to sustainability or a diversion. Sustainable Development, Carter, C. R. (2000). Ethical issues in international buyer-seller relationships: a dyadic examination. Journal of Operations Management, 18, 191-208.
6) Carter, C. R., & Jennings, M. M. (2002). Social responsibility and supply chain relationships. Transportation Research E, 38, 37-52.
7) Choi, T. H., & Jung, J. (2007). Ethical commitment, financial performance, and valuation: an empirical investigation of Korean companies. Journal of Business Ethics, 81, 447-463.
8) Christmann, P., & Taylor, G. (2006). Firm self-regulation through international certifiable standards: determinants of symbolic versus substantive implementation. Journal of International Business Studies, 37, Ciliberti, F., Pontrandolfo, P., & Scozzi, B. (2008a). Investigating corporate social responsibility in supply chains:a SME perspective. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16, 1579-1588.
9) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.04.016
10) Ciliberti, F., Pontrandolfo, P., & Scozzi, B. (2008b). Logistics social responsibility: standard adoption and practices in Italian

companies. International Journal of Production Economics, 113, 88-106.

11) Cole, D., Sirgy, J. M., & Bird, M. M. (2000). How do managers make teleological evaluations in ethical dilemmas? Testing part of and extending the Hunt-Vitell model. Journal of Business Ethics, 26, 259-269.

12) Craig Smith, N. (2009). Bounded goodness: marketing implications of Drucker on corporate responsibility.

13) Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 37, 73-84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-008-0110-4

14) Cramer, J. M. (2008). Organising corporate social responsibility in international product chains. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16, 395-400.

15) Cruz, J. M. (2008). Dynamics of supply chain networks with corporate social responsibility through integrated environmental decision-making. European Journal of Operational Research, 184, 1005-1031.

16) Cruz. J. M., & Matsypura, D. (2009). Supply chain networks with corporate social responsibility through integrated environmental decision-making. International Journal of Production Research, 47(3), 621-648.

17) Cruz, J. M., & Wakolbinger, T. (2008). Multiperiod effects of corporate social responsibility on supply chain networks, transaction costs, emissions, and risk. International Journal of Production Economics, 116, 64-74.

18) Den Butter, F. A. G., & Linse, K. A. (2008). Rethinking procurement in the era of globalization. MIT Sloan

19) Management Review, 50(1), 76-207.

20) Donaldson, T., & Preston, I. (1998). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. Academy of Management Review, 20 (1), 65–91.

21) Drake, M. J., & Schlacter, J. T. (2008). A virtue-ethics analysis of supply chain collaboration. Journal of Business Ethics, 82, 851-864.

22) Dubbink, W., & van der Putten, F. P. (2008).Is competition law an impediment to CSR? Journal of Business Ethics, 83, 381-395.

23) Egels-Zandén, N. (2007). Suppliers' Compliance with MNCs' codes of conduct: behind the scenes at Chinese toy suppliers. Journal of Business Ethics, 75, 45-62.

24) Emiliani, M. L. (2005). Regulating B2B online reverse auctions through voluntary codes of conduct. Industrial Marketing Management, 34, 526-534.

25) Faisal, M. N. (2010). Analysing the barriers to corporate social responsibility in supply chains: an interpretive structural modelling approach. Intl.J.of Logistics – Research and Applications, 13(3), 179-195.

26) Fearne, A., Duffy, R., & Hornibrook, S. (2005). Justice in UK supermarket buyer-supplier relationships: an empirical analysis. International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 33(8), 570-582.

27) Fisher, J. (2007). Business marketing and the ethics of gift giving. Industrial Marketing Management, 36, 99-108.

28) Ford, J. B., LaTour, M. S., & Henthorne, T. L. (2000). Cognitive Moral Development and Japanese procurement executives: implications for Industrial Marketers. Industrial Marketing Management, 29, 589-600.

29) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0019-8501(00)00119-X

30) Frederick, W. C. (1994). From CSR1 to CSR2: the maturing of business-and-society thought. Business and Society, 33(2), 150-164.

31) Giampietro, C., & Emiliani, M. L. (2007). Coercion and reverse auctions. Supply Chain Management: an International Journal, 12(2), 75-84.

32) Gonzalez-Padron, T., Hult, T. G., Tomas, M., & Calantone, R. (2008). Exploiting innovative opportunities in global purchasing: an assessment of ethical climate and relationship performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 37, 69-82.

33) Hadjikhani, A., & Håkansson, H. (1996). Political actions in business networks: a Swedish case. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 13, 431-447.

34) Hale, A., & Opondo, M. (2005). Humanising the cut flower chain: confronting the realities of flower production for workers in Kenya. Antipode, 301-323.

35) Hillman, A. J., & Keim, G. D. (2001). Shareholder value, stakeholder management, and social issues: what's the Bottom Line? Strategic Management Journal, 22, 125-139.

36) Hughes, A. (2005). Corporate strategy and the management of ethical trade: the case of the UK food and clothing retailers. Environment and Planning, 37, 1145-1163.

37) Younus, A. M., & Younus, K. M. (2021). SUPPLY CHAIN USING SMART CONTRACT BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY IN ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS.

38) Younus, A. M., & Younis, H. (2021). Conceptual Framework of Agile Project Management, Affecting Project Performance, Key: Requirements and Challenges.

39) Hutchins, M. J., & Sutherland, J. W. (2008). An exploration of measures of social sustainability and their application to supply chain decisions. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16, 1688-1698.

40) Johnson, G., Scholes, K., & Whittington, R. (2009). Fundamentals of Strategy, London: Prentice Hall.

41) Keating, B., Quazi, A., Kriz, A., & Coltman, T. (2008). In pursuit of a sustainable supply chain: insights from Westpac Banking Corporation. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 13(3), 175-179.

42) Lahdesmaki, M. (2005). When ethics matters – interpreting the ethical discourse of small nature-based entrepreneurs. Journal of Business Ethics, 61, 55-68.

43) Lantos, G. P. (2001). The boundaries of strategic corporate social responsibility. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 18(7), 595-630.

44) Lantos, G. P. (2002). The ethicality of altruistic corporate social responsibility. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 19(3), 205-230.

45) Laudal, T. (2010). An attempt to determine the CSR potential of the international clothing business. Journal of Business Ethics, 96(1), 63-77.

46) Lawrence, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility, supply-chains and Saami claims: tracing the political in the Finnish Forestry Industry. Geographical Research, 45(2), 167-176.

47) Liedtka, J. (2000). Strategy as design. California Management Review, 42(3).

48) Lillywhite, S. (2007). Ethical purchasing and worker's rights in China: The case of the Brotherhood of St.Laurence. Journal of Industrial Relations, 49(5), 684-700.

49) Lim, S. J., & Phillips, J. (2008). Embedding CSR Values: The Global Footwear Industry's Evolving Governance Structure. Journal of Business Ethics, 81, 143-156.

50) Locke, R. M., Qin, F., & Brause, A. (2007). Does Monitoring Improve Labor Standards? Lessons from Nike. Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 61(1), 3-31.

51) Locke, R. M., & Romis, M. (2007). Improving Work Conditions in a Global Supply Chain. MIT Management Review, 48(2), 54-61.

52) Muayad, A., & Abumandil, M. (2021). The Impact of Agile Risk Management Utilization in Small and Medium (Smes) Enterprises. International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development, 4(3).

53) Muayad, A. (2021). Resilient Features of Organizational Culture in Implementation Of Smart Contract Technology Blockchain In Iraqi Gas And Oil Companies. International Journal for Quality Research, 15(2), 435-450.

54) Lund-Thomsen, P. (2008). The Global Sourcing and Codes of Conduct Debate: Five Myths and Five Recommendations. Development and Change, 39(6), 1005-1018.