ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

STRATEGIC CAPITAL BUDGETING AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Mr. Amiyaranjan Swain[1], Mr.Prasan Dash[2]
[1]*Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Ravenshaw University, Cuttack, Odisha*
[2]*Lecturer in Commerce, Koida Higher Secondary School, Koida , Sundargarh*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra28177
DOI No: 10.36713/epra28177

ABSTRACT

Capital budgeting, which is a key part of making financial decisions, has always been used to look at investment chances with the goal of increasing shareholder value. However, in today's business world, companies are facing more pressure to consider wider social, environmental, and ethical issues. This review looks at how strategic capital budgeting and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) are coming together, showing how the way we evaluate investments is changing to focus on sustainability. The discussion brings together recent research to explain how methods like sustainability-adjusted net present value (NPV), real options analysis, social return on investment (SROI), and multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) include non-financial factors when deciding where to put money. The paper pays special attention to the challenges of measuring CSR outcomes – like reputation, fairness, and the ability of the environment to recover – using traditional financial measures. It also talks about the conflict between making quick profits and aiming for long-term sustainability. The review highlights how the expectations of stakeholders, changes in company governance, and new rules are pushing businesses to include CSR in their investment choices. By looking closely at these changes, the paper shows that putting CSR into capital budgeting isn't just about doing the right thing – it's also a smart way to build resilience, stay competitive, and create lasting value.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context

The contemporary business landscape has witnessed a profound transformation in how organizations approach investment decision-making, marking a significant departure from traditional profit-maximization paradigms toward more comprehensive value creation frameworks that integrate corporate social responsibility (CSR) considerations (Porter & Kramer, 2006; Eccles & Krzus, 2010). This evolution reflects a growing recognition that sustainable competitive advantage and long-term organizational viability increasingly depend on the ability to address complex environmental, social, and governance challenges while maintaining financial performance (Lins et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2016).

Traditional capital budgeting practices, rooted in neoclassical economic theory, have historically emphasized financial metrics such as Net Present Value (NPV), Internal Rate of Return (IRR), and Payback Period as primary decision-making criteria (Brealey et al., 2020). While these approaches have provided valuable frameworks for assessing financial viability, mounting evidence suggests their limitations in capturing the full spectrum of value creation and risk mitigation associated with contemporary investment decisions (Bebbington & Unerman, 2018; Schaltegger et al., 2012). The increasing frequency and severity of environmental catastrophes, social inequalities, and governance failures have highlighted the inadequacy of purely financial evaluation methods in addressing the complex interdependencies between business operations and societal outcomes (Costanza et al., 1997; Raworth, 2017).

1.2 Research Objectives

Given the complexity and evolving nature of CSR-integrated capital budgeting, this comprehensive review addresses several critical research questions that have emerged at the intersection of financial management, sustainability science, and strategic planning. The primary objectives of this review are multifaceted and designed to provide both theoretical insights and practical guidance for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers working in this rapidly developing field.

The first objective is to examine the evolution of capital budgeting practices in the context of CSR, tracing the theoretical and methodological developments that have emerged over the past two decades. This analysis encompasses the transition from traditional financial evaluation methods to more comprehensive frameworks that incorporate environmental, social, and governance considerations alongside economic performance indicators (Elkington, 1997; Maas & Liket, 2011). Particular attention is devoted to understanding how different theoretical perspectives – including stakeholder theory, natural capital accounting, sustainable finance, and systems thinking – have contributed to the development of integrated assessment approaches (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2010; Walker et al., 2004).

The second objective involves Analyzing methodological approaches to sustainable capital budgeting, with emphasis on the development and validation of composite indicator systems, multi-criteria decision analysis frameworks, and innovative measurement techniques that enable the integration of quantitative and qualitative sustainability metrics (Cinelli et al., 2014; Mardani et al., 2015). This analysis

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

includes examination of sector-specific adaptations, cross-cultural applications, and the challenges associated with standardization and comparability across different organizational and geographical contexts (Abdullah et al., 2021).

The third objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of multidimensional assessment frameworks through critical analysis of empirical evidence, case study findings, and practical implementation experiences across various industries and regions. This evaluation encompasses assessment of both the technical performance of different methodological approaches and their practical utility in supporting strategic decision-making processes (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025).

1.3 Scope and Structure

This comprehensive review encompasses literature published between 2006 and 2025, capturing the period during which CSR-integrated capital budgeting has emerged as a distinct field of academic inquiry and practical application. The temporal scope reflects the recognition that systematic integration of sustainability considerations into investment decision-making represents a relatively recent phenomenon, with most significant theoretical and methodological developments occurring within this timeframe (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020). The review incorporates multiple types of scholarly contributions, including peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, policy documents, and industry reports, to provide a comprehensive perspective on both academic research and practical developments.

The geographical scope of the review is deliberately broad, encompassing studies from developed and developing economies across multiple continents. This approach recognizes that the integration of CSR considerations into capital budgeting practices varies significantly across different regulatory environments, cultural contexts, and stages of economic development (Okoye, 2006). Particular attention is devoted to understanding how contextual factors influence the design, implementation, and effectiveness of sustainable capital budgeting approaches, with case studies drawn from diverse settings including Sri Lankan manufacturing firms, European utilities, North American social enterprises, and multinational corporations operating across multiple jurisdictions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Evolution of Capital Budgeting Theory

2.1.1 Traditional Approaches

The theoretical foundations of capital budgeting trace their origins to the pioneering work of Irving Fisher (1930) and were subsequently formalized through the contributions of Hirshleifer (1958), Lorie and Savage (1955), and later developments by scholars such as Bierman and Smidt (2012) and Brealey et al. (2020). Traditional capital budgeting methodologies have been predominantly anchored in neoclassical economic theory, which assumes rational decision-making, market efficiency, and the primacy of shareholder wealth maximization as the fundamental objective of corporate financial management (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Copeland, 1979)The cornerstone metrics of traditional capital budgeting include Net Present Value (NPV), which measures the present value of expected cash flows minus the initial investment; Internal Rate of Return (IRR), representing the discount rate at which NPV equals zero; and Payback Period, indicating the time required to recover the initial investment (Herbst, 2002; Magni, 2013). These financial metrics have been complemented by sophisticated risk assessment techniques, including sensitivity analysis, scenario planning, and Monte Carlo simulations, designed to address uncertainty and variability in projected cash flows (Saltelli et al., 2008; Amer et al., 2013).

2.1.2 Limitations of Traditional Methods

Despite their mathematical sophistication and widespread adoption, traditional capital budgeting approaches have faced increasing criticism for their inability to address the complex, interconnected challenges of contemporary business environments (Hahn & Figge, 2011; Bebbington & Unerman, 2018). The fundamental limitations of purely financial approaches have become increasingly apparent as organizations grapple with environmental degradation, social inequality, and governance failures that traditional metrics fail to capture or adequately address.

overweight short-term costs (Weitzman, 2001; Gollier, 2013). This temporal bias is particularly problematic for sustainability-related investments, which frequently involve substantial upfront costs but generate benefits over extended time horizons that may span decades or centuries (Nordhaus, 2007; Stern, 2007). The choice of discount rate becomes especially controversial when evaluating climate change mitigation or social development projects, where the welfare of future generations is at stake (Cline, 1992; Portney & Weyant, 1999).

2.2 Corporate Social Responsibility in Investment Decisions

2.2.1 CSR as Externality Mitigation

The conceptualization of corporate social responsibility as a framework for externality management has emerged as a dominant paradigm in contemporary sustainability literature, with significant implications for capital budgeting theory and practice (Sheehy, 2015; Boardman et al., 2018). This perspective views CSR not as philanthropy or public relations, but as a strategic imperative for addressing the negative spillover effects of business activities on environmental and social systems (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011; Kramer & Pfitzer, 2016).

Empirical research has increasingly validated the externality mitigation framework through comprehensive cost-benefit analyses that quantify the social and environmental impacts of corporate activities (Jenkins et al., 2018; Boardman, 2009). These studies demonstrate that negative externalities often represent substantial hidden costs that, when properly quantified, significantly alter traditional investment evaluation outcomes. For example, research by Trucost (2013) found that environmental externalities in key economic sectors often exceed

2.2.2 Stakeholder Theory Integration

The integration of stakeholder theory into capital budgeting represents a fundamental paradigm shift from shareholder primacy to stakeholder capitalism, with profound

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

implications for how organizations evaluate and prioritize investment opportunities (Freeman, 1984; Freeman et al., 2010; Parmar et al., 2010). This theoretical evolution reflects growing recognition that sustainable competitive advantage increasingly depends on the ability to create value for multiple stakeholder groups simultaneously, rather than focusing exclusively on shareholder returns (Porter & Kramer, 2011; Eccles et al., 2014).

2.3 Uncertainty and Environmental Factors

2.3.1 Social Uncertainty as a Moderating Factor

The role of social uncertainty as a critical moderating variable in the relationship between capital budgeting practices and organizational performance has gained substantial empirical support through rigorous quantitative research across diverse geographical and sectoral contexts (Kengatharan, 2017; Verbeeten, 2006; Miller, 1992). Social uncertainty, encompassing political instability, policy volatility, regulatory unpredictability, and social unrest, creates complex decision-making environments that challenge traditional capital budgeting assumptions and methodologies..

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO SUSTAINABLE CAPITAL BUDGETING

3.1 Multidimensional Assessment Frameworks

3.1.1 EESG Framework Development

The conceptual evolution from Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) frameworks to Economic, Environmental, Social, and Governance (EESG) approaches represents a fundamental advancement in sustainable capital budgeting methodology, addressing critical gaps in traditional ESG models by explicitly integrating economic viability as a core dimension of sustainability assessment (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025; Schaltegger & Burritt, 2010). This theoretical progression reflects growing recognition that sustainable development cannot be achieved without economic viability, and that financial sustainability must be considered alongside environmental and social performance to create truly comprehensive evaluation frameworks.

3.1.2 Composite Scoring Matrices

The development of sophisticated composite scoring systems represents a critical methodological advancement that enables the integration of diverse quantitative and qualitative sustainability indicators into coherent decision-making frameworks (Sikdar, 2009; Cinelli et al., 2014; Mardani et al., 2015). These systems address the fundamental challenge of combining incommensurable metrics—such as carbon emissions (measured in tons CO2 equivalent), employment creation (measured in jobs), and financial returns (measured in currency units)—into unified assessment frameworks that support comparative analysis and strategic decision-making across different investment opportunities and contexts.

3.2 Triple Bottom Line Integration

3.2.1 Efficacy, Efficiency, and Sustainability

The integration of Elkington's (1997) triple bottom line framework into capital budgeting methodology has evolved into sophisticated evaluation systems that assess investment projects across three interconnected dimensions: technical efficacy in addressing target externalities, economic efficiency in creating stakeholder value, and financial sustainability for long-term organizational viability (Slaper & Hall, 2011; Savitz & Weber, 2006; Alhaddi, 2015). This comprehensive approach addresses the limitations of single-criterion evaluation methods by explicitly recognizing the multidimensional nature of sustainable value creation and the need for balanced performance across economic, environmental, and social outcomes.

3.2.2 The Capital Budgeting Circle

The capital budgeting circle methodology, as developed by Bosch-Badia et al. (2020), represents a comprehensive framework that systematically integrates CSR considerations into traditional investment evaluation processes through a structured five-stage approach that ensures thorough analysis of both primary investment projects and their associated sustainability implications. This methodological innovation addresses the fragmentation that often characterizes sustainability assessment by creating explicit linkages between mainstream business investments and their environmental and social mitigation requirements.

The initial stage involves comprehensive financial value creation assessment of primary investment projects using traditional capital budgeting techniques, including NPV, IRR, and risk-adjusted return calculations, establishing baseline financial performance expectations that serve as the foundation for subsequent sustainability analysis (Ross et al., 2019; Damodaran, 2012). This stage employs sophisticated financial modeling techniques including Monte Carlo simulation, sensitivity analysis, and scenario planning to establish robust baseline performance estimates under various market conditions and operational assumptions (Mun, 2006; Vose, 2008)

3.3 Measurement and Evaluation Tools

3.3.1 Composite Indicators

The development of integrated measurement systems for sustainable capital budgeting has advanced significantly through the creation of sophisticated composite indicators that combine multiple performance dimensions into unified metrics suitable for strategic decision-making and performance monitoring (Nardo et al., 2008; Saltelli, 2007; Saisana & Tarantola, 2002). These measurement systems address the fundamental challenge of creating decision-relevant information from complex, multidimensional sustainability data while maintaining scientific rigor and stakeholder credibility.

Natural capital efficacy ratios have been developed to measure the effectiveness of environmental investments in improving ecological outcomes relative to baseline conditions and investment costs (Costanza et al., 1997; Daily et al., 2000; Natural Capital Project, 2021). These ratios typically employ scientifically validated environmental indicators such as biodiversity indices, ecosystem service values, carbon sequestration rates, and pollution reduction measures that can be directly attributed to specific investment interventions (CBD, 2010; TEEB, 2010).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

3.3.2 Visualization and Communication Tools

The development of sophisticated visualization and communication tools represents a critical advancement in making complex sustainability performance data accessible and actionable for diverse stakeholder audiences, from board directors and senior executives to community representatives and regulatory authorities (Tufte, 2001; Cairo, 2013; Few, 2012). These tools address the fundamental challenge of communicating multidimensional performance information in formats that support effective decision-making while maintaining transparency and stakeholder engagement.

4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND CASE STUDIES

4.1 Sector-Specific Applications

4.1.1 Manufacturing Sector

Empirical evidence from manufacturing sector applications of sustainable capital budgeting reveals complex performance patterns that challenge traditional assumptions about the trade-offs between environmental stewardship and financial performance (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020; Porter & van der Linde, 1995). Manufacturing case studies demonstrate that carbon retrofit projects, while requiring substantial upfront investments, consistently show strong environmental and governance performance metrics that translate into significant long-term value creation through multiple channels including regulatory risk reduction, operational efficiency gains, and enhanced stakeholder relationships (Hart & Ahuja, 1996; King & Lenox, 2002)..

4.1.2 Infrastructure and Public Utilities

Infrastructure and public utilities sector applications demonstrate distinctive performance patterns that reflect the public service mandate and long-term asset lifecycles characteristic of these industries (Kengatharan, 2017; Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). Water infrastructure projects consistently illustrate high social and environmental performance metrics, with case studies showing strong correlation between comprehensive sustainability assessment and improved project outcomes across technical, economic, and political dimensions.

4.1.3 Social Enterprises

Social enterprise applications of sustainable capital budgeting demonstrate unique performance characteristics that reflect their hybrid organizational forms and multiple bottom line objectives (Dees, 1998; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Santos, 2012). Circular packaging initiatives consistently show exceptional environmental innovation metrics and strong community engagement outcomes, but face significant financial sustainability challenges that require patient capital and innovative financing approaches.

4.2 Geographic and Cultural Variations

4.2.1 Developing Economy Contexts

Empirical research from developing economy contexts reveals significant variations in sustainable capital budgeting implementation that reflect differences in regulatory frameworks, institutional capacity, stakeholder expectations, and resource availability (Kengatharan, 2017; Okoye, 2006). Studies from emerging markets demonstrate both opportunities and challenges for sustainable capital budgeting adoption, with particular emphasis on the need for context-specific adaptations that address local conditions while maintaining international comparability and credibility.

4.2.2 Cross-Cultural Implementation

Cross-cultural analysis reveals significant variations in sustainable capital budgeting implementation that reflect differences in cultural values, stakeholder expectations, regulatory environments, and institutional frameworks across different national and regional contexts (Hofstede, 2001; Schwartz, 2006; House et al., 2004). These variations have important implications for weight assignment in composite scoring systems, stakeholder engagement approaches, and definitions of long-term sustainability that must be addressed in multinational applications of sustainable capital budgeting frameworks.

5. STRATEGIC INTEGRATION AND PLANNING

5.1 Linking Capital Budgeting to Corporate Strategy

5.1.1 Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up Approaches

Top-down strategic planning approaches provide essential frameworks for establishing organizational sustainability priorities, resource allocation parameters, and performance expectations that guide capital budgeting decisions at operational levels (Andrews, 1971; Ansoff, 1991; Grant, 2016). Corporate-level strategy development typically involves comprehensive stakeholder analysis, materiality assessment, and scenario planning exercises that identify key sustainability challenges and opportunities facing the organization over strategic planning horizons of five to ten years or longer (Freeman et al., 2010; AccountAbility, 2018).

5.2 Stakeholder Engagement in Investment Decisions

5.2.1 Participatory Evaluation Methods

Stakeholder-derived weighting systems provide mechanisms for incorporating diverse values and priorities into composite scoring frameworks, addressing the limitation of expert-determined weights that may not reflect the preferences and priorities of affected stakeholders (Keeney & Raiffa, 1976; Saaty, 1980; Belton & Stewart, 2002). Participatory multi-criteria decision analysis approaches enable stakeholders to contribute directly to the determination of relative importance weights for different evaluation criteria including financial performance, environmental impact, social benefits, and governance quality (Mendoza & Martins, 2006; Diaz-Balteiro & Romero, 2008).

5.2.2 Value Co-Creation Approaches.

The theoretical foundation for shared value approaches draws on stakeholder theory, resource-based view of the firm, and institutional theory to explain how organizations can create competitive advantage through the development of distinctive capabilities in addressing social and environmental challenges (Freeman et al., 2010; Barney, 1991; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Empirical research demonstrates that organizations with strong shared value capabilities often demonstrate superior financial performance, stakeholder relationships, and operational resilience compared to organizations with

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

traditional approaches to corporate social responsibility (Eccles et al., 2014; Flammer, 2015).

6.1 Methodological Strengths and Limitations

6.1.1 Advantages of Integrated Approaches

The development of integrated sustainable capital budgeting approaches offers significant methodological advantages that address fundamental limitations of traditional financial evaluation methods while creating new capabilities for comprehensive investment analysis (Eccles et al., 2014; Serafeim, 2020; Khan et al., 2016). These advantages extend beyond simple addition of sustainability metrics to encompass fundamental improvements in risk assessment, stakeholder relationship management, value creation potential, and strategic alignment capabilities that enhance overall investment decision-making quality.

6.1.2 Implementation Challenges

Despite significant methodological advantages, integrated sustainable capital budgeting approaches face substantial implementation challenges that limit their widespread adoption and effectiveness in many organizational contexts (Hahn & Figge, 2011; Schaltegger et al., 2012; Perego & Hartmann, 2009). These challenges reflect both technical limitations of available methodologies and organizational barriers to adopting comprehensive sustainability assessment approaches.

Subjectivity in scoring and weighting systems represents a fundamental methodological challenge that affects the credibility and comparability of sustainability assessments across different contexts and applications (Nardo et al., 2008; Saisana & Tarantola, 2002). Weight assignment for different sustainability criteria often relies on expert judgment or stakeholder consultation processes that may not be representative of broader stakeholder populations or may reflect biases and inconsistencies that undermine assessment validity (Saaty, 1980; Belton & Stewart, 2002). Scoring methodologies for qualitative indicators frequently involve subjective interpretation of complex phenomena that may not be reliably comparable across different evaluators or time periods.

6.2 Theoretical Contributions

6.2.1 Framework Development

The literature on sustainable capital budgeting has generated several significant theoretical contributions that extend traditional capital budgeting theory while addressing fundamental limitations of single-objective optimization approaches (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020; Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025; Schaltegger & Burritt, 2010). These theoretical advances represent genuine innovations rather than simple extensions of existing frameworks, addressing conceptual challenges that previous approaches could not adequately resolve.

The extension of traditional capital budgeting theory to include multiple capitals represents a fundamental theoretical advance that addresses the limitations of single-capital approaches by explicitly recognizing the interdependence between financial, natural, social, and human capital in value creation processes (International Integrated Reporting Council, 2013; Capitals Coalition, 2016). This theoretical development draws on ecological economics, social capital theory, and stakeholder theory to create comprehensive frameworks that recognize multiple forms of value creation and depletion while maintaining analytical rigor and decision-making relevance (Costanza et al., 1997; Coleman, 1988; Freeman, 1984).

6.2.2 Conceptual Integration

The synthesis of previously disparate fields represents one of the most significant conceptual contributions of the sustainable capital budgeting literature, creating interdisciplinary frameworks that draw insights from multiple domains while maintaining coherence and analytical rigor (Porter & Kramer, 2011; Eccles & Krzus, 2010). This conceptual integration addresses fragmentation that has historically limited the effectiveness of both financial analysis and sustainability assessment by creating unified approaches that leverage insights from multiple fields.

6.3 Gaps and Limitations in Current Research

6.3.1 Methodological Gaps

Limited longitudinal studies of implementation effectiveness represent a critical research gap that constrains understanding of how sustainable capital budgeting approaches perform over extended time periods and varying market conditions (Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Orlitzky et al., 2003). Most existing research relies on cross-sectional studies or short-term case studies that provide limited insight into the long-term effectiveness, adaptability, and sustainability of integrated assessment approaches. This limitation is particularly problematic given that sustainability investments often involve long payback periods and uncertain benefit realization timelines that require extended observation periods for meaningful evaluation.

Insufficient validation of composite scoring systems represents another significant methodological gap, with limited research addressing the reliability, validity, and comparability of different aggregation methodologies and weighting approaches (Nardo et al., 2008; Saisana & Tarantola, 2002). The proliferation of different composite indicator systems has created confusion about which approaches are most appropriate for different contexts and applications, while the lack of systematic validation studies limits confidence in assessment results and comparability across different studies and applications.

6.3.2 Contextual Limitations

Current research demonstrates several important contextual limitations that restrict the generalizability and applicability of existing findings across different organizational, geographical, and sectoral contexts (Kengatharan, 2017; Matten & Moon, 2008). These limitations reflect both sampling biases in existing research and genuine contextual variations that require adaptive approaches and context-specific methodological development.

Predominant focus on developed economy contexts limits understanding of how sustainable capital budgeting approaches perform in emerging markets, developing economies, and post-conflict settings where institutional capacity, regulatory frameworks, and stakeholder expectations may differ significantly from developed economy norms

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

(Kengatharan, 2017; Okoye, 2006). This limitation is particularly problematic given that many of the world's most significant sustainability challenges are concentrated in developing economy contexts where sustainable capital budgeting could potentially make the greatest contribution to addressing social and environmental problems.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

7.1 Methodological Advancements

7.1.1 Technology Integration and Digital Innovation

The integration of advanced technologies presents significant opportunities for enhancing sustainable capital budgeting practices. Future research should explore the development of digital platforms that enable real-time assessment and monitoring of CSR investment projects, incorporating both financial and non-financial performance indicators (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020). These platforms could leverage blockchain technology to ensure transparency and accountability in reporting externalities and social impacts, addressing the governance dimension of the EESG framework (Economic, Environmental, Social, and Governance) developed by Nurfitriani and Latif (2025).

7.1.2 Measurement Refinement and Standardization

The development of standardized metrics across industries emerges as a critical research priority. Current approaches to measuring CSR efficacy vary significantly between sectors and organizations, limiting comparability and hindering the development of best practices (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020). Future research should focus on creating industry-tailored assessment frameworks that maintain consistency while acknowledging sector-specific characteristics and challenges (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025).

Integration of behavioural economics insights represents an underexplored area with substantial potential (Kengatharan, 2017). Research should examine how cognitive biases and psychological factors influence decision-making in sustainable capital budgeting contexts. Understanding these behavioural dimensions could inform the design of decision-support tools that mitigate biases while promoting long-term thinking and stakeholder consideration.

7.1.3 Integration of Stakeholder Perspectives

Research should advance methodologies for incorporating diverse stakeholder viewpoints into capital budgeting frameworks (Okoye, 2006). This includes developing systematic approaches for stakeholder engagement that go beyond traditional shareholder-focused models. Future studies should investigate how participatory evaluation processes can be integrated into capital budgeting without compromising decision-making efficiency (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020).

The development of stakeholder-derived weighting systems for composite indicators presents another research opportunity (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). Studies should explore how different stakeholder groups prioritize various aspects of sustainability and how these preferences can be systematically incorporated into evaluation frameworks.

7.2 Contextual Extensions and Cross-Cultural Applications

7.2.1 Geographic Expansion and Cultural Adaptation

Comparative studies across different regulatory environments represent a significant research gap. Future investigations should examine how varying legal frameworks, cultural contexts, and institutional settings influence the effectiveness of sustainable capital budgeting practices (Okoye, 2006). This is particularly important given that most current research focuses on developed economy contexts, with limited understanding of how these frameworks perform in emerging markets.

Research on indigenous and community-based evaluation methods could provide valuable insights for organizations operating in culturally diverse contexts (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). Studies should explore how traditional decision-making processes and local knowledge systems can be integrated with modern capital budgeting frameworks to enhance legitimacy and effectiveness.

7.2.2 Sector-Specific Development and Adaptation

The development of industry-tailored assessment frameworks requires continued attention (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). While current research provides general principles for sustainable capital budgeting, specific industries face unique challenges that require specialized approaches. Future studies should develop sector-specific indicators and weighting systems that reflect industry characteristics while maintaining comparability across sectors.

Small and medium enterprise (SME) applications represent an underexplored area with significant practical importance (Okoye, 2006). Research should investigate how sustainable capital budgeting frameworks can be adapted for organizations with limited resources and simplified decision-making structures. This includes developing streamlined evaluation tools that maintain methodological rigor while remaining practical for SME implementation.

7.3 Policy and Practice Implications

7.3.1 Regulatory Development and Harmonization

Integration with existing financial reporting standards presents both opportunities and challenges for future research (Okoye, 2006). Studies should investigate how sustainable capital budgeting requirements can be incorporated into established accounting frameworks without creating excessive regulatory burden. This includes examining the potential for mandatory CSR expenditure disclosure requirements and their impact on investment decision-making.

International harmonization of sustainability metrics requires coordinated research efforts (Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). Future studies should explore pathways for developing globally consistent measurement standards while allowing for regional and cultural adaptations. This research should consider the role of international organizations in promoting standardization and the potential challenges of implementing uniform standards across diverse regulatory environments (Okoye, 2006).

7.3.2 Capacity Building and Institutional Development

Professional development and training programs require research-based design and evaluation. Future studies should

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 6| June 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

investigate effective pedagogical approaches for teaching sustainable capital budgeting concepts to finance professionals, including the integration of case-based learning and simulation exercises.

Educational curriculum integration represents a systematic challenge requiring comprehensive research. Studies should examine how sustainable capital budgeting concepts can be incorporated into business and finance education at various levels, from undergraduate programs to executive education.

7.4 Emerging Themes and Interdisciplinary Integration

7.4.1 Resilience and Adaptive Capacity

Future research should explore how capital budgeting frameworks can incorporate resilience thinking and adaptive capacity assessment. This includes investigating how investment decisions can enhance organizational and community resilience in the face of climate change, technological disruption, and social transformation.

The integration of systems thinking into capital budgeting represents an important interdisciplinary opportunity. Research should examine how complex systems perspectives can inform investment decisions that account for feedback loops, emergent properties, and long-term system evolution.

7.4.2 Circular Economy and Resource Efficiency

Research on circular economy principles in capital budgeting requires increased attention. Studies should investigate how investment decisions can promote resource efficiency, waste reduction, and circular business models while maintaining financial viability.

The development of life-cycle assessment integration into capital budgeting frameworks presents technical and methodological challenges requiring further research. Studies should explore practical approaches for incorporating full life-cycle impacts into investment evaluation without creating excessive complexity.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This comprehensive review reveals a significant evolution in capital budgeting practices toward multidimensional evaluation frameworks that integrate financial, environmental, social, and governance considerations (Bosch-Badia et al., 2020; Nurfitriani & Latif, 2025). The analysis of existing literature and methodological approaches demonstrates several critical insights that reshape our understanding of sustainable investment decision-making.

8.1. Key Findings

- Shift to Multidimensional Frameworks: The review found a significant evolution in capital budgeting practices, moving beyond simple profit-maximization models. Modern approaches, such as the EESG framework, integrate environmental, social, and governance factors alongside economic viability, providing a more holistic view of investment value. This is a substantial improvement over conventional ESG models.
- Methodological Innovations: Tools like Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) have emerged to handle complex trade-offs. They use weighted scoring, radar charts, and heatmaps to help decision-makers visualize complex data and communicate effectively with stakeholders.
- Contextual Adaptation is Crucial: The effectiveness of these frameworks isn't universal. Successful implementation requires adapting to specific geographic, cultural, and sectoral factors. For example, a manufacturing firm's priorities (e.g., carbon reduction) will differ from a public utility's (e.g., social equity).
- Stakeholder Integration and Governance: Meaningful engagement with stakeholders beyond just shareholders is essential. While stakeholder-derived weighting systems can address subjectivity in evaluation, managing diverse perspectives while maintaining efficiency remains a challenge.

8.2. Recommendations

- Phased Implementation: Organizations should adopt a phased approach, beginning with adapting a framework to their specific context, stakeholder priorities, and strategic goals. A composite scoring matrix can serve as a practical starting point.
- Cross-Functional Teams: Successful implementation requires creating cross-functional teams that include expertise from finance, sustainability, operations, and stakeholder relations. This ensures a comprehensive perspective.
- Policy and Professional Development: The review recommends enhanced regulatory frameworks for corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure and standardized sustainability reporting. It also calls for integrating sustainable capital budgeting principles into professional education, including specialized certifications.

REFERENCES

1. *Bosch-Badia, M. T., Montllor-Serrats, J., & Tarrazon-Rodon, M. A. (2020). The capital budgeting of corporate social responsibility. Sustainability, 12(9), 3542. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093542*
2. *Kengatharan, L. (2017). Moderating effect of social uncertainty between capital budgeting practices and performance. International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting, 7(2), 79-95. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijafr.v7i2.11936*
3. *Nurfitriani, N., & Latif, I. N. (2025). Sustainable capital budgeting: Assessing long-term effects beyond profitability. JASF Journal of Accounting and Strategic Finance, 8(1), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.33005/jasf.v8i1.581*
4. *Okoye, E. I., & Aroh, N. N. (2006). Budgeting controlling and accounting for social responsibility expenditure: A trend analysis of impending issues. Knowledge Builders, 1(1), 138-148.*
5. *Schoenmaker, D., & Schramade, W. (2023). Corporate finance for long-term value. In Springer texts in business and economics. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35009-2_7*