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# Article summary:

1. The concept of creating shared value (CSV) has gained popularity among practitioners and academics for its ability to connect strategy and social goals.

2. However, the concept suffers from shortcomings such as being unoriginal, ignoring tensions in responsible business activity, and having a shallow conception of the corporation's role in society.

3. The article argues that while CSV has some useful aspects, it is ultimately a reactionary response to the crisis of capitalism rather than a transformative solution.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Contesting the Value of 'Creating Shared Value'" provides a critical analysis of the concept of creating shared value (CSV) popularized by Michael Porter and Mark Kramer. While the article acknowledges some strengths of the concept, it also highlights several shortcomings and limitations.

One potential bias in the article is its focus on criticizing CSV rather than providing a balanced assessment. The authors argue that CSV is unoriginal and ignores tensions inherent to responsible business activity, but they do not provide sufficient evidence or examples to support these claims. They also suggest that CSV is based on a shallow conception of the corporation's role in society, but again, fail to provide concrete evidence for this assertion.

The article also seems to have a bias against Porter and Kramer themselves. The authors mention that Porter and Kramer were invited to respond to their critique, but their response is not included in the article. This omission may give the impression that Porter and Kramer were unable or unwilling to defend their concept.

Furthermore, the article does not adequately address counterarguments or alternative perspectives on CSV. While it briefly mentions that CSV has been positively received by practitioners and academics, it does not explore why this might be the case or consider any potential benefits of the concept.

Additionally, the article lacks empirical evidence to support its claims about the limitations of CSV. It relies heavily on theoretical arguments and general statements without providing specific examples or data to back them up.

Overall, while the article raises some valid points about potential shortcomings of CSV, it fails to provide a comprehensive analysis or consider alternative viewpoints. It would benefit from a more balanced approach that explores both the strengths and weaknesses of CSV in a more nuanced manner.

# Topics for further research:

* Critiques of creating shared value concept
* Counterarguments to criticisms of creating shared value
* Benefits of creating shared value in business
* Michael Porter and Mark Kramer's defense of creating shared value
* Empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of creating shared value
* Alternative perspectives on corporate social responsibility
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