

The International Review of Financial Consumers

www.eirfc.com

Citizens' Perspective of Corporate Social Responsibility(CSR): Are They Societal or Promotional?

Muhammad Ziaulhaq Mamun[†]

ABSTRACT

The study tried to find out citizens' perception regarding different CSR activities undertaken by the financial institutions of Bangladesh. The financial institutions of Bangladesh are found to be mostly involved in 27 CSR activities in five major areas (education, health, infrastructural, public awareness, socio-cultural). The analysis of the 27 CSR activities on the basis of the citizens' responses has shown a clear perception of the citizens' understanding regarding the CSR activities undertaken by different institutions of Bangladesh. As noted, the citizens very clearly indicated that the health sector activities, infrastructural development and social awareness campaigns for CSR are more societal than profit-oriented. On the other hand, education related activities to them are to some extent societal than profit driven. But the socio-cultural events they perceive to be more profit driven than societal. Overall the citizens view regarding these CSR activities not purely societal but more societal than profit-oriented. Gender-wise not much difference is observed in the responses.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility (CSR), education, health, infrastructural, promotional, public awareness, societal, socio-cultural

I . BACKGROUND

Ethical corporate responsibility originating from humanistic, religious and moral orientation are taken as additional responsibilities going beyond legal compliance and profit making and include those that firms trust are the right things to do. The voluntary responsibilities to the society refer to the discretionary nature of obligations rooted in the altruistic principles which are not required by law (Jamali and Mishak 2007). Such sense of errands arises from the reciprocal obligation of giving back to the society in exchange of profit and power that companies receive from them. This gave rise to CSR¹ (Corporate

Social Responsibility) which is seen as continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to improving the quality of life of the workforce, their families, local community, and society at large, including the environment. With global steady business growth, the importance of CSR activities in the globe have risen significantly (Siegel and Vitaliano 2007).

Business is an inseparable and embedded part of the society. In addition to its economic role in society, business also has several other roles and responsibilities towards society (Preston and Post 1975; Davis and Blomstrom 1971). Responsible business conducts activities while pursuing economic gains; the social and environmental responsibilities of the business towards its stakeholders; and business's contributions that would benefit the society at large (Margolis and Walsh 2001; Sethi 1975). CSR has become an important part of the corporate fabric

[†] Professor, Institute of Business administration University of Dhaka
mzmamun@yahoo.com

and it calls for socially responsible activities from corporations. There has been a significant increase in the expectations of a wide range of stakeholders - consumers, employees, investors, communities, and governments. As such, businesses are coming at the forefront position, asserting their commitment in addressing the needs of the community. The history of social and environmental concerns about business is as old as trade and business itself. Nowadays, businesses not only need to fulfill their economic obligations, but also have to be socially responsible in order to stay competitive and thus uses the CSR program as a marketing tool to improve image and make good business sense (Friedman 1970).

Today CSR is not about philanthropy or charitable work; it refers to something more fundamental. It is about how companies take responsibility for their actions in the world at large (Sethi 1975). To address the problems of the stakeholders, the business community evolved the approach of CSR in their business strategies to strike a balance between economic and social goals, where resources are used in a rational manner and social needs are addressed responsibly. A company might implement these activities as part of a strategic CSR plan or because it sees these activities as good for business. CSR activities are either real examples of responsibility or just instances of a company tooting its own horn without a social impact. CSR has become a buzzword in the corporate world; As a result, to be competitive, more and more business organizations are engaging themselves in socially responsible activities. A number of companies with good social and environmental records indicate that these activities can result in better performance and can generate more profit and growth.

The rationale for CSR has been articulated in a number of ways. In essence it is about building sustainable businesses, which need healthy economies, markets and communities. The key drivers for CSR include:

- Enlightened self-interest - creating a synergy of ethics, a cohesive society and a sustainable global economy where markets, labor and communities are able to function well together.
- Social investment - contributing to physical infrastructure and social capital is increasingly seen as a necessary part of doing business.
- Transparency and trust - business has low ratings of trust in public perception. There is increasing expectation that companies will be more open, more

accountable and be prepared to report publicly on their performance in social and environmental arenas

- Increased public expectations of business - globally companies are expected to do more than merely provide jobs and contribute to the economy through taxes and employment.”

In Bangladesh, apart from the benevolent social services by some business firms, the new concept of CSR is emerging despite several hindrances. Globalization has made CSR practice an imperative for Bangladesh business. Companies are getting aware of it because being a part of global market, as it is really difficult to ignore CSR particularly in the export sector. Stringent compliance from the importer has taught the local business community about the immense importance of CSR and adoption of this modern and competitive practice for increasing value to the brand. Awareness and sense of necessity for practicing CSR is becoming more and more pronounced as the country has to adapt itself to the process of globalization (Belal 2001). But the overall standing of CSR in Bangladesh is still very dubious and meager. Lack of good governance, absence of strong labor unions or consumer rights groups, and inability of the business community to perceive CSR as a survival pre-condition in export and PR investment - local market constitute some of elements undermining the evolution of CSR practices.

It is evident that CSR practices are gradually getting integrated into cross-border business practices and consequently becoming one of the determining factors for accessing market. There has been increasing pressure on national and multinational corporations in Bangladesh to consider the social implications of their actions (Belal 2001). With well-informed and educated general people, it has become threat to the corporate and CSR is the solution to it. Most of the companies in Bangladesh gradually engage themselves in CSR activities and their broad categorization are: Education, Health, Social Awareness, Poverty Alleviation, Empowerment, Environmental, Social events, Disaster relief, etc. Among the local companies, banks are at the leading position, followed by the pharmaceutical companies, local production companies, textiles and garments.

In a Bangladesh context, several multinational companies and few local companies practice CSR. While the multinationals are influenced by their own “enterprise social responsibility” disposition, most of the business

concerns in Bangladesh do not rate high in practicing CSR unless being pressured (Islam 2012). So, the question arises why these business organizations are doing CSR activities, and what the cognizant citizens² think about those activities. This research tried to explore the citizens thought about these activities: whether these are promotional³ (only for promotion to increase profitably) or societal⁴ (for social welfare).

II. OBJECTIVES

The broad objective of the study is to explore the perception of the citizens regarding CSR activities that are executed by the financial institutions in Bangladesh. Specifically, the study looked into citizens' perspective about CSR activities related to i) health care, ii) educational, iii) multi-facet events (i.e., sports, cultural, competitions, conferences, etc.), iv) infrastructure and aesthetic initiatives, v) socio-environmental awareness raising programs taken by the companies.

III. METHODOLOGY

The main objective of this research was to analyze the perception of people about the CSR activities in Bangladesh. The research used both primary and secondary sources and made pertinent literature review. The primary data was collected by means of questionnaire survey of 194 community conscious citizens (e.g., students, service holders, businessmen and housewives). The survey questionnaire contains 27 key variables using a 5-point Likert scale (1: Only societal, 2: More societal than profit driven, 3: Neutral, 4: More profit driven than societal, and 5: Only profit driven). From the responses mean indices are calculated to measure the citizens' views and perceptions.

The survey was conducted within Dhaka Metropolitan – the capital of Bangladesh. A combination of convenience, judgmental and quota sampling techniques were used to select the respondents (n=194). The secondary sources include books, reports, journal articles, etc. The study used face validity and the responses were found to be

reliable (Cronbach's alpha=0.845). The survey questionnaire was pretested with 15 respondents and necessary editing was done. Data analyses were done using a number of statistical tests. The tests used are one-sample frequency distribution, descriptive statistics, indexing, t-tests, factor analysis, etc.

The limitations of the study include small sample size and study area confined to the capital city only. The sample of 194 citizens can be justified with a level of significance of 10%, precision of 6%, and proportion of 50%. Time shortage and non-response error resulted into small sample size. Keeping the boundary within capital city is rational in the sense that most of the people living here are conscious, cognizant, alert and vigilant of the CSR activities of the corporations.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

The citizens' view regarding the CSR activities are grouped into 5 complex variables containing 27 simple variables. The five CSR related complex variables are: i) health sector facilities, ii) education related activities, iii) multi-facet events, iv) aesthetic-infrastructure CSR, and v) socio-environmental awareness campaign. The citizens' survey is conducted using a 5-point Likert scale regarding their view towards these activities (1: only societal, 2: more societal than profit driven, 3: neutral, 4: more profit driven than societal, 5: only profit driven). Here 194 citizens view restricted to 27 variables are quantified using the 5-point likert scale values (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). On the basis of the responses the mean indices of all the variables are calculated for testing the research objectives. The detailed analyses of these complex variables are described below.

A. Health Sector

The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving health sector contains seven simple variables. The citizens' have given their view against each of the components in a 5-point Likert scale focusing if it is societal or promotional. The component wise analysis is given below.

1. Health care facilities

Regarding health care facilities (Table 1) we can see that most (30.9%) of the respondents think it is more societal than profit driven, but quite a few (17.5%) of the respondents think that health care facilities taken by the companies are only societal. Again, a significant number (29.9%) think these are more profit driven than societal. About 16.5% gave a neutral view, whereas another 4.6% respondents think health facilities are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. But the central tendency of 2.72 indicates that mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are quite bi-modal and are quite dispersed ($\sigma = 1.21$).

2. Free medicine provided

From the Table 2 we can see, 22.2% of the respondents think that free medicine provided by the companies are purely societal, whereas 45.9% see it as more societal than profit driven. Though 8.8% gave a neutral view but quite a few (23.3%) think these are more profit driven than societal. Here it is noted that the central tendency is again 2.33 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that nobody think this initiative is profit driven only. Here

also responses are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.065$) which means people have different views.

3. Free Medical check-up

From the Table 3 regarding free medical check-up we can see, 32.0% of the respondents think that free medical checkup programs taken by the companies are only societal whereas 47.4% think it as more societal than profit driven, 8.8% gave a neutral view, 11.3% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 0.5% respondents think free checkup facilities are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. As noted the mean index here is 2.01 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are also quite dispersed (0.955).

4. Free dental checkup

From the Table 4 we can see, 24.2% of the respondents think that free dental checkup programs taken by the companies are only societal, whereas, 41.8% think it as more societal than profit driven, 12.9% gave a neutral view, 20.1% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 1% respondents think free dental checkup facilities are only given for promotion and to drive profit

Table 1. Health care facilities

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	1	0.5	Mean Index (μ)=2.72 Std. Deviation (σ)=1.212 Significance Level (α)=0.001
Only Societal	34	17.5	
More Societal than profit driven	60	30.9	
Neutral	32	16.5	
More Profit driven than societal	58	29.9	
Profit driven	9	4.6	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 2. Free medicine provided

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
Only Societal	43	22.2	Mean Index (μ)=2.33 Std. Deviation (σ)=1.065 Significance Level (α)=0.000
More Societal than profit driven	89	45.9	
Neutral	17	8.8	
More Profit driven than societal	45	23.2	
Total	194	100.0	

from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.32 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.083$).

5. Free pure drinking water supply

From the Table 5 we see that 29.9% of the respondents think that free pure drinking water supply program taken by the companies are only societal whereas 39.2% think it as more societal than profit driven, 15.5% gave a neutral view, 13.4% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 1.5% respondents think these campaigns are only undertaken only for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.16 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more

societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.063$) which means people have different views.

6. Free vaccination service

From the Table 6 we can see, 32.0% of the respondents think that free vaccination service programs taken by the companies are only societal whereas 40.7% think it as more societal than profit driven, 9.8% gave a neutral view, 14.9% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 1.5% respondents think free vaccination facilities are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. So we see that the mean index is 2.10 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses quite

Table 3. Free medical check-up

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
Only Societal	62	32.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.01
More Societal than profit driven	92	47.4	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.955
Neutral	17	8.8	Significance Level (α)=0.000
More Profit driven than societal	22	11.3	
Profit driven	1	0.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 4. Free dental checkup

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
Only Societal	47	24.2	Mean Index (μ)=2.32
More Societal than profit driven	81	41.8	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.083
Neutral	25	12.9	Significance Level (α)=0.000
More Profit driven than societal	39	20.1	
Profit driven	2	1.0	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 5. Free pure drinking water supply

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	1	0.5	Mean Index (μ)=2.16
Only Societal	58	29.9	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.063
More Societal than profit driven	76	39.2	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	30	15.5	
More Profit driven than societal	26	13.4	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	194	100.0	

dispersed ($\sigma=1.092$) which means people have different views.

7. Free eye care

From the Table 7 we can see, 26.3% of the respondents think that free eye care facilities taken by the companies are only societal whereas 42.3% think it as more societal than profit driven, 16.0% gave a neutral view, 13.4% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 1.5% respondents think eye care facilities are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. So we see the central tendency in the scale is 2.2 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more societal

than profit driven. Here we notice that the data is quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.041$) which means people’s views are mostly societal oriented.

8. Overall (Health sector)

The citizens’ perspective about CSR activities involving health sector contains seven simple variables. The mean indices, standard deviations and significant difference from neutral view (3) of each of the variables are summarized in Table 8. The overall mean indexes of the variables is found to be 2.26 [significantly ($\alpha=0.000$) less than 3 (neutral)] and narrowly dispersed ($\sigma=0.23$) [between 2 (more societal than profit driven) and 3

Table 6. Free vaccination service

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	2	1.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.10
Only Societal	62	32.0	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.092
More Societal than profit driven	79	40.7	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	19	9.8	
More Profit driven than societal	29	14.9	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 7. Free eye care

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	1	.5	Mean Index (μ)=2.20
Only Societal	51	26.3	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.041
More Societal than profit driven	82	42.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	31	16.0	
More Profit driven than societal	26	13.4	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 8. Health Care Sector

Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Deviation (σ)	Significance Level (α)
Health care facilities	2.72	1.212	0.001
Free medicine provided	2.33	1.065	0.000
Free medical check-up	2.01	0.955	0.000
Free dental check-up	2.32	1.083	0.000
Free pure drinking water supply	2.16	1.063	0.000
Free vaccination service	2.10	1.092	0.000
Free eye care	2.20	1.041	0.000

(neutral)]. This indicates that the citizens' view regarding the health-related CSR activities are more societal than profit-oriented.

B. Education Sector

There are 3 variables in this sector to measure the citizen's perspective about the CSR activities involving the education sector. The detailed analysis is given below.

1. Establishment of Educational Institutes

We can see from the Table 9 that 9.8% of the respondents think educational institutes established by the companies are only societal whereas 25.8% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 21.1% gave a neutral view, 28.4% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 13.9% respondents think that these educational institutes are established only for promotion and to drive profit from that. So we see the central tendency in the scale was 3.09 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more profit driven than societal. We can also notice that the responses are quite dispersed which means people have different views about these

initiatives.

2. Donation for Library

We can see from the Table 10 that 11.9% of the respondents think donations made by the companies for libraries are only societal whereas 36.1% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 25.3% of the respondents gave a neutral view, 19.6% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 6.2% respondents think that they donate for the libraries only for promotion and to drive profit from that. So we see the central tendency in the scale was 2.69 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We can also notice that the responses are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.132$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

3. Scholarship Offers

We can see from the Table 11 that 26.8% of the respondents think the companies offer scholarship only for societal purpose whereas 41.2% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 13.9% gave a neutral view, 14.4% think these are more profit driven than societal

Table 9. Establishment of educational institution

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	2	1.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.09
Only Societal	19	9.8	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.259
More Societal than profit driven	50	25.8	Significance Level (α)=0.393
Neutral	41	21.1	
More Profit driven than societal	55	28.4	
Profit driven	27	13.9	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 10. Donation for Library

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	2	1.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.69
Only Societal	23	11.9	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.132
More Societal than profit driven	70	36.1	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	49	25.3	
More Profit driven than societal	38	19.6	
Profit driven	12	6.2	
Total	194	100.0	

and the other 3.6% respondents think that these scholarships are offered only for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.27 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. Here we can notice that the respondents' views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.115$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

d) Overall (Education sector)

The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving education sector contains three simple variables. The mean indices, standard deviations and significant difference from neutral view (3) of each of the variables are summarized in Table 12. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be 2.68 [not significantly ($\alpha < 0.305$) less than 3 (neutral)] and quite dispersed ($\sigma=0.405$) [between 2 (more societal than profit driven) and 3

(neutral)]. This indicates that the citizens' view regarding the health-related CSR activities are more societal than profit-oriented.

C. Multi-facet Events

We had five variables to measure citizens' perspective towards CSR activities by different companies involving different types of events.

1. Sports Events

We can see from the Table 13 that 4.1% of the respondents think that the companies sponsor sports events only for societal purpose whereas 12.4% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 14.4% gave a neutral view, 42.3% think these are more profit driven

Table 11. Scholarship Offers

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.27
Only Societal	52	26.8	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.115
More Societal than profit driven	80	41.2	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	27	13.9	
More Profit driven than societal	28	14.4	
Profit driven	7	3.6	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 12. Education sector

Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Deviation (σ)	Significance Level (α)
Building educational institution	3.08	1.259	0.393
Donation for library	2.69	1.132	0.000
Student scholarship	2.27	1.115	0.000

Table 13. Sports Events

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.75
Only Societal	8	4.1	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.11
More Societal than profit driven	24	12.4	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	28	14.4	
More Profit driven than societal	82	42.3	
Profit driven	52	26.8	
Total	194	100.0	

than societal and the other 26.8% respondents think that the sports events are sponsored by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 3.75 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more profit driven than societal. Here we can notice that the respondents' views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.11$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

2. Cultural Events

We can see from Table 14 that 2.6% of the respondents think that the companies sponsor cultural events only for societal purpose whereas 10.3% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 19.6% gave a neutral view, 42.8% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 24.2% respondents think that the cultural events are sponsored by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. The mean index in this case is 3.76 which means mostly people see these initiatives as more profit driven than societal. And it is seen that the respondents' views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.02$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

Table 14. Cultural Events

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.76
Only Societal	5	2.6	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.02
More Societal than profit driven	20	10.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	38	19.6	
More Profit driven than societal	83	42.8	
Profit driven	47	24.2	
Total	193	99.5	

Table 15. Seminar and Workshop

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.11
Only Societal	11	5.7	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.946
More Societal than profit driven	40	20.6	Significance Level (α)=0.113
Neutral	64	33.0	
More Profit driven than societal	75	38.7	
Profit driven	4	2.1	
Total	194	100.0	

3. Seminar and Workshop

We can see from Table 15 that 5.7% of the respondents think that the companies organize seminars and workshops only for societal purpose whereas 20.6% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 33% gave a neutral view, 38.7% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 2.1% respondents think that the seminars and workshops are organized by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. The mean index in this case is 3.11 which means mostly people see these initiatives neither profit driven nor societal. And it is seen that the respondents' views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.02$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

4. Conferences

We can see from the Table 16 that 3.6% of the respondents think that the companies sponsor conferences only for societal purpose whereas 16% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 26.8% gave a neutral view, 31.4% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 22.2% respondents think that the conferences are sponsored by the companies only

for promotion and to drive profit from that. The mean index in this case is 3.53 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more profit driven than societal. And it is seen that the respondents' views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.11$) which means people have different views about these initiatives.

5. Competitions

We can see from the Table 17 that 2.1% of the respondents think that the companies sponsor competitions only for societal purpose whereas 9.3% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 19.1% gave a neutral view, 45.9% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 23.7% respondents think that the competitions are sponsored by the companies only

for promotion and to drive profit from that. The mean index in this case is 3.80 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more profit driven than societal. And it is seen that the respondents' views are not that dispersed ($\sigma=0.974$) and most of them think that these activities are mostly profit driven.

6. Overall (Multi-facet Events)

The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving social events contains five simple variables. The mean indices, standard deviations and significant difference from neutral view (3) of each of the variables are summarized in Table 18. The overall mean indexes of the variables is found to be 3.59 [significantly ($\alpha<0.01$) greater than 3 (neutral)] and narrowly dispersed ($\sigma=0.29$) [between

Table 16. Conferences

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.53
Only Societal	7	3.6	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.11
More Societal than profit driven	31	16.0	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	52	26.8	
More Profit driven than societal	61	31.4	
Profit driven	43	22.2	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 17. Competitions

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.80
Only Societal	4	2.1	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.974
More Societal than profit driven	18	9.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	37	19.1	
More Profit driven than societal	89	45.9	
Profit driven	46	23.7	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 18. Overall (Socio-cultural Events)

Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Deviation (σ)	Significance Level (α)
Sports events	3.75	1.106	0.00
Cultural events	3.76	1.018	0.00
Seminar and workshop	3.11	0.946	0.113
Conferences	3.53	1.111	0.00
Competitions	3.80	0.974	0.00

4 (more profit driven than societal) and 3 (neutral)]. This indicates that the peoples’ perception about social event related CSR activities is more promotional than societal.

D. Infrastructure and Aesthetic Development

The study had six variables to measure citizens’ perspective towards CSR activities involving infrastructures. The citizens’ have given their view against each of the components in a 5-point Likert scale focusing if it is societal or promotional. The detailed analysis is given below.

1. Road Dividers

We can see from Table 19 that 24.2% of the respondents think that the companies build road dividers only for societal purpose whereas 40.2% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 19.1% gave a neutral view, 13.9% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 2.6% respondents think that road dividers are built by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. The mean index in this case is 2.3 which mean most of the people see these initiatives

as more societal than profit driven. And it is seen that the respondents’ views are quite dispersed ($\sigma=1.065$).

2. Constructing Waiting sheds

We can see from Table 20 that 9.3% of the respondents think that the companies build waiting sheds only for societal purpose whereas 24.2% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 16.5% gave a neutral view, 43.3% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 6.7% respondents think that waiting spots are built by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 3.14 which means most of the people see these initiatives neither as profit driven nor societal. And it is seen that the respondents’ views are quiet dispersed ($\sigma=1.14$).

3. Roads and Bridges

We can see from Table 21 that 22.7% of the respondents think that the companies build roads and bridges only for societal purpose whereas 44.3% think that it is actually more societal than profit driven, 17% gave a neutral view, 14.4% think these are more profit driven than societal

Table 19. Road Dividers

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.30
Only Societal	47	24.2	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.065
More Societal than profit driven	78	40.2	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	37	19.1	
More Profit driven than societal	27	13.9	
Profit driven	5	2.6	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 20. Constructing Waiting Spots

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=3.14
Only Societal	18	9.3	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.14
More Societal than profit driven	47	24.2	Significance Level (α)=0.091
Neutral	32	16.5	
More Profit driven than societal	84	43.3	
Profit driven	13	6.7	
Total	194	100.0	

and the other 1.5% respondents think that roads and bridges are built by the companies only for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.28 which means most of the people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. And it is seen that the respondents' views are a little dispersed ($\sigma=1.02$) and mostly societal oriented.

4. Lake Cleaning and maintenance

From Table 22 we can see, 31.4% of the respondents think that lake cleaning and maintenance program taken by the companies are only societal whereas 40.7% think it as more societal than profit driven, 16.5% gave a neutral

view, 9.3% think these are more profit driven than societal. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.01 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

5. Beautifications of roads and highways

From Table 23 we can see, 13.4% of the respondents think that beautification programs of roads and highways taken by the companies are only societal whereas 22.7% think it as more societal than profit driven, 27.3% gave a neutral view, 33.5% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 3.1% respondents think are

Table 21. Roads and Bridges

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.28
Only Societal	44	22.7	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.02
More Societal than profit driven	86	44.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	33	17.0	
More Profit driven than societal	28	14.4	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 22. Lake Cleaning and maintenance

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	3	1.5	Mean Index (μ)=2.01
Only Societal	61	31.4	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.96
More Societal than profit driven	79	40.7	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	32	16.5	
More Profit driven than societal	18	9.3	
Profit driven	-	-	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 23. Beautifications of roads and highways

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	0	0.0	Mean Index (μ)=2.9
Only Societal	26	13.4	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.104
More Societal than profit driven	44	22.7	Significance Level (α)=0.218
Neutral	53	27.3	
More Profit driven than societal	65	33.5	
Profit driven	6	3.1	
Total	194	100.0	

only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.9 ($\alpha=0.218$) and quite diverse ($\sigma=1.104$) meaning mostly people see these initiatives neither as profit driven nor societal.

6. Waste disposal initiative

From Table 24 we can see, 31.4% of the respondents think that waste disposal initiatives taken by the companies are only societal whereas 42.3% think it as more societal than profit driven, 13.4% gave a neutral view, 9.3% people think this kind of activities are more profit driven than societal and only 1.5% think these are only profit driven. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.01 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly.

7. Overall (Infrastructural development programs)

The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving infrastructural development programs contains six simple variables. The mean indices, standard deviations and significant difference from neutral view (3) of each of the variables are summarized in Table 25. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be 2.44

[significantly ($\alpha<0.034$) different than 3 (neutral)] and narrowly dispersed ($\sigma=0.473$) [between 2 (more societal than profit driven) and 3 (neutral)]. This indicates that the peoples' think that CSR activities related to infrastructure undertaken by the companies are mostly for the sake of the society and not promotion oriented.

E. Socio-Environmental Awareness Campaign

The study had six variables to measure citizens' perspective towards socio-environmental awareness raising programs undertaken by the companies as a part of their CSR activities. The citizens' have given their view against each of the components in a 5-point Likert scale focusing if it is societal or promotional. The detailed analysis is given below.

1. Anti-drug awareness

From Table 26 we can see, 39.2% of the respondents think that antidrug awareness campaign programs taken by the companies are only societal whereas 45.4% think it as more societal than profit driven, 6.7% gave a neutral view, 6.7% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 2.1% respondents think antidrug awareness

Table 24. Waste disposal initiative

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	4	2.1	Mean Index (μ)=2.01
Only Societal	61	31.4	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.02
More Societal than profit driven	82	42.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	26	13.4	
More Profit driven than societal	18	9.3	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 25. Overall (Infrastructure and aesthetic development)

Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Deviation (σ)	Significance Level (α)
Road dividers	2.30	1.065	0.000
Roads and bridges	2.28	1.020	0.000
Waiting sheds	3.14	1.141	0.091
Lake cleaning and maintenance	2.01	0.96	0.000
Beautification of roads and highways	2.90	1.104	0.218
Waste disposal initiative	2.01	1.023	0.000

campaigns are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 1.87 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

2. Road safety campaign

From Table 27 we can see, 35.1% of the respondents think that road safety awareness campaign programs taken by the companies are only societal whereas 42.8% think it as more societal than profit driven, 13.4% gave a neutral view, 6.7% think these are more profit driven than societal

and the other 2.1% respondents think road safety awareness campaigns are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 1.988 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

3. Hand washing campaign

From Table 28 we can see, 19.1% of the respondents think that hand washing campaigns are taken by the companies are only societal whereas 25.3% think it as more societal than profit driven, 24.2% gave a neutral view,

Table 26. Anti-drug awareness

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	-	-	Mean Index (μ)=1.87
Only Societal	76	39.2	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.949
More Societal than profit driven	88	45.4	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	13	6.7	
More Profit driven than societal	13	6.7	
Profit driven	4	2.1	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 27. Road safety campaign

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	-	-	Mean Index (μ)=1.988
Only Societal	68	35.1	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.971
More Societal than profit driven	83	42.8	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	26	13.4	
More Profit driven than societal	13	6.7	
Profit driven	4	2.1	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 28. Hand washing campaign

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	-	-	Mean Index (μ)=2.74
Only Societal	37	19.1	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.21
More Societal than profit driven	49	25.3	Significance Level (α)=0.003
Neutral	47	24.2	
More Profit driven than societal	49	25.3	
Profit driven	12	6.2	
Total	194	100.0	

25.3% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 6.2% respondents think are only profit driven activities. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.74 which means most of the people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. And it is seen that the respondents' views are a little dispersed ($\sigma=1.21$) and a little societal oriented.

4. *Anti-Dowry campaign*

From Table 29 we can see, 50.5% of the respondents think that Anti-Dowry campaign taken by companies are only societal whereas 33.5% think it as more societal than profit driven, 11.3% gave a neutral view, 4.1% people think this kind of activities are more profit driven than societal and only 0.5% think these are only profit driven. It is noted that the mean index here is 1.718 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

5. *Waste disposal awareness*

From Table 30 we can see, 29.9% of the respondents think that waste disposal awareness program taken by

the companies are only societal whereas, 44.3% think it as more societal than profit driven, 16.5% gave a neutral view, 5.2%% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other 1.5% respondents think eye care facilities are nothing but profit driven. It is noted that the mean index here is 1.97 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

6. *Tree plantation*

From Table 31 we can see, 31.4% of the respondents think that tree plantation programs taken by the companies are only societal whereas 45.9% think it as more societal than profit driven, 10.3% gave a neutral view, 10.3% think these are more profit driven than societal and the other .2.1% respondents think tree plantation activities are only given for promotion and to drive profit from that. It is noted that the mean index here is 2.06 which mean mostly people see these initiatives as more societal than profit driven. We also notice that responses are societal oriented mostly and skewed towards that.

Table 29. Hand washing campaign

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	-	-	Mean Index (μ)=1.718
Only Societal	98	50.5	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.865
More Societal than profit driven	65	33.5	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	22	11.3	
More Profit driven than societal	8	4.1	
Profit driven	1	.5	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 30. Waste disposal awareness

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	4	2.1	Mean Index (μ)=1.97
Only Societal	58	29.9	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.949
More Societal than profit driven	86	44.3	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	32	16.5	
More Profit driven than societal	10	5.2	
Profit driven	3	1.5	
Total	193	99.5	

7. Overall (Socio-environmental awareness campaign)

The citizens' perspective about social awareness related CSR activities contains six simple variables. The mean indices, standard deviations and significant difference from neutral view (3) of each of the variables are summarized in Table 32. The overall mean indexes of the variables is found to be 2.055 [significantly ($\alpha < 0.001$) different from 3 (neutral)] and narrowly dispersed ($\sigma = 0.356$) [close to 2 (more societal than profit driven)]. This indicates that the people think that environmental CSR activities undertaken by the companies are mostly for the sake of the society and less promotion oriented.

F. CITIZENS' OVERALL VIEW

The analysis of the 27 simple variables grouped into five complex variables on the basis of the citizens' responses has shown a clear perception of the citizens' understanding regarding the CSR activities undertaken by different corporations (Table 33). As noted, the citizens very clearly indicated that all complex variables except socio-cultural events (i.e., health sector activities, educational activities, infrastructural development, and social awareness campaigns) for CSR are more societal than profit-oriented. But the socio-cultural events they perceive to be more profit driven than societal. The overall mean index of the complex variables (2.61) is found between

Table 31. Tree plantation

Responses	f	%	Descriptive Statistics
No Response	-	-	Mean Index (μ)=2.06
Only Societal	61	31.4	Std. Deviation (σ)=1.01
More Societal than profit driven	89	45.9	Significance Level (α)=0.000
Neutral	20	10.3	
More Profit driven than societal	20	10.3	
Profit driven	4	2.1	
Total	194	100.0	

Table 32. Overall (Socio-environmental awareness campaign)

Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Deviation (σ)	Significance Level (α)
Anti drug awareness	1.87	0.949	0.000
Hand washing campaign	2.74	1.207	0.003
Road safety campaign	1.98	0.971	0.000
Anti Dowry campaign	1.71	0.865	0.000
Waste disposal awareness	1.97	0.949	0.000
Tree plantation	2.06	1.01	0.000

Table 33. Mean Indices of the Complex Variables

Complex Variables	Mean Index (μ)	Std. Dev. (σ)	Significance Level (α)	Overall statistics
Health sector activities	2.26	0.23	0.000	Mean Index (μ)=2.61
Education related activities	2.68	0.45	0.305*	Std. Deviation (σ)=0.597
Multi-facet events	3.59	0.29	0.010	Significance Level (α)=0.213*
Aesthetic-infrastructural development	2.44	0.473	0.034	
Socio-environmental awareness campaign	2.06	0.356	0.001	

* not significant at $\alpha = 5\%$.

2 (more societal than profit driven) and 3 (neutral). This indicates that the citizens overall view regarding these CSR activities not purely societal but more societal than profit-oriented.

Further analysis of the simple variables shows that except 4 (i.e., building educational institutes, organizing seminars, construction of waiting sheds and beautification of roads and highways) the mean indices of all the variables are significantly different from neutral value (3). Again, it is noted that mean indices of only four variables (i.e., Sponsoring Sports events, cultural events, conferences and competitions) are found significantly above 3. All of these are socio-cultural events. The overall mean of the 27 simple variables found to be 2.55 (significantly less than 3) with a standard deviation of 0.63. Hence it can be concluded that overall the citizens perceive the CSR activities to be more societal than profit-oriented, but for socio-cultural events they view the other way.

G. FACTOR ANALYSIS

A factor analysis is conducted to reduce the 27 variables into sizable factors. The factor analysis reduced the 27 survey variables into six factors with eigen-value greater than one (Table 34). The factor analysis of 27 variables with 194 sample is found adequate (KMO test result=0.786 ≥ 0.5) and valid (Bartlett’s test of sphericity indicates a significance level of 0.000). As can be seen from the table, these six factors explain 61.90% of the variability. Also, it can be noted that the first two factors (Health sector events and Socio-cultural activities) appears to be the most important as they explain 21.41% and 13.6% of the variability respectively. Other factors include social awareness campaign ($s^2=9.81\%$), infrastructural initiatives ($s^2=6.17\%$) and educational activities ($s^2=4.944\%$). The communalities of the variables that constituted the factors are found very strong, which indicates strong relationships among the variables.

As can be noted from the factors table that the grouping we made from the schema and the variables under the factors are quite consistent. As noted, factor 1 (Health

Table 34. Factor Analysis

Factors	Variables	Factor Loadings
Factor 1: Health Sector Events ($\sigma^2=21.41$)	Free dental Check up	0.794
	Free Vaccination service	0.784
	Free medical check-up	0.731
	Free medicine provided	0.714
	Free eye care	0.705
Factor 2: Multi-facet events ($\sigma^2=13.6$)	Free pure drinking water supply	0.685
	Cultural events	0.804
	Sports events	0.803
	Conferences	0.780
	Competitions	0.704
Factor 3: Social awareness Campaign ($\sigma^2=9.81$)	Seminar and workshop	0.601
	Anti-drug awareness	0.808
	Road safety campaign	0.776
	Anti-Dowry campaign	0.738
Factor 4: Infrastructural Initiatives ($\sigma^2=6.17$)	Waste disposal awareness	0.718
	Roads and bridges	0.812
	Lake cleaning and maintenance	0.692
	Road Dividers	0.637
Factor 5: Aesthetic CSR ($\sigma^2=5.74$)	Waste disposal Initiative	0.590
	Waiting sheds	0.746
	Beautification of roads and highways	0.522
	Scholarship offer	-0.505
	Hand washing campaign	0.437
Factor 6: Educational ($\sigma^2=5.19$)	Health care facilities	0.427
	tree plantation	-0.413
	Establish educational institution	0.811
	Donation for library	0.646

contains 6 of the 7 variables considered in previous health related grouping; whereas factor 2 (Multi-facet events) includes all 5 of initial multi-facet variables. Both the factor 3 (Social awareness) and 4 (infrastructural initiatives) has 4 out of 6 variables in common from previous similar groups (socio-environmental and infrastructural). The variables of factor 5 (Aesthetic) are a combination of 1 or 2 variables from different groups developed earlier. The sixth factor (education) has 2 out of 3 variables from education grouping.

V. GENDERWISE RESPONSES OF THE VARIABLES

Difference of opinion between male (n=150) and female (n=44) citizens' responses are tabulated in Table 35. As noted, that all except three activities (i.e., waste disposal awareness, road safety campaign, and anti-dowry campaign) the gender-wise responses are not significantly different at 5% level of significance.

Table 35. Gender-wise Responses

Simple Variables	Male (150)		Female (44)		Sig. (2-tailed)	
	μ	σ	μ	σ	$\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ assumed	$\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$ assumed
Health care facilities	2.66	1.197	2.91	1.254	0.231	0.246
Free medicine provided	2.27	1.029	2.52	1.171	0.173	0.207
Free medical check-up	1.98	0.937	2.11	1.017	0.416	0.438
Free dental check up	2.26	1.058	2.52	1.151	0.157	0.180
Free pure drinking water supply	2.14	1.062	2.23	1.075	0.633	0.637
Free vaccination service	2.04	1.055	2.32	1.196	0.138	0.169
Free eye care	2.22	1.035	2.14	1.069	0.641	0.467
Establish educational institution	3.05	1.241	3.16	1.328	0.625	0.639
Scholarship offering	2.29	1.125	2.20	1.091	0.669	0.664
Donation for library	2.65	1.112	2.84	1.200	0.318	0.341
Sponsoring sports events	3.73	1.091	3.82	1.167	0.656	0.668
Sponsoring conferences	3.49	1.104	3.64	1.143	0.454	0.465
Sponsoring cultural events	3.69	1.033	4.00	0.940	0.077	0.065
Sponsoring competitions	3.75	0.984	.984	0.080	0.168	0.157
Seminar and workshop	3.06	0.950	3.27	0.924	0.190	0.186
Road dividers	2.29	1.119	2.36	0.865	0.675	0.630
Roads and bridges	2.27	1.055	2.30	0.904	0.900	0.891
Constructing waiting spots	3.10	1.157	3.27	1.086	0.379	0.364
Beautification of roads & highways	2.89	1.100	2.93	1.129	0.839	0.842
Lake cleaning and maintenance	2.03	0.965	1.93	0.950	0.565	0.563
Waste disposal initiative	2.05	1.025	1.89	1.017	0.362	0.362
tree plantation	2.09	1.045	1.93	0.873	0.352	0.306
Waste disposal awareness	2.05	0.968	1.70	0.832	0.030*	0.020*
Anti drug awareness	1.92	1.013	1.70	0.668	0.186	0.101
Hand washing campaign	2.77	1.199	2.64	1.241	0.509	0.519
Road safety campaign	2.05	1.035	1.73	0.660	0.050*	0.014*
Anti Dowry campaign	1.78	0.911	1.45	0.627	0.028*	0.008*

* Different at 5% level of significance

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This research tried to find out the citizens' perception of the CSR activities of the Business organizations. Specifically, this study tried to see whether these CSR activities are done for promotion purpose to increase profitability or for contributing to social welfare. Our hypotheses include business organizations' positive attitude towards the social development and thus engagement in CSR activities aiming at both societal and promotional benefit. The study is conducted among 194 citizens of Bangladesh. A convenience sampling technique was adopted for the sample survey. The responses are found reliable and valid.

The study focused on citizens' perception regarding (i) health, (ii) educational, (iii) socio-cultural, (iv) infrastructural, and (v) public awareness development related CSR activities. The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving health sector contains seven simple variables. Overall the citizens' view regarding the health-related CSR activities are more societal than profit-oriented. The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving education sector contains three simple variables. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be more societal than profit driven. The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving socio-cultural events contains five simple variables. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be more profit driven than societal.

The citizens' perspective about CSR activities involving infrastructural development programs contains six simple variables. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be more societal than profit driven. This indicates that the peoples' think that CSR activities related to infrastructure undertaken by the companies are mostly for the sake of the society and not promotion oriented. The citizens' perspective about social awareness related CSR activities contains six simple variables. The overall mean indexes of the variables are found to be more societal than profit driven. This indicates that the people think that environmental CSR activities undertaken by the companies are mostly for the sake of the society and less promotion oriented. Demography wise (Gender, age, education, occupation, etc.) not much difference is observed in the responses.

The factor analysis has found that the initial grouping of variables made from the schema and the variables

found under the factors are quite consistent. As noted, factor titled "Health" contains 6 of the 7 variables considered in previous health related grouping; whereas factor titled "socio-cultural" includes all 5 of initial socio-cultural variables. Both the factor "social awareness" and "infrastructural initiatives" has 4 out of 6 variables in common from previous similar groups. The factor "education" has 2 out of 3 variables from previous education group. The variables of factor "Aesthetic" are a combination of 1 or 2 variables from different groups developed earlier.

NOTE

1. According to Business for Social Responsibility (BSR), corporate social responsibility is defined as "achieving commercial success in ways that honor ethical values and respect people, communities, and the natural environment." McWilliams and Siegel (2001:117) describe CSR as "actions that appear to further some social good, beyond the interest of the firm and that which is required by law." But by Frooman (1997:227), the definition of what would exemplify CSR is "An action by a firm, which the firm chooses to take, that substantially affects an identifiable social stakeholder's welfare."
2. Typically, citizen means any person inhabiting in a particular town or city. But in this research, by citizen it means citizens who are socially aware of the issue of CSR. They can involve in or beneficiaries of CSR activities or any stakeholder in the CSR system.
3. Promotional means any activity that is of or relating to the publicizing of a product, organization, business activity or venture to increase sales or public awareness.
4. Societal means identifying a need in the community & coming up with a way of remedying that issue voluntarily.

References

- Belal, A.T. 2001. A study of corporate social disclosures

- in Bangladesh. *Management Auditing Journal* 16 (5), pp. 274-289.
- Davis, K. & Blomstrom, R. (1971). *Business, society and environment: Social power and social response*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Friedman, M. 1970. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, September 13: pp: 32-33, 122, 124, 126.
- Islam, Sazzadul. 2012. *Corporate Social Responsibility - Dynamics of Corporate Social Responsibility in Bangladesh (Part-1)*. 12 February 2012. Internship report of national, private and international companies, banks, leasing companies and other organizations.
- Jamali, D., Mishak, R. 2007. Corporate social responsibility (CSR): Theory and practice in a developing country context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72 (3), pp. 243-262.
- McWilliams, A., and Siegel, D. 2000. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: Correlation or Misspecification?" *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, pp. 603-609.
- Preston, L. E. and Post, J. E. 1975. *Private management and public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sethi, S. P. 1975. Dimensions of corporate social performance - An analytical framework. *California Management Review*, 17, pp. 58-64.
- Siegel, D., and Vitaliano, D. (2007), "An Empirical Analysis of the Strategic Use of Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, Vol. 16(3), pp. 773-792.
-

Received/ 2018. 09. 05
Revised/ 2018. 10. 03
Accepted/ 2018. 10. 17