Journal of International Relations, Security and Economic Studies (JIRSES), Vol. 1, No 2, May, 2021.
Available online at http://journals.rcmss.com/index.php/jirses
ISSN: 2756-522X

Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Brand Management in Telecommunication Industries in Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Josephine Eluan Lloyd, PhD
Dept. of Business Administration
Faculty of Management Science, Federal University Otuoke, Bayelsa Nigeria
Email: josephineeluan@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is on the effect of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on brand management in telecommunication industry in Bayelsa State. The study was carried out with the aim of determining the effect CSR have on the ability of the organization to market its services. In order to achieve the above objective. Questionnaires were randomly distributed to different categories of employees of the industry under (telecommunication industries in Bayelsa State), especially the marketing/service department. The data collected were analyzed using simple percentage method, while the hypothesis was tested using Chi-Square method. After analyzing the responses as well as testing the hypothesis. The following were the findings of the study: That corporate social responsibility (CSR) plays a key role in brand performance, image and profitability of the organizations. Based on the findings, the following conclusion was made: telecommunication industries be involved in corporate social responsibility as this will significantly improve their brand performance, corporate image and organizational profitability. Based on this, following recommendations were made: Corporate social responsibility should form part of management decisions and process. This will make management to see corporate social responsibility as a must and incorporate it in its management decision area. Also, the researcher recommended that corporate social responsibility should be given greater attention and more commitment from corporate organizations.

Key Words: *Effect, Corporate Social Responsibility, Brand, Management, Telecommunication*

DOI URL:https://doi.org/10.36758/jirses/v1n2.2021/3

Introduction

Corporate social responsibility (CRS) is the organizations sense of responsibility socially and ecologically towards the community and environment in which it operates. Organizations express this through their waste and pollution reduction processes, by contributing to educational and social programs, and by earning adequate returns on the employed resources. Since, the early 1990s, corporate responsibility issues have attained prominence in the political and business agenda. There is the need for a more proactive role by states, organizations and communities in the development process aimed at balancing economic growth and development.

In today's economic and social environment, issues related to social responsibility and sustainability are gaining more importance, especially in the business sector. Business goals are in separable from the societies and environment within which they operate. Brand management is the active process of discovering, developing and bringing the right image or identity of your industries to the market place. Too on often organizations focused on the late stages of the brand identity development process, such as the presentation on site or advertisement in magazine. Effective brad management can be achieved through corporate social responsibility. Brand name can be used by manufacturing firms as a strategy to create and sustained corporate social responsibility.

Despite this general recognition, the main characteristic of the CSR concept is still the lack of agreement on what it really means (Brammer and Millington, 2008; Valor, 2005; Lantos 2001; O' Dwyer, 2003). This may be due to the vagueness and intangibility of the term (Frankental, 2001), its ambiguity (Valor, 2005) or simply to the fact that compared to other business functions, CSR's appearance as a legitimate area of inquiry in the mainstream management literature is very recent (Harrison and Freeman, 1999), even "embryonic" (Lantos, 2001). The fact is that social responsibility has become an "Inescapable priority" (Porter and Kramer, 2006) for business leaders. CSR's emergence as a legitimate, even critical endeavour (Gelb and Strawser, 2001) is corroborated by Schnietz and Epstein (2005), McWilliams et al. (2006), Lockett et al. (2006), Hull and Rothenberg (2008), Quazi and O'Brien (2000) and practically all the authors cited from the year 2000 on. The objectives of the Research are to evaluate the extent of corporate social responsibility on organizational profitability. Also, to find the extent of corporate social responsibility (CRS) in building corporate image in telecommunication industries. To explore whether Telecommunication industries actually carried out corporate social responsibility. And to access the impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on the environment of operation and accessing the impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on stakeholders.

Research Questions

The following research questions are to be examined in the study:

1. To what extent does corporate social responsibility affect brand performance in Telecommunication industries?
2. What is the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability?
3. To what extent is corporate social responsibility (CSR) used in building corporate image in telecommunication industries?
4. Do telecommunication industries actually carry out corporate social responsibility (CSR)?
5. Does corporate social responsibility (CSR) impact on the environment of operation?
6. Has corporate social responsibility (CSR) impacted on stakeholders within their environment of operation?

Literature Review

History of Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been examined for decades by theorists in a variety of academic disciplines (Maignan & Ferrell, 2004). There are three ears which outline the evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities. The first phase correlates with the 19 and 20 centuries, when the focus was predominantly on maximization of profit. Phase two ran from the 1920s to the 1930s, and although the focus was still on increasing profits as the primary goal, this phase imitated an expectation that corporate leaders would operate with concern for organizational constituents beyond the stockholders. Phase three ran from the 1960s to the 1970s. the emphasis of this phase was on increasing the quality of life of all organizational stakeholders. Organizations were expected to place more interest on a commitment to society and solving social problems than on maximizing profits. The corporate social responsibility (CSR) theory has been widely accepted across multiple educational disciplines, but it has also been highly criticized. Opponents of corporate social responsibility (CSR) have indicated that the theory is too vague and has too many highly subjective and varying meanings (Pinkston & Carroll, 1996).

Despite the criticism of corporate social responsibility (CSR), there is a great deal of support for the theory. Over the years, the social contract between business and society has been steadily restructured. This started with passage of the Sherman Act in 1890. Later, political figures such as Franklin O. Roosevelt (FDR) addressed the relationship between business and society in his politically charged platform called the New Deal. He created a new philosophy which indicated that the government had a duty to make sure businesses were going beyond merely creating conditions by which people could pursue happiness. He insisted that businesses were responsible for assuring the well-being of all citizens. He believed the government should be charged with the responsibility of monitoring the level of happiness felt by citizens (Slack, 2006). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) originated from the supposition that organizations owe something to societal stakeholders rather than merely to the organization's stockholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995).

The new social contract proposed by Roosevelt was well intended, however, the responsibilities and obligations of businesses were seemingly too aggressive and perhaps even repressive. Despite the aggressive and repressive nature, his efforts did raise the levels of social consciousness (Slack, 2006). The topic of Corporate social responsibility (CSR) may still be difficult to understand, but the interest in how organizations and the professionals within, impact society continue to grow (Freeman, 2000). Education disciplines such as management science, business ethics, psychology, sociology and organizational development have addressed the Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been linked to increased financial performance, improved stock market performance, increased levels of organizational citizenship and high levels of employer attractiveness (Gomez-Mejia et. Al, 2005).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has also been linked to increased employee satisfaction (Ruggie, 2002), well-established workforce diversity initiatives solid employee retention efforts (Welford, 2005), exceptional organizational performance (Gomez-Mejia et. Al, 2005), and effective employee recruitment programs (Freeman, 2000). The core values of society have largely driven the increased emphasis on corporate social responsibility (CSR), and it continues to emerge as a relevant organizational issue. The increased attention placed on corporate social responsibility (CSR) has originated from changes in the core values of society. It may have been acceptable that making a profit was the primary goal of business organizations in previous decades, but today topics such as global warming, environmental deterioration, discrimination, respect for human rights, safety in the workplace, and doing the right thing have become increasingly relevant to society. These values are driven by the following key factors:

- Increased regulation – a number of diverse organizations, such as the Office of Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD), have developed guidelines which the industry is expected to adhere to in terms of operating with the good of society in mind.
- Pressure from consumer markets-consumers is capable of making more informed choices due to technology.
- Pressures from the financial market-investors are more likely to do business with industries that have good CSR practices.

Viewpoints of Corporate Social Responsibility

Defined as the process, by which an organization attempts to meet its economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibilities to society, the corporate social responsibility (CSR) theory revolves around two basic and opposing viewpoints (Carroll,2000). These viewpoints are themed into two categories known as the Classical viewpoint and the socioeconomic viewpoint.

The first view is the Classical viewpoint, which holds that the only responsibility an executive has is to the stockholders of the company. The important factor in this view is that they use corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a way to leverage business performance by increasing customer opinions and community loyalty. Therefore, the primary role of individuals within the organization is only to maximize profits. One of the most vocal advocates for the Classical viewpoint is Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman. He believed when organization pay too much attention to what is best for the social good of the community, the market mechanism is undermined. The impact of undermining the market mechanism results in a domino effect, where eventually the employees and consumers lose because someone must pay for the redistribution of assets.

Stockholders typically will not assume the losses themselves; they will pass the losses onto others by increasing prices or decreasing wages. Some management experts maintain that the business industry should be concerned for society; however, they identify the principal social responsibility of business as economic advancement. The other predominant viewpoint is that corporate social responsibility (CSR) efforts are altruistic or essentially considered as the right thing to do. This is known as the socioeconomic viewpoint and opposes the Classical viewpoint in that the financial gains sought must be achieved by following the laws, regulations, and expectations of society (Takala 1996). This viewpoint indicates the responsibility of organizations. Organizations go beyond making profits and include protecting the welfare of the communities, environment, and the larger society in which they serve. Individuals who fall within the legal, ethical, or discretional categories will be naturally driven by their concern for society and the organizational stakeholders, such as employees, patients, or customers, and those in the community (Slack, 2006).

This viewpoint has been publicly emphasized over the years when organizations have been found guilty of withholding information from community members concerning life – threatening agents that were knowingly being emitted into the environment form factories (Takala, 19996). This led to social legislation and the creation of groups south as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA), and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) (Carroll, 2000). Like the Classical viewpoint, the socioeconomic viewpoint also indicates that maximizing profits should be a chief concern of those within the organization. However, financial solidarity is viewed merely as a means by which to continue to offer ethical and moral service to the stakeholders (Carroll, 2000). The Socioeconomic viewpoint focused on the long term rather than merely the short term. As seen with asbestos contamination issues, it is difficult to maintain a hefty profit margin ten years from now if what the industries does today kills a majority of their employees within the next two years (Takala, 1996). The Socioeconomic viewpoint concluded by suggesting that the Classical viewpoint does not serve the public interest.

Concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Many customers of social responsibility advocate the feeling that businesses should not only make profit but consider the social implications of their operation. Whitehouse (2006) opined that corporate social responsibility is referred to the obligations of a corporate body to seek action that protect and improve the welfare of society along with its own interest. Gatewood (1995) looked at corporate social responsibility as a business obligation which assumes to maximize its positive and negative impacts on the society. With respect to this definition, an action must be voluntary to qualify as a socially responsible action. Social responsibility is the duty industries have to conduct its affairs ethically in a manner that benefits both employees and the larger society, Gomez-Mejia (2005). Vogel (2005) said that the most important single objective of business is to create customers; it is the customers who determine what the business is and it is their willingness to pay for goods and services that converts economic resources into revenue.

Social responsibility is concerned with how individuals and organizations deal with current social issues. The general public however, has a broad and all-inclusive definition of the social responsibility which means participation in multitude of issues and problems. The concept assumes that organizations have some social duties to render to the society. In other words, organizations have a duty to conduct themselves in the interest of society. However, this has been variously interpreted as; concern for employees' safety, employment of ethnic minority/disabled people and position discrimination in favours of women. Others include selling safe products, avoiding pollution and above all giving to charity. Set forth the classical views of corporate social responsibility based on the principles of the charity and the stewardship. Charity principle is a doctrine of social responsibility which requires more fortunate individual to assist less fortunate members of the society, such as the unemployed, the handicapped, the sick and the elderly. Stewardship principle on the other hand is a biblical doctrine that requires wealthy individuals to see themselves as stewards or caretakers holding their property in trust for the benefit of the whole society.

According to Carroll (2000) "Corporate social responsibility involves the conduct/services of a business so that it is economically profitable, law abiding, ethical and socially supportive. To be socially responsible then means that profitability and obedience to the law are foremost conditions when discussing the organizations ethics and the extent to which it supports the society in which it exits with contributions to money, time and talent:

Early Theoretical Views

As early as 1916 J.M. Clark emphasized the importance of transparency in business dealings, writing in the Journal of Political Economy "If men are responsible for the known results of their actions, business responsibilities must include the known results of business dealings, whether these have been recognized by law or not". In the early 1930s, Professor Theodore Kreps introduced the subject of business and social welfare to Stanford and used the term "social audit" for the first time in relation to industries reporting on their social responsibilities. Vogel (2005) argued that industries have a social dimension as well as an economic purpose in his second book "the Future of Industrial Man" which addressed primarily responsibility and preservation of freedom. Corporate social responsibilities were defined by Bowen (1953) as "the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society. At the time, corporate social obligation was linked to power that business social responsibility a "the businessman's decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm's direct economic or technical interest, which need to be commensurate with the company's social power".

Carroll (1983) in these book responsibility industries referred to various activities in the mid and late 1950s and suggested that social audit could provide a management tool and could offer stakeholders a platform for challenging and influencing industries. Opposition to the notion that industries have social responsibilities has been prevalent on the grounds that it will divert attention from the primary economic objectives. Friedman (1962) states that "few trends could thoroughly undermine the very foundation of our free society as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their stakeholders a possibility. A balanced view of CSR is expressed by Vogel (2005) in "the market for virtue: The potential and limits of Corporate Social Responsibility" suggested that CRS is not a precondition for business success but a dimension for cooperate strategy, "Just as firms that spent more on marketing are not necessarily more profitable than those that spend less, there is no reason to expect more responsible firms to outperform less responsible ones. In other words, the risks associated with CSR are not different from those associated with any other business strategy; sometimes investments in CSR make business sense and sometimes they do not." Vogel also highlights that "Surveys of the world's top brands rarely cite CSR as an issue associated with a given brand. And industries that make most-admired lists do so by virtue of other factors; financial performance, customer satisfaction, innovation and so on.

Early Social Responsibility Models: Early theoretical work specifically addressing corporate social responsibilities is represented by Sethi (1975) who developed a three-tier model for classifying corporate behavior which he labeled "corporate social performance". The three states of corporate behavior are based on:

a) Social obligation (response to legal and market constraints)
b) Social responsibility (addressing social norms, values and expectations of performance).
c) Social responsiveness (anticipatory and preventive adaptation to social needs). Sethi's second tier that an industry moves beyond compliance and recognizes and addresses societal expectations. The third tier requires that industries develop the competence to engage effectively with stakeholders and take proactive measurers on their issues and concerns. Sethi also emphasized the cultural and temporal dependencies of corporate responsibilities and the importance of stable management systems and standard classifications to facilitate measurement of progress and comparative analysis. Building on Sethi's model Carrol (1979) proposed a model that contains the following four categories of corporate responsibility in decreasing order of importance;

- Economic – be profitable
- Legal – obey the law
- Ethical – does what is right and fair and avoid harm
- Discretional/philanthropic – be a good corporate citizen

The four classes of responsibility are seen to reflect the evolution of business and society interaction in the United States. According to Carroll "the history business suggests an early emphasis on the economic and then legal aspects and a latter concern for the ethical and discretionary aspects". Economic obligations are therefore seen to be tempered by ethical responsibilities or social expectations and norms. Discretionary responsibilities go beyond ethical responsibilities and include philanthropic measures such as corporate sponsored programmes for disadvantage workers. In 1991, Carroll presented his CRS model as a pyramid and suggested that although the components are not mutually exclusive, it helps the manger to see that the different types of obligations are in constant tension with one another.

The model been validated in Pinkston and Carroll (1996) by a number of studies. A summary of the two main streams represents the CSR perspective emphasizing ethical issues and social audit and the stakeholder approach representing the social dimension of strategic management. It should be noted that sustainability did not feature in corporate responsibility issues but is related to environmental economics established to address environmental issues, scarce resource and to ensure that the costs and the benefits of environmental measures are well balanced. In contrast, one of the arguments against states that the primary task of business is to maximize profit which can be achieved by strictly focusing of a corporate organization to be responsive to their social responsibilities should be considered a matter of great social importance. Various approaches to CSR were stated in the study.

Cole (2004) contends that organizations can be encouraged in two major ways to be responsive to their social responsibilities. There is also a third approach by Ogundele (2005) which is a product service of the Nigerian experience. The three approaches will be discussed.

i) Laissez-faire or Voluntary Approach: According to this approach an organization's desire to discharge it social responsibility may be altruistic in nature or motivated by self-interest. Generally, a middle of the road approach is often preferred as a firm cannot afford to be totally motivated by either altruism or selfish interest.
ii) State Intervention of the Force of Law Approach: This approach argues that the state may intervene through the enactment of certain regulations to compel organizations to fulfill their social responsibilities for the development of the community in which they operate.
iii) Coercive Approach by the Local Community: This approach posits that in view of a government's inability to either coercive or persuade corporations operating in a particular locally to discharge their social responsibilities in a commensurate measure to the damage wrecked on the environment, the inhabitations of such a community may adopt certain extra – judicial strategies to ensure compliance. For example, as earlier mentioned in the oil producing region of Nigeria, militant groups have emerged and their strategies range from kidnap of oil staff, incessant vandalization of oil installations to forceful and physical occupation of the premises of multinational corporations located in the area. The discharge and non-discharge of social responsibility by corporate organizations involves some costs for the parties concerned, but the cost of non-discharge have been found to have tremendous negative impacts on the host community, which far outweighed the cost borne (e.g. forceful stoppage of work, loss of man-hour, threat to life) by the organization. As an illustration, can be host community be adequately compensated for the loss of a means of livelihood, health hazards, death, destruction of natural resources of the forest and wildlife? Where such organizations appear to adhere, the cost analysis as noted by Ogundele (2005) represents "surface" treatment of enormous responsibilities. He further explained that protection of life and properties, improve public image as their social responsibility.

The discourse on corporate social responsibility raises the question of how social performance can be evaluated. Welford (2005) adopted the concept of environmental auditing which they contend, "consist of a regular, independent, systematic, documented and objective evaluation of the environmental performance of an organization. It should measure how well organizations, management and equipment are performing with the aim of helping management to safeguard the environment. It also provides information which can be used in the control of environmental practices and in assessing compliance with organization policies, which include meeting regulatory requirements".

Methods and Data

The personal method of data collection was used to collect primary data from the respondents with the aid of questionnaires. The questionnaires were used because it guarantees a high level of anonymity of individual. The instrument is an open and close ended questionnaire and was divided into three sections. Section A sought to collect bio-data of respondents. Section B and C was designed using multiple-choice questions; elicited the opinion of respondents on corporate social responsibility on brand management. The questions were structured in relation to the hypothesis formulated in addition to variables on effect of corporate social responsibility on brand management

Journal of International Relations, Security and Economic Studies (JIRSES), Vol. 1, No 2, May, 2021.
Available online at http://journals.rcmss.com/index.php/jirses
ISSN: 2756-522X

in telecommunication industries. Questionnaires were administered based on the sample size of 60 and 55 were successfully retrieved and used for the analysis.

Data Presentation

Data collected from staff of MTN, GLO, AIRTEL and ETISALAT the sampled four telecommunication industries in Bayelsa State were presented in the form of tables and analyzed using percentages and frequencies. Also, the three hypotheses formulated to guide the research were analyzed using Chi-Square at 0.05 significant levels using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSSS) was used to run frequency table test.

Data Analysis

The two hypotheses formulated to guide the study was analyzed using Chi-Square test at 0.05 significant levels.

Decision Rule: Reject the null hypotheses if Chi-Square calculated is greater than Chi-Square tabulated.

Hypothesis 1

HO_1: Corporate Social Responsibility does not affect brand performance in Telecommunication industries.

Table 1. Corporate Social Responsibility affect brand performance in Telecommunication industries

			Agree	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Total**
Organization of Respondent	MTN	Count	16	2	6	24
		Expected Count	16.6	2.2	5.2	24.0
	AIRTEL	Count	8	1	3	12
		Expected Count	8.3	1.1	2.6	12.0
	GLO	Count	10	1	1	12
		Expected Count	8.3	1.1	2.6	12.0
	ETISLAT	Count	4	1	2	7
		Expected Count	4.8	6	1.5	7.0
Total		Count	38	5	12	55
		Expected Count	38.0	5.0	12.0	55.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	**Df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	47.847[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	39.024	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.646	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	55		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.

The result of our analysis using Chi-Square test revealed that Pearson Chi-Square calculated 47.847 is greater than Chi-Square tabulated 12.59. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which state that corporate social responsibility affects brand performance in telecommunication industries.

Hypothesis 2

Ho_2: There is no relationship between corporate social responsibility and organizational profitability in Telecommunication industries.

Table 4:8: There is relationship between corporate social responsibility and organizational profitability in Telecommunication industries.

			Agree	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Total**
Organization of Respondent	MTN	Count	15	2	7	24
		Expected Count	16.1	2.2	5.7	24.0
	AIRTEL	Count	8	1	3	12
		Expected Count	8.1	1.1	2.8	12.0
	GLO	Count	9	1	2	12
		Expected Count	8.1	1.1	2.8	12.0
	ETISLAT	Count	5	1	1	7
		Expected Count	4.7	6	1.7	7.0
Total		Count	37	5	13	55
		Expected Count	37.0	5.0	13.0	55.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.714[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	25.134	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.788	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	55		

The result of our analysis using Chi-Square test revealed that Pearson Chi-Square calculated 37.714 is greater than Chi-Square tabulated 12.59. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which state that there is relationship between corporate social responsibility and organizational profitability in telecommunication industries.

Hypothesis 3

Ho_3: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has no significant effect on corporate image building in Telecommunication industries.

Table 2. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has significant effect on corporate image building in Telecommunication industries.

			Agree	**Undecided**	**Disagree**	**Total**
Organization of Respondent	MTN	Count	16	3	5	24
		Expected Count	16.6	2.6	4.8	24.0
	AIRTEL	Count	9	1	2	12
		Expected Count	8.3	1.3	2.4	12.0
	GLO	Count	9	1	2	12
		Expected Count	8.3	1.3	2.4	12.0
	ETISLAT	Count	4	1	2	7
		Expected Count	4.8	8	1.4	7.0
Total		Count	38	6	11	55
		Expected Count	38.0	6.0	11.0	55.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.580[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.109	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.440	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	55		

The result of our analysis using Chi-Square test revealed that Pearson Chi-Square calculated 29.580 is greater than Chi-Square tabulated 12.59.

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which state that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has significant effect on corporate image building in telecommunication industries.

Data Interpretation

The study was on the effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on brand management in telecommunication industries in Bayelsa State. Data collected from the sampled four telecommunication industries was analyzed using percentages and frequencies. Based on the sample size of 60, questionnaires were administered and 55 successfully retrieved and used for the analysis.

The result of our analysis from table 4.1 using percentages and frequencies shows that distribution of sex as 39 male and 16 female respondents. Also, the distribution of the four telecommunication industries with MTN having 24, GLO having 12, AIRTEL having 12 and ETISALAT having 8 respondents respectively. Table 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 revealed that majority of respondents are of the opinion that corporate social responsibility has significant effect on corporate image, organizational profitability and brand performance.

Also, the result of the three hypotheses using Chi-Square test confirmed the percentage and frequency computation. The result of the first hypothesis revealed that corporate social responsibility affects brand performance. The result of the second hypothesis revealed that corporate social responsibility affects organizational profitability. Lastly, the result of the third hypothesis shows that corporate social responsibility affects corporate image.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the result of the data collected and analyzed, the researcher concluded that telecommunication industries be involve in corporate social responsibility as this will significantly improve their brand performance, corporate image and organizational profitability. Reasons been that the more Nigerian telecommunication firms involves in corporate social responsibility, more awareness is been created about the corporation and its product/services. Again, corporate social responsibility activities lead to more patronage of the industries product/services because the organization will be perceived as public friendly. Finally, the researcher concluded that corporate social responsibility has enhanced the image of the organization by pursing the course of the society. The study hereby recommend that corporate social responsibility should form part of management decisions and process. This will make management to see corporate social responsibility as a must and incorporate it in its management decision area. It also recommended that corporate social responsibility should be given greater attention and more commitment from corporate organizations. This will enable them to boost their corporate images. Corporate social responsibility projects should be well structured and implemented to have maximum impact. Finally, the researcher recommended that corporate social responsibility should have legal backing. This will make it mandatory for all firms to be involve in corporate social responsibility activities as a way of giving back to the society.

References

Asika, N. (1991) Research Methodology in the Behaviour Sciences, Lagos; Longman Nigeria Plc.

Brammer, S. and Millington, A.: (2008), "Does it pay to be different? An analysis of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance", Strategic Management Journal 29(12), 1325-1343.

Bowen, H. (1953), Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. New York: Harper and Row

Cole G. A. (2004), Management: Theory and Practice. Thomson, United Kingdom.

Carroll A. B. (1979), A Three-Dimensional Model of Corporate Performance. Academy of Management Review, 4(4), p.497-505.

Carroll, A.B. (1983) Corporate Social Responsibility; Will industry respond to Cut-backs in social program funding? Vital Speeches of the Day, 49. P. 604-608.

Carroll, A. B. (2000). Ethical Challenges for Business for Business in the New Millennium: Corporate Social Responsibility and Models of Management Morality. Business Ethics Quarterly, 10(1), p.33-42.

Carroll, A.B. (2004). Managing Ethically with Global Stakeholders: A Present and Future Challenge. Academy of Management Executive, 18(2), p.114-120.

Emory, C.W. (1980) Business Research Methods. Illinois: Richard Irwin Inc.

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995), The Stakeholder theory of the Corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implication, academy of Management Review, 20.

Frankental, P.: (2001), "Corporate social responsibility – a PR invention?", Corporate Communications: An international Journal 6(1), 18-23.

Friedman, M. (1962), Captialism and Freedom, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, E. R. (2000), Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach, Pitman, Boston.

Gatewood, R.D. et. Al (1995), Management Comprehension, Analysis, and Application Chicago, Richard D. Irwin. Inc and Austen Press. P105.

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

Maignan, I. (2004), Corporate Social Responsibility and Marketing: An Integrative Framework, Journal of Academy of Marketing Science Vol. 32, No.1, pp.3-19.

Ogundele, O. J. K. (2005), Management and Organisation: Theory and Practice. Molofin Nominee, Lagos.

Pinkston, T.S. & Carroll, A.B. (1996), A Retrospective Examination of CSR Orientations: Have they Changed? Journal of Business Ethics.

Ruggie, J.G. (2002), "The Theory and Practice of Learning Networks: Corporate Social Responsibility and Global Compact". The Journal of Corporate Citizenship, No.5, pp.27-36.