

# ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS BEHAVIOR AS PART IN COMPANIES

Maryam Alhassan Talatu, Viktória Vida<sup>1</sup>

University of Debrecen, Faculty of Economics and Business

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author e-mail address: vida.viktoria@econ.unideb.hu

**Abstract:** *This research estimates public perceptions of corporate environmental responsibility and the use of clean energy in terms of how businesses exhibit environmentally sensitive behaviour through their operations and how clean energy is used within daily business operations. It carries out a large-scale survey among 100 participants, analyzing responses across various dimensions of corporate social responsibility, especially those relevant to environmental practices. The findings show that there is a high public expectation of business environmental responsibility, as 82% of the respondents regard it as very important for companies to undertake social responsibility activities. The same percentage (80%) feel it is essential that companies be liable for environmental damage. The same study also firmly focused on carbon emission reduction since 91% rated it somewhat or very important for companies to reduce their carbon emissions. On the other hand, a perception gap was indicated since 52% of the respondents strongly believed that companies genuinely care about their social and environmental impact. This contrasts with the 77% of participants publicly declaring support for corporations promising to reduce environmental degradation. On the use of clean energy, while the research does not give an explicit quantitative status of the practice by corporate entities, it generally creates a good case demonstrating popular support for such corporate initiatives. A 72% rated a firm's effort to reduce its carbon footprint as essential, representing a clear expectation of adopting clean energy within corporate operations. The study finds considerable public mandate for companies to engage in environmentally sensitive business practices, including using clean energy. It also calls for improving business environmental responsibility programs, better communication transparency, prioritizing clean energy, and using environmental initiatives to gain market advantage. The findings and recommendations carry significant implications for corporate strategy, public policy, and future research in corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability.*

**Keywords:** *Corporate Social Responsibility, Environmental Consciousness, Clean Energy, Public Perception, Carbon Emissions, Sustainability, Corporate Accountability*  
(JEL code: M14, Q56)

## INTRODUCTION

The importance of the environment to human lives can never be overstated because our environment defines us; therefore, our conscious behaviour towards it must be very positive. It is a massive task for the community, businesses, and government to ensure sustainable environmental behaviour. Several studies have suggested that environmental corporate social responsibility can enhance staff members' affective dedication, managerial recognition, and professional fulfilment (Mueller et al., 2012; Farooq et al., 2014; Rongbin et al., 2022). The need for sustainability extends beyond corporate operations and has been shown to be a central concern in agriculture as well, particularly in animal husbandry, where sustainable practices are increasingly emphasized (Nábrádi et al., 2011).

Corporate social responsibility is a business concept and tool corporate organizations use to establish good relationships with their host community for harmonious working relations.

However, when CSR is mentioned, most people consider taking a portion of an organization's profit to finance one social course. However, the concept has gone far beyond that. There are many ways in which an organization can be socially responsible to its host community where it operates. Customers around the globe are progressively conscious of firms' environmentally genial, economic, and socially responsible implementation (Vitell, 2015; González-Rodríguez et al., 2021), along with intermediate-term and indelible outcomes. Firms have executed CSR measures within their career by assisting the environment and competing in the market (Suganthi, 2019; González-Rodríguez et al., 2021).

An organization can engage in many social responsibility activities, including being environmentally responsible and having conscious behaviour towards our environment. Previous research has indicated that corporate social responsibility (CSR) imparts an organization's competitive advantage by modifying stakeholders' viewpoints. While the current survey stipulates that CSR correlates with part of employee outcomes, each technique that steers an employee's antiphon to CSR resourcefulness remains obscure (De Roeck et al., 2014; Mousiolis & Bourletidis, 2014). Numerous enterprises concede the need to collide the steadiness connecting renewability and protruding a pragmatic public depiction by accepting social and environmental responsibility (Mozes et al., 2011; Mousiolis & Bourletidis, 2014). Developing and utilizing bioenergy, as noted by Popp et al. (2013), represents an additional dimension of corporate sustainability, highlighting potential challenges such as risks to food supply, energy security, and environmental stability.

Moreover, advanced approaches, such as machine and deep learning models, have been applied to environmental research to predict CO<sub>2</sub> emissions across diverse agroclimatic zones. These innovations provide critical insights into mitigation strategies, including soil carbon storage, that directly support sustainable business practices (Harsányi et al., 2024). Bai et al., 2023 suggest that while power-to-biomethane technology holds promise, substantial financial support and optimal operating conditions are essential for its economic viability. Additionally, CSR programs must account for the economic structures of society, including the differing financial needs and expectations of various family types, which can provide a relevant basis for developing corporate strategies (Nagy, 2007).

Nearly all firms admit that effective environmental corporate social responsibility is an achievement to the communal, and firms can enhance their critical determination by adopting environmental corporate social responsibility benefits, such as by expanding commodities that are not injurious to habitat and human wellbeing, energy-efficient in the manufacturing method and lessening radiation (Chuang & Huang, 2018; Sarfraz et al., 2020; Khan et al. 2020a, 2020b; Rongbin et al., 2022).

Recent studies highlight that in an era characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), corporate approaches must incorporate adaptive sustainability strategies to remain relevant and impactful. For instance, sustainable public transportation systems offer a blueprint for addressing environmental challenges while ensuring societal benefits (Kovács et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the rise of platform-based collaborative economic models offers another pathway to sustainability by enabling resource sharing and fostering demand-side efficiency, which has been systematically analyzed and classified in recent research (Kovács et al., 2021). It should be noted that not every sustainable system provide only benefits: in many cases a circular economy is not always sustainable (Lengyel et al., 2021).

Mao et al. (2020) and Rongbin et al. (2022) also suggest that firms' environmental corporate social responsibility action can shape a surrounding of certainty and credibility among staff members, allowing them to take risks without awe of

adverse outcomes. Since their working environment significantly affects employees' conscious behaviours (Memon et al., 2021; Rongbin et al., 2022).

The analysis of distinctive definitions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), given by different educationists and philosophers, proves that CSR can connect with social, economic, and environmental sustainability components (Dahlsrud, 2008; Zhao et al., 2021). Bowen (the father of CSR) first introduced the approach of CSR in 1930 (Hishan et al., 2017; Pactwa & Woźniak, 2020; Zhao et al., 2021).

Howard R. Bowen proposed the corporate social responsibility approach in the 1950s, and over the years, its perception was substantially developed (Ashrafi et al., 2018; Matsunani et al., 2022). In accordance with Sarkar and Searcy (2016) and Matsunani et al., (2022), research literature introduced contrasting rationales for corporate social responsibility; nonetheless, since the 2003 increment, the effect of ethical aspects and shareholder administration.

Over the years, environmental and social aspects have earned more immersion in board decisiveness. Corporate social responsibility is a multidirectional approach that indicates various path pivots on how firms run (Van Marrewijk, 2003; Cader et al., 2022).

In accordance with the European Commission (EC), CSR is a policy change in strategic corporate management, which requires economic advancement regarding the concept of economy, ethics, and environment (European Commission, 2011; Cader et al., 2022).

According to Du et al. (2011) corporate social responsibility alludes to companies' dedication to increasing everlasting economic, societal, and environmental welfare through business conduct, strategy, and funds. As previously mentioned, CSR impacts firm contentment (Barcelos, 2015), recognition (Pérez et al., 2013) or allegiance (Mandhachitara & Poolthong, 2011; González-Rodríguez et al., 2021).

CSR is discerned as a notion that has more advantages than disadvantages. Generally cited advantages are advancing the organizations relationship with shareholder and public interest, intensifying managerial perception and appearance, resolving disputes, and bolstering integrity (Crisan-Mitra & Borza, 2015; Martinuzzi & Krumay, 2013; Cader et al., 2022).

Gonzalez-Ortiz et al. (2018) and Cader et al. (2022) define corporate social responsibility as an everlasting, tactical approach that reciprocates the objections prompted by the development of the economy, the public, and the environment. Energy is a crucial sector that adds substantial pressure and impacts human welfare.

A firm's corporate social responsibility action can be recognized as a continuation from conscious to cautious, which regulates the intensity of social responsibility and the type of CSR processes enforced.

CSR is defined as a company's engagement in preventing or minimizing any destructive effects and enhancing its sustainable beneficial impact on society (Mohr et al., 2001). Companies are enforcing different forms of CSR actions, such as voluntary contributions, the usage of bio-based products, and diversity initiatives (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Voluntary work for a good cause is based on old traditions and is of

great help to social organizations, be it for the needy or supporting cultural life (Bakosné Kiss et al., 2024).

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activity is an active mechanism to triumph over the “hearts and minds” of the workforce, and employees who admit their firms are more socially significant are more expected to remain (Bozkurta & Balb, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2014; El-Kassaar et al., 2017; Rupp et al., 2013; Li & Chen, 2023).

According to Vlachos, et al., 2013 and Li & Chen, 2023, CSR acknowledgement can contribute beneficial data for an organization to implement CSR efficiently. The intended beneficiaries of CSR include firm employees, municipalities, government entities, established charities, sponsored foundations, and social security. Further advanced analysis of CSR affirms its contributions to economic sustainability (Frynas, 2015; Lamb et al., 2017).

Nonetheless, it is still an element of supposition whether CSR initiatives play an essential role in helping to accomplish international development goals, simplify local development, lessen competition, and alleviate impacts on societies (Frynas, 2005; Lamb et al., 2017).

When firms engage in CSR, the user's perspective towards the firm is positively augmented through improved appraisal of the firm and its commodities (Barone et al., 2000; Bhat-tacharya & Sen, 2004; Brown & Dacin, 1997; Sen & Bhat-tacharya, 2001; Jiménez et al., 2017).

The positive effects of corporate social responsibility (CSR, subsequently) on companies' competitiveness, performance, reputation, entrepreneurial potential, shareholder negotiation and risk reduction are approved in the academic work (Vishwanathan et al., 2020; González-De-la-Rosa et al., 2023).

One of the key factors that alter the way end users acknowledge CSR is akin to the congruence between the social drive and the major action of the firm (Becker-Olsen et al., 2006; Bigné et al., 2012; Webb & Mohr, 1998; Jiménez et al., 2017).

Thus, firms should embrace formalized CSR methods and authorize the strategy and mechanism aligned with corporate strategy (Bocquet et al., 2013; Bernal-Conesa et al., 2016).

Several studies show that CSR has a compelling positive grant to rivalry (Battaglia et al., 2014; Boulouta & Pitelis, 2014; Bernal-Conesa et al., 2016).

Hence, the European Union states, "A tactical approach to CSR is progressively significant to the competitiveness of companies. It can bring benefits such as innovation capacity, access to capital, risk management, human resource management, and customer relationship" (European Commission, 2011; Bernal-Conesa et al., 2016).

Thus, in many firms, standard, health, safety, and environmental management exist as three counterpart schemes (Hamidi et al., 2012; Bernal-Conesa et al., 2016). CSR refers to a company's legal or moral responsibilities to government employees, suppliers, customers, staff members, communities, and the environment while assuming economic responsibilities (Brummer, 1991; Carroll, 1999; Kytte & Ruggie, 2005; Tong et al., 2019).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This chapter outlines the research methods and decisions about the research objectives and phenomena studied. It also includes the materials and methods of the data collection and analysis processes and the assessment of the study's design, population, sample size, techniques for data analysis and data presentation.

This study will be conducted using quantitative data, which questionnaire will be distributed, collected, and analyzed. This study's population comprises students who are full-time employed, self-employed, part-time employed, and unemployed. The total population size is 100 individuals, distributed across various countries. This includes Germany, Nigeria, Hungary, Russia, Morocco, USA, Ghana etc.

A descriptive statistical method was used to process and analyze the questionnaire data, including tables and rank order. Quantity stimulation from questionnaire data analysis, for example an average index calculator (Azevedo et al., 2017). The frequency and average indexes were used to rank the analysis.

This index was computed as follows:

“Average index formula”

Average =

“= Weighting given to each factor by respondents (1 to 5)

“n = Frequency of the response”

“N = Total number of responses”

In this case, the use of average index in a questionnaire would be as follows:

“= 1, frequency of “not important at all” response” “= 2, frequency of “not very important” response” “= 3, frequency of “neutral” response” “= 4, frequency of “somewhat important” response” “= 5, frequency of “very important” response”

With rating scale as below:

“1 = not important at all ( $1.00 \leq \text{Average index} < 2.5$ ) “2 = not very important ( $1.50 \leq \text{Average index} < 2.5$ ) “3 = neutral ( $2.50 \leq \text{Average index} < 3.5$ ) “4 = somewhat important ( $3.5 \leq \text{Average index} < 4.5$ ) “5 = very important ( $4.5 \leq \text{Average index} < 5.00$ )

This study used several statistical techniques to examine the data related to social and environmentally conscious behaviour as part of the company's social responsibility and its public acceptance. The primary methods of data analysis used in this study were descriptive statistics, focusing on frequency distributions, percentages, and measures of central tendency, particularly the arithmetic mean.

Frequency distributions have been calculated for each item from the questionnaire. This technique involves counting the number of responses for each category within a variable. The formula for frequency can be expressed as:  $f = \sum x$ . Where  $f$  is the frequency and  $x$  are the number of occurrences of each response category.

Percentages have been calculated to provide a relative measure of the frequency distributions. This allows for easier comparison across different items and gives a clearer picture of the proportion of respondents in each category. The percentage formula is:

Percentage = (f / N) × 100.

This study analyzes data from questionnaire distribution using descriptive statistics. Demographic data and variable features are analyzed using frequency count percentages and central tendency measures. The data analysis was done using the statistical software IBM SPSS Version 23.0.

Cronbach's Alpha is a figure used to explain the reliability of a test or questionnaire by examining the internal consistency of the test with itself and assessing the extent to which such items in a test or questionnaire measure the same underlying idea embedded within them. As the reliability statistics recorded achieved Cronbach's Alpha of 0.713, it can be said that the parameters are reliable since most of the research, especially in social sciences, falls in the range of 0.7 to 0.8.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The demographic data presented in Table 1 offers valuable insights into the respondent pool for a study on social and environmentally conscious behavior as part of a company's social responsibility and public acceptance.

Regarding the distribution of respondents by sex, there is a higher number of females (53%) than males (47%). The proportion of males and females is substantively upside-down, giving room for such a topic to be considered more comprehensively; with such an attitude, any underlying gender issues in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities may be identified.

Asked about age and sex, in particular, all respondents were in the skewed age category of 18-34 years, comprising 83% of the respondents.

With the educational background information, this implies that most respondents pursued higher education at about 67%, wherein 37% have Master's Degrees and 30% have Bachelor's Degrees. The respondents' relatively high level of education may relate to increased awareness and expectations about corporate social and environmental responsibilities.

The statuses of the respondents are pretty varied, with students leading the chart at 40%, full-time employees at 27%, and self-employed at 19%. These shall give a blend of different professional perspectives that shall assist in getting a comprehensive view of how various segments of society perceive and value corporate social responsibility efforts.

The marital status indicates a dominance of single responses at 68%, corresponding with the younger age profile recorded in this sample. This can be a factor in attitude and opinion toward social and environmental issues since single persons very well may place different emphases on life concerns compared to married couples.

These data on citizenship and country of residence reflect an international sample but with some significant overrepresentation of Nigeria therein: 78% are citizens of the country,

and another 56% reside therein. Hopefully, this international element would make a valid contribution toward understanding how corporate social responsibility is viewed across different cultural and economic contexts.

Table 1. Demographic Distribution Respondents

	Frequency	Percentages
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	47	47.0
Female	53	53.0
Total	100	100.0
<b>age group</b>		
18-24 years	34	34.0
25-34 years	49	49.0
35-44 years	14	14.0
45_54	2	2.0
55+	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0
<b>highest level of education</b>		
High School or equivalent	28	28.0
Master's Degree	37	37.0
Bachelor's Degree	30	30.0
Associate Degree	2	2.0
Other	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0
<b>employment status</b>		
Unemployed	9	9.0
Student	40	40.0
Self-employed	19	19.0
Employed Part-time	5	5.0
Employed Full-time	27	27.0
Total	100	100.0
<b>Marital status</b>		
Single	68	68.0
Married	31	31.0
Prefer not to say	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0
<b>Citizenship</b>		
Nigeria	78	78.0
Kenya	1	1.0
Kazakhstan	1	1.0
Ugandan	1	1.0
Jordan	2	2.0
Ghanaian	3	3.0
Maldives	2	2.0
Hungarian	2	2.0



Qatar	1	1.0
German	1	1.0
Italian	1	1.0
Total	93	93.0
current country of residence		
Nigeria	56	56.0
United Kingdom	4	4.0
Hungary	15	15.0
Morocco	7	7.0
Italy	4	4.0
China	2	2.0
Germany	1	1.0
Algeria	1	1.0
Ghana	2	2.0
American	1	1.0
Russia	1	1.0
Total	94	94.0

Source: field survey 2024

In the survey, when the respondents were asked about the importance of a company's engagement in social responsibility initiatives (Table 2), the overwhelming majority considered it "Very important," with an average of 4.73 out of 5. This positive feeling could point toward the public's high value to CSR activities, which might include environmentally conscious practices and clean energy use. The high mean score indicates that companies engaging in such practices would appear positive to consumers and create some competitive advantage and better brand perception.

The second statement, accountability by companies for their impact on the environment, was supported just as strongly. 74% believed this was "Very important," with an average score of 4.65. That result supports the request that corporate operations be responsible from an environmental perspective very well and directly supports the research question about environmentally conscious behavior in the operations of companies. The implication is that there is strong public support for actions that would make companies take responsibility and minimize environmental damage, perhaps by embracing clean energy solutions.

The third statement deals with a business commitment to social responsibility correlated with consumers buying behaviour. The hypothesis showed that 61% strongly agreed that CSR directs their purchasing choice, with an average score of 4.39. It is particularly germane to the research topic because it has shown that a firm's green behaviour and clean energy could have a tangible impact on customers' behaviour and, subsequently, on a company's bottom line.

Considering the research questions, such a finding would give companies powerful motives for including environmentally responsible practices in business due to the increased corporate accountability demanded by most people for envi-

Table 2. Perception of Corporate Social Responsibility

S/N	State-ments	Responses	Frequency	Percentages	Mean	Remarks
1	Importance of corporate social responsibility initiatives	Not very important	2	2	4.73	Important
		Neutral	5	5		
		Somewhat important	11	11		
		Very important	82	82		
		Total	100	100		
2	Account-ability for environ-mental impact	Not important at all	1	1	4.65	Important
		Not very important	1	1		
		Neutral	4	4		
		Somewhat important	20	20		
		Very important	74	74		
		Total	100	100		
3	Influence of social responsibility on purchasing decisions	Not important at all	2	2	4.39	Important
		Not very important	1	1		
		Neutral	14	14		
		Somewhat important	22	22		
		Very important	61	61		
		Total	100	100		
				<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>4.52</b>	

Source: field survey 2024

ronmental damage. Indeed, companies that use clean energy in daily activities are likely to attract consumer affinity easily. Similarly, environmental responsibility practices might translate into marketplace competitiveness via CSR's influence on buying behavior.

As to the first objective, which is the assessment of perceptions about how corporations exercise environmentally conscious behavior in their operations, our analysis showed that there is, in fact, a tremendous public expectation for corporate environmental responsibility. From the perceptions demonstrated in all three tables, the environmental sustainability efforts ranked highly important, with mean scores that ranged between 4.62 and 4.73. This agrees with Zhu et al. (2019) study on the importance of environmental impact in CSR in light of community participation. This perception is further corroborated by the fact that the public's expectations to hold companies responsible for environmental impact was high at a mean score of 4.66 and to reduce carbon emissions at a mean score of 4.51.

Table 3. presented provides crucial insights into public attitudes towards companies' environmental consciousness and sustainability efforts. This data is highly relevant to the research questions regarding how companies demonstrate environmentally conscious behavior in their operations and the extent to which they utilize clean energy in their day-to-day activities.

Table 3. Environmental Conscious Behavior

Statements	Responses	Frequency	Percentages	Mean	Remarks
Importance of environmental sustainability efforts	Neutral	13	13.0	4.62	Important
	Somewhat important	12	12.0		
	Very important	75	75.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Support for companies reducing their carbon footprint	Not important at all	7	7.0	4.02	Important
	Not very important	3	3.0		
	Neutral	18	18.0		
	Somewhat important	25	25.0		
	Very important	47	47.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
			Grand Mean	4.32	

Source: field survey 2024

The first statement gauges the importance of a company's environmental sustainability efforts to the respondents (Table 3). A huge 75% of the participants have rated this as "Very important" with an average score of 4.62 on a scale of 5. Such positivity in attitude implies that the public has goodwill for companies practicing environmental sustainability. A strong preference like this hints that companies adhering to environmentally conscious practices, such as using clean energy, are likely to garner favorable recognition and support from the public. This finding thus relates directly to the research question on how companies exercise environmentally conscious behavior and would therefore suggest that there is significant public pressure for corporations to adopt and maintain such practices.

The second question assesses the degree of support for businesses that take active measures to reduce their carbon footprint. Responses, while somewhat more scattered, still strongly favor importance: 47% rate it "Very important," and 25% as "Somewhat important." Overall, the average is very strong at 4.02 for positivity. This data point will have direct relations to the identified research question, focusing on clean energy use in everyday business activities. This usually entails the implementation of clean energy solutions, meaning any company investing in such technology would more than likely be supported by society. However, given that this question differed more from the first question, it could be interpreted

to mean that, while generally the public would support carbon footprint reduction, there may be disagreements over the methods of doing so or the extent of measures taken.

The grand mean of 4.32 (Table 3) for the two questions, therefore, underlines overall the importance of environmental consciousness in corporate behavior from the perspective of the public. This high score suggests that companies' environmentally conscious behaviors/clean energy use are now moving beyond being 'nice-to-have' features but are, as a matter of fact, an integral part of corporate social responsibility within the eye of the public.

However, our analysis also showed a degree of skepticism that companies are genuinely concerned with the environmental impact of their operations, with the average score being only 4.13. This shows the probable expectation gap between the public and perceived corporate actions. The finding, therefore, aligns with the notion of CSR by Bowen (1953) and Carroll (1979) that businesses must conduct activities consistent with the values and objectives of the society.

Table 4. shows an overview of the general public's perception in relation to corporate practices in clean energy application and their environmental awareness. Interestingly, regarding the genuineness of companies' concern for their social and environmental impact, there was a more divided opinion: 52% saw it as "Very important," yet with a mean score of 4.13, there was also some skepticism in corporate motives. This perception could influence companies' disclosure of their environmentally conscious behaviors and clean energy pursuits.

Respondents rated the importance of companies reducing their carbon emissions as high, with 62% rating it as "Very important" for a mean score of 4.51. This relates directly to the research question of clean energy usage since reducing carbon emissions often involves using cleaner energy sources.

The responses were more varied for single-use plastics reduction, with a low average of 3.71. This would mean that environmental concerns associated with energy are more important in the same population than plastic use.

On the contrary, there was a high likelihood of supporting companies that publicly commit to reducing environmental impact, with a 57% rating of "Very important" and a mean of 4.21; this shows that companies showcasing environmentally conscious behavior-for instance, clean energy use-will, gain support from the public.

Responses to items addressing companies striving to reduce water waste showed mixed opinions and a mean score of 3.90. That would then make it less critical than energy-related environmental issues.

Stricter government regulations on companies regarding environmental issues were strongly supported, with 73% rating this as "Very important" (mean 4.64). This suggests the belief that there is a need for external pressures to ensure that companies maintain environmentally conscious practices, including clean energy use.

The future impact that CSR initiatives will have on consumer behavior was rated critical through the mean of 4.38, with 56% rating it as "Very important." Therefore, this may point to the future where environmentally friendly behavior and clean energy use influence consumer choice.

The willingness to recommend companies based on their social and environmental responsibility was high, with 58% rating it "Very important" for an average of 4.35. This suggests that companies' environmental practices can significantly affect their public image and customer base.

With an average of 4.30 out of all answers, it shows how much the public attaches importance to firms being sensitive to the environment and using clean energy.

Table 4. Perception of Clean Usage by Companies

Statements	Responses	Frequency	Percentages	Mean	Remarks
Accountability for environmental impact	Not important at all	3	3.0	4.66	Important
	Neutral	5	5.0		
	Somewhat important	12	12.0		
	Very important	80	80.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Perception of genuine corporate care vs public image	Not important at all	6	6.0	4.13	Important
	Not very important	2	2.0		
	Neutral	17	17.0		
	Somewhat important	23	23.0		
	Very important	52	52.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Importance of reducing carbon emissions	Not very important	2	2.0	4.51	Important
	Neutral	7	7.0		
	Somewhat important	29	29.0		
	Very important	62	62.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Observation of reducing single-use plastics	Not important at all	9	9.0	3.71	Important
	Not very important	9	9.0		
	Neutral	24	24.0		
	Somewhat important	18	18.0		
	Very important	40	40.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Likelihood of supporting companies committed to reducing environmental impact	Not important at all	4	4.0	4.21	Important
	Not very important	5	5.0		
	Neutral	14	14.0		
	Somewhat important	20	20.0		

	Very important	57	57.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Efforts to minimize water waste	Not important at all	7	7.0	3.90	Important
	Not very important	8	8.0		
	Neutral	19	19.0		
	Somewhat important	20	20.0		
	Very important	46	46.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Stricter government regulations on companies	Not very important	1	1.0	4.64	Important
	Neutral	7	7.0		
	Somewhat important	19	19.0		
	Very important	73	73.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Influence of CSR initiatives on consumer behavior	Not important at all	2	2.0	4.38	Important
	Not very important	2	2.0		
	Neutral	8	8.0		
	Somewhat important	32	32.0		
	Very important	56	56.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Recommendation based on CSR commitment	Not important at all	2	2.0	4.35	Important
	Not very important	2	2.0		
	Neutral	13	13.0		
	Somewhat important	25	25.0		
	Very important	58	58.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
Future influence of CSR initiatives on behavior	Not important at all	4	4.0	4.43	Important
	Not very important	1	1.0		
	Neutral	7	7.0		
	Somewhat important	24	24.0		
	Very important	64	64.0		
	Total	100	100.0		
			Grand mean	4.30	

Source: field survey 2024

Regarding the second, related to understanding the percentage of clean energy usage companies use in their day-to-day business operations, the current analysis does not render direct quantitative data related to using clean energy. However, it does provide substantial insight into public expectations and the support given to such practices. High importance is therefore attributed to companies reducing their carbon footprint (mean score 4.02) and carbon emissions (mean score 4.51), suggesting a high public expectation for clean energy adoption. This aligns with Arena et al. (2018) and Zhao et al.'s (2021) description of CSR qualities, including using renewable resources and clean manufacturing methods.

Overall, our findings agree with the empirical reviews cited. Strong support for public demand over environmental responsibility directly emanates from Elkington & Rowlands, 1999 triple bottom line, which stresses the balance of economic, environmental, and social performance. The high mean score of government regulations is 4.64, supporting that CSR goes beyond financial interests only, as defined by Kaur et al. (2022).

However, there are a few noticeable discrepancies. For instance, the empirical reviews focus on CSR from a business outlook, while our review gives information about CSR from the public's outlook. This identifies a potential mismatch between corporate understanding of CSR and public expectations. For example, even though a firm perceives CSR as a balance between economic, environmental, and social factors, our review indicates that the public places more emphasis on environmental factors.

Our analysis goes further, however, to uncover nuances not represented in the empirical reviews. For example, the differential importance granted to different environmental issues, such as carbon emissions compared with water waste, would suggest public conceptions of environmental responsibility are more multi-dimensional than often supposed in the CSR literature.

To the first objective, which establishes a review of perceptions on how enterprises practice their environmentally conscious behavior in their operations, there is a robust and stable public desire for responsible enterprise environmental performance. Overwhelmingly, 82% of respondents believe it is essential that firms undertake social responsibility, with particular attention being given to environmental sustainability exercises. This level of importance is further reinforced by solid support, with 80% rating it as very important for holding companies accountable for their environmental impact. These results suggest that the public considers environmental consciousness a core part of corporate social responsibility rather than an optional or peripheral concern.

However, the study also unveils a notable skepticism about the authenticity of companies' environmental efforts. While 52% of respondents believe it's essential that companies genuinely care about their social and environmental impact, the lower mean score (4.13) compared to other environmental questions suggests a level of public doubt about corporate motivations. This indicates that although the public highly supports environmentally responsible corporate behavior, there is a perceived expectation-reality gap. It thus follows that companies not only have to adopt environmentally responsible practice but also must communicate credibly the sincerity of such prac-

tices to engender confidence among the public. Concerning the second goal, which relates to determining what percentage of clean energy is used as part of companies' daily operations, indirect evidence of public support for this idea is powerfully given by this study, while direct quantitative data related to actual corporate usage are not. The high importance placed on companies reducing their carbon footprint-72% rated it as somewhat or very important- and carbon emissions-91% rated it as somewhat or very important strongly suggests that the public would expect and support the adoption of clean energy into corporate operations. This is further bolstered by a willingness from the majority (77%) to help companies which publicly commit to reducing their environmental impact.

This research also suggests that the public considers different aspects of environmental responsibility to be of varying importance. While carbon emissions and general environmental impact are rated critically important, other concerns, such as water waste management, drew lower yet still significant problems. Such a nuanced understanding of the public's priorities may lead companies toward focusing their environmental efforts and communications strategies.

It is also clear from the results that corporations' environmental awareness and clean energy use could greatly impact public image and market performance. 83% of the respondents said they would likely recommend a corporation based on its commitments to social and environmental responsibility.

Moreover, 88% of the respondents said they believe that, in the future, Corporate Social Responsibility initiatives will continue to have a much greater impact on the behavior of consumers. This would underscore the competitive advantage companies can achieve by embracing and communicating effective environmentally conscious practices, including clean energy.

With such strong support, 92% rating it as somewhat or very important for stricter government regulations on companies when it comes to environmental issues, the public expects external pressure to ensure corporate environmental responsibility. Thus, those businesses that proactively adopt environmentally conscious behavior and clean energy solutions might be better equipped to face potential future regulatory changes.

## CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this research is to examine the effect of CSR on society and its acceptance and determine how society's responses to CSR vary with their individual social and environmentally conscious behavior. The findings suggest that CSR perception strongly determines society-conscious behavior regarding companies and the use of clean energy.

However, this study has limitations; despite the valuable insights gained from the data, it primarily captures the short-term public perception and limits its predictive power for the long-term public perception. Future research would benefit from a more varied sample, and deeper qualitative analysis would be beneficial. In general, CSR perception in the community, the employees, and consumers highly supports environmentally responsible corporate behavior, positively impacting the companies and using clean energy.



The findings show that, indeed, there is high public expectation from business environmental responsibility, as 82% of the respondents regard it as very important for companies to undertake social responsibility activities. The same percentage (80%) feel it is essential that companies be liable for environmental damage. The same study also firmly focused on carbon emission reduction since 91% rated it somewhat or very important for companies to reduce their carbon emissions. Yet, on the other hand, a perception gap was indicated since 52% of the respondents strongly believed that companies genuinely care about their social and environmental impact. This contrasts with the 77% of participants publicly declaring support for corporations promising to reduce environmental degradation. On the use of clean energy, while the research does not give an explicit quantitative status of the practice by corporate entities, it generally creates a good case demonstrating popular support for such corporate initiatives. A 72% rated a firm's effort to reduce its carbon footprint as essential or significant, representing a clear expectation of adopting clean energy within corporate operations. The study finds considerable public mandate for companies to engage in environmentally sensitive business practices, including using clean energy.

In the future, companies must build Corporate Environmental Responsibility Programs: A company must be able to design and implement fully fleshed-out environmental responsibility programs beyond mere compliance. The program should be inculcated into core business strategies and operations, addressing main areas of carbon emissions reduction, clean energy adoption, and sustainable resources management. Implementation should involve a cross-functional team led by senior management with clear goals, timelines, and accountability measures. The strategy will allow the corporations to meet the public's high expectations with respect to corporate environmental accountability and, in turn, achieve a better brand image, customer loyalty, and sustainability.

Companies need to develop various environmental strategies across different spheres of environmental responsibilities, mainly focusing on issues of critical importance to the public, such as carbon emissions. As such, they must not fail in other aspects, such as wasting water. This balanced approach should be addressed through an environmental management system that is fully inclusive and reviewed from time to time about stakeholder responses and emerging environmental issues. In this way, companies can directly meet public priorities and show, at the same time, their comprehensive concern for the environment.

It also calls for improving environmental responsibility programs in businesses, better communication transparency, prioritizing clean energy, and using environmental initiatives to gain market advantage. The findings and recommendations carry significant implications for corporate strategy, public policy, and future research in corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability.

## REFERENCES

- Arena, M., Azzone, G. & Mapelli, F. (2018). What drives the evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility strategies? An institutional logics perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 171, 345–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.245>
- Ashrafi, M., Adams, M., Walker, T.R. & Magnan, M. G. (2018). How corporate social responsibility can be integrated into corporate sustainability: a theoretical review of their relationships. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 25(8), 671–681. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2018.1471628>
- Azevedo, S. G., Godina, R., & Matias, J. C. D. O. (2017). Proposal of a sustainable circular index for manufacturing companies. *Resources*, 6(4), 63. <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources6040063>
- Bai, A., Balogh, P., Nagy, A., Csedő, Z., Sinóros-Szabó, B., Pintér, G., Prajapati, SK., Singh, A., Gabnai, Z. (2023). Economic Evaluation of a 1 MWel Capacity Power-to-Biomethane System. *Energies* 16(24):8009. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en16248009>
- Bakosné Kiss, V. Á., Kiss, K., Szakács, A., & Szűcs, R. (2024). CSR expectations and voluntary participation among employees. *Economica*, 15(3-4), 14-21. <https://doi.org/10.47282/economica/2024/15/3-4/14668>
- Barcelos, E. M. B., de Paula Baptista, P., Maffezzoli, E. C. F., da Silva, W. V., Zancan, R., & Marchetti, C. P. D. V. (2015). Relationship between an organization evaluated as being socially responsible and the satisfaction, trust and loyalty of its clients. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 9(7), 429-438.
- Barone, M.J., Miyazaki, A.D. & Taylor, K.A. (2000) The Influence of Cause Related Marketing on Consumer Choice: Dose One Good Turn Deserve Another? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*, 28, 248-262. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0092070300282006>
- Battaglia, M., Testa, F., Bianchi, L., Iraldo, F., & Frey, M. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and competitiveness within SMEs of the fashion industry: Evidence from Italy and France. *Sustainability*, 6(2), 872–893. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su6020872>
- Becker-Olsen, K. L., Cudmore, B. A., & Hill, R. P. (2006). The impact of perceived corporate social responsibility on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(1), 46-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.01.001>
- Bernal-Conesa, J. A., Briones-Penalver, A. J., & De Nieves-Nieto, C. (2016). The integration of CSR management systems and their influence on the performance of technology companies. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 25(3), 121-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redeen.2016.07.002>
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47, 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166284>
- Bigné, E., Currás-Pérez, R., & Aldás-Manzano, J. (2012). Dual nature of cause-brand fit: Influence on corporate social responsibility consumer perception. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(3/4), 575-594. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561211202620>

- Bocquet, R., Le Bas, C., Mothe, C., & Poussing, N. (2013). Are firms with different CSR profiles equally innovative? Empirical analysis with survey data. *European Management Journal*, 31(6), 642–654. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2012.07.001>
- Boulouta, I., & Pitelis, C. N. (2014). Who needs CSR? The impact of corporate social responsibility on national competitiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(3), 349–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1633-2>
- Bozkurt, S., & Balb, Y. (2012). Investigation of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and organizational citizenship behavior: A research. *International Journal of Innovations and Business*, 1(1), 1–20.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper&Row.
- Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(1), 68–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299706100106>
- Brummer, J.J., (1991). *Corporate responsibility and legitimacy: an interdisciplinary analysis*. New York: Greenwood Press. ISBN: 0313247269.
- Cader, J., Olczak, P., Koneczna, R. (2021). Regional dependencies of interest in my electricity photovoltaic subsidy program in Poland. *Polityka Energ. – Energy Policy Journal*, 24, 97–116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33223/epj/133473>
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257850>
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>
- Choi, Y., & Yu, Y. (2014). The influence of perceived corporate sustainability practices on employees and organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 6(1), 348–364. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su6010348>
- Chuang S. P., Huang S. J. (2018). The effect of environmental corporate social responsibility on environmental performance and business competitiveness: the mediation of green information technology capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, 991–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3167-x>.
- Crişan-Mitra, C. & Borza, A. (2015). Approaching CSR in Romania: An empirical analysis. *Procedia - Social Behavioral Science*, 207, 546–552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.125>
- Du, S., Bhattacharya, C.B. & Sen, S. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility and Competitive Advantage: Overcoming the Trust Barrier. *Management Science*, 57(9), 1528–1545. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1110.1403>
- El-Kassar, A.-N., Yunis, M., & El-Khalil, R. (2017). The mediating effects of employee company identification on the relationship between ethics, corporate social responsibility, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 23(3), 419–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2017.1294872>.
- Elkington, J., & Rowlands, I. H. (1999). Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business. *Alternatives Journal*, 25(4), 42.
- European Commission, (2011). Corporate social responsibility: A new definition, a new agenda for action. Memo/11/730 1–4. [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/memo\\_11\\_730](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/memo_11_730)
- Dahlsrud A. (2008): How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsible Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.132>
- De Roeck, K., Marique, G., Stinglhamer, F., & Swaen, V. (2013). Understanding employees' responses to corporate social responsibility: mediating roles of overall justice and organisational identification. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(1), 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.781528>
- Farooq M., Farooq O., Jasimuddin S. M. (2014). Employees response to corporate social responsibility: Exploring the role of employees' collectivist orientation. *European Management Journal* 32(6), 916–927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.002>
- Frynas, J. G. (2005). The false developmental promise of corporate social responsibility: Evidence from multinational oil companies. *International affairs*, 81(3), 581–598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00470.x>
- Frynas, J. G. (2015). Strategic CSR, value creation and competitive advantage. In: *The Routledge companion to non-market strategy* (pp. 245–262). Routledge. ISBN 9781315819389.
- González-De-la-Rosa, M., Armas-Cruz, Y., Dorta-Afonso, D. & García-Rodríguez, F. J. (2023). The impact of employee-oriented CSR on quality of life: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management*, 97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2023.104740>
- Gonzalez-Ortiz, A., Reichel, A., Arceredillo, A. T., Unterstaller, A., Meiner, A., Lukewille, A., & Hoogeveen, Y. (2018). Environmental indicator report 2018: in support to the monitoring of the seventh environment action programme. <https://doi.org/10.2800/180334>
- González-Rodríguez M. R., Díaz-Fernández M. C., Shi F., Okumus F. (2021). Exploring the links among corporate social responsibility, reputation, and performance from a multi-dimensional perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.103079>
- Hamidi, N., Omidvari, M., & Meftahi, M. (2012). The effect of integrated management system on safety and productivity indices: Case study; Iranian cement industries. *Safety Science*, 50(5), 1180–1189. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2012.01.004>
- Harsányi, E., Mirzaei, M., Arshad, S., Alsilibe, F., Vad, A., Nagy, A., Ratonyi, T., Gorji, M., Al-Dalahme, M., & Mohammed, S. (2024). Assessment of advanced machine and deep learning approaches for predicting CO2 emissions from agricultural lands: Insights across diverse agroclimatic zones. *Earth Systems and Environment*, 8(1109–1125). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-024-00424-x>
- Hishan, S. S., Ramakrishnan, S., Lim, B. K. & Umar, A. (2017). The Concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) - A Review of Literature. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(9), 9287–9290. <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2017.10072>

- Jiménez, J. V. G., Ruiz-de-Maya, S. & López, I. (2017). The impact of congruence between the CSR activity and the company's core business on consumer response to CSR. *Spanish Journal of Marketing –ESIC*, 21(6), 26-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjme.2017.01.001>
- Khan T. M., Bai G., Fareed Z. & Yasmeen R. (2020a). The impact of CEO tenure on corporate social and environmental performance: an emerging country's analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27, 19314–19326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-08468-y>
- Khan T. M., Bai G., Fareed Z. & Khan A. (2020b). How does CEO tenure affect corporate social and environmental disclosures in China? Moderating role of information intermediaries and independent board. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28, 9204–9220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11315-9>
- Kaur, P., Talwar, S., Madanaguli, A., Srivastava, S., & Dhir, A. (2022). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and hospitality sector: Charting new frontiers for restaurant businesses. *Journal of Business Research*, 144, 1234-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.01.067>
- Kovács, T., David, F., Nagy, A., Szűcs, I., Nábrádi, A. (2021). An Analysis of the Demand-Side, Platform-Based Collaborative Economy: Creation of a Clear Classification Taxonomy. *Sustainability*, 13(5):2817. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052817>
- Kovács, T., Nábrádi, A., Tóth, S., Huzsvai, L., Nagy, A., Bittner, B. (2023). Sustainable Public Transportation in a Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous (VUCA) Age. *Sustainability*. 15(21):15310. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115310>
- Kytle, B., & Ruggie, J. G. (2005). Corporate social responsibility as risk management: A model for multinationals.
- Lamb, S., Jennings, J., & Calain, P. (2017). The evolving role of CSR in international development: Evidence from Canadian extractive companies' involvement in community health initiatives in low-income countries. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 4(3), 614-621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2017.05.011>
- Lengyel, P., Bai, A., Gabnai, Z., Mustafa, O.M.A., Balogh, P., Péter, E., Tóth-Kaszás, N., Németh K. (2021). Development of the Concept of Circular Supply Chain Management-A Systematic Review. *Processes* 2021, 9(10), 1740. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pr9101740>
- Li, Y., & Chen, C. H. (2023). The impact of employee-perceived CSR on organizational citizenship behavior-evidence from China. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 28(4), 487-500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2023.02.003>
- Mao Y., He J., Morrison A. M. & Coca-Stefaniak A. (2020) Effects of tourism CSR on employee psychological capital in the COVID-19 crisis: from the perspective of conservation of resources theory. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24, 2716-2734. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1770706>
- Mandhachitara, R., & Poolthong, Y. (2011). A model of customer loyalty and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(2), 122-133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041111119840>
- Martinuzzi, A., Krumay, B., 2013. The good, the bad, and the successful – How corporate social responsibility leads to competitive advantage and organizational transformation. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(4), 424–443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2013.851953>
- Matsutani, L., Rampasso, I. S., Serafim, M. P., Quelhas, O. L., Leal Filho, W., & Anholon, R. (2022). Critical analysis of corporate social responsibility projects developed by Brazilian companies: Providing new insights for debates. *Cleaner Engineering and Technology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clet.2022.100412>
- Memon K. R., Ooi S. K., Khalid S. & Ghani B. (2021). Mediation-moderation mechanism between the relationship of corporate social responsibility and employees' promotive voice behavior. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, Volume 16 (1). <https://doi.org/10.69864/ijbsam.16-1.142>
- Mohr, L.A.; Webb, D.J.; Harris, K.E. (2001). Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The impact of corporate social responsibility on buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 45-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2001.tb00102.x>
- Mozes, M., Josman, Z., & Yaniv, E. (2011). Corporate social responsibility organizational identification and motivation. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7(2), 310-325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17471111111141558>
- Mousiolis D. T. & Bourletidis K. (2014). The Corporate Identity through the CSR's Paths. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 511 – 514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1230>
- Mueller, K., Hatstrup, K., Spiess, S.-O., & Lin-Hi, N. (2012). The effects of corporate social responsibility on employees' affective commitment: A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1186–1200. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030204>
- Nagy, A. S. (2007). Analysis of the expected income of several family types. *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 1(1), 49-51. <https://doi.org/10.19041/APSTRACT/2007/1/6>
- Nábrádi, A., Madai, H., & Nagy, A. (2011). Animal Husbandry in Focus of Sustainability. In *Sustainable Agricultural Development* (pp. 225–233). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0519-7\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0519-7_16)
- Pactwa, K. & Woźniak J. (2020). Knowledge of CSR Issues Among Mining Business Stakeholders and the Academic Environment—Case Study from Poland. *Gospodarka Surowcami Mineralnymi-Mineral Resources Management* 36(1), 149-166. <https://doi.org/10.24425/gsm.2020.132548>
- Pérez, A., del Mar García de los Salmones, M., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I. (2013). The effect of corporate associations on consumer behaviour. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(1/2), 218-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090561311128552>
- Popp J, Harangi-Rákos M, Pető K, Nagy A. (2013). Bioenergy: Risks to food-, energy- and environmental security. *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 7(4-5), 121-130. <https://doi.org/10.19041/APSTRACT/2013/4-5/17>



- Rongbin R., Wan C. & Zuping Z (2022). *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, Volume 29, pages 52189–52203. <https://link.springer.com/journal/11356>.
- Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Thornton, M. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of firstparty justice perceptions and moral identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 895-933. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12030>
- Sarfraz, M., Syed, Shah, G. M., Zeeshan, F. & Farrukh. S. (2020). Demonstrating the interconnection of hierarchical order disturbances in CEO succession with corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27, 2956-2971. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2014>
- Sarkar, S. & Searcy, C. (2016). Zeitgeist or chameleon? A quantitative analysis of CSR definitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135, 1423–1435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.157>
- Sen, S. & Bhattacharya, C. (2001). Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 225-243. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838>
- Suganthi, L. (2019). Examining the relationship between corporate social responsibility, performance, employees' pro-environmental behavior at work with green practices as mediator. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 232, 739–750. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.295>
- Tong, C., Wong, A. T. T., & Cheng, T. (2019). Do corporate social responsibility and safety of food affect reputation? A study of fast-food restaurants industry in Hong Kong. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 22(3), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.9734/JEMT/2019/46107>
- Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(2), 95-105. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023331212247>
- Vitell, S.J. (2015). A Case for Consumer Social Responsibility (CnSR): Including a Selected Review of Consumer Ethics/Social Responsibility Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, 767–774. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2110-2>
- Vishwanathan, P., van Oosterhout, H. J., Heugens, Pursey P. M. A. R., Duran, P. & van Essen, M. (2020), Strategic CSR: A Concept Building Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(2), 314-350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12514>
- Vlachos, P. A., Epitropaki, O., Panagopoulos, N. G., & Rapp, A. A. (2013). Causal attributions and employee reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 334e337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12061>
- Webb, D. J., & Mohr, L. A. (1998). A Typology of Consumer Responses to Cause-Related Marketing: From Skeptics to Socially Concerned. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 17(2), 226-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074391569801700207>
- Zhao, G., Irfan Ahmed, R., Ahmad, N., Yan, C. & Usmani, M.S. (2021). Prioritizing critical success factors for sustainable energy sector in China: A DEMATEL approach. *Energy Strategy Review*, 35, 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2021.100635>
- Zhu, Q., Zou, F. & Zhang, P. (2019). The role of innovation for performance improvement through corporate social responsibility practices among small and medium-sized suppliers in China. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(2), 341-350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1686>