

Strategic CSR, Globalization, and Performance of Korean and Chinese Companies

Sun-Young Byun* 변 선 영

Xiaoyan Zhu** 시 안 주

Tai Li*** 타 이 리

| 목 차 |

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| I. Introduction | IV. Result |
| II. Literature Review And
Hypothesis Development | V. Conclusion |
| III. Research Method | Reference |
| | Abstract |

• Abstract •

This study reviews strategic CSR, which recently has become a controversial topic, and examines the implications of strategic CSR activities on corporate performance. For this, three hypotheses were set. First we categorize CSR activities into economic, legal · ethical, philanthropic, and social innovation responsibility, and to verify if these CSR activities have positive influences on the performance of Chinese and Korean companies. Second, we explore the moderating effects of globalization between the

* 동아대학교 국제무역학과 조교수, First author

** Economic and Management School, HU Bei University of Technology, Co-author

*** Economic and Management School, HU Bei University of Technology, Corresponding author

CSR activities and corporate performance. In addition, CSR activities were separated into traditional and strategic in order, and to determine whether the strategic activities had a more positive influence on corporate performance than traditional CSR activities. For this, a total of 646 surveys (401 from China and 245 from Korea) were collected from MBA students in China and Korea, and the results were comparatively analyzed.

〈주제어〉 CSR, Globalization, Strategic CSR

I. Introduction

In the past, CSR activities had a tendency to be limited to only passive activities, such as preventing scandals or illegal acts. However, in the business environment with the ISO 26000 implementation and the spread of the Global Compact of UN, and with advanced informatization and globalization, the CSR activities have become an inevitable object, and anti-CSR companies would even face a great challenge on the Corporate Sustainability. Furthermore, the recent Kyoto Protocol and the eco-friendly policies in advanced countries such as the EU and the US bring more responsibilities to the firms, and this shows that CSR activities are not just limited to the reputation of the firm.

The Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility (strategic CSR), which was initially introduced by Fry et al. (1982) and become popular by Porter and Kramer (2002), is a concept that utilizes the CSR activities of the companies as the resource to obtain sustainability or to secure a competitive advantage.

The concept of CSR was first proposed as a management philosophy in 1950s, went through management innovation, expansion of customer movement in 1960~70s, then it was expanded to a practical level like customer protection and observance of social norms. Then after 1980s, the business activities shrunk due to the worldwide recession, which caused the CSR to focus on the 'practice' and 'performance' rather than the 'responsibility'. Since

2000s, when the world was lead by the globalization and the informatization, and the transparency and sustainability was raised as the worldwide issues, the CSR has been transforming from theoretical concept from the past to strategic ideas (Byun and Kim, 2011).

As the negative sides of the economical growth rose to the surface after the economic reform in China, Chinese people considered that the various social issues they faced were related to the unethical management of companies. Because of this, the Chinese raised their awareness of the social roles that companies had, and have been demanding the companies to actively pursue the solutions. Furthermore, the Chinese government determined the CSR could positively influence the social issues, and have actively working toward the CSR expansion. The bond of sympathy that the CSR was one of the solutions to the social issues was formed among the academic world and the business world (Wong, 2009). As the Chinese manufacturers faced the social and economical pressure, the globalization could have an effect on Chinese CSR activity. China experienced very fast economical growth after joining WTO in 2001, and the WTO membership increased the need of requirements and other business related matters for international business of Chinese firms, especially export oriented firms (Van Hoa, 2010). Now China has been enjoyed the economic prosperity and simultaneously started to pay attention to the responsibilities and the related matters for the stakeholders of the environment protections, human rights, and social responsibility (Noronha et al., 2013). This progress of social responsibility activities of the Chinese companies was heavily influenced by the learning activities from the advanced companies through globalization, the spread of Global Compact, the new rules or international restrictions such as ISO. When looking back at the negative reaction to the CSR by the early Chinese businesspersons, as they said that they did not have capability to take charge of social responsibilities yet and the restrictions were a type of non-tariff barrier, the change of awareness on CSR of the Chinese companies seems to have a significant meaning (Lin, 2007).

On the other hand, in Korea, as one of the ways to gain international

competitiveness through the economical growth in 1960s and 70s, the companies became conglomerates and large in scale. So called, the economical function was considered as the fundamental role of the firms. Everything to increase the size of the pie was justified under the proposition of the advancement of business activities. Korean companies incredibly grew in last 40 years of relatively short period, and some of the large companies joined the lists of global companies. According to the growth trend in business index, at least externally the level of contribution of the companies to the economic growth could be positive. However, monopolistic production systems in various industries were created, and the unethical corporate activities or the arrogation of the companies on the customers in the seller's market, which the supplying capability was not good enough for the demand in market, had become huge social problems (Park, 1998). Around the enforcement of 'Anti-Bribery Act on International Business Transaction' from OECD in February 1996, Korean companies started pay attention again to enactment of 'Business Ethics Code' and practice of ethical business management. As the growth of Korean companies were supported in many ways by the country, especially the government, the companies must be responsible to the social problems (Jung, 1996). Also as they faced the challenge to meet the global standards, Korean companies are in a situation to meet the global ethical standards in a short period time for the CSR while domestically the ethical foundation is relatively weak.

Therefore, China progressively drives the CSR activity under the government initiatives, while the Korean companies conduct CSR activity on their own in order to survive in domestic and global market. Despite the difference, the companies in both countries are aware of the importance of CSR activities. In both countries, the strategic CSR means a strategic investment, which is to bring positive influence to the society by offering social contribution and innovations as well as bringing benefits to the companies, beyond the old concept of using CSR as the cost of marketing tools. Taking a step further, CSR activities are known to reduce the capital cost by raising the reputation or confidence level of the firm, to improve the relationship

with customers or with suppliers, to bring more talented manpower and improve the loyalty and commitment of the employees to the companies, which improve the corporate performance. Therefore verifying if the strategic CSR brings more positive effect on the corporate performance than the traditional CSR does, will have a significant meaning in reviewing the conceptual significance and possible proliferation of the strategic CSR. Also, both Korean and Chinese companies take an important position in global market, the relation between the CSR activity and the globalization needs to be clearly explained.

This study, as the global markets are emerging into one and the Chinese companies and Korean companies are actively working toward globalization, has the purpose to study the moderating effect of the globalization between the CSR activities and the corporate performance. it is also going to be studied to classify the CSR activities into Strategic CSR and Traditional CSR, and observe if the strategic CSR activity brings more positive effect on the corporate performance than the traditional CSR activity does.

II. Literature Review And Hypothesis Development

1. Strategic CSR

Due to its high interdisciplinary, the CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) has been studied throughout in many fields, but it is not easy to define or to understand exactly of the concept of CSR. However recently as CSR activities have been conducted more actively, the core concept of CSR has been considered as the success of the firm being dependant on the social responsibility and social result that the companies bring to the society, and the concept has been forming in regards with the stakeholders and the diversity of the corporate social activities (Matten and Moon, 2008).

The Strategic CSR is that the firm continuously creates profits by market

activities without violating economic feasibilities, and provides social contribution products or services by the knowledge and knowhow learned by the traditional business activities without violating social natures. This is an ideal win-win business activity. Through these business activities, the companies continuously focus on CSR activities with citizens, local communities and even governments in order to create the competitive advantage. Therefore, CSR activity is not an option to ignore anymore, and has been gaining more importance as a core strategy to create sustainable competitive advantage.

This strategic CSR suggests the solutions to the issues with the traditional CSR, and Fry et al. (1982) first introduced in ‘strategic philanthropy’ (Bhattacharyya et al., 2008), which might be understood as a type of management strategy as well as a support for the philanthropic activity. Therefore the majority of the researchers define the CSR activity that profits the firm and gives positive effect to the society, as the strategic CSR (Carroll, 2001; Porter and Kramer, 2006).

Strategic CSR or strategic contribution (Carroll, 2001) is that the ‘belief of the good deeds supporting the society as well as the business activities’ is set as the strategic object of the business activity, and ultimately it is believed for the firm to receive the corresponding financial benefit, “the give back”(Quester and Thompson, 2001). The expense for the strategic CSR is to be considered as the investment (Goodpaster, 1996).

Porter and Kramer (2006) suggested that the “strategic CSR should be recognized as the foundation of opportunity, innovation and competitive advantage not as cost”, and said that the corporate performance and social welfare were not the zero-sum game, and the ‘business’ and the ‘society’ should share the values and make investment to the social aspect related to the competitiveness of the firm in order to bring benefits for everyone. Furthermore, he explained that the strategic CSR would form good citizenships and ease harmful value-chains. Additionally it would contribute to the society, and implement the innovation, which improves the competitive advantage of the companies. For examples, he mentioned the IT professional training partnership with community colleges and Microsoft, and Toyota’s development of environmental friendly hybrid vehicles. This has a significant meaning that

he suggested the concept of innovation which wasn't present in Carroll(1991)'s 4th level of responsibility, and raised the area of responsibilities into strategic level by converting too ideal CSR activity into more practical ideas by combining it with business activity.

Also Ibuki (2005) mentioned that in order for companies to make sustainable improvement by practicing CSR activities, the companies should clearly establish their stance with CSR and convergence of CSR within the business strategy. She proposed the strategic CSR activities in two forms: "defensive ethics" and "offensive ethics". According to him, beyond the responsive and passive activities of traditional CSR, the strategic CSR activities are consisted of social contribution responsibility and social innovation responsibilities. This is consistent with the idea of Porter and Kramer (2006) and can be considered to the extension of the philanthropic responsibility among 4 levels responsibilities by Carroll (1991).

Social contribution responsibility is a type of countermeasure of companies to maintain satisfactory relationship with the society, and is the investment strategy that brings both social and business effects. This area is the activity that the firm directly contributes to the society, so it requires a large financial capability and the strategy of the companies. Also the social innovation responsibility is to target the profit while conducting the business, but simultaneously to innovate the society through the business and to add business strategy for adding social value. The social nature of the firm has a high potential to be an important factor of the competitive, therefore the social innovation through the innovative products is an activity with the proper direction to build a good relationship with the society.

2. Corporate Financial Performance

Generally, CSR activity and the corporate performance can be recognized as the 'different matters.' Of course, it is not true that only ethical companies have high performance, or vice versa. Majority of the studies about the CSR activity and the performance shows the fact that the companies with better

practice of CSR activities perform better (Hammond and Slocum, 1996; Waddock and Smith, 2000).

Based on stakeholder theory, Barnett (2007) provided that a company's ability to affect stakeholder is essential in positively moderating the relationship between CSR and CFP(Corporate Financial Performance). The company's stakeholder influence capacity refers to the ability that a company can identify CSR activities and conduct them in order to achieve better client relationship and higher customer loyalty consequently. Better stakeholder relationship then will improve CFP. Industry differentiation is another important moderator in the relation between CSR and CFP. For industry with lower level of differentiation, companies' social responsibility activities are more reliable in improving their financial performance (Hull and Rothenberg, 2008). Wang et al. (2008) analyzed the relationship between Philanthropy Responsibility and CFP with Dynamic Environments as the moderator. They concluded that under a more dynamic environment, companies rely more on stakeholders, so their charity activities like donation will are more helpful in keeping a good stakeholder relationship and then decrease the cost of their implicit contract which will bring better CFP.

Tang, Hull and Rothenberg (2012) Expectations of stakeholders is also an important moderator in the relationship between Philanthropy Responsibility and CFP. Namely, if stakeholders have very high expectations on a company's CSR activity, they will respond more positively to a company's CSR activity.

Nevertheless, the empirical study result of CSR and CFP could not provide the conclusive evidence, and the researchers started to focus on the corporate social performance. More and more scholars realize that since every company has its own internal feathers (company scale, industry that it belongs to) and external changing environment (market environment, legal, social, cultural and political environment), the relationship between CSR and CFP can't keep constant and stable under all conditions (McWilliams and Siegel, 2000).

3. Strategic CSR and CFP

In this study, the Traditional CSR and the Strategic CSR are categorized and analyzed by the 4 levels of responsibility by the models of Carroll (1991), Porter and Kramer (2006) Ibuki (2005) and Byun and Kim (2011).

The social contribution responsibilities and social innovation responsibilities in category of the strategic CSR that his study suggests, can form the credibility and social reputation through long relationship with stakeholders, to extend the corporate performance in limited market performance (Barney and Hansen, 1994). In a point that the two factors of the strategic CSR are the contributing activity in the social aspect related to the competitive advantage of the firm, and the innovation activities that bring the competitive advantage, they are differentiated from vague philanthropic activities or donation for the social welfare. Therefore as verified in the study Hillman and Keim (2001), the CSR activities that use the resource to social issues unrelated to the stakeholders of the firm do affect negatively on the financial performance such as decrease in stakeholders' wealth, however the strategic use of the firm's resource is believed to affect positively on the performance.

Therefore the strategic CSR activities are estimated to work more positively toward the performance than the traditional CSR activities. Based on the above previous studies, following hypotheses can be set up.

Hypothesis 1: CSR activity will affect positively (+) on the corporate performance.

Hypothesis 1-1: Traditional CSR activity will affect positively (+) on the CFP.

Hypothesis 1-2: Strategic CSR activity will affect positively (+) on the CFP.

Hypothesis 2: Strategic CSR activity will affect more positively (+) on the CFP than the traditional CSR activity will.

4. CSR and Globalization

Despite the disadvantage to local companies in developing countries by the globalization (Contractor et al., 2007; Pangarkar and Wu, 2012), it cannot be denied as well that the important changes in the business environment are led by the globalization (Reed, 2002; Fiss and Hirsch, 2005; Bowen et al., 2014). Recently, there are studies about “making globalization fair (Stiglitz and Charlton, 2005)” and the CSR of multinational companies in the process of globalization in developing countries have become an important issues (Winston, 2002; Levy, 2005). Regarding the social responsibility of multinational companies by the “global pressures”, with focusing on what international responsibility those companies should bear, Davis et al. (2007) suggested that the multinational companies should comply with international standards such as GRI Reports or Environment Standard of ISO 14000. Especially because European CSR standards are tight, the multinational companies that have entered to EC have needs to reorganize their CSR activities. Edward and Willmott (2008) suggested that as the multinational companies grow into international organization, their political and business policies would become renewed and advanced. They analyzed that the companies improve their own business activities through the globalization. Pitts (2008) studied the possible legal boundary of business activities, human rights, and environment protection regarding CSR and “ethical globalization,” and he suggested the model of a global company between the spontaneity of companies and legal restrictions.

With CSR efforts of MNCs, the host countries also experienced the change in CSR due to globalization. The learning of the companies advances technologies (Yam et al., 2011; Kocoglu et al., 2012) and also affects value creation, corporate cultures, as well as social changes (Sinkula, 1994; Sinkula et al., 1997; Czinkota and Ronkainen, 2005). Especially “globalization learning” can also mean development, accountability, education as cultural imperialism, curriculum renewal and paradigm shift. Jaussaud and Liu (2011) suggested that the Chinese companies learn from foreign partners, and they

learn the training of foreign companies but also the employment related area as well.

Like this, the local CSR activities of multinational companies became an attractive factor to ease the legal restriction (Moon, 2002) and the multinational companies played a new role as the “societal governance” (Moon, 2007). Due to this, the multinational companies reduced the outside risk of business activities in the local countries, and were able to conduct sustainable business activities (Steurer, 2010).

Based on the proposals of these researchers, this study believes that as the business strategy that ignores CSR in the process of globalization activity of a firm negatively affects the corporate performance, the level of globalization influences the CSR activities and the performance of both Korean and Chinese companies. Also as it is strategically necessary for the CSR to develop the shared value, norms, and attitudes (Cramer, 2005), this study also focuses on the fact that “the learning process of the companies through globalization strengthens the competition in global market.” After all, the risks from the globalization are offset by the learning of the companies, and the series of the learning process can positively work for CSR practice. Therefore the second hypothesis is as follows.

H3: globalization will have moderating effect in the pathway between CSR and firm Performance.

III. Research Method

1 Research Design

As suggested earlier, in this study is to distinguish the CSR activities into traditional CSR and strategic CSR, based on the concepts from Carroll (1991)’s 4 levels of ‘CSR Pyramid model’, Porter and Kramer (2006)’s idea,

and the ‘basic frame of Strategic CSR’ by Ibuki (2005).

Among CSR activities, to measure the economic responsibility belonged to traditional CSR, 4 survey available items through economic performance index from GRI Report, contribution to economy development index from KEJI index, BSR index and etc. were selected by the item’s level of economic responsibility, and to measure legal · ethical responsibility, with considering survey questions of Byun and Kim (2011), 5 survey available items from fairness of corporate activity item in KEJI Index were selected. Also in order to measure the philanthropic responsibility activity which is categorized to the strategic CSR activity, survey available items from evaluation items of the social service contribution index, environmental protection satisfaction index, employee satisfaction index in KEJI Index, and from the social performance index of GRI Report were selected, and in order to measure the social innovation responsibility, 4 question items were created based on the social innovation examples from Pot and Vaas (2008) and theory of Ibuki (2005). Each items was measured with scales from 1 to 5, where ‘1 being Not At All to 5 being Definitely Yes’.

For the financial performance section was consisted of 5 items, which were revenue, operation margin and price-earning ratio among the financially significant performance index from Balanced Scorecard of Niven (2002) and debt ratio from the survey items of Byun and Kim (2011). The question items were measured with the likert scale of 1 to 5, where ‘1 being Not At All to 5 being Definitely Yes’.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection from Korea was targeted to the MBA students in Seoul and Busan region, and the research period was 34 days from March 16th to April 18th of 2016. Total 250 questionnaires were returned, and after excluding 5 questionnaires due to poor response or strong centralization tendency, total 245 questionnaires were used for the empirical study.

And data collection from China was targeted to the MBA students attend-

ing to the universities in Hubei region, and the research period was 28 days, from February 1st to 28th in 2016. Total 450 questionnaires were returned, but after excluding 49 questionnaires due to poor response or strong centralization tendency, total 401 responses were used for empirical analysis.

Also to reduce the common method bias that occurs in the survey statistics, all the questions in the survey questionnaires were as simple and clear as possible.

IV. Result

Since the data collection is from one resource, we use the method suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003) to test the effect of common method bias. The result is showed in Table 1 as follow.

〈Table 1〉 Korean and Chinese sample common method bias test

Panel A. Korea sample common method bias test						
	RMSEA	GFI	NFI	X2	df	X2/df
One factors	0.256	0.47	0.39	1325.74	104	12.75
Two factors	0.254	0.47	0.41	1293.81	103	12.56
Three factors	0.220	0.52	0.55	972.46	101	9.63
Four factors	0.178	0.67	0.70	654.64	98	6.68
Five factors	0.182	0.81	0.81	178.10	25	6.90
Panel B. Chinese sample common method bias test						
One factors	0.162	0.74	0.58	577.12	77	7.50
Two factors	0.163	0.74	0.59	568.88	76	7.49
Three factors	0.144	0.79	0.67	450.81	74	6.09
Four factors	0.146	0.79	0.68	439.83	71	6.20
Five factors	0.085	0.95	0.92	69.05	25	2.76

Note: 1) one factor: TCSR+SCSR+CSP+GLO+CFP, 2) two factors: TCSR; SCSR+CSP+GLO+CFP, 3) three factors: TCSR;SCSR; CSP+GLO+CFP 4) four factors: TCSR;SCSR;GLO; CSP+ CFP 5) five factors: TCSR;SCSR;GLO; CSP; CFP

And the descriptive statistic of chinese sample and korean sample is as follow in Table 2.

〈Table 2〉 Korean and Chinese sample descriptive static

Panel A. Korean sample descriptive static									
	Mean	St.d	AGE	Education	Work-age	TCSR	SCSR	CFP	GLO
AGE	2.56	0.83	1.00						
Education	2.28	0.68	-0.12	1.00					
Work-age	2.37	0.90	0.33**	0.57**	1.00				
TCSR	3.72	0.67	0.08	-0.29**	-0.32**	1.00			
SCSR	3.07	1.14	0.01	0.13	0.16*	0.28**	1.00		
CF	3.45	0.72	0.12	-0.12	-0.10	0.44**	0.27**	1.00	
GLO	3.28	1.01	-0.01	0.30**	0.21**	0.20**	0.52**	0.34**	1.00
Panel B. Chinese sample descriptive static									
AGE	2.14	0.82	1.00						
Education	1.99	0.66	-0.32**	1.00					
Work-age	2.04	0.72	0.69**	-0.24**	1.00				
TCSR	3.75	0.52	-0.12	0.17**	-0.07	1.00			
SCSR	3.62	0.66	0.07	-0.05	0.07	0.51**	1.00		
CFP	3.41	0.61	-0.07	0.25**	-0.12	0.46**	0.40**	1.00	
GLO	3.50	0.61	-0.20**	0.25**	-0.23**	0.52**	0.28**	0.70**	1.00

Note : 1) *, **, ***: statistically significant at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

2) TCSR; Traditional CSR, SCSR; Strategic CSR, GLO; Globalization

In order to test the hypothesis above, we use linear regression suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986). The report is in Table 3 as follow. From the regression, models show the results are able to partly testify the hypothesizes. In M1 and M3, the coefficient of Traditional CSR and Strategic CSR to CFP in Korean and Chinese samples are 3.220($p < 0.05$) and 2.700($p < 0.05$), 5.929($p < 0.001$), 4.582($p < 0.001$) respectively. Therefore, the hy-

pothesis 1 is testified correct. At the same time, the coefficients of Traditional CSR are greater than these of Strategic CSR in Chinese and Korean samples, therefore, the hypothesis 2 is not able to be testified correctly²⁾. In order to testify the moderator effect of Globalization between Traditional CSR, Strategic CSR and CFP. The coefficient of combination of Traditional CSR and Globalization in M2 and M4 have negative effects on CFP while these are positively significant between Strategic CSR and Globalization in Korean and Chinese samples, so hypothesis 3 is testified correct.

〈Table 3〉 Coefficient of regression

	Panel A. Korean sample		Panel B. Chinese sample	
	M1	M2	M3	M4
	CFP	CFP	CFP	CFP
Age	0.082 (.935)	-0.209 (.835)	1.933* (.054)	2.141** (.033)
Education	2.396** (0.018)	1.766* (.079)	4.660*** (.000)	3.337** (.001)
Work-age	0.658 (.512)	0.869 (.386)	-1.164 (.245)	-0.368 (.713)
TCSR	3.220*** (.002)	3.124*** (.057)	5.929*** (.000)	4.102*** (.000)
SCSR	2.700*** (0.008)	2.571** (.011)	4.582*** (.000)	2.002** (.046)
TCSR*GLO		-2.186** (.030)		-3.237** (.001)
SCSR*GLO		3.108** (.002)		5.382*** (.000)
F-value	10.401*** (.000)	11.157*** (.000)	29.705*** (.000)	38.999*** (.000)
R ²	0.230	0.312	0.263	0.398
ΔR ²		0.082		0.135

Note : 1) *, **, ***: statistically significant at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

2) Parentheses are p-values

2) You can see more specific results for hypothesis 2.

(Korean data) TCSR - SCSR = 0

Coef. Std. Err. t P>|t| [95% Conf. Interval]
.1165915 .1398898 0.83 0.406 -.1597173 .392900

(Chinese data) TCSR - SCSR = 0

Coef. Std. Err. t P>|t| [95% Conf. Interval]
.2365662 .0874494 2.71 0.007 .0646548 .4084776

V. Conclusion

Question about CSR activity providing positive effect on the corporate performance has become a practical ground to estimate how the companies can strive for the CSR activity beyond the matter of management philosophy. In that regard, verifying if the strategic CSR, a newly rising concept, has more positive effect on the corporate performance than the traditional CSR can be a touchstone to estimate the significance and spread ability of strategic CSR.

Traditionally, in the field of international management, CSR activity has been a strategic resource to reduce the political risk for the company or the national risk. As shown in several studies, the CSR has been working as the insurance for the corporate performance whenever there is the anti-company incident, and the corporate social contribution activity has supported to raise the social reputation and credibility of the company.

This study had its primary goal to verify if the corporate CSR activity with addition of strategy responds better against the social pressure and affects more positively on the corporate performance than the traditional CSR does. For this, CSR activities were categorized into traditional CSR and strategic CSR, and it was verified how each activity affected on the corporate performance.

Also this study compared the difference between the effects of CSR on Chinese and Korean companies. As everyone knows, regarding the implementation of CSR, there are differences in the viewpoint of Chinese companies and Korean companies, and in the level of social awareness on the CSR activities, therefore there should be difference in the corporate performance of CSR between Korea and China. Basically in terms of securing universality of the study result about the strategic CSR and the corporate performance, the common analysis on Korean and Chinese companies was tried, but especially the difference between the social and financial performance of the strategic CSR and the traditional CSR could be anticipated to be different from that between Korean and Chinese companies.

This study has a purpose to set and prove three hypotheses based on above anticipation. To suggest the result and Implication of the study are as follows.

First, on the subject of corporate performance of strategic CSR and traditional CSR showed positive (+) effect on both Chinese and Korean companies.

Next, on the subject that if the strategic CSR affects more positively on the corporate performance than the traditional CSR does, the strategic CSR didn't show more positive effect on Corporate Performance for the Chinese and Korean companies. Both Korean and Chinese companies seem to have a low understanding of strategic CSR.

On the subject of the relationship between CSR and the globalization, Strategic CSR activities showed positive (+) moderating effect with globalization on both Chinese and Korean companies.

A discovery of this fact assures of the different viewpoints of Chinese companies and Korean companies on the difference in the idea of CSR, and on the response or compliance of stakeholders. Therefore these findings provide Korean companies the exemplary foundation where the awareness that the strategic CSR could increase the social and financial performance, would proliferate.

In spite of this significance, this study has a few limitations.

First, the samples collected for this test were not very many. The awareness of the members about the CSR was different by the characteristic of the companies and the departments. And the survey only targeted the MBA students in limited locations. In the future, to increase the universal validity of the study, a more comprehensive study with larger samples should be conducted.

Also another limitation for this study is that despite that the CSR had many factors to affect the corporate performance, this study did not consider the control variables.

Though it was not a big issue because the questions and contents of the survey were created simply as possible, the last limitation is a common method bias by using both control variables and dependant variables collected

by one measuring method in the model. In the future, more study needs to be conducted with secondary data source for the corporate performance in order to reduce the accommodation.

Reference

- Barnett, M. L.(2007), “Stakeholder influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.32 No.3, pp.794-816.
- Barney, J. B. and Hansen, M. H.(1994), “Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage”, *Strategic management journal*, Vol.15 No.S1, pp.175-190.
- Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A.(1986). “The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations”, *Journal of personality and social psychology*, Vol.51 No.6, pp.1173.
- Bhattacharyya, S. S., Sahay, A., Pratap Arora, A., and Chaturvedi, A.(2008). “A toolkit for designing firm level strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives”, *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol.4 No.3, pp.265-282.
- Bowen, H. P., Baker, H. K., and Powell, G. E.(2014), “Globalization and diversification strategy: A managerial perspective”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol.31 No.1, pp.1-15.
- Byun, S.Y. and Kim, J.W.(2011), “Strategic CSR and corporate performance in Korean and Japanese corporations”, *International Business Journal*, Vol.22 No.1, pp.83-110(Korean).
- Carroll, A. B.(1991), “The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders”, *Business Horizons*, Vol.34 No.4, pp.39-48.

- Carroll, A. B.(2001), "Models of management morality for the new millennium", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, pp.365–371.
- Contractor, Farok J., Kumar, Vikas, Kundu, and Sumit K.(2007), "Nature of the relationship between international expansion and performance: The case of emerging market firms", *Journal of World Business*, Vol.42 No.4, pp.401-417.
- Cramer, J.(2005), "Company learning about corporate social responsibility", *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol.14 No.4, pp.255–266.
- Czinkota, Michael and Ronkainen, I. A.(2005), "A forecast of globalization, international business and trade: Report from a Delphi study", *Journal of World Business*, Vol.40 No.2, pp.111–123.
- Davis, G. F. Whitman, M. V. N., and Zald, M. N.(2007), "The responsibility paradox: Multinational firms and global corporate social responsibility", *Working Papers, University of Michigan Department of Economics* pp.1–41.
- Edward, P. and Willmott, H.(2008), "Structures, identities and politics: Bringing corporate citizenship into the corporate", *Handbook of Research on Global Corporate Citizenship*, Ed. A. G. Scherer and G Palazzo, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar: 409–429
- Fiss, P. C. and Hirsch, P. M.(2005), "The discourse of globalization: Framing and sensemaking of an emerging concept", *American Sociological Review*, Vol.70 No.1, pp.29–52.
- Fry, L. W., G. D. Keim and Meiners, R. E.(1982), "Corporate contributions: Altruistic or for-profit?", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.25 No.1, pp.94-106.
- Goodpaster, K. E.(1996). *Business ethics and stakeholder analysis' in* Rae, SB, and Wong, KL (Eds), *Beyond Integrity: A Judeo-Christian Approach*.
- Hillman, A. J. and Keim, G. D.(2001), "Shareholder value, stakeholder management, and social issues: What's the bottom line?", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.22 No.2, pp.125-139.
- Hammond, S. A. and Slocum, J. W. Jr.(1996), "The impact of prior firm

- financial performance on subsequent corporate reputation”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.15 No.2, pp. 159–165.
- Hull, C. E. and Rothenberg, S.(2008), “Firm performance: The interactions of corporate social performance with innovation and industry differentiation”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.29 No.7, pp.781–789.
- Ibuki, E.(2005), “CSR management strategy” , *Toyo Keizai* April 2005
- Jaussaud, J. and Liu, X.(2011), “When in China... The HRM practices of Chinese and foreign-owned enterprises during a global crisis”, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, Vol.17 No.4, pp.473–491.
- Jung, K. H.(1996), “Social responsibility of Korean business”, *Yonsei Business Review*, Vol.33 No.2, pp.233–251(Korean).
- Kocoglu, I., Imamoglu, S. Z, Ince, H. and Keskin, H.(2012), “Learning R&D and manufacturing capabilities as determinants of technological learning: Enhancing innovation and firm performance”, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol.58, pp.842–852.
- Levy, B.(2005), “The interface between globalization, trade and development: Theoretical issue for international business studies”, *International Business Review*, Vol.16 No.5, pp.594–612.
- Lin, L. W.(2007), “Corporate social responsibility standards in the global supply chain: Resistance, reconsideration, and resolution in China” , *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law*, Vol.15 No.2, pp.330–340.
- Matten, D. and Moon, J.(2008), ““Implicit” and “explicit” CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.33 No.2, pp.404–424.
- McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D.(2000), “Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Correlation or misspecification?” *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol.21 No.5, pp.603–609.
- Moon, J.(2002), “The social responsibility of business and new governance”, *Government and Opposition*, Vol.37 No.3, pp.385–408.

- Moon, J.(2007), "The contribution of corporate social responsibility to sustainable development", *Sustainable Development*, Vol.15 No.5, pp.296–306.
- Noronha, C., Tou, S., Cynthia, M. I., and Guan, J. J.(2013), "Corporate social responsibility reporting in China: An overview and comparison with major trends", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol.20 No.1, pp.29–42.
- Pangarkar, Nitin and Wu, J.(2012), "Industry globalization and the performance of emerging market firms: Evidence from China", *International Business Review*, Vol.21 No.2, pp.196–209.
- Park, H. J.(1998), "Ethical decision making and behavior in Korea", *Yonsei Business Review*, Vol.35 No.2, pp.195–226(Korean).
- Pitts III, J. W.(2008), "Business, human rights, & the Environment: The Role of the Lawyer in CSR & Ethical Globalization", *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, Vol.26 No.2, pp.479–502.
- Pot, F. and Vaas, F.(2008), "Social innovation, the new challenge for Europe" , *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol.57 No.6, pp. 468–473.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R.(2002), "The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy" , *Harvard Business Review*, Vol.80 No.12, pp.56–68.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R.(2006), "Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility" , *Harvard Business Review*, Vol.84 No.12, pp.78–92.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P., and Lee, J. Y.(2003), "The mismeasure of man (agement) and its implications for leadership research", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.14 No.6, pp.615–656.
- Quester, P. G. and Thompson, B.(2001), "Assessing market value of event sponsoring: corporate olympic sponsorship", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol.41 No.1, pp.9–16.
- Reed, D.(2002), "Management education in an age of globalization: The

- need for critical perspectives”, *Rethinking Management Education for the 21st century*, vol.1, pp.209–236.
- Sinkula, J.(1994), “Market information processing and organizational learning”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.14 No.3, pp.5–29.
- Sinkula, J., Baker, W. E., and Noordewier, T.(1997), “A framework for market-based organizational learning: Linking values, knowledge, and behavior”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.25 No.4, pp.305–318.
- Steurer, R.(2010), “The role of governments in corporate social responsibility: Characterising public policies on CSR in Europe”, *Policy Sciences*, Vol.43 No.1, pp.49–72.
- Van Hoa, T. (2010), “Impact of the WTO membership, regional economic integration, and structural change on China’s trade and growth”, *Review of Development Economics*, Vol.14 No.3, pp.577–591.
- Waddock, S. and Smith, N.(2000), “Corporate responsibility audit: Doing well by doing good”, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol.41 No.2, pp.75–83.
- Wang, H., Choi, J. and Li, J.(2008), “Too little or too much? Untangling the relationship between corporate philanthropy and firm financial performance”, *Organization Science*, Vol.19 No.1, pp.143–159.
- Winston, M.(2002), “NGO strategies for promoting corporate social responsibility”, *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol.16 No.1, pp.71–87.
- Yam, R. C. M, Lo, W., Tang, E. P. Y. and Lau, A. K. W.(2011), “Analysis of sources of innovation, technological innovation capabilities and performance: An empirical study of Hong Kong manufacturing industries”, *Research Policy*, Vol.40 No.3, pp.391–402.

중국과 한국기업의 전략적 CSR 활동과 기업성과

변 선 영

시 안 주

타 이 리

국문초록

이 연구는 전략적 CSR에 관한 논문으로 한국과 중국의 MBA를 대상으로 연구를 실시하였다. 먼저 CSR의 활동을 경제적, 법·윤리적 책임을 전통적 CSR 활동으로 분류하고, 자선적, 사회혁신 책임을 전략적 CSR 활동으로 카테고리를 나누어 이러한 CSR 활동이 한국과 중국 기업의 성과에 어떠한 영향을 주는지 살펴보았다. 둘째, 글로벌화가 CSR 활동과 기업성과 사이에서 조절효과를 갖는지 살펴봄으로서 글로벌기업으로 성장하는 한국기업과 중국기업의 CSR을 탐구하였다.

본 연구를 위해 중국의 후베이지역 대학들의 MBA 학생들을 대상으로 401매의 설문지를, 한국의 서울과 부산지역의 대학 MBA학생들을 대상으로 205매의 설문지를 사용하였다. 그 결과 한국과 중국기업 모두 CSR 활동은 기업의 성과에 긍정적인 영향을 끼치는 것으로 나타났으나, 전략적 CSR 활동이 전통적 CSR 활동보다 기업성과에 더 큰 영향을 줄 것이라는 가설은 기각되었다. 또한 두 나라 모두 글로벌화의 조절효과는 전략적 CSR 활동에는 긍정적으로, 전통적 CSR 활동에는 부정적인 조절효과가 있는 것으로 나타났다.

〈주제어〉 기업의 사회적 책임, 글로벌화, 전략적 CSR