

Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Financial Performance and Institutional Ownership: Evidence from Malaysia

Rusnah Muhamad*, Mustaruddin Saleh** and Norhayah Zulkifli***

The purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and corporate financial performance (CFP) as well as institutional ownership (IO) in the Malaysian Public Listed Companies (PLCs). The panel data analysis involving 200 companies listed on Bursa Malaysia during the period of 1999 to 2005 is conducted. The results reveal that CSR and all its dimensions are significant positively related to CFP. It was also found that CSR and only two of its dimensions, namely, employee relation and product dimension are significant positively related to IO. The empirical findings of this study pave the way for embarking on promising and relevant future research, which is needed to substantiate and enrich the academic understanding and managerial practice of the relationship between CSR and CFP as well as IO, particularly in the emerging market such as Malaysia.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility, corporate financial performance, institutional ownership, Malaysia.

1. Introduction

Efforts to encourage companies to be more involved in CSR activities and disclosures have been carried out by the Malaysian government and the capital market authorities. In 2006, Bursa Malaysia has released a CSR framework that is a set of guidelines on CSR practices for companies. The Prime Minister of Malaysia in his 2006 budget speech has encouraged companies to disclose their CSR activities (Bursa Malaysia, 2007). Various awards are introduced to give recognition to companies that are actively involved in CSR activities including the launching of the Prime Minister's CSR Awards in 2007. However, the level of involvement and disclosure of CSR activities in Malaysia is still low (Bursa Malaysia, 2007; Nik Ahmad and Abdul Rahim, 2003; Williams and Pei, 1999). Thus, more efforts are needed to improve the awareness of companies on CSR as well as to motivate them to actively involve in CSR activities and to disclose these activities in the annual reports.

*Dr. Rusnah Muhamad, Department of Financial Accounting & Auditing, Faculty of Business & Accounting, University Malaya, Malaysia. Email: rusnah@um.edu.my

**Dr. Mustaruddin Saleh, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak, Indonesia. Email: mustaruddin@yahoo.com

***Dr Norhayah Zulkifli. Department of Financial Accounting & Auditing, Faculty of Business & Accounting, University Malaya, Malaysia. Email: norhayah@um.edu.my

A substantial literature on the empirical evidences on the relationship between CSR and CFP as well as IO in developed markets is already in place. In Malaysia, the lack of empirical evidences on such relationship may be one possible reason for the low CSR disclosure by companies. Thus, using CSR disclosure (CSR D) as a proxy of CSR activities it is the aim of this paper to explore whether or not there is any association between CSR and CFP as well as IO in the context of the Malaysian PLCs.

2. Literature Review

The current globalization demand companies to be more involved in CSR practices (Chapple and Moon, 2005). In the period of increasing corporate financial scandals CSR has become an important strategy for companies worldwide to improve their image as these activities can potentially create a brand image for companies and develop positive relations with stakeholders (Yoon *et al.*, 2006). During the last two decades, the concept of CSR has been progressively rationalized and become associated with broader organizational goals such as reputation and stakeholder management (Lee, 2008). The majority of studies and literature on CSR argue that CSR positively affects the bottom line of a company (for a review of empirical studies, see Margolis and Walsh, 2003; Orlitzky *et al.*, 2003; Pava and Krausz, 1996).

Muirhead *et al.* (2002) recorded that as many as 90% of business managers reported that their company regarded CSR as the core of company principles, and 70% assert their companies have business foundation that aim to promote social activities. In Malaysia, there are companies that are actively involved in various CSR practices. Prathaban (2005) recorded that 65 PLCs contributed RM82.1 million to various charitable community programmes, such as donation to the orphanage and the poor and needy peoples. Based on sectors, telecommunication sector has the highest contribution followed by the banking and financial services sector. In the third and fourth places are construction and property related companies and government-linked companies (GLCs). Zulkifli and Amran (2006) observe that companies usually carried out CSR activities that are in line with their business activities and are seasonal in nature following the religious/ethnic related festivals such as *Ramadan* and *Eid Mubarraq* for the Muslims, Chinese New Year for the Chinese and Deepavali for the Indian community.

The empirical studies conducted in developed markets on the relationship between CSR and CFP are essentially of two distinct categories (see, Margolis and Walsh, 2003). The first category adopts event studies that consider the short-run financial impact if the company is involved in either socially or irresponsible actions. The findings are mixed. For instance, Wright and Ferris (1997) found negative relationships, while other researchers found positive relationships (Hall and Rieck, 1998; Posnikoff, 1997; Wright and Ferris, 1997 and Teoh *et al.*, 1999) and no relationship was evidenced in the study conducted by Teoh *et al.* (1999). The second category, examines the relationship of CSR and CFP in the long-run, using accounting and market based measurements. The findings are also mixed. Various studies report a negative relationship between CSR and CFP (Moore, 2001; Vance, 1975), while other studies reveal a neutral or no relationship (Mahoney and Roberts, 2007; McWilliams and Seigel, 2000; Patten, 1990; Alexander and Buchholz, 1978). Most of the prior studies found a positive relationship between CSR and CFP (see, Simpson and Kohers, 2002; Roman *et al.*, 1999; Graves and Waddock, 1994; Roberts, 1992; McGuire *et al.*, 1988; Cochran and Wood, 1984; Anderson and Frankle, 1980; Belkaoui, 1976; Bowman and Haire, 1975).

From the theoretical perspective, Spicer (1978) argues that institutional investors consider investing in the low socially responsible companies as a risky investment. This risk emerges from the possibility of damaging sanctions that result in legislative or regulatory action, decisions of a court, or consumer relations. Thus, investing in companies that are

socially responsible may reduce the above risk. Therefore, managers should take cue from this theoretical perspective to invest in CSR activities (Cox *et al.*, 2004). The empirical studies of the relationship between CSR and IO reveal positive relationship (Cox *et al.*, 2004; Johnson and Greening, 1999; Waddock and Graves, 1997; Graves and Waddock, 1994) and no relationship (Mahoney and Roberts, 2007).

4. The Methodology and Model

The data for this study are gathered from the annual reports of 200 large companies representing 70 percent of the market capitalization of the Bursa Malaysia for the period of 1999 to 2005 which is consistent with prior studies (Thompson and Zakaria, 2004; Guthrie and Parker, 1990). The annual reports of companies were chosen based on two main reasons. *First*, the annual report is the most important source of corporate reporting (Jenkins and Yakovlena, 2005; Al-Tuwaijri *et al.*, 2004; and Tilt, 1994). *Second*, in Malaysia, annual reports of listed companies are the most accessible source of information, either in hard copy or electronic publications (Christopher *et al.*, 1997; Wiseman, 1982).

There are two main variables, namely dependent variables, comprise of CFP and IO and independent variables, which include CSR and dimensions of CSR as well as a set of control variables. This paper utilizes one-year time lag, for example the year 2000 data is used for dependent variable and the year 1999 data for independent variables (Mahoney and Roberts, 2007; Waddock and Graves, 1997). Three alternative measurements are used to measure CFP, namely, accounting-based performance measurements in the form of return on assets (ROA); market-based performance measurements in the form of stock market return (R_i); and Tobin's q ratio (q), which represents market value of total equity and debt. IO is represented by the number of institutional investors holding companies shares (NUMBIO) and the percentage of outstanding shares held by institutional investors (PERCIO). The independent variables include the main independent variables and control variables. The main independent variables are CSR and its four dimensions of CSR, namely, employee relations, community involvement, product and environment. The control variables consist of SIZE, LEVERAGE (LEV), BETA, SALES, ASSET TURNOVER RATIO (ATR), and EARNING PER SHARE (EPS).

In this study CSRD represents the involvement of companies in CSR activities which are communicated to their stakeholders *via* the annual reports of companies. We assign value for each item disclosed (see for example, Al-Tuwaijri *et al.*, 2004; Hughes *et al.*, 2001) based on the type of disclosure as follows: (1) *quantitative disclosure* – 3; (2) *qualitative specific disclosure* – 2; (3) *qualitative disclosure* – 1; (4) no disclosure – 0. The total scores for CSRD are obtained by summing up all the sub scores obtained for the four CSR dimensions examined.

In this study, generalized least squares (GLS) method is used. The model specifications are given as follows:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + x_{it}\beta + v_i + \mu_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + x_{it}\beta + v_i + \mu_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where y is the dependent variable (i.e. CFP measures, namely, ROA, Stock Return (R_i), and Tobin's q ratio (Q); Y is the dependent variable of the IO, represented by the number of institutional investors which hold shares of companies (NUMBIO) and percentage of shares owned by institutional investors (PERCIO). x represents the independent variables (i.e. CSR and the four dimensions of CSR, namely, employee relation disclosure score (EMPD), community involvement disclosure score (COMD), product disclosure score (PROD), environment disclosure score (ENVD), and the control variables including firms' systematic risk (BETA), leverage (LEV), logSize (LSIZE), log sales (LSALES), asset

turnover (ATR), and earnings per share (EPS); β is the coefficient of the independent variables; μ represents the error term; v is the unobserved firm effect; i indicates a firm number; and t represents time. The error term (μ_{it}) for the random effects model using equation (1) and (2) can be defined as:

$$\mu_{it} = e_i + v_{it} \quad (3)$$

Where e_i is the cross-section error component and v_{it} , combines the cross-section and time series error component. The Hausman test is employed to evaluate the significance level between estimators in deciding the more precise model, either the fixed effect or the random effect model.

5. The findings

Table 1 reports the results of descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation matrix. CFP is measured by ROA, Ri and Tobin's q ratio. The mean value and standard deviation for ROA are 4.48 percent and 16.62 percent, respectively. This result indicates that on average the profitability of companies for the fiscal year is 4.48 percent. The mean and standard deviation value of share return are 8.59 percent and 22.46 percent respectively implying that the average of share returns during the period under study is 8.59 percent and the variance of shares returns among companies is 22.46 percent. These results indicate that, on average, investors are making profits from their investment in the shares of companies under observation.

Tobin's q ratio is measured by the market value of a company divided by the replacement cost of its assets (Lindenberg and Ross, 1981). At equilibrium condition, value of Tobin's q ratio is around 1. If Tobin's q ratio is greater than 1, the investors have high incentive to invest and *vice versa* (Kim *et al.*, 1993). The mean value for the Tobin's q ratio is 0.96 and the standard deviation is 0.95 indicating that on the average companies only have 0.96 of resources to replace their assets. This result reveals that the market value of companies is below 1.0, implying that the cost to replace the assets is larger than the share values of companies observed.

Table 1 depicts that the mean score for the number of the institutional investors is 13. On average, 51.73 percent of company's shares are held by institutional investors. The mean score for CSRD is 1.36 and the average systematic risk represented by betas is 1.10 and the standard deviation is 0.42 percent. The average amount of assets in ringgit for companies in this data set is RM1.79 billion and the total sales are RM1.25 billion. The average return on asset (ROA) is RM0.04 and earning per share is RM25.00. When IO is represented by NUMBIO, five variables namely PERCIO, CSRD, LEV, LSIZE and LSALES are found to have significant positive correlation with NUMBIO. On the other hand, when PERCIO is used, five variables comprising CSRD, LSIZE, LSALES, ATR and EPS are found to be significantly correlated to PERCIO. It was found that PERCIO is positively correlated to CSRD, LSIZE and LSALES; however it is negatively related to ATR and EPS. The significant positive correlation established between CSR and the two alternative measures of IO (i.e. NUMBIO and PERCIO) indicates that CSR activities are positively related with the level of shareholdings by the institutional investors.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistic and Pearson's Correlations Matrix of Variables

Variable	MEAN	SD	ROA	Ri	Q	NUMBIO	PERCIO	CSRD	BETA	LEV	Lsize	LSALES	ATR	EPS
ROA	0.0448	0.1662	1.000											
Ri	-0.0859	0.2246	0.300**	1.000										
Tobin's Q	0.9611	0.9556	0.532**	0.431**	1.000									
NUMBIO	13.201	5.386	-0.029	0.012	-0.052	1.000								
PERCIO	51.7301	23.911	0.011	0.192**	-0.047	0.437***	1.000							
CSRD	1.3608	1.3671	0.062	0.252**	0.073*	0.126**	0.060*	1.000						
BETA	1.1018	0.4175	-0.153**	-0.259**	-0.136**	-0.042	-0.036	-0.031	1.000					
LEV	0.4320	0.3374	0.239**	-0.107**	-0.163**	0.106**	-0.044	0.174**	0.222**	1.000				
Lsize	17.9463	1.3174	0.064*	0.463**	0.341**	0.112**	0.156**	0.372**	-0.054*	0.158**	1.000			
LSALES	12.5129	1.5892	-0.054	0.254**	0.002	0.188**	0.108**	0.407**	0.000	0.404**	0.647**	1.0000		
ATR	0.5632	0.5581	0.353**	0.159**	0.341**	0.034	-0.056*	0.112**	-0.110**	0.093**	-0.008	0.516**	1.000	
EPS	0.2548	0.6107	0.505**	0.492**	0.225**	-0.052	-0.148**	0.192**	-0.212**	-0.007	0.286**	0.246**	0.174**	1.000

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed),

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows results of hypothesis testing between CSR and its dimension with CFP using GLS with the fixed effects model (FEM). Generally, the outcomes of the *t* test are significant, at least at 10 percent. The results indicate that CFP is clearly explained by CSR and the set of explanatory variables, and the overall estimation is good ranging between 77.14 percent and 98.35 percent.

The results indicate that each company has its own characteristics differing between small and big companies and between companies that have more debt and less debt. Bigger companies are more highly leveraged than small companies and companies with high leverage assume more risk than lower leverage companies. Therefore, we can conclude that leverage (LEV) may have either a negative or positive impact on the financial performances of companies. The high leverage companies needed financial resources to pay the cost of debts and repay, resulting in negative impact on CFP and as at certain level, the cost of debt is usually less expensive than cost of equity and acquiring debts is relatively easier lead to a positive impact on CFP.

Table 2: The relationship between CSR and CFP

Variables	CSR on CFP			Dimension of CSR on CFP		
	Model 1.1: (ROA)	Model 1.2: (Ri)	Model 1.3: Tobin's Q	Model 1.1: (ROA)	Model 1.2: (Ri)	Model 1.3: Tobin's Q
C	-0.1161 (0.0229)	-1.5801*** (03132)	0.8732*** (02479)	-0.0097 (0.0314)	-1.6142*** (0.3455)	06157*** (0.2404)
CSR	0.0007*** (5.88E-05)	0.0047*** (0.0007)	0.0008*** (0.0002)			
EMPLD	-	-	-	0.0007*** (0.0001)	0.0088*** (0.0021)	0.0018*** (0.0004)
COMD	-	-	-	0.0014*** (0.0001)	0.0133*** (0.0020)	-0.0148*** (0.0004)
PROD	-	-	-	0.0003*** (0.0001)	-0.0177*** (0.0020)	0.0153*** (0.0004)
ENVD	-	-	-	0.0010*** (0.0001)	0.0174*** (0.0016)	-0.0134*** (0.0008)
BETA	0.0030*** (0.0003)	0.0931*** (0.0134)	0.0442*** (0.0010)	0.0025*** (0.0003)	0.0968*** (0.0129)	0.0400*** (0.0011)
LEV	-0.0563*** (0.0055)	0.0895* (0.0515)	0.1813*** (0.0010)	-0.0580*** (0.0056)	0.0727 (0.0467)	0.1883*** (0.0005)
LSIZE	0.0035*** (0.0003)	4.17E-08*** (2.05E-09)	1.01E-07*** (4.62E-10)	0.0033*** (0.0003)	4.95E-08*** (2.91E-09)	9.94E-08*** (5.37E-10)
LSALES	-7.81E-09*** (2.97E-10)	-8.66E-09** (4.35E-09)	-3.64E-02*** (8.16E-04)	-7.18E-09*** (2.69E-10)	-8.61E-09* (4.57E-09)	-3.85E-02*** (8.53E-04)
ATR	0.0216*** (0.0011)	0.0698*** (0.0095)	0.1272*** (0.0036)	0.0211*** (0.0011)	0.0625*** (0.0090)	0.1360*** (0.0035)
EPS	0.0007*** (1.92E-05)	0.0010*** (0.0001)	7.94E-05*** (8.96E-06)	0.0007*** (1.90E-05)	0.0007*** (9.96E-05)	9.03E-05*** (8.89E-06)
Adjusted R ²	0.7714	0.9335	0.9121	0.7635	0.9379	0.9173
F-statistic	23.5874***	400.8966***	109.8469***	22.3002***	538.675***	119.7289***
DW-statistic	2.0002	1.6337	1.7498	1.9989	1.6459	1.7607
Hausman test	157.4781***	87.8979***	7.8783***	219.869***	149.4923***	5.2848**
Type of Panel Data	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed

Notes: (i) Figures in parentheses are standard errors robust to heteroscedasticity

(ii) DW statistic is Durbin-Watson d test for autocorrelation

(iii) * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, and *** $p < 0.01$

(iv) Number of observations is 1102

Table 2 also reports the results for the four dimensions of CSR. Overall, all dimensions are significantly related to CFP. These results support hypotheses for CSR dimensions. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a significant positive relationship between CSR and CFP. The results support the proposal made by Yoon *et al.* (2006) which suggest that these activities create a brand image for a company that can develop positive public relations with stakeholders such as creating customers loyalty and investors trust that result in improved earnings and market value of a company. Overall, the significantly positive relationships between CSR dimensions and CFP indicate that stakeholders reacted positively towards the involvement of companies in the specific dimension of CSR. For instance EMPD is significantly positive related to CFP implying that CFP can be improved if managers have knowledge and good relations with employees. Thus,

suggesting that managers should find ways to improve employee relations which may results in improve productivity and hence may lead to a better financial performance for the company.

COMD is significantly positive related to CFP which indicating that stakeholders do not react negatively towards companies spending for the betterment of the society. This result implicates that Malaysian managers may use the community enhancement program to strategically position their company in the competitive market.

A significant positive relationship established between PROD and CFP signifies that companies need to give emphasis to the continuous improvement of their products, such as having in place a systematic and organised research and development program to ensure the quality and safety of products/services are continuously enhanced.

ENVD is found to be significantly positive related to CFP showing that there is a strong link between environmental management and CFP. Therefore, companies may consider disclosing information on the environmental conservation and protection as part of a strategy to improve their financial performance (Bewley and Li, 2000).

Table 3 provides results for the hypothesis testing on the relationship between CSR and its dimensions with IO. Overall, the outcomes of *t* tests are significant at 1 percent level (*F* test is statistically significant at $p < 0.01$). Therefore, we can conclude that there is a strong association between CSR and its dimensions with IO.

Table 3: The relationship between CSR and IO using Unbalanced Panel Data

Variable	CSR on IO		Dimensions of CSR on IO	
	Model 2.1: (NUMBIO)	Model 2.2: (PERCIO)	Model 2.1: (NUMBIO)	Model 2.2: (PERCIO)
C	11.8114* (0.0872)	43.5669*** (1.1787)	11.7307*** (1.6876)	43.0823*** (1.1684)
CSR_D	0.0689 (0.0560)	0.1468*** (0.0478)		
EMPLD			0.6684*** (0.1656)	0.3903*** (0.1446)
COMD			-0.2745*** (0.1125)	-0.2627** (0.1506)
PROD			0.2103*** (0.0928)	-0.0480 (0.1050)
ENVD			-0.0800 (0.0837)	-0.1819*** (0.0516)
Ri	-0.3242* (0.1653)	-0.3243*** (0.0965)	-0.2507 (0.1649)	-0.4662*** (0.1350)
BETA	-0.5313*** (0.1437)	-1.0228*** (0.0641)	-0.4838*** (0.1220)	-0.9560*** (0.0887)
LEV	-0.8524*** (0.1839)	0.3447 (0.0641)	-0.7296*** (0.1855)	0.2746** (0.1209)
LSIZE	0.6233*** (0.2543)	0.0738 (0.0625)	0.4889*** (0.1882)	0.7989*** (0.1302)
LSALES	0.5101** (0.2543)	-0.0509 (0.1214)	0.4889** (0.1882)	-0.8884*** (0.2780)
ATR	-0.1281* (0.0757)	0.0582 (0.0789)	-0.1375 (0.0885)	0.4249*** (0.1480)
EPS	-4.52E-05** (1.96E-05)	-0.0001*** (4.54E-05)	-4.12E-05** (1.89E-05)	-0.0002*** (0.0000)
Adjusted R ²	0.9240	0.9361	0.9243	0.9359
F-Statistic	82.7566***	1755.58***	81.8540***	1626.20***
DW-Stat	1.2261	1.3666	1.2336	1.3558
Hausman Test	23.8471***	30.1491***	87.77***	6.1993**
Type of Panel Data	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed

Notes: (i) Figures in parentheses are standard errors robust to heteroscedasticity,

(ii) DW statistic is Durbin-Watson d test for autocorrelation,

(iii) * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, and *** $p < 0.01$,

(iv) Number of observation is 1095.

These results are consistent with the point of view that institutional investors are concerned with how managers manage the social issues in their company as established in various studies showing companies having high rating in social performance are more attractive for institutional investors (see for example, Mahoney and Roberts, 2007; Graves

and Waddock, 1994) and institutional investors use CSR information in their shareholding decision (e.g., Mahoney and Roberts, 2007; Coffey and Fryxell, 1991; Teoh and Shiu, 1990).

The relationships between the CSR dimensions and IO as reflected in Table 3 show mixed results. Only one dimension of CSR, namely, EMPD is significantly positive related to IO in both models, while PROD is found to be significantly positive related to IO only in Model 2.1. However, we found significant negative relationship in COMD (in both models) and ENVD (only in Model 2.2). Therefore, we can conclude that the preceding discussion partially support H2 and is consistent with the findings established in studies by Cox *et al.*, (2004) for EMPD and Mahoney and Roberts (2007) for PROD. Therefore, confirming the assertion made by Teoh and Shiu, (1990) that institutional investors are not totally opposed to companies' involvement in social activities. The negative relationships of both COMD and ENVD may possibly indicate that institutional investors perceived that the investment in both dimensions requires significant amount of financial resources and thus, giving negative impact on the cash flow of companies. The higher expenditure allocated to both community involvement and environment may place companies at an economic disadvantage compared to other companies that are less socially responsible (Balabanis *et al.*, 1998). These findings indicate that institutional investors in Malaysia are mainly profit orientated and short-termism rather than focusing on the long term sustainability of a company.

6. Summary and Conclusions

The main aim of this study is to explore the relationship between CSR and CFP as well as IO in the Malaysian PLCs. The results of longitudinal data analysis found that CSR are significantly positive related to CFP and IO. It was also found that all the four dimensions of CSR are significantly positive related to CFP which signify that companies may strategically use the investment in CSR activities to improve the financial performance of companies. The significant positive relationship between CSR and IO indicates that institutional investors are considering the social performance of companies in making investment decision, particularly for ethical investors such as *Shariah* Compliant Funds, Unit Trusts and Investment Trusts which emphasise on social responsibility of companies. Future research may be conducted to include a larger sample size according to categories of companies. It will be useful to examine the motives and perceptions of managers in disclosing CSR by conducting in-depth interviews or employing questionnaire survey method. The same study could also be conducted in other emerging markets to find out whether the same general relationship exists.

References

- Alexander, G. J. and Buchholz, R. A. 1978 "Corporate social responsibility and stock market performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 21, pp. 479-486.
- Al-Tuwaijri, S. A., Christensen, T. E. and Hughes II, K. E. 2004. "The relations among environmental disclosure, environmental performance, and economic performance: A simultaneous equations approach", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 29, pp. 447-471.
- Anderson, J. C. and Frankle, A. C. 1980. "Voluntary social reporting: An iso-beta portfolio analysis", *The Accounting Review*, vol 55, no. 3, pp. 467-779.

- Balabanis, G., Philip. H. G. and Lyall, J. 1998. "Corporate social responsibility and economic performance in the top British companies: Are they linked?", *European Business Review*, vol. 98 no. 1, pp. 25-44.
- Belkaoui, A. 1976. "The impact of the disclosure of the environmental effects of organizational behavior on the market", *Financial Management*, vol. 5 no. 4, pp. 26-31.
- Bewley, K., and Li, Y. 2000. "Disclosure of environmental information by Canadian manufacturing companies: A voluntary disclosure perspective", *Advances in Environmental Accounting and Management*, vol. 1, pp. 201-226.
- Bowman, E. H. and Haire, M. A. 1975. "A strategic posture toward corporate social responsibility", *California Management Review*, vol. 18, no.2, pp. 49-58.
- Bursa Malaysia. 2007. "Corporate Social Responsibility in Malaysian PLCs, An executive summary, 2007 Status Report", available at: [http://www.klse.com.my/website/bm/about us/the organization/csr /downloaded/ csr booklet.pdf](http://www.klse.com.my/website/bm/about%20us/the%20organization/csr/downloaded/csr_booklet.pdf) (accessed 12 July 2008).
- Chapple, W. and Moon, J. 2005. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia", *Business and Society*, vol. 44, no.4, pp. 415-441.
- Christopher. T, Hutomo, Y. B. S. and Monroe, G. 1997. "Voluntary environmental disclosure by Australian listed mineral mining companies: an application of stakeholder theory", *The International Journal of Accounting and Business Society*, vol. 5, no.1, pp. 42-65.
- Cochran, P. L. and Wood, R. A. (1984), "Corporate social responsibility and financial performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 42-56.
- Coffey, B. S. and Fryxell, G. E. 1991. "Institutional ownership of stock and dimensions of corporate social performance: an empirical examination", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 437-444.
- Cox, P., Brammer, S. and Millington, A. 2004. "An empirical examination of institutional investor preferences for corporate social performance", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 27-42.
- Graves, S. B. and Waddock, S. A. 1994. "Institutional ownership and corporate social performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 1034-1046.
- Hall, P. L. and Rieck, R. 1998. "The effect of positive corporate social actions on shareholder wealth", *Journal of Financial and Strategic Decisions*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 83-89.
- Jenkins, H. and Yakovlena, N. 2005. "Corporate social responsibility in the mining industry: exploring trends in social and environmental disclosure", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, pp. 1-14.
- Johnson, R. A. and Greening, D. W. 1999. "The effects of corporate governance and institutional ownership types on corporate social performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 564-576.

- Kim, K., Henderson, G. and Garrison, S. 1993. "Examination of Tobin's q for takeover firms", *Quarterly Journal of Business and Economics*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 3-26.
- Lee, M. P. 2008. "A Review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: its evolutionary path and the road ahead", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 53-73.
- Lindenberg, E. and Ross, S. 1981. "Tobin's q ratio and industrial organization", *Journal of Business*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1-32.
- Mahoney, L. and Roberts, R. W. 2007. "Corporate social performance, and financial performance and institutional ownership in Canadian firms", *Accounting Forum*, vol. 31, pp. 233-253.
- Margolis, J. D. and Walsh, J. P. 2003. "Misery loves companies: rethinking social initiatives by business", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 48, pp. 655-689.
- McGuire, J., Sundgren, A. and Schneeweis, T. 1988. "Corporate social responsibility and firm financial performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 854-872.
- McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D. 2000. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: correlation or misspecification?", *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 21, pp. 603-609.
- Moore, G. 2001. "Corporate social and financial performance: an investigation in the U.K. Supermarket industry", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 34, no. 3/4, pp. 299-316.
- Muirhead, S. A., Bennett, C. J., Berenbeim, R. E., Kao, A. and Vidal, D. J. 2002. "*Corporate Citizenship in the New Century: Accountability, Transparency, and Global Stakeholder Engagement*", The Conference Board, New York.
- Nik Ahmad, N. Z. and Abdul Rahim, N. L. A. 2003. "Awareness of the concepts of corporate social responsibility among Malaysian managers in selected public listed companies", paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Global Business and Economic development, Plaza Athanee Hotel, Bangkok, Thailand, 8-11 January.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., and Rynes, S. L. 2003. "Corporate Social and Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis", *Organization Studies*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 403-441.
- Patten, D. M. 1990. "The Market reaction to social responsibility disclosures: the case of the Sullivan principles signings", *Accounting, Organization and Society*, vol. 15, pp. 575-587.
- Pava, M. L. and Krausz, J. 1996. "The association between corporate social-responsibility and financial performance – the paradox of social cost", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 321-357.
- Posnikoff, J. F. 1997. "Disinvestment from South Africa: They did well by doing good", *Contemporary Economic Policy*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 76–86.
- Prathaban, V. 2005. "Big earners, small givers?", *Malaysian Business*, 16 September.

- Robert, R. W. 1992. "Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: an application of stakeholder theory", *Accounting, Organisations and Society*, pp. 595-612.
- Roman, R. M., Hayibor, S. and Agle, B. R. 1999. "The relationship between social and financial performance: repainting a portrait", *Business and Society*, vol. 38, pp. 109-118.
- Simpson, W. G. and Kohers, T. 2002. "The link between corporate social and financial performance: Evidence from the banking industry", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 97-109.
- Spicer, B. H. 1978. "Investors, corporate social performance and information disclosure: An empirical paper", *Accounting Review*, vol. 53, pp. 94-111.
- Teoh, H. Y. and Shiu, G. Y. 1990. "Attitudes towards corporate social responsibility and perceived importance of social responsibility information characteristics in a decision context", *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 71-77.
- Teoh, S. H., Welch, I. and Wazzan, C. P. 1999. "The effect of socially activist investment policies on the financial markets: Evidence from the South African Boycott", *Journal of Business*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 36-89.
- Tilt, C. A. 1994. "The influence of external pressure groups on corporate social disclosure: some empirical evidence", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 47-72.
- Vance, S. C. 1975. "Are socially responsible corporations good investment risk?", *Management Review*, vol. 64, pp. 18-24.
- Waddock, S. A. and Graves, S. B. 1997. "The corporate social performance-financial performance link", *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 303-319.
- Williams, S. M. and Pei, C. H. W. 1999. "Corporate social disclosures by listed companies on their web sites: An international comparison", *The International Journal of Accounting*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 389-419.
- Wiseman J. 1982. "An evaluation of environmental disclosures made in corporate annual reports", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 53-63.
- Wright, P. and Ferris, S. P. 1997. "Agency conflict and corporate strategy: Effect of divestment on corporate value", *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 77-83.
- Yoon, Y., Giihrhan-Canli, Z. and Schwarz, N. 2006. "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Activities on Companies with Bad Reputations", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 377-390.
- Zulkifli, N. and Amran, A. 2006. "Realising Corporate Social Responsibility in Malaysia: View from the Accounting Profession", *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, vol. 24, pp. 110-114.