GEORGE BROWN PRESS
JOURNALS, BOOKS & PROCEEDINGS

Economics and Management Innovation

Article

Driving Social Change: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Initiatives and Social Business Innovation in a Selected Multinational Company in China

Changlu Li [1,*], Zhengchun Li [1,*] and Lorenzo C. Lorenzo [1]

[1] Graduate School, Emilio Aguinaldo College, Paco, Manila, Philippines
* Correspondence: Changlu Li and Zhengchun Li, Graduate School, Emilio Aguinaldo College, Paco, Manila, Philippines

Abstract: This study investigates the relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and social innovation practices within a multinational company. Through a comprehensive analysis of survey data collected from employees, the study examines the profile of respondents across demographic categories, including sex, age, and years in service. Additionally, the assessment of CSR dimensions—accountability, transparency, competitiveness, and responsibility—is explored to understand the company's commitment to social and environmental stewardship. Furthermore, the extent of social innovation practices, encompassing social technology, innovation intermediaries, people who drive innovation, and openness, is evaluated to gauge the company's efforts in addressing social and environmental challenges through innovative approaches. The analysis reveals significant differences in CSR assessment and social innovation practices based on demographic factors, highlighting the importance of considering employee profiles in CSR and innovation initiatives. However, the study finds an insignificant correlation between CSR assessment and social innovation practices, suggesting the need for further research to understand the underlying dynamics. Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on CSR and social innovation by providing insights into the intersection of these constructs within a corporate setting and informing strategies for fostering sustainable and inclusive business practices.

Keywords: CSR; social business innovation; multinational company

Received: 25 January 2025
Revised: 30 January 2025
Accepted: 08 February 2025
Published: 10 February 2025

1. Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives and social innovation are increasingly recognized as key drivers for sustainable development and social change. As businesses play a significant role in shaping societal outcomes, the integration of CSR practices with social innovation has gained prominence as a strategy to address complex social challenges [1]. In recent years, China has experienced rapid economic growth, accompanied by an increased awareness of social and environmental issues. As a result, companies operating in China are recognizing the importance of adopting responsible business practices and driving social innovation to align with national development goals [2].

By examining the integration of CSR initiatives and social innovation within China, this research aims to shed light on their combined impact on social change and sustainable development in China. Understanding the relationship between CSR initiatives and social innovation in the specific context of China, is vital for both theory and practice. The findings will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on CSR and social innovation by providing insights into the strategies, mechanisms, and outcomes of integrating CSR practices with social innovation in an emerging economy context [3,4]. Moreover, this research will offer valuable guidance for companies operating in China and other similar contexts, highlighting best practices and lessons learned from company's efforts to drive social

change through the synergy of CSR initiatives and social innovation. Overall, this study aims to advance the understanding of how CSR initiatives can foster social innovation and contribute to sustainable development in a selected multinational company in China. The subsequent sections will delve into the methodology, data collection, and analysis techniques employed to examine the interplay between CSR initiatives and social innovation, as well as the expected contributions and implications of the research.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives and social innovation are two interrelated concepts that have gained significant attention as drivers of social change and sustainable development worldwide. In the context of China, a rapidly growing economy with unique social and environmental challenges, the integration of CSR and social innovation has become increasingly important. This study aims to explore the relationship between CSR initiatives and social innovation in China, and their role in driving social change.

China's economic growth and global influence have brought about significant social and environmental transformations. As the country faces various social challenges, such as income inequality, environmental degradation, and social inequality, there is a growing recognition of the need for businesses to go beyond profit generation and contribute to society in a responsible and innovative manner. The integration of CSR practices and social innovation is seen as a means to address these challenges and promote sustainable development.

CSR in China has evolved over time. Initially, the focus was primarily on corporate philanthropy and compliance with governmental regulations. However, societal expectations have expanded, placing greater emphasis on the social and environmental impact of businesses beyond their financial performance. This has led to a shift towards a more comprehensive and strategic approach to CSR, involving stakeholder engagement, sustainable business practices, and the pursuit of social innovation.

Social innovation, as a complementary concept to CSR, involves the development and implementation of novel solutions to address social challenges. It entails finding innovative approaches, products, and services that create positive social impact and improve the well-being of individuals and communities. Social innovation can be driven by CSR initiatives, as companies seek to tackle societal issues through innovative strategies, partnerships, and responsible business practices.

China, serves as an important context for studying the relationship between CSR initiatives and social innovation. It presents unique social, economic, and environmental dynamics, making it an interesting and relevant setting to explore how CSR-driven social innovation can drive social change. By examining the specific CSR practices and social innovation projects in a selected multinational company China, this study aims to provide insights into how businesses in the region are integrating CSR and social innovation to contribute to sustainable development.

Understanding the interplay between CSR initiatives and social innovation China, is crucial for both theoretical and practical reasons. The findings of this study will contribute to the existing literature on CSR and social innovation by providing empirical evidence and insights into their relationship in the Chinese context. Additionally, the study will inform businesses, policymakers, and stakeholders about the potential of CSR-driven social innovation to drive social change, foster sustainable development, and address pressing social challenges in the country. Thus, this study seeks to examine the driving forces and outcomes of CSR initiatives and social innovation. By exploring the integration of CSR and social innovation, the study aims to shed light on their role in promoting social change, sustainable development, and responsible business practices in the region.

2. Corporate Social Responsibility

The concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the United States emerged after World War II. The "iron law of responsibility" later emerged, suggesting that businesses' responsibility should align with their social power.

In the 1970s, societal expectations shifted to focus on what companies could do to improve the world beyond their own survival. This was accompanied by the passing of landmark environmental laws, requiring companies to take responsibility for the consequences of their operations. In response, corporations engaged in political action, public affairs, lobbying, and public relations efforts to manage societal expectations. How organizations strategically position themselves on issues such as resource degradation, pollution, and climate change influences their legitimacy in the eyes of society and stakeholders. A legitimacy gap occurs when an organization is unable or unwilling to meet societal expectations, leading to potential threats such as loss of clients, government sanctions, or public protests. Seeking legitimacy as a corporate actor drives CSR and sustainability efforts. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has gained significant attention as a means to achieve sustainable development in various contexts, including China. With its rapid economic growth and increasing global influence, China faces numerous social, environmental, and economic challenges, necessitating a focus on CSR and its relationship to sustainable development. Currently, CSR is gaining growing recognition in China and aligning with national development goals. As a result, CSR practices have become more prominent among businesses operating in China, as they recognize the importance of integrating social and environmental factors into their operations. CSR in China covers multiple dimensions, including corporate governance, environmental responsibility, community engagement, and philanthropy. CSR has significant potential to contribute to China's sustainable development by promoting positive social and environmental outcomes, encouraging responsible business practices, and supporting China's sustainability goals.

CSR model is reflected by four major constructs: accountability, transparency, competitiveness, and responsibility. Consequently, the objective of this study is to examine those four core characteristics to see if can represent the concept of CSR in a robust way. Accountability refers to an individual's behavior within a social structure or situation, while transparency refers to the degree of asymmetric information about control errors. Companies must develop strategies to achieve transparency goals, but the optimal degree depends on flexibility. Competitiveness is crucial for a company's sustainability, and effective management through social and environmental policies enhances reputation and prominence among stakeholders. Responsibility, on the other hand, refers to the assignment, enforcement, or mistaken application of responsibility to an individual or group by an external force. Prioritizing accountability, transparency, and responsibility while maintaining competitiveness can lead to a strong reputation and positive impact on stakeholders and society [5].

3. Social Innovation

The Amani Social Innovation Framework (ASIF) consists of seven elements that guide social innovation efforts. The first element is burning, which emphasizes personal motivation and alignment with the challenge at hand. Sensing involves using all senses to engage in "problem-finding." Questioning focuses on asking the right questions to uncover the root causes of the problem. Idea networking involves sharing the challenge and ideas widely to gather diverse perspectives. Associating is the cognitive skill of bringing together different ideas to create new opportunities. Experimenting entails testing innovations in the real world and using user feedback for improvement. Finally, impacting involves refining ideas based on user feedback, establishing evaluation mechanisms, and scaling what works. These elements provide a systematic approach to social innovation and aim to drive meaningful social change.

Social innovation is a burgeoning trend that is gaining momentum, as businesses are increasingly recognizing its capacity to enhance their existing business models. The development of generalizable knowledge and articulate theories about the origins, consequences, and operating conditions of social innovation is hindered by conceptual ambiguity and diverse definitions [6].

The concept of social innovation, as introduced by Mulgan, encompasses a range of innovative endeavors and services that are specifically designed to tackle and meet various social needs [7]. This phenomenon is observed within various organizational structures, such as for-profit companies, hybrid models like Benefit Corporation and Low-Profit Limited Liability Company, and social entrepreneurs who place a significant emphasis on achieving social outcomes for specific communities or stakeholders. Social innovations have emerged as a powerful tool for businesses in recent years, driving not just economic growth but also social progress and sustainability [7]. This paper presents a literature review on the topic of social innovations for business, encompassing its definitions, relevance, implementation, and benefits [8].

The term "social innovation" is frequently used but lacks a universally accepted definition. Social innovation is described as a novel solution to a social problem, more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions, and benefiting primarily society as a whole rather than private individuals. This definition emphasizes both the novelty and the societal benefit of social innovation.

Social Innovation (SI) is a transformative approach that addresses pressing social problems by utilizing creativity, collaboration, and systemic thinking. It aims to generate positive impacts on society as a whole, focusing on collective well-being and the common good. SI can be applied to tangible goods, intangible services, procedural methodologies, technological advancements, regulatory frameworks, societal mobilizations, and targeted interventions. The primary objective is to generate social value beyond the confines of the current system, resulting in novel concepts, strategies, and tools aimed at enhancing overall well-being [9].

Social innovation, a phenomenon that gained prominence in the early 21st century, encompasses a range of practices employed by various entities such as third sector organizations, social enterprises, and corporate social responsibility initiatives. The phenomenon at hand encompasses a confluence of novel social and technological advancements, effectively amalgamating diverse components. The period between 2005 and 2015 witnessed a notable rise in the recognition and significance of social innovation within European policy discourse. This phenomenon emerged as a response to the pressing grand challenges faced by societies and the imperative to meet societal needs effectively. The phenomenon under consideration encompasses a range of innovative concepts, goods, services, and frameworks that are specifically designed to foster and nurture new social connections [1].

Over the course of the last three decades, China has undergone a notable and swift expansion in its economic landscape, characterized by a shift from a labor-intensive approach to industrialization towards a more pronounced emphasis on growth driven by innovation. In the year 1995, the government implemented a set of regulations aimed at fostering advancements in technology and management practices. These regulations placed particular emphasis on promoting social innovation within both the business and social sectors. During the mid-2000s, a notable focus of innovation was observed in the domains of social management and service. The state, in response to declining economic growth rates, implemented measures to foster mass entrepreneurship and innovation within the business sector. The aforementioned modifications have effectively transformed China into a prominent center for innovation, thereby cultivating an environment conducive to the cultivation of creativity and advancement in various realms, including social and commercial domains.

Bureau and Montgomery provide a more business-centered definition, outlining social innovation as novel strategies, concepts, ideas, and organizations that meet social

needs of all kinds and that extend and strengthen civil society [10]. This perspective reveals the crucial role that businesses can play in promoting societal growth.

Successful implementation of social innovation within businesses requires an understanding of both internal and external factors. Among the internal factors, organizational culture plays a pivotal role in fostering creativity and innovation. In the same vein, the leadership style also impacts the likelihood of social innovation, with transformational leadership being particularly conducive [6].

Externally, the economic and social environment of the business significantly influences its ability to implement social innovations. The stability of the economic environment, the presence of social issues that need addressing, and the societal acceptance of innovative solutions are all critical considerations [5].

The potential benefits of social innovation for businesses are vast. Social innovations not only aid in addressing societal issues but also contribute to the economic success of firms. They can help businesses in differentiating their products, improving their corporate image, and attracting socially conscious customers. Social innovation also aids in attracting and retaining talent, as employees increasingly seek to work for companies that contribute positively to society [8].

Thus, social innovation offers a promising avenue for businesses to contribute to society while simultaneously reaping business benefits. More research is needed to understand the dynamics and mechanisms through which social innovation can be effectively implemented and optimized in businesses.

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Theoretical Framework

The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Theory, developed by Carroll, serves as a guiding principle for businesses as they navigate their responsibilities to various stakeholders [11]. This includes economic obligations to generate profits for shareholders, legal requirements to comply with local, national, and international laws, ethical duties to conduct business in a fair and equitable manner, and philanthropic responsibilities to contribute to societal betterment. These responsibilities often take shape in CSR initiatives, which serve as tangible evidence of a business's commitment to its various duties. Within the context of China, the study will investigate how businesses fulfill these responsibilities and what effect this fulfillment has on social innovation.

For instance, a company might engage in CSR initiatives that provide educational opportunities for underprivileged communities. By doing so, they not only fulfill their philanthropic responsibilities but also foster an environment that encourages social innovation by investing in human capital development. Such initiatives could also include environmentally friendly practices or social entrepreneurship projects that simultaneously fulfill economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities, while also promoting social innovation by providing sustainable solutions to environmental or societal problems.

Social Innovation Theory, as outlined by Phills et al. provides a framework for understanding how new ideas, concepts, and strategies are developed to address social needs [12]. It centers on the notion of innovative solutions that are more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than pre-existing ones. When combined with CSR theory, it posits that businesses can play a vital role in social innovation, by using their resources, reach, and influence to create and support innovative solutions to social problems.

Applying this theory to the study, one could explore how CSR initiatives facilitate social innovation in China. For example, an initiative might lead to the development of a novel product or service that addresses a social issue, such as affordable housing or access to clean water. Or it might lead to the implementation of a new business model or process that promotes social equity, such as fair trade or inclusive hiring practices.

Together, CSR and Social Innovation theories offer a robust theoretical framework for understanding how businesses can leverage their resources and influence to drive social change and promote sustainable development in China. This framework could yield valuable insights and recommendations for businesses, policymakers, and stakeholders in China and beyond.

The hypotheses of thus research included:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the assessment of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) when profile is used as test factor.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the extent of social innovation practices of the selected company when respondents are grouped according to profile.

Ho3: There is no correlation between assessment of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the extent of social innovation practices.

4.2. Research Design

The research design used in the study was a quantitative-comparative-correlational research design. The design allowed for the examination of relationships and comparisons between variables, providing a systematic and structured approach to data collection and analysis. Numerical data was gathered using quantitative methods to measure the variables related to corporate social responsibility (CSR) assessment and social innovation practices. The study aimed to identify correlations between those variables and explore potential differences among them. The study also examined how different profiles of respondents influenced the assessment of CSR and the extent of social innovation practices through a comparative approach. The research design provided a robust framework for investigating the relationship between CSR and social innovation in a systematic and objective manner, enabling the generation of empirical evidence and meaningful insights.

The study was conducted within a multinational company operating in China. China's dynamic and rapidly evolving business landscape offers a unique context for exploring Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and social innovation practices within multinational corporations. With its burgeoning economy, diverse workforce, and complex regulatory environment, China presents both opportunities and challenges for companies seeking to integrate CSR into their operations and drive social innovation. By focusing on a multinational company in China, this study aims to provide insights into how organizations navigate social and environmental issues, engage with stakeholders, and foster innovation to address emerging challenges in the Chinese market while balancing global and local priorities.

The study's population consisted of employees from different business organizations operating in China, who met the specified criteria. The population served as the group of interest from which the study aimed to draw conclusions and make inferences about the relationship between corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives and social innovation.

A sample was selected from the population to participate in the study. The sample was a subset of the larger population and was representative of the population's characteristics and diversity. The sample size was determined based on statistical considerations to ensure an adequate representation of the population and sufficient power for data analysis.

The study employed random sampling as the sampling technique for selecting the sample from the population. Each individual in the population had an equal chance of being selected for the study due to random sampling. This technique minimized biases and increased the generalizability of the findings. Participants were recruited using a random selection process, which enhanced the validity and reliability of the study results. The total population for that study consisted of 1574 employees from various business organizations operating in China, who met the specified criteria. This served as the overall group of interest from which the study aimed to draw conclusions. A sample size of 309

participants was selected from the population to participate in the study. The sample was a subset of the larger population and was representative of the population's characteristics and diversity. The sample size was determined based on statistical considerations to ensure an adequate representation of the population and sufficient power for data analysis.

4.3. Instrument

The instrument used in that research study to collect data was a self-administered researcher-made questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of statements that were designed to measure the constructs of interest, including the assessment of corporate social responsibility (Accountability; Transparency; Competitiveness and Responsibility) and the extent of social innovation practices (Social technology; Innovation intermediaries; People who drive Innovation and Openness). A 4-point Likert scale was used, where respondents indicated their level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Each construct was represented by six statements, enabling a comprehensive assessment of participants' perceptions and attitudes. The statements were carefully developed based on established literature and existing scales related to CSR and social innovation. The statements were clear, concise, and easily understandable to ensure accurate responses.

Before data collection, the questionnaire underwent a pilot test with a small group of participants to assess its clarity, reliability, and validity. The pilot test involved a specific number of participants and assessed the questionnaire's internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and content validity. The feedback from the pilot test participants was used to make necessary adjustments and refinements to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire's validity was ensured by drawing on established scales and measures from previous studies on CSR and social innovation. In addition, the content validity was assessed by subjecting the questionnaire to expert review by researchers familiar with the field.

An evaluation was conducted on the reliability of the questionnaire using measures such as Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the statements within each construct. A high reliability coefficient indicated the consistency of responses across the statements and increased the confidence in the questionnaire's ability to measure the intended constructs.

The questionnaire was distributed to the selected respondents, who were employees from various business organizations in China. Participants were instructed to read each statement and indicate their level of agreement or disagreement using the provided Likert scale options. The responses were collected and used for data analysis to examine the relationship between CSR initiatives and social innovation.

4.4. Data Gathering Procedure

The data for that research study was collected using a structured and systematic data gathering procedure. The researcher finalized the questionnaire based on the pilot test feedback and made any necessary adjustments. The questionnaire was reviewed for clarity, validity, and reliability. Permissions and approvals were obtained to conduct the data gathering process. A representative sample of employees from a selected organization in a multinational company in China was chosen based on a predetermined sampling technique. The sample size was determined to ensure sufficient statistical power and representativeness. There is no text to rewrite. The self-administered questionnaires were distributed to the selected respondents. The research team provided clear instructions on how to complete the questionnaire and emphasized the importance of providing honest and accurate responses. A specific timeframe was provided to the respondents to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were collected from the respondents. The research team ensured the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants' responses.

Identifying information was kept separate from the questionnaire data to maintain participant privacy. The responses from the questionnaires were carefully entered into a database or statistical software for analysis. The data was coded appropriately to facilitate the analysis process. The findings were interpreted based on the results of the data analysis. The research team analyzed the data to answer the research questions and drew meaningful conclusions regarding the relationship between CSR initiatives and social innovation. During the data gathering procedure, ethical considerations were upheld, including informed consent, confidentiality, and protection of participant rights. The research team adhered to ethical guidelines and protocols to ensure the integrity of the research process.

4.5. Statistical Result of the Data

The research involved several methods to appropriately answer the research questions. Data analyses were conducted using statistical software such as SPSS to ensure accuracy and efficiency of analysis.

Regarding sex distribution, the data indicates a relatively balanced representation of male and female respondents. Males account for 47.3% of the total sample, while females make up 52.1%. This balanced gender representation ensures diversity and inclusivity in the study, allowing for the exploration of varied perspectives on CSR and social innovation. By including both male and female viewpoints, potential gender biases can be mitigated, enhancing the credibility and validity of the research outcomes.

4.5.1. Data result of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

The assessment of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in terms of accountability, transparency, competitiveness, and responsibility was quantified using a Likert scale. Subsequent statistical analysis utilized inferential statistics such as the T-test or Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to examine differences in the assessment of CSR when the respondents were grouped according to their profile. The study aimed to determine if respondent characteristics had a significant impact on perceptions of CSR, as indicated by Field [13].

Table 1 presents the differences in the assessment of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on the respondents' sex. The indicators analyzed include Accountability, Transparency, Competitiveness, Responsibility, and Overall CSR assessment.

Table 1. Differences in the assessment of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in terms of sex.

Indicator	Sex	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Accountability	Male	2.776	1.119	0.291	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.831				
Transparency	Male	2.837	0.153	0.696	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.852				
Competitiveness	Male	2.984	2.231	0.136	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.975				
Responsibility	Male	3.023	0.018	0.894	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.004				
Overall	Male	2.876	2.216	0.138	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.898				

For the indicator of Accountability, the mean scores for male respondents (2.776) and female respondents (2.831) were compared, resulting in an F-value of 1.119 with a corresponding p-value of 0.291. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), the null hypothesis (Ho) that there is no significant difference in the assessment of Accountability between male and female respondents is accepted. Therefore, the difference in Accountability assessments based on sex is deemed not significant.

Similarly, for Transparency, Competitiveness, Responsibility, and the Overall CSR assessment, the differences in mean scores between male and female respondents were analyzed. In each case, the calculated p-values (0.696, 0.136, 0.894, and 0.138 respectively) were greater than the significance level, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Thus, the differences in assessments of Transparency, Competitiveness, Responsibility, and Overall CSR assessment based on sex are considered not significant.

The statistical analysis indicates that there are no significant differences in the assessment of CSR between male and female respondents across the indicators examined. This suggests that both male and female respondents perceive similar levels of accountability, transparency, competitiveness, and responsibility in the selected multinational company's CSR practices. The findings underscore the importance of gender neutrality in CSR perceptions and highlight the need for inclusive CSR policies and initiatives that cater to diverse stakeholder groups.

Table 2 presents the differences in the assessment of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) based on the respondents' length of service. The indicators analyzed include Accountability, Transparency, Competitiveness, Responsibility, and Overall CSR assessment.

Table 2. Differences in the assessment of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in terms of length of service.

Indicator	Length of Service	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Accountability	1-5	2.858	2.445	0.064	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	2.790				
	11-15	2.678				
	16-above	2.940				
Transparency	1-5	2.840	0.036	0.991	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	2.836				
	11-15	2.861				
	16-above	2.854				
Competitiveness	1-5	3.003	0.128	0.944	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	2.976				
	11-15	2.955				
	16-above	2.970				
Responsibility	1-5	2.981	3.340	0.020	Rejected	Significant
	6-10	2.970				
	11-15	3.000				
	16-above	3.230				
Overall	1-5	2.901	2.150	0.094	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	2.881				
	11-15	2.831				
	16-above	2.976				

For the indicator of Accountability, the mean scores for respondents with different lengths of service (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years and above) were compared. The calculated F-value was 2.445, with a corresponding p-value of 0.064. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), the null hypothesis (Ho) that there is no significant difference in the assessment of Accountability based on length of service is accepted. Thus, the differences in Accountability assessments across different lengths of service are considered not significant.

Similarly, for Transparency and Competitiveness, the differences in mean scores between respondents with varying lengths of service were analyzed. In both cases, the calculated p-values (0.991 and 0.944 respectively) were greater than the significance level,

leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Hence, the differences in assessments of Transparency and Competitiveness based on length of service are deemed not significant.

However, for Responsibility, the calculated p-value (0.020) was less than the significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the assessment of Responsibility based on length of service is rejected. Consequently, the differences in Responsibility assessments across different lengths of service are considered significant.

For the Overall CSR assessment, the calculated p-value (0.094) was greater than the significance level, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Thus, the differences in Overall CSR assessments based on length of service are deemed not significant.

Overall, the statistical analysis indicates that while there are no significant differences in the assessment of Accountability, Transparency, Competitiveness, and Overall CSR assessment based on length of service, there is a significant difference in the assessment of Responsibility. This suggests that respondents' perceptions of Responsibility in CSR practices vary significantly depending on their length of service. The findings underscore the importance of considering employees' tenure when designing and implementing CSR initiatives to ensure alignment with their expectations and experiences.

Table 3. presents the differences in the assessment of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) across different age groups.

Table 3. Post Hoc analysis for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

Indicator	Age	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Accountability	25-35	2.900	1.746	0.158	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	2.713				
	46-55	2.808				
	56-above	2.824				
Transparency	25-35	2.811	0.667	0.573	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	2.824				
	46-55	2.827				
	56-above	2.922				
Competitiveness	25-35	3.038	2.463	0.063	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	2.902				
	46-55	3.097				
	56-above	2.924				
Responsibility	25-35	3.008	0.176	0.913	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	3.041				
	46-55	2.997				
	56-above	2.995				
Overall	25-35	2.918	1.480	0.220	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	2.836				
	46-55	2.913				
	56-above	2.903				

For the indicator of Accountability, the mean scores across age groups (25-35, 36-45, 46-55, and 56-above) were compared. The ANOVA test resulted in an F-value of 1.746 with a corresponding p-value of 0.158. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in Accountability scores across age groups is accepted, indicating that age does not significantly influence perceptions of Accountability.

Similarly, for the Transparency indicator, the ANOVA test yielded an F-value of 0.667 with a p-value of 0.573. As the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis that

there is no significant difference in Transparency scores across age groups is accepted. Thus, age does not have a significant effect on perceptions of Transparency.

For the Competitiveness indicator, the F-value was 2.463 with a corresponding p-value of 0.063. Although the p-value is slightly below the significance level, the difference is not significant enough to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, age does not significantly impact perceptions of Competitiveness.

Similarly, for the Responsibility indicator, the F-value was 0.176 with a p-value of 0.913, indicating that age does not have a significant influence on perceptions of Responsibility.

Overall, for the aggregated data, the ANOVA test resulted in an F-value of 1.480 with a p-value of 0.220. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in overall CSR assessment scores across age groups is accepted. Therefore, age does not play a significant role in shaping overall perceptions of CSR in the selected multinational company.

4.5.2. Data result of social innovation practices

Social innovation practices were measured and analyzed in terms of social technology, innovation intermediaries, people who drove innovation, and openness. T-tests or ANOVA were utilized to examine potential differences when respondents were grouped according to their profile [14,15].

Table 4 examines the differences in the extent of social innovation practices between male and female respondents.

Table 4. Differences in the extent of social innovation practices of the selected company in terms of sex.

Indicator	Sex	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Social Technology	Male Female	2.914 2.954	0.023	0.881	Accepted	Not Significant
Innovation Intermediarie-s	Male Female	3.012 3.006	3.734	0.054	Rejected	Significant
People Who Drive Innova-tion	Male Female	3.040 3.047	0.167	0.683	Accepted	Not Significant
Openness	Male Female	3.054 3.055	2.007	0.158	Accepted	Not Significant
Overall	Male Female	3.005 3.015	0.322	0.571	Accepted	Not Significant

For the Social Technology indicator, the mean scores for males and females were compared. The ANOVA test resulted in an F-value of 0.023 with a corresponding p-value of 0.881. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in Social Technology scores between genders is accepted. Therefore, gender does not significantly influence perceptions of Social Technology.

In contrast, for the Innovation Intermediaries indicator, the F-value was 3.734 with a p-value of 0.054. Although the p-value is slightly above the traditional significance level of 0.05, the difference in means is approaching significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, suggesting that there is a significant difference in perceptions of Innovation Intermediaries between males and females. For the People Who Drive Innovation indicator, the F-value was 0.167 with a corresponding p-value of 0.683, indicating no significant difference in perceptions between genders. Similarly, for the Openness indicator, the F-value

was 2.007 with a p-value of 0.158, suggesting that there is no significant difference in perceptions of Openness between males and females.

Overall, when considering the aggregated data across all indicators, the ANOVA test resulted in an F-value of 0.322 with a p-value of 0.571. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the overall extent of social innovation practices between genders is accepted [16]. Therefore, gender does not play a significant role in shaping overall perceptions of social innovation practices in the selected company.

Table 5 presents the differences in the extent of social innovation practices based on respondents' length of service within the selected company.

Table 5. Differences in the extent of social innovation practices of the selected company in terms of length of service.

Indicator	Length of Service	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Social Technology	1-5	2.938	0.341	0.796	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	2.902				
	11-15	2.978				
	16-above	2.935				
Innovation Intermediaries	1-5	2.986	8.425	0.000	Rejected	Significant
	6-10	2.995				
	11-15	3.192				
	16-above	2.769				
People Who Drive Innovation	1-5	3.083	0.529	0.663	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	3.008				
	11-15	3.032				
	16-above	3.059				
Openness	1-5	3.064	0.529	0.663	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10	3.033				
	11-15	3.115				
	16-above	2.978				
Overall	1-5	3.018	3.047	0.029	Rejected	Significant
	6-10	2.984				
	11-15	3.079				
	16-above	2.935				

Conversely, for the People Who Drive Innovation and Openness indicators, the ANOVA tests resulted in p-values of 0.663 and 0.663, respectively, indicating no significant differences in perceptions based on length of service.

When considering the aggregated data across all indicators (Overall), the F-value was 3.047 with a corresponding p-value of 0.029. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant difference in the overall extent of social innovation practices across different lengths of service. Thus, length of service does play a significant role in shaping overall perceptions of social innovation practices within the selected company [17].

Table 6 presents the post hoc analysis of the extent of social innovation practices in terms of social technology, people who drive innovation, and openness across different age groups within the organization.

Table 6. Post Hoc analysis of extent of social innovation practices.

Variable	Age	Age	Mean Difference	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpreta-tion
Social Technology	25-35	36-45	0.169	0.091	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.332*	0.000	Rejected	Significant
		56-above	0.117	0.423	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	25-35	-0.169	0.091	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.162	0.163	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	-0.052	0.892	Accepted	Not Significant
	46-55	25-35	-0.332*	0.000	Rejected	Significant
		36-45	-0.162	0.163	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	-0.214*	0.048	Rejected	Significant
	56-above	25-35	-0.117	0.423	Accepted	Not Significant
		36-45	0.052	0.892	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.214*	0.048	Rejected	Significant
People Who Drive Innovation	25-35	36-45	0.066	0.754	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	-0.028	0.982	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	0.228*	0.008	Rejected	Significant
	36-45	25-35	-0.066	0.754	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	-0.094	0.555	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	0.162	0.077	Accepted	Not Significant
	46-55	25-35	0.028	0.982	Accepted	Not Significant
		36-45	0.094	0.555	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	0.257*	0.004	Rejected	Significant
	56-above	25-35	-0.228*	0.008	Rejected	Significant
		36-45	-0.162	0.077	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	-0.257*	0.004	Rejected	Significant
Openness	25-35	36-45	-0.021	0.983	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.113	0.335	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	-0.074	0.640	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45	25-35	0.021	0.983	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.134	0.153	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	-0.052	0.815	Accepted	Not Significant
	46-55	25-35	-0.113	0.335	Accepted	Not Significant
		36-45	-0.134	0.153	Accepted	Not Significant
		56-above	-0.187*	0.029	Rejected	Significant
	56-above	25-35	0.074	0.640	Accepted	Not Significant
		36-45	0.052	0.815	Accepted	Not Significant
		46-55	0.187*	0.029	Accepted	Not Significant

For social technology practices, a significant difference was observed between the age group 46-55 and the other age groups (25-35, 36-45, and 55-above), indicating that individuals aged 46-55 exhibit significantly different levels of social technology utilization compared to other age cohorts. Similarly, for people who drive innovation, a significant difference was found between the age group 56-above and the other age groups, suggesting distinct levels of involvement in driving innovation among older employees. Additionally, a significant difference in openness practices was observed between the age group 56-above and the other age groups, indicating varying perceptions and implementations of openness in social innovation initiatives among older employees [18].

Conversely, for social technology and people who drive innovation practices, no significant differences were found between the other age group pairs. Similarly, for openness practices, no significant differences were observed between the age group pairs except for the comparison between the age group 46-55 and 56-above.

These findings suggest that age may influence specific aspects of social innovation practices within the organization, particularly in terms of social technology utilization, involvement in driving innovation, and openness to new ideas and approaches. Understanding these age-related differences can inform targeted strategies for promoting social innovation and leveraging the diverse capabilities and perspectives of employees across different age demographics. Further investigation may be necessary to explore the underlying factors contributing to these age-related variations in social innovation practices and their implications for organizational performance and effectiveness.

4.5.3. Data result of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and social innovation practices

Table 7 displays the correlation between the assessment of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the extent of Social Innovation Practices within the selected company.

Table 7. Correlation between assessment of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the extent of social innovation practices.

Variables	R	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Social innovation practices	0.051	0.369	Accepted	Not Significant

The correlation coefficient (R) of 0.051 suggests a very weak positive correlation between CSR and Social Innovation Practices. Furthermore, with a p-value of 0.369, the correlation is deemed statistically not significant. This implies that there is no meaningful relationship between the two variables based on the data analyzed.

The weak and statistically insignificant correlation ($R = 0.051$, $p = 0.369$) between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and the extent of Social Innovation Practices suggests that these two aspects of organizational behavior are not strongly associated with each other within the selected company. In other words, the level of emphasis or effectiveness in CSR initiatives does not appear to directly impact the extent to which the company engages in social innovation practices, and vice versa.

One possible explanation for this lack of correlation could be that CSR and social innovation are driven by different motivations, objectives, and internal dynamics within the organization. While CSR often focuses on fulfilling ethical responsibilities, managing stakeholder relationships, and mitigating negative impacts, social innovation typically revolves around generating novel solutions to societal challenges and fostering positive social change through innovative approaches. As a result, the strategies, resources, and structures that drive CSR may not necessarily align perfectly with those that promote social innovation.

Additionally, the lack of correlation could be attributed to the complexity and multifaceted nature of both CSR and social innovation. Each of these domains encompasses a wide range of activities, initiatives, and practices that may vary in scope, focus, and impact. Therefore, even within the same organization, certain CSR practices may be highly developed while social innovation practices remain relatively nascent, or vice versa.

Furthermore, organizational culture, leadership priorities, resource allocation, and external pressures can also influence the extent to which CSR and social innovation are pursued and integrated within the company. If CSR and social innovation are not strategically aligned or if there are competing priorities within the organization, it may hinder the establishment of a strong correlation between the two.

Overall, while both CSR and social innovation are important for addressing societal challenges and driving positive social change, their interrelationship within an organization can be complex and context-dependent. Further research and analysis are needed to delve deeper into the underlying factors shaping the relationship between CSR and social innovation and to identify potential strategies for enhancing their synergy and effectiveness within the organizational context.

5. Conclusion

The study provided insights into various aspects of the selected multinational company's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and social innovation practices, as well as how they are perceived by employees across different demographic groups.

The profile of respondents revealed a balanced representation across genders, diverse age groups, and varied tenure within the company, providing a comprehensive understanding of the study participants.

The study meticulously assessed the company's CSR initiatives across key dimensions, including accountability, transparency, competitiveness, and responsibility. The findings unveiled the company's proactive stance towards social and environmental stewardship, highlighting its efforts to integrate ethical practices, foster transparency, and uphold responsible business conduct. This comprehensive evaluation offered a nuanced understanding of the company's CSR performance and its alignment with stakeholder expectations.

Extent of Social Innovation Practices: In parallel, the study explored the company's social innovation practices, encompassing dimensions such as social technology utilization, engagement with innovation intermediaries, empowerment of innovation drivers, and promotion of openness. Through this analysis, the study illuminated the company's endeavors to harness innovation for social impact, foster collaboration with external stakeholders, and cultivate an organizational culture conducive to creativity and idea generation. Significant differences were observed in the assessment of CSR based on demographic factors such as sex, age, and years of service, indicating varying perceptions and expectations among employees.

Similarly, significant differences were noted in the extent of social innovation practices based on demographic factors, highlighting disparities in perception and engagement with social innovation initiatives across different groups of employees.

The analysis revealed a non-significant correlation between CSR assessment and the extent of social innovation practices. This finding suggests that while the company may excel in certain aspects of CSR, such as accountability and transparency, it may not necessarily translate into heightened engagement or innovation in social impact initiatives. This underscores the complexity of organizational dynamics and the need for a multifaceted approach to foster both CSR and social innovation synergistically.

References

1. E. Amanatidou, D. Gagliardi, and D. Cox, "Social engagement: Towards a typology of social innovation," *MIOIR / MBS Working Paper Series*, 2018, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.28787.84002.
2. M. W. Allen and C. A. Craig, "Rethinking corporate social responsibility in the age of climate change: A communication perspective," *Int. J. Corp. Soc. Responsib.*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s40991-016-0002-8.
3. N. Choi and X. Yu, Social Innovation for Sustainable Development: Challenges and Solutions in Asia. Routledge, 2019. ISBN: 9783642365393
4. G. Cheney, S. May, and D. Munshi, *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*. Routledge, 2011. ISBN: 9780415994644.
5. R. Adams, S. Jeanrenaud, J. Bessant, D. Denyer, and P. Overy, "Sustainability-oriented innovation: A systematic review," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 180-205, 2016, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12068.
6. B. M. Bass, "Leadership: Good, better, best," *Organiz. Dyn.*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 26-40, 1985, doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2.
7. G. Mulgan, S. Tucker, R. Ali, and B. Sanders, "Social innovation: What it is, why it matters, and how it can be accelerated," Oxford: The Young Foundation, 2007. ISBN: 9781905551033.

8. C. B. Bhattacharya, S. Sen, and D. Korschun, "Using corporate social responsibility to win the war for talent," *MIT Sloan Manag. Rev.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 37-44, 2008. [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2333549. [Accessed: Feb. 7, 2025].
9. M. Gasparin, W. Green, S. Lilley, M. Quinn, M. Saren, and C. Schinckus, "Business as unusual: A business model for social innovation," *J. Bus. Res.*, Vol.125, pp. 698-709, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.01.034.
10. S. Bureau and D. Montgomery, *Social Innovation: Comparative Perspectives*. Routledge, 2018. ISBN: 9781315158020.
11. A. B. Carroll, "The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholder," *Bus. Horiz.*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 39-48, 1991, doi: 10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G.
12. J. A. Phills, K. Deiglmeier, and D. T. Miller, "Rediscovering social innovation," *Stanford Social Innovation*, 2008. [Online]. Available: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/rediscovering_social_innovation. [Accessed: Feb. 7, 2025].
13. A. Field, Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. SAGE, 2013. ISBN: 9781526419514.
14. C. H. Chen, "The major components of corporate social responsibility," *J. Glob. Responsib.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 85-99, 2011, doi: 10.1108/20412561111128546.
15. R. W. Cox, Environmental Communication and the Public Sphere. SAGE Publications, 2013. ISBN: 9781412992091.
16. P. Oeij, W. van der Torre, F. Vaas, and S. Dhondt, "Understanding social innovation as an innovation process: Applying the innovation journey model," *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 101, no. 8, pp. 243-254, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.028.
17. I. Rabbat and R. Paul, "Seven elements of social innovation: A new framework emerges for social innovation education," *Stanford Social Innov. Rev.*, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/seven_elements_of_social_innovation#. [Accessed: Feb. 7, 2025].
18. D. B. Resnik, "What is ethics in research & why is it important," *National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences*, 2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis. [Accessed: Feb. 7, 2025].