CHAPTER - 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

About the Chapter

Data Analysis and Interpretation is an important part in the total research process as the various parameters of the problems are presented in a systematic and sequential order of importance as per the design of the research after the process of thorough editing, coding and classification of both quantitative and qualitative data to arrive at conclusions in a coherent and meaningful manner.

Various statistical techniques and tools are applied to establish relationship between the variables and arrive at logical inference and deduction through tabulations and graphical presentation of data.

For the present study the Data Interpretation and Analysis has been structured and split into two sections

Part One: Part I of the Chapter is presented in two sections. Section I deals with the profile of the organizations and respondents under study. Section II deals with presentation of the data through single frequency distribution along with graphical presentations for the following variables under Study. The aim of the single frequency distribution and presentation aims at identifying and tracing the exact picture on the responses on various dimensions under the study and is most appropriate for a descriptive and exploratory study to have insights into the qualitative dimensions. alongwith quantification of data to arrive at findings.

Part Two: Part II of the Chapter is also split into two sections.

Sections I deals with the bivariate tables and chi square analysis. The dependent variable mentioned above have been analyzed with three independent variables viz. Age, Education and Designation of Respondents

Section II deals with overall analysis and presentation of the data though use of P Charts for percentage positive response and classification of data into areas of excellence results, average results and areas of improvement, at a glance tables of various significant areas emerging from chi square analysis in descending order and overall graphical presentations through parameter wise split up of
significant chi square tables along, designation and experience wise analysis and Area Charts to reveal emerging results arising in major areas of the Study

Various techniques used for analyzing the data along with its description is mentioned below.

DATA PROCESSING TREATMENT AND ANALYSIS:

- Data has been analyzed through use of SPSS package to analyze the data. Various statistical techniques have been used such as
  - **Univariate Analysis** using Simple Frequency Distribution to find out average responses as a measure of central tendency.
  - **Chi square test** for finding out association between independent and dependent variables under the Study.
  - **Paired T test** – to find out whether the responses to selected questions are differing significantly.
  - **Pareto Chart analysis** - Chart for classifying the attributes into descending order so as to find the main source, areas of concentration in the response and main weightage.
  - **P Chart Analysis** – Chart for attributes used for the yes/no questions. It is a chart for attributes which shows percentage of positive responses for yes and no questions through the questionnaire, the excellent, very good and areas of improvement are highlighted using control limits for better insights into the data.
  - **Coefficient of Variation** – to find out the relative measure of dispersion for rank analysis.
  - **Graphical Presentations** – for frequency and percentage analysis.
### PART 1

#### ORGANISATION PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: List of Industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  20 microns               | 36  GE Plastics  
| 2  Asea Brown Boveri India Ltd. | 37  General Motors India Pvt Ltd.  
| 3  ABC Ltd.                 | 38  Gujarat Heavy Chemicals Ltd.  
| 4  Acme Chemicals           | 39  Gujarat Industrial Power Corporation Ltd.  
| 5  Alembic Ltd.             | 40  Gujarat Machinery Manufactures.  
| 6  Alstom Power Ltd.        | 41  Grasim Pvt. Ltd.  
| 7  Amul Dist. M.J. Ltd.     | 42  Gujarat Reclam & Rubber Products Ltd.  
| 8  Apar Industries Ltd.     | 43  Gujarat State Fertilizer & Chemicals Ltd.  
| 9  Apollo Hospital International Ltd. | 44  Guj Antibiotics Ltd.  
| 10 Apollo Tyres Ltd.        | 45  Gujarat Containers Pvt. Ltd.  
| 11 Aventis Pharma Ltd.      | 46  Gujarat Fluro Chemicals Ltd.  
| 12 Avike Pharmaceutical Ltd. | 47  Gujbrandson Chemicals Ltd.  
| 13 Baan Pharma              | 48  Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Ltd.  
| 14 Barn organics            | 49  Guj Antibiotics Ltd.  
| 15 Baroda Dairy Cooperative | 50  Hemani organics  
| 16 Bayer ABS Pvt. Ltd.      | 51  Hikal Chemicals Pvt Ltd.  
| 17 Bayer Diagnostic         | 52  Hindustan Mega Cobar Chemicals Ltd.  
| 18 Bell Granito Ceramica Ltd. | 53  Industrial Carbon Ltd.  
| 19 Birla Cellulose          | 54  Intas Biotech Ltd.  
| 20 Birla NGK Insulator Ltd. | 55  Intas Biotech Ltd.  
| 21 Blue Star Ltd.           | 56  Intas Pharma Ltd.  
| 22 Bundy India Ltd.         | 57  Intas Pharma Ltd.  
| 23 Cadila (Zydus) Ltd.      | 58  Intas Pharma Ltd.  
| 24 Calonix Ltd.             | 59  Intas Pharma Ltd.  
| 25 Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. | 60  Intas Pharma Ltd.  
| 26 Cheminova Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. | 61  JCT Electronics  
| 27 Comed Chemicals          | 62  JCT Electronics  
| 28 E.I. DuPont. Pvt. Ltd. (MNC) | 63  JCT Electronics  
| 29 Elecon Engg. Ltd.        | 64  KAPL -Indian Oil Corporation Ltd  
| 30 FAG Bearings India Ltd.  | 65  KAPL -Indian Oil Corporation Ltd  
| 31 Fortune Infotech         | 66  KAPL -Indian Oil Corporation Ltd  
| 32 Gujarat Alkalies & Chemicals Ltd. | 67  KAPL -Indian Oil Corporation Ltd  
| 33 GAIL (India) Ltd.        | 68  Lofan petrochem  
| 34 Gallyor Thyonil Ltd.     | 69  Luna Chemicals  
| 35 GE (India) industrial Pvt. Ltd. | 70  Madura Coats  
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The above table highlights the list of Industries covered for Data Collection, total number of industries and respondents from twelve districts of Gujarat.

**Table : II  District wise classification (with no. of Industries and Respondents covered)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baroda</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharuch</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amdavad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamnagar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehsana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajkot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of Industries = 103
Total No. of Respondents = 117

(With extended units of few companies)
The table elicits the details of industries and respondents in that a total of 103 industries have been covered with 117 number of respondents. Majority of Industries 59.22%(61) have been covered from Baroda District with 61.53(72) no of respondents followed by Bharuch 25.24%(26) with 23.07(27) no of respondents to a moderate extent. Amongst other districts were Ahmedabad with 4.88%(4) industries and 5.12%(6) respondents, Anand with 2.91%(3) industries and 2.56%(3) respondents, Vapi with 1.94%(2) industries and 1.70%(2) respondents, and other Industries in Jamnagar, Mehsana, Rajkot, Panchmahal, Porbandar, Gandhinagar and Bhuj district with one industry 0.97% (1) and one respondents 0.85%(1) each.
Baroda & Bharuch districts are occupying 84.62% of total industries under consideration.

Baroda & Bharuch districts are occupying 84.67% of total respondents under consideration.
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### Table: Constitution of Industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Public Ltd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Partnership / Joint</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Private Ltd</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] MNC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Co-operative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 103 100%

The above table elicits the constitution of Industries in that majority of the Industries 80.58% (83) were Private sector Industries, about 3.88% (4) were Public Sector Industries, 4.85% (5) industries each from Partnership/Joint and Service Sector and about 2.91% (3) were from Cooperative Sector and MNCs.
The above table reveals that majority of the industries were from Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals sector with 45.30%(53), followed by Manufacturing and others 27.35%(31), engineering with 17.09%(20) followed by Petrochemicals with 5.98%(7) and Service sector with 4.27%(5) respectively.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table V: Sector: Manufacturing & Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic related</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birla NGK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic tiles mfg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting mfg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical equipment mfg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermoplastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 5

--- 199 ---
The above table reveals that majority of the industries were from manufacturing and others were Electronics with 18.75% (6) and Plastics related with 12.50% (4) and other industries as reflected in the table.

Table VI  Age (in Years) of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] 25 to 30 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 31 to 35 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 36 to 40 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 41 to 45 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 46 to 50 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] 51 to 55 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] 56 to 60 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] 61 to 65 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] 66 to 67 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10] No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The above table reveals the age of respondents in that majority of the respondents 27.35% (32) are in the age group of 36-40 years, followed by respondents in the age group of 31-35 years 18.80% (22) and respondents in the age group of 46-50 years with 15.38% (18) followed by 6.84% (8) respondents in the age group of 25-30 years. There are 4.27% (5) respondents each in the age group of 51-55 years and 56-60 years and 0.85% (1) respondents in the age group of 66-67 years. 5.98% (7) respondents did not respond.
The graphical presentation reveals that 52.99% (62) respondents fall between the age group of 25-40 years and 47.00% respondents fall in the age group of 41-67 Years.

Table: VII Education of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Below graduation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Graduation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Post graduation</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Additional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 7

The above table reveals that majority of the respondents 86.32% (101) had education up to post graduation and only 5.98% (7) respondents had education up to graduation level. About 6.84% (8) did not respond. Thus the level of education has been high for all the respondents under study.
The above table reveals the designation of respondents in that majority of them were managers with 50.43%(59), followed by head of the depts. With 12.82%(15) and general managers with 9.40%(11). The no. of respondents above general managers is 4.27%(5) and below managers is 16.23%(19).
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The at a glance split of respondents reveals that 33.33% (39) respondents are senior managers holding various positions and 66.67% (78) respondents include managers and staff.

Table IX  At a glance split up of designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Senior managers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Managers &amp; staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The at a glance split of respondents reveals that 33.33 (39) respondents are senior managers holding various positions and 66.67% (78) respondents include managers and staff.

Graph 9

[Graph showing percentage and frequency of senior managers, managers & staff, and total]
Table: X  Total Work Experience in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] 2 to 16 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 17 to 40 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the experience of respondents in that 52.14%(61) respondents had experience of 2-16 years and 47.86%(56) respondents had experience of 2-16 years.
Scales Used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale : 1</th>
<th>Scale : 2</th>
<th>Scale : 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI = Very Important</td>
<td>SA = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>NA = Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I = Important</td>
<td>A = Agree</td>
<td>TSE = To Some Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI = Some what Important</td>
<td>N = Neutral</td>
<td>NE = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI = Less Important</td>
<td>D = Disagree</td>
<td>ME = Moderate Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI = Not Important</td>
<td>SD = Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>GE = Great Extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A – CSR Basic Awareness

Table : 11 Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>To a Little extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Are you familiar with the term Corporate Social Responsibility?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 If your answer is Yes, your view with respect to below statements is</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meeting Shareholder interests / Employee Interests</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reducing negative environmental impact caused by the Company</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reducing negative social impact caused by the company</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Good relations with Neighboring areas</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Paying legitimate Taxes / dues</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Maximizing Raw Material efficiency</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>VI %</td>
<td>I %</td>
<td>SI %</td>
<td>LI %</td>
<td>NI %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donating to charity / Adopting a village / Supporting a school / Village</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept where we integrate social &amp; environmental concerns in our business</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64.96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare and development of employee / worker and his family</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64.96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to pay bribes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67.52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially responsible investing by business</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 11
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The table shows the familiarity of respondents with the term Corporate Social Responsibility in that 65 (55.56) were thoroughly aware about corporate social responsibility 47 (40.17%) were aware to a little extent and 5 (4.27%) were not aware.

The table reveals as opined by the respondents majority of the respondents believed CSR meant paying legitimate taxes with 85 (72.65%) stating it as very important and 21 (17.95%) as important, refusing to pay bribes with 79 (67.52%), stating it as very important and 19 (16.24%) as important, concept where we integrate social and environmental concerns in business with 76 (64.96%) stating it as very important and 25 (21.37%) as important, keeping good relations with neighbourhood communities with 74 (63.25%) stating it as very important and 30 (25.64%) as important, welfare and development of employees with 76 (64.96%) stating it as very important and 28 (23.93%) as important, reducing negative environmental effects with 64 (54.70%), stating it as very important and 29 (24.79%) as important socially responsible interest and about 15 (12.82%) did not respond to CSR as socially responsible investing with 70 (59.83%), stating it as very important and 18 (15.38%) as important, donating to charity with 51 (43.59%), stating it as very important and 27 (23.08%) as important and lastly meeting shareholder interests with only 41 (35.04%), stating it as very important and 26 (22.22%) as important. It is striking to note that as many as 17 (14.53%) opined donation to charity as less important and 6 (5.13%) as not important About 41 (35.04%) gave no response for CSR meaning as meeting shareholders investing.

Thus it is clearly observed that respondents have given more weightage to areas like corporate ethics and corporate governance, integrating social and environmental concerns in business, community relations, employee welfare and development, reducing environmental impact than areas
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

like donating to charity and meeting shareholders interest. A clear shift from corporate philanthropy to responsible corporate social behaviour is observed. Two distinct areas that is meeting shareholders interest and socially responsible investing have higher response in the no response category revealing that either respondents prefer to remain silent on the issue particularly for the first since it involves company brand image and reputation however the respondents showed low awareness of socially responsible investing thereby higher no response rate.

**Table : 12 Focus of CSR function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.</th>
<th>The focus of CSR function in your company is</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the focus of the CSR function in the company's in that 34.18%(40) respondents have focus on environmental aspect, 29.05%(34) have focus on social aspects and 36.75% (43) respondents have focus on both social and environmental aspects revealing companies contribution in addressing the environmental and social issues to positively impact the surrounding environment.
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Table : 13 Terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR in your company is better known as</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Business Ethics</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corporate Citizenship</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Corporate Accountability</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph : 13

When asked how is CSR known in the company majority of the respondents 78(66.67) strongly agreed and 27(23.08%) agreed that it is known as Corporate Accountability followed by 73(62.39%) who strongly agreed and 29(24.79%) agreed that it is known as Corporate Citizenship. About 44 (37.61%) strongly agreed and 23(19.66%) agreed that it is known as Business Ethics. The table reveals a striking response with 27(23.08%) who disagree to CSR as Business ethics and 7(5.98%) who strongly disagree. About 11(9.40%), 7(5.98%) and 6 (5.13%) gave neutral response reflecting mixed views. The no response category varied between 4-5%.
The above table reveals that 58 (56.31%) companies contribute to community and social development, 38 (36.89%) companies contribute to a small extent and almost 21 (20.39%) does not contribute to community and social development but other areas like environment, disaster training, employee welfare programmes etc. Majority of the industries were contributing in several ways for the...
welfare and development of the workers as revealed by 69 (58.97\%) responses to a very great extent and 14 (11.97\%) to a moderate extent, followed by planning and undertaking need based community programmes with 62 (52.99\%), to a very great extent and 22 (18.0\%) to a moderate extent, another area scoring high is working towards health, education and community development with programmes with 62 (52.99\%), to a very great extent and 24 (20.15\%) to a moderate extent. Where responses for reducing negative environmental impact were 59 (50.43\%) to a great extent and 22 (18.0\%) to a moderate extent. It was observed that responses were comparatively lower in areas like promoting social equity with 44 (37.61\%) to a great extent category and 15 (12.82\%) in the moderate extent category, however a no response rate was higher in this category with 29 (24.79\%) not responding. Thus the table gives a fairly clear-cut picture of the areas where the companies make their contributions.

**Table : 15 Need & Emergence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since how many years the corporate is contributing its Social Responsibility</th>
<th>&lt; 5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-11</th>
<th>12-15</th>
<th>&gt;15</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph : 15**

The above table reveals the time span and total period with the number of years the corporate has contributed to CSR to understand the processes and impact, it reveals that majority of the industries with 47 (40.17\%) were into CSR for less than five years but minimum one year, however it is
glaring to note that about 21 (17.95%) had contributed for more than 15 years with Tata and Birla group amongst the major followed by companies like Alembic, Sarabhai, Cadila, ABB, and others.

**Table 16** Factors which led to the Emergence of the need for community based programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Selected</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Concern for workers improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poverty &amp; issues in Health, education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Company’s willingness to support community problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Corporate Philanthropy &amp; charity concern</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Social progress &amp; growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Improving company’s image</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Global Market pressures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst the factors which led to the need and emergence of CSR majority of the respondents opined that it was concern for workers improvement with 78 (66.67%), to a very great extent and 17 (14.53%) to a moderate extent, another major factor has been improving company’s image as opined by 73 (62.39%) to a very great extent and 14 (11.97%) to a moderate extent, global market pressures and company’s willingness to support the communities, poverty and issues of health and education are another major factors with 62 (52.99%), 60 (51.28%) and 52 (44.44%) to a very great extent category in the respective three areas.
A striking feature noted is low response for the corporate philanthropy with only 29(24.97%) to a great extent and as many as 34(29.06%) in the not at all category showing a transition of companies from undertaking CSR activities with charity based or philanthropic approach to a better understanding and response of the social realities and role of business in demonstrating good behaviour as a corporate citizen by being sensitive to the stark social realities around and understanding the need of social performance of the company with rising standards and global market pressures.

Table : 17 Corporate Social Responsibility initiative of company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Social Responsibility initiative in your company is attributed to</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>% SE</th>
<th>% N</th>
<th>% ME</th>
<th>% GE</th>
<th>% NR</th>
<th>% T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Board of Directors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Top Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Govt. Rules &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professional staff</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Company's guiding philosophy in rendering social services

The Company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social services has been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company's guiding philosophy</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Philanthropy / Voluntary / Tradition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Remedial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Protective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Welfare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Empowerment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Business return through Socially responsible Investing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 18

The company's guiding philosophy behind CSR reveals a major trend in that it is less philanthropic, remedial and protective and more welfare, development and empowerment oriented. The responses clearly depict a major shift in that majority responded that guiding philosophy behind CSR was welfare with 81 (69.23%) to a very great extent category and 18 (15.38%) to a moderate category, followed by development with 71 (60.68%) to a very great extent category and 27 (23.08%) to a moderate extent category and empowerment with 68 (58.12%) to a very great extent and 18 (15.38%) to a moderate extent category. Another positive response noted is 40 (34.19%) have attributed CSR
guiding philosophy as business return through socially responsible investing. The no response category has been higher for philanthropy with 44(37.61%) and business returns through socially responsible investing with 24(20.51%) responses. Thus it is clearly observed that majority of the Industries have welfare, development and empowerment perspective while undertaking CSR.

Table: 19 Companies beliefs and CSR Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your company through its CSR Programme believes (Kindly Rank)</th>
<th>R 1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R 3</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R 4</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addressing &amp; challenging barriers, in equalities &amp; injustice that exist in society</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In providing primary &amp; basic infrastructure support for community development</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving capacities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In creating social , legal awareness for human rights &amp; empowerment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing quality of lives of the poor with ultimate goal of self reliance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In community capacity Building Leadership participation &amp; Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of care for senior citizens persons with mental / physical disabilities, socio economic backward class</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the industries through its CSR programme believe in enhancing quality of life with 40(34.19%), and providing primary and basic infrastructure facilities with 38(32.48%) respondents giving rank one,
Followed by addressing challenging barriers and care of needy and senior citizen with 22(18.80%) and community capacity building with 21(17.95%) giving rank one. A mixed response was observed with responses in rank two three and four for various reasons. It is observed that the no response category is high as respondents did not give rank specified.

### Table: 20 Company’s goal in rendering contribution to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society is</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enhancement of company’s profile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Better alignment to corporate Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Compliances with statutory rules</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enhancing organizational Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Leverage Industrial profits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To positively impact the areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Build market image</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Enhance shareholders values</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals different goals of the company with mixed responses in that majority of the respondents opined that the basic goal of the company in undertaking CSR activity is compliances with statutory rules with 68(58.12%) responding to a great extent and 17(14.53%) to a moderate extent followed by two major goals of better alignment with corporate goals and building market image with 63(53.85%) to a great extent in the both the categories and 26(22.22%) & 20(17.09%) to a moderate extent respectively. Other goals given equal weightage is enhancing organizational health & positively impacting the surrounding areas with 61(52.14%) to a great extent and 29(24.79%) to a moderate extent similarly enhancement of the company profile and leveraging industrial profits were also responded as major goals with 60(51.28%) responding to a very great extent in both the categories, and 23(19.66%) and 14(11.97%) to a moderate extent respectively.
### Table: 21 Company Values & CSR Practises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTISES</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Honesty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transparency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Acceptance of people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faith in inherent worth, dignity of people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Faith in capability of people for change and development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 People's participation, self determination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Empathy &amp; understanding for depressed group and class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Empowering attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Respect for people with diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals a very high response for upholding values viz Honesty with 97(82.91%) to a very great extent followed by values like Integrity ,transparency, commitment, acceptance of people with 96(82.5%),95(81.20%), 93(79.49%)and 90(76.92%)responding to a very great extent respectively.
Amongst other values upheld were faith in inherent worth and dignity of people with 82(70.09%) responding to a very great extent, faith in capability of people with 80(68.38%) responding to a very great extent, 74(63.25%) and 73(62.39%) respondents responded to values like peoples participation and self determination and respect for people with diverse background to a very great extent respectively followed by values like empathy and understanding and empowerment with 65(55.56%) and 64(54.70%) responding to a very great extent respectively.
Table 22: Approach of the company towards corporate social responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach of company with its social responsibilities is</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Traditional: Yes [30, 25.64%]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modern: Yes 69, 58.98%, No response 18 [15.38]</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Well devised management structure &amp; operation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional staff to handle CSR functions</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our company has very good image in workers community in near by villages</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People rarely approach our functionaries to share their problems and difficulties</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA %</td>
<td>A %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>D %</td>
<td>SD %</td>
<td>NR %</td>
<td>T %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There are several indirect advantages to the company due to CSR functions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In times of emergencies people look forward for industrial response.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There is a need for adequate training component for CSR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CSR function has in our company has played &amp; important roll in building corporate image</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As far as approach of the company for CSR is concerned 30(25.64%) responded that it is traditional and majority of them responded that it is modern with 69(8.98%) about 18(15.38%) gave no response.

With respect to various factors it can be revealed that majority of the companies responded to the statements with 67(57.26%) and 30(25.64%) strongly agreeing and agreeing that the company has a very good image, 65(55.56%) and 37(31.62%) strongly agreeing and agreeing that corporate and community relations over the years strengthened, 64(54.70%) and 38(32.48%) strongly agreeing and agreeing that in times of emergencies people look forward for corporate level support, 57(48.72%) and 30(25.64%) strongly agreeing and agreeing that there are several indirect advantages, almost 50(42.74%) and 20(17.09%) strongly agreed and agreed that people rarely approach our functionaries with their problems revealing poor participation of the people in the programme, about 47(40.17%) strongly agreed that CSR function has played and important role and there is need for training in CSR and about 30(25.64%) and 33(28.21%) agreeing to the respective statements, about 45(38.46%) and 19(16.24%) strongly agreeing and agreeing that the company has clear and strong philosophy for CSR, whereas almost 32(27.35%) strongly disagreed to the statement, and about 44(37.61%) and 25(21.37%) strongly agreed and agreed that companies have a well devised management structure for CSR whereas almost 30(25.64%) strongly disagreed. Only 33(28.21%) and 21(17.95%) strongly agreed and agreed that their companies have professional staff to handle CSR functions whereas 30(25.64%) strongly disagreed. Thus it can be inferred that areas of improvement are in helping companies have clear CSR philosophy and policy, a proper management structure and professional staff to discharge the functions.
### Table 23: Motivational factors for corporate involvement in social responsibility.

In your opinion what are the factors, which has motivated your company for involvement in Social Responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Factors</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve / Protect business reputation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and managing business risk and attracting and retaining motivated employees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve attractiveness to investors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers interests / pressures</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral reasons</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve long term company profit</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal expectation.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: 23**
Amongst the major factors which has motivated the companies to undertake CSR activities are improving long term company profit with 51(43.59%) strongly agreeing and 36(30.77%) agreeing to the statement followed by societal expectation with 49(41.88%)and 51(43.59%) in the strongly agreed and agreed category, other factors included moral reasons with 45(38.46%)and 29(24.79%) in the respective categories, factors like customers interest & pressures, improving attractiveness to investors and understanding and managing business risk have been attributed 36(30.77%)and 29(24.79%),30(25.64%)and 41(35.04%) and 34(29.06%) and 45(38.46%)in the strongly agreed and agreed category of the respective three factors however 24(20.51 %)22(18.80%) and 17(14.53%) strongly disagreed to these respective factors . About 25(21.37%)and 47(40.17%) strongly agreed and agreed that it is also to improve /protect business reputation whereas almost 22(18.80%) disagreed.

Table : 24 Factors driving move towards Corporate Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your opinion what are the factors driving the move towards CSR (Kindly Rank)</th>
<th>R 1</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>R 3</th>
<th>R 4</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 New concerns &amp; expectations from citizens, consumers, public authorities &amp; investors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Social criteria are increasingly influencing the investment decision</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Increased concern about the damage cost by economic activity to social &amp; physical environment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transparency of business activities brought about by media and modern communication technology</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the factors driving the move towards CSR in that majority of the respondents i.e. 63 (53.85%) gave 1st rank to transparency of business, followed by new concerns & expectations from citizens, consumers with 25 (21.37%), increase concern on the damage caused to the environment with 15 (12.82%) giving 1st rank and social criteria influencing the investment decision with 7 (5.98%) giving 1st rank. A horizontal rankwise analysis reveals that transparency of business and new concerns & expectations from citizens and consumers have been ranked as first 63 (53.85%) and second 43 (36.75%), factors driving the move towards CSR. However, majority of the respondents have given rank three 51 (43.59%) to social criteria increasingly influencing business and majority have given rank four 47 (40.17%) increased concern over damage caused to the environment and society by industries.
### Table: 25 Awareness on external standards in CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability AA1000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global reporting Initiative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Accountability 8000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Global Compact</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Guidelines for Multination Enterprise</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle for Global Corporate responsibility</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caux round table</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Sullivan Principle</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keidanran Charter for Good corporate behaviour</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific (APEC) Business Code</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is glaring to note that majority of the respondents showed very low awareness on CSR standards with an average of 51.5% not aware about the various standard in CSR about and 40-42% did not respond due to the same. Amongst the various standards majority of the respondents were aware about Social accountability SA 8000 with 11(9.40%)to a great extent and 9(7.69%) to a moderate extent followed by extent of awareness on Principles for Global Corporate behaviour with 9(7.69%) to a great extent and 10(8.55%)to a moderate extent, united nations global compact with 6(5.13%) to a great extent and 15(12.82%) to a moderate extent and Asia pacific business code with 6(5.13%) to a great extent and 9(7.69%) to a moderate extent amongst others to follow are global reporting initiative with 4(3.42%) aware to a great extent and 7(5.98%) aware to a moderate extent. Awareness about other standards such as OECD guidelines for Multinational enterprises, Caux round table, global sullivan principles, keidanran charter for good behaviour etc was minimal.

Table : 26 Corporate ISO Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you obtained ISO 9000,14000 etc</th>
<th>Yes 49 [41.88]</th>
<th>No 8 [6.8]</th>
<th>NR 60 [51.28%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The table reveals that 49(41.88%) industries had obtained ISO standards however almost 60(51.28%) did not respond and only 8(6.8%) did not have ISO standards, the higher rate of no response revealed the company's unwillingness to share the information.

Table : 27 Advantages / Benefits of ISO Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel that the adoption of above standards have</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Boosted Domestic Sales</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Boosted Exports</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enabled More efficient Mfg</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86.32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enhance company image</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brought indirect business returns</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 None of the above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals that the respondents have given positive response on the advantages that a company has through adoption of various ISO standards in that majority of the respondents 101 (86.32%) opined that it has enabled more efficient manufacturing, followed by boost in exports and domestic sales with 98 (83.76%) and 97 (82.91%), amongst other important factors were enhancement of company’s image 93 (79.49%), and indirect business returns with 90 (76.92%), the negative responses were to the extent of an average of 4 (3.42%), the no response category varied from 11 (9.40%) to 23 (19.66%).
Table : 28  Corporate Quality Assurance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Quality Assurance Standards are</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Your own internal standards</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Individually agreed with customer</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76.07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Established Indian Standards</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Established overseas Standards</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 None of the above</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The quality assurance standards adopted by the company are in majority of the companies established Indian standards with 91(77.78%) and international standards 91(77.78%) followed by standards individually agreed with the customers with 89(76.07%) whereas other standards than those mentioned in the table amounted to 34(29.06%). The rate of no response was high.

Table : 29  Pressures on Corporate from Buyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are exporting, have you buyers insisted or pressured you to adopt</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Special Environmental standards</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Special Social Standards</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other type of standards</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat
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The table depicts to what extent the buyers insist or pressurize industries for adoption of various standards, in that majority of them insist on special social standards with 53(45.30%) responding yes and about 46(39.32%) responding no and special environmental standards with 46(39.32%) responding yes and an equal number responding no and others type of standards with 31(26.50%) responding yes and about 50(42.74%) responding no.

Table : 30 Corporate views on need to draw CSR Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Possibility or Feasibility</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Desirability</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Value, is it worth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Effect on your International local competitiveness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat
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With respect to drawing CSR code and the extent of its possibility/feasibility, desirability and value whether it is worth it can be noted that there are mixed responses with almost 10(8.55%) & 9(7.69%) responding that it is feasible to a moderate and great extent however majority almost 38(32.48%) responded that it is not feasible and 29(24.79%) responded that it is feasible to some extent, 11(9.40%) gave neutral responses and about 20(17.09%) did not respond.

As far as the desirability is concerned 17(14.53%) & 14(11.97%) responded to a moderate and great extent however majority almost 39(33.33%) responded that it is not feasible and 14(11.97%) responded that it is feasible to some extent, 13(11.11%) gave neutral responses and about 20(17.09%) did not respond.

A striking response is noted for the value of CSR code and its worth, with majority 66(56.41%) responding to a great extent and 14(11.97%) responding to a moderate extent. Responses in the other category are very low, and about 21(17.95%) did not respond.

As far as the effect of CSR code on the international and local competitiveness of the industry is concerned majority of them did not respond with 39(33.33%) followed by response in the not at all category with 26(22.22%), about 21(17.95%) responded to some extent, 8(6.84%) gave neutral; responses, however 17(14.53%) and 6(5.13%) responded to a moderate and a great extent respectively.
The above table reflects the opinion of the respondents with respect to which agency is best suited to draw the CSR code and monitor the CSR code in that majority of the respondents opined that International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) were best suited to draw the standards with 54(46.15%), followed by Indian Govt ministry of commerce and Industries with 45(38.46%) amongst others were United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) with 38(32.47%) ,any Indian and any international organization with 37(31.62%) and...
36(30.76%), World Trade Organization with 35(29.91%) and International Labour Organization with 31(26.49%).

With respect to monitoring the standards majority of the respondents opined International Labour Organisation with 37(31.62%) followed by any international organization 31(26.49%) and International Organisation for Standardization with 29(24.78%) , any Indian organization with 26(22.22%) and World Trade Organisation with 18(15.38%) amongst others were United Nations Cooperation for trade and industries (UNCTAD), Bureau of Indian Standards with 15(12.82%), Indian govt min of commerce & industry with 14(11.96%) and others viz. UNEP, UNIDO etc. Thus a clear difference was observed between the agencies suggested for drawing the standards and those for monitoring the standards.
31.A TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS USING PAIRED 'T' TEST

Null Hypothesis [ H1 ] : There is no significant difference between the drawup standard & monitor standards.

Alternate hypothesis [ K1 ] : There is a significant difference between the drawup standard & monitor standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Draw up std</th>
<th>Monitor std</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total no. of parameters = n = 10

Average Draw up std : 24.2 Monitor std : 14.9

D' Bar = -9.3 [Average Difference obtained]

S = 11.05591 [Sample standard deviation]

't' Calculated = 2.66 ' & ' t' Tabulated = 2.228

Level of Significance = 5 % = Alpha value

Findings : Since, ' t ' Calculated value is > the ' t ' tabulated value, at 5 % level of the Null Hypothesis [ H1 ] & find that. There is significant difference between drawup the standard and monitor the standard.

The responses received for drawup standards are significantly higher than that for monitoring them. BIS, ISO, UNIDO & Indian govt may be given priority for concentrating on monitoring the standards. For ILO & UNCTAD, monitoring is stronger as compared with drawing up the standard.
Table: 32 Opinion on key developments for growing importance to CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>R1 %</th>
<th>R2 %</th>
<th>R3 %</th>
<th>R4 %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Global market, LPG scenario</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Public and various stakeholders have more expectation from business</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Engagement of corporate with different stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Proliferation of codes, std. And guidelines in CSR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Expansion of corporate accountability through out value chain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals the extent to which the above mentioned key developments can be attributed for growing importance to CSR by corporate in that Global market and LPG scenario have been given.
rank one and rank two by majority of the respondents with 64(54.70%) and 22(18.80%), expectations of public and various stakeholders has been given rank two and rank three with 29(24.79%) and 23(19.66%), engagement of corporate with different stakeholders has been given rank three by majority with 31(26.50%), proliferation of codes have been given rank four by majority 30(25.64%) followed by rank with 25(21.37%), expansion of corporate accountability throughout the value chain has been given rank two with 45(38.46%), followed by rank one with 18(15.38%), however in all global market pressures and LPG scenario have been given the highest rank.

Table : 33 Rating of bottom line benefits of socially responsible corporate performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you rate the following bottom line benefits of socially responsible corporate performance?</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Improved financial performance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reduced operating cost</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enhanced brand image &amp; reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Increased sales &amp; customer royalty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Increased productivity &amp; Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Increased ability to attract &amp; retain employees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reduced regulatory oversight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Access to capital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the ratings of respondents on the bottom line benefits of CSR in that majority have opined increased productivity and increased ability to attract customers with 59(50.43%) responding to a great extent in both the categories & 19(16.24%) and 15(12.82%) in the moderate extent category respectively followed by enhanced brand image with 56(47.86%) to a great extent and almost 31(26.50%) to a moderate extent, reduced regulatory oversights with 50(42.74%) and 19(16.24%) to a moderate extent, and increased customer sales with 48(41.03%) in the great extent category and 28(23.93%) in the moderate extent category. Improved financial performance with 39(33.33%) to a great extent category and 28(23.93%) in the moderate extent category, reduced operating cost with 33(28.21%) and 29(24.79%) and access to capital with 32(27.35%) and 16(13.24%) in the great and moderate extent respectively. The responses in to some extent category varied from 11(9.40%) as minimum to 19(16.24%) as maximum, the responses in the not at all and no response category were minimal.
Table : 34.1 Focus of CSR function of Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The focus of CSR in your company is</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Dimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Human Resource Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Health and Safety at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Employee welfare &amp; respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Adaptation to change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Management of Environment Impact and Natural Resource</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the focus of CSR in the company's in that it can be observed that majority of them have a greater focus on internal dimensions and comparatively less focus on the external dimensions with the explanation emerging from the above table.

The focus of CSR function in the company has been studied with the internal and external dimension through a set of parameters a company gives weight age to. Amongst the internal dimension...
CSR focus has been as stated by majority of the respondents on employee welfare and respect with 83(70.94%) responding to a great extent and 19(16.24%) and 8(6.84%) in the moderate and some extent category, followed by health and safety at work with 81(69.23%) responding to a great extent and 22(18.80%) and 7(5.98%) in the moderate and some extent category, adaptation to change with 67(57.26%) responding to a great extent and 26(22.22%) and 11(9.40%) in the moderate and some extent category management of environmental impact and natural resources with 59(50.43%) responding to a great extent and 25(21.37%) and 6(5.13%) in the moderate and some extent category and human resource management with 52(44.44%) responding to a great extent and 26(23.93%) and 24(20.51%) in the moderate and some extent category. Responses in the not at all and no response category were minimal.

Table 34.2 Focus of CSR function of Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Dimension</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local communities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues and Health issues viz dedication and HIV AIDS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business partners, suppliers consumers.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global environmental concerns.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-::241::-
As far as the external dimension is concerned majority of the respondent opined that the focus of CSR in their industries is on global environmental concerns with 47(40.17%) in the great extent category and 12(10.26%) and 8(6.84%) in the moderate and some extent category, followed by focus on local communities with 27(23.08%) in the great extent category and 23(19.66%) and 18(15.38%) in the moderate and some extent category, human rights issues with 20(17.09%) in the great extent category and 17(14.53%) and 19(16.24%) in the moderate and some extent category, social issues and health issues viz de-addiction and HIV/AIDS issues with 13(11.11%) in the great extent category and 19(16.24%) and 18(15.38%) in the moderate and some extent category, Business partners, suppliers, consumers with 9(7.69%) in the great extent category and 20(17.09%) and 23(19.66%) in the moderate and some extent category.
Table 35: Opinion on corporate social responsibility & business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindly respond to the following statement as perceived by you</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When companies look at how to conduct their business &amp; expand it more company strategists look beyond shareholders to a broader vision of stakeholder corporation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of CSR goes beyond strict legal obligations that companies have to comply with</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR is increasingly becoming a normal way of doing business &amp; often an asset rather than exceptional additional constraint</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As observed in the table majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with 43(36.75%) and 48(41.03%) in the respective categories to the statement that when companies look at how to conduct their business and expand it more and more company strategists look beyond...
shareholders to a broader vision of stakeholders corporation. About 11(9.40%) gave neutral response, 9(7.69%) did not respond however a very minor proportion disagreed and strongly disagreed to the statement with 4(3.42%) and 2(1.71%) in the respective categories.
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With reference to the response on the statement "The development of CSR goes beyond strict legal obligations that companies have to comply with majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with 45(38.46%) and 48(41.03%) in the respective categories to the statement About 12(10.26%) gave neutral response, 7(5.98%) did not respond however a very minor proportion disagreed and strongly disagreed to the statement with 3(2.56%) and 2(1.71%) in the respective categories.

With reference to the response on the statement CSR is increasingly becoming a normal way of doing business and often an asset rather than an exceptional additional constraint majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with 34(29.06%) and 49(41.88%) in the respective categories. About 19(16.24%) gave neutral response, 8(6.24%) did not respond however a very minor proportion disagreed and strongly disagreed to the statement with 4(3.42%) and 3(2.56%) in the respective categories.
## Company Focus for CSR in the future

In which areas do you think your company shall focus for CSR in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social, economic and education enhancement of community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with groups with special needs like physically &amp; mentally handicapped</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to cause of HIV / AIDS.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training for self Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Social, economic and education
- Work with groups with special needs
- Support to cause of HIV / AIDS.
- Vocational Training for self Employment
- Entrepreneurship development
The table reflects the areas company shall focus with respect to CSR in that majority of the respondents responded social, economic and educational enhancement with 63(53.85%) to a great extent category, 26(22.22%) to a moderate extent category and 10(8.55%) to some extent category, about 8(6.84%) responded in the not at all category, about 7(5.98%) gave neutral responses and 3(2.46%) did not respond at all. The next category opined by the respondents for future areas of CSR are vocational training for self employment with 60(51.28%) to a great extent category, 28(23.3%) to a moderate extent category and 13(11.11%) to some extent category, about 2(1.71%) responded in the not at all category, about 9(7.69%) gave neutral responses and 5(4.27%) did not respond at all. Entrepreneurship development emerged to be another future area for CSR in that majority of the respondents with 36(30.77%) responded to a great extent category, 22(18.80%) to a moderate extent category and 21(17.95%) to some extent category, about 18(15.38%) responded in the not at all category, about 9(7.69%) gave neutral responses and 11(9.40%) did not respond at all. Amongst other areas were support to the cause of HIV/AIDS with 21(17.95%) to a great extent category, 20(17.09%) to a moderate extent category and 23(19.66%) to some extent category, however it is striking to note that about 38(32.48%) responded in the not at all category, about 9(7.69%) gave neutral responses and 6(5.13%) did not respond at all.

Working with groups of special needs was another future area for CSR as perceived by the respondents with 14(11.97%) to a great extent category, 24(20.51%) to a moderate extent category and 23(19.66%) to some extent category, however it is striking to note that about 39(33.33%) responded in the not at all category, about 13(11.11%) gave neutral responses and 4(3.42%) did not respond at all.
Table: 37 Opinion on relevance of Social Work & HR Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindly respond to the following statement as perceived by you</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance of social Work and HR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social work education &amp; training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Qualities like empathy, relating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the opinion of respondents with respect to these statements in that with respect to relevance of professional social work and HR education for CSR was responded by majority very positively with 75(64.10%) to a great extent category, 22(18.80%) to a moderate extent category and 6(5.13%) to some extent category, only 3 (2.56%) responded in the not at all category. About 5(4.27%) gave neutral responses and 6(5.13%) did not respond at all.

Graph: 37

With respect to what extent social work education and training have the inherent potential to impart the domain knowledge and soft skills needed for development work was responded by majority very positively with 74(63.25%) to a great extent category, 19(16.24%) to a moderate extent category.
and 11(9.40%) to some extent category, only 2 (1.71%) responded in the not at all category about 9(7.69 %) gave neutral responses and a minor proportion 2(1.71%) did not respond at all.

With respect to what extent are qualities like empathy relating with people, extroversion, understanding of social issues are vital for CSR it was responded by majority very positively with 80(68.38 %) to a great extent category, 16(13.68 %) to a moderate extent category and 7(5.98%) to some extent category, a striking absolutely positive response with 0(0.00%) responded in the not at all category about 12(10.26 %) gave neutral responses and a minor proportion 2(1.71%) did not respond at all.

Table : 38 Opinion on CSR Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>In Your opinion</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees should be aware of realities of society &amp; environment in which they operate to make them empathetic &amp; better managers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR initiative bridges gap between business &amp; factors that support bus.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR instills symbiotic feelings &amp; helps business and society enter into a mutually rewarding relationship.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR initiative would lend credibility to the face of the organ. &amp; seen as an entity that cares for society at large</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is not possible for government to cater to the needs of vast pool of needy &amp; marginalized</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table reveals the opinion of respondents with respect to these statements in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement that employees should be aware of realities of society and environment with 71(60.68%) and 36(30.77%), about 5(4.27%) gave neutral responses, it is striking to note that absolutely 0(0.00%) in the disagree and 2(1.71%) in the strongly disagree category and no response category with 3(2.56%) with respect to whether CSR initiative bridges the gap between business and society and the factors that support business in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement with 63(53.85%) and 30(25.64%), about 14(11.97%) gave neutral responses, 3(2.56%) in the disagree category and the strongly disagree category and no response category with 4(3.42%) with respect to whether CSR instills symbiotic feelings and helps business and society enter into a mutually rewarding relationship in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement with 65(55.56%) and 35(29.06%), about 8(6.84%) gave neutral responses, 3(2.56%) in the disagree category and the strongly disagree category and no response category with 3(2.56%) with respect to whether CSR initiative would lend credibility to the face of the organizations and seen as an entity that cares for society at large in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement with 65(55.56%) and 34(29.06%), about 9(7.69%) gave neutral responses, 3(2.56%) in the disagree category and 2(1.71%) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 4(3.42%) with respect to CSR is imperative because it is not possible for government to cater to the needs of the vast pool of needy and in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement with 44(37.61%) and
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17(14.53%), about 24(20.51%) gave neutral responses, 14(11.97 %) in the disagree category and 6(5.13 %) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 12(10.26%).

Table : 39 Opinion on need for CSR codification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs for Codification</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CSR need to be codified in the vision of the company</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It should ensure that every employee is sensitive of societal &amp; env. Concerns and dedicates his effort to support the same.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CSR needs to formalized as a discipline in individuals work life Which offers him weighted benefits in performance review.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There should be uniform CSR code to be followed by companies.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the need for CSR codification in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the statement that CSR needs to be codified in the vision of the company with 39(33.33%) and 52(44.44%), about 17(14.53%) gave neutral responses, 5(4.27 %) in the disagree category and 1(0.85 %) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 3(2.56%).

With respect to the statement that CSR code should ensure that every employee is sensitive in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with 44(37.61%) and 54(46.15%), about 12(10.26%) gave neutral responses, 3(2.56 %) in the disagree category and 0(0.0 %) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 4(3.42%).
With respect to the statement that CSR needs to formalise as a discipline in individuals work life, which offers him weighted benefits in performance review majority of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with 44(37.61%) and 46(39.32%), about 15(12.82%) gave neutral responses, 7(5.98 %) in the disagree category and 2(1.71 %) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 3(2.56%).

With respect to the statement that there should be a uniform CSR code to be followed by companies mixed responses were seen in that 11(9.40%) strongly agreed and 27(23.08%) agreed, 33(28.21%) gave neutral responses, a majority 32(27.35 %) gave responses in the disagree category and 8(6.84 %) the strongly disagree category and no response category with 6(5.13%).
B – CSR Process Implementation

Table: 40  
Years of contribution of company to community development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] 1-2 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 2 to 5 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 5 to 10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] More than 10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] As per needs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the time span of companies contribution to Community Development in that majority of the companies had contributed from 2-5 years 33.33%(39), followed by 5-10 years with 16.23%(19), 1-2 years 10.25%(12), however 34.18%(40) responded that it as per needs like natural calamities, genuine needs of the community, sponsored programmes etc revealing no fixed time frame and contribution as and when need arises.
Table : 41  Opinion on Community Scenario in the pre Intervention Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Briefly describe the community scenario in the pre intervention Sage w.r.t.</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Housing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Health Status Health Infrastructure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Economic Status/ Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Public Infrastructure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Extent of Social Problems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Quality of Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Gender Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Environmental conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the community scenario in the pre intervention stage wrt to various areas such as housing, health status and health infrastructure, education status and education infrastructure, economic status and employment opportunities, public infrastructure, extent of social problems, quality of life, gender development and environmental conditions in that it is observed that housing conditions were opined by majority in the very poor category with 52(44.44%), 23(19.66%) in the poor category, about 8(6.84%) responded as fair, 14(11.97%) as good and 5(4.27%) as excellent, about 15(12.82%) did not respond at all.

Similarly as far as the health status is concerned responses in very poor category were 20(17.09%), 8(6.84%) in the poor category, about 22(18.80%) responded as fair, 33(28.21 %) as good and 21(17.95%) as excellent, about 13(11.11%) did not respond at all.
Similarly in the education status responses in very poor category were 17(14.53%), 37(31.62%) in the poor category, about 29(24.79%) responded as fair, 11(9.40%) as good and 11(9.40%) as excellent, about 14(11.97%) did not respond at all.

Other areas like extent of social problems, status of public infrastructure & employment conditions were rated as very poor with 16(13.68%), 13(11.11%) and 10(8.55%) respectively followed by status of gender development, environmental conditions and quality of life. The no response category has been higher since many industries are not directly working with communities ranging from 13(11.11%) to 21(17.95%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Did the company undertake a Base Line Survey prior to interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table reveals the responses with reference to base line survey undertaken by the companies prior to interventions in that majority of the respondents 32(52.99%) opined that they did not undertake any type of base line survey and identification of communities was on the basis of felt needs, demands, dialogue and interactions with the community, however 32(27.35%) had undertaken a base line survey reflecting scientific approach and organized community involvement for better outcome as many as 23(19.65%) did not respond.

**Table : 43  Opinion on Agencies hired for base line survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] NGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Academics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Internally by the company</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Research organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Any other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Table reveals the agencies hired for base line studies in that majority of the companies have hired assistance from academics with 24(75.00%), others have carried out the studies internally by the company with 5 (15.63%) and amongst others were NGO and research organizations but to a very minimal extent.
Table: 44 Major areas of companies for Corporate Social Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, awareness campaigns, Scholarships</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, clean drinking water, medical camps, Health education &amp; Awareness,</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood donation camps, Railway station cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Public utilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training, Empowerment &amp; Capacity Building</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern, Protection &amp; Conservation, Pollution control</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary services / Animal husbandry /New Approaches in Cattle Care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Support &amp; Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Rights, Awareness development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic needs fulfilment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development/Supporting Villages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment distribution</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Development/Technical Assistance in Approaches for Irrigation/Farming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster management &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Training &amp; Education Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored &amp; Collaborative Programmes through NGOs / Academics / Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals multiple responses in that the major focus areas of the company in that majority of the respondents opined education and school support as the major area with 10.53%(30) respondents, followed by health with 9.47%(27) respondents, vocational training and guidance/capacity building with 8.77%(25) respondents, environment protection and conservation with 8.42%(24) respondents, basic need fulfilment with 5.96%(17) respondents, infrastructure with 5.61%(16) respondents, charity with 4.91%(14) respondents as the major areas followed by other areas such as sponsored programmes with academia/NGOs, watershed development, women rights and awareness, equipment assistance to the needy and disabled, veterinary care and animal husbandry, technical assistance, social welfare, safety training and disaster management and rehabilitation amongst others.
Table : 45 Adoption of CSR tools and guidelines by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Did the company adopt specific CSR tools and guidelines for implementation.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals data regarding specific CSR tools and guidelines adopted by companies for implementation in that only 11 (9.40%) adopted specific CSR tools and guidelines, about 42 (35.89%) did not adopt any such tools and guidelines and 64 (54.70%) did not respond at all.

Table : 46 Ratings on the impact of community programme through CSR functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you rate impact of community programs</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Fulfilment of basic needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Improvement in health Education Employment &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Solving community problems / psycho social problem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Creation of self sufficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Provision of equipments and services for needy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Providing opportunity for development &amp; social progress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows the impact of community programmes in various areas viz. fulfilment of basic needs, provision of and improved infrastructure, improvement in health, solving community problems, creation of self-sufficiency, providing opportunities, changing environment, improvement in overall human development, quality of life improvement, bringing change in social system, providing socio-legal aid, returns on social responsibility, distinct business advantages, receiving corporate awards etc.
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In that major impact is observed in improvement in health with 63(53.85%) responding to a great extent and 25(21.37%) responding to a moderate extent, followed by improvement in overall human development with 60(51.28%) responding to a great extent and 33(28.21%) responding to a moderate extent, changing environment with 54(46.15%) responding to a great extent and 33(28.21%) responding to a moderate extent, followed by provision of new and improved infrastructure with 51(43.59%) responding to a great extent and 32(27.35%) responding to a moderate extent. Provision of new opportunities and quality of life improvement revealed the same rate of impact with 49(41.88%) responding to a great extent in both the categories and 35(29.91%) and 37(31.62%) responding to a moderate extent in the respective categories. Followed by fulfillment of basic needs with 47(40.17%) responding to a great extent and 24(20.51%) responding to a moderate extent followed by other areas like bringing change in the social system with 26(22.22%) responding to a great extent, 30(25.64%) to a moderate extent, solving community problems with 22(18.80%) responding to a great extent, 30(25.64%) to a moderate extent and 31(26.50%) responding to some extent, followed by direct business advantages with 16(13.68%) responding to a great extent, 28(23.93%) to a moderate extent, returns on social responsibility with 13(11.11%) responding to a great extent, 37(31.62%) to a moderate extent and lastly receiving corporate awards with only 11(9.40%) responding to a great extent and 12(10.26%) responding to a moderate extent.
### Major difficulties encountered in process of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major difficulties encountered</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community resistance for co-operating</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of faith &amp; trust of communities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of faith &amp; trust of functionaries</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Community resistance for Economic contribution</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Poor participation of beneficiaries</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ability to learn and adapt by community</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Poor skill in managing CSR function by staff</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Lack of training and orientation to CSR function</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CSR function seen as ancillary &amp; not a core business function</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of technical expertise in CSR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the major difficulties encountered in that majority of the respondents opined rigidity in thinking of community to be one of the major difficulties with 37(31.62%) responding to a great extent, 10(8.55%) responding to a moderate extent and 25(21.37%) to some extent. Community resistance for cooperation was another major area where difficulties were faced with 24(20.51%) to great extent, 17(14.53%) to a moderate extent and 28(23.93%) to some extent. Following by poor participation of beneficiaries with 22(18.80%) to a great extent, 18(15.38%) to a moderate extent, 23(19.66%) to some extent. Other major difficulties encountered were community resistance for economic contribution & poor skills in managing CSR function by staff with 16(13.68%) responding to a great extent in both the categories, 29(24.79%) & 7(5.98%) responding to a moderate extent and 24(11.97%) & 22(18.80%) responding to some extent in the respective categories. CSR function seen as an ancillary and not a core business function was another major difficulty with almost the same i.e 16(13.68%) responding to a great extent, 15(12.82%) responding to a moderate extent, 21(17.95%) responding to some extent, followed by lack of orientation and training in CSR with 15(12.82%) responding to a great extent, 8(6.84%) responding to a moderate extent and 28(23.93%) responding to some extent. Amongst other reasons were lack of technical expertise in CSR, ability to learn and adapt by the community, lack of faith and trust of community and lack of faith and trust of functionaries.
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Table 48: Major difficulties faced in different CSR stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[G] In which of the following CSR stages major difficulties were faced</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CSR Planning</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CSR Communication To Mgt Staff</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CSR Communication to Community</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CSR Implementation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CSR Monitoring</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CSR Evaluation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CSR Reporting</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 48: [Bar chart showing difficulties faced in different CSR stages]

The above table reveals that as far as CSR planning is concerned majority of the respondents 52(44.44%) opined that there were no difficulties however 26(22.22%) responded difficulties in planning stage to some extent, about 8(6.84%) responded to a moderate extent and 4(3.42%) responded to a great extent, about 20(17.09%) did not respond. With respect to CSR communication to management staff is concerned majority 64(54.70%) did not face any difficulty, 19(16.24%) faced difficulty to some extent and a few 11(9.40%) faced difficulties to some extent.
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As far as CSR communication to community is concerned, majority i.e., 57 (48.72%) did not face difficulties about extent, whereas 19 (16.24%), 10 (8.65%), and 6 (5.13%) faced difficulties to some, moderate, and great extent and 11 (9.40%) did not respond. About 51 (43.11%) did not face difficulties in CSR implementation, whereas nearly 26 (22.22%) faced difficulties to some extent, 15 (12.82%) to a moderate extent and 5 (4.27%) to a great extent. About 18 (15.38%) did not face difficulties in CSR monitoring, whereas nearly 30 (25.46%) faced difficulties to some extent, 11 (9.40%) to a moderate extent, and 9 (7.69%) to a great extent. The overall analysis of the table reveals that more problems were experienced in CSR implementation, CSR monitoring, CSR evaluation, reporting, and benchmarking.
Table: Major Areas of indirect positive impact noticed by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In which of the following areas did the company notice an indirect positive impact</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and awards in CSR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization culture shop floor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's productivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response from shareholders, Investors, Govt., Customer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market competition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 49
With respect to the returns of CSR in the organization the major difficulties were faced due to community response and workers attitude with 53(45.30%) to a great extent in both categories, 28(25.58%) and 23(19.66%) to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%) and 16(13.68%) to some extent in the respective categories. Workers motivation and workers productivity were another areas of difficulty with 52(44.44%) and 49(41.88%) responding to a great extent, 27(23.08%) and 30(25.64%) responding to a moderate extent, 16(13.68%) and 15(12.82%) responding to some extent, work culture, response from shareholders, investors, govt, customers, market competition, workers morale were other areas where difficulties were faced with 49(41.88%), 49(41.88%) and 48(41.03%) in the great extent category and 32(27.35%), 26(22.22%), 33(28.21%) to a moderate extent in the respective categories. Amongst other reasons were organization culture (shop floor) with 35(29.91%) to a moderate extent and 41(35.04%) to a great extent, corporate image with 40(34.19%) in the moderate and great extent category, followed by business performance with 32(27.35%) and 34(29.06%) in the moderate and great extent category and lastly recognition and awards in CSR with 24(20.51%) and 25(21.37%) in the moderate and great extent category.
### Table: 50 Companies' Suggestions on Areas of CSR Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your suggestion to what extent you believe &amp; may extend support to the following areas</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enhancing CSR function of the company based on global needs &amp; standard</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Benchmarking CSR practises</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Preparing for achieving excellence in area of CSR</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Instituting a professor chair of community and social development</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supporting education through technological assistance</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Support for provision of transport service &amp; conveyance in rural areas.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Entrepreneurship training development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Community capacity building (Youth, Women, Teacher, Families)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Improving agricultural productivity</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Promoting research and development in areas of CSR</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: 50**

- Enhancing CSR function
- Benchmarking CSR practises
- Preparing for achieving excellence
- Instituting a professional chair
- Supporting education through technological assistance
- Support for provision of transport service & conveyance in rural areas.
- Entrepreneurship training development
- Community capacity building (Youth, Women, Teacher, Families)
- Improving agricultural productivity
- Promoting research and development in areas of CSR
As far as suggestions of the respondents to the extent of support which could be provided the above table clearly elicits that majority of the respondents have responded positively to all the areas. In that companies are primarily interested in supporting education through technological assistance with 83(70.94%) responses in the yes category, enhancing CSR function with 81(69.23%) in the yes category, supporting entrepreneurship training with 81(69.23%) in the yes category, community capacity building with 80(68.38%) in the yes category, followed by other important areas such as promoting research and development, benchmarking CSR practises, preparing for achieving excellence in the area of CSR, instituting a professor chair for community and social development with 78(66.67%), 69(58.97%), 69(58.97%) & 64(54.70%), in the yes category in the respective areas, other areas included improving agricultural productivity with 50(42.74%) and least support for provision of transport service and conveyance in the rural areas.

Table : 51 Planning & Implementation of Community Programmes by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>How did the company plan &amp; implement its community programmes?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overview of situation &amp; General understanding</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Based on scientific need assessment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CSR compliance specified in CSR tool kit (any National / International Standard)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph : 51

- Overview of situation
- Based on scientific need
- CSR compliance specified
The table reveals the company’s planning and implementation in the area of CSR in that majority of the respondents opined that CSR planning and implementation was done through overview of the situation and general understanding with 67(57.26%) responding yes and only 27(23.08%) responding no. As far as planning and implementation on the basis of a scientific need assessment is concerned majority of the respondents 66(56.41%) responded yes and 32(27.35%) responded no. About 14(11.97%) responded the compliances to CSR as specified in the CSR tool kit whereas majority 70(59.83%) responded negatively. In all 23(19.66%), 19(16.24%) and 33(28.21%) were the no response answers in the respective three categories.

Table: 52 Evolution of objectives, goals, indicators, performance standard policies, strategies, training, reporting & external standard in CSR by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the company evolve</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Major objectives to be fulfilled</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Short term and long term goals</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Input, Output, Outcome &amp; Impact Indicators</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Performance Standards to Evaluate Work</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75.21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vision, Mission &amp; policy statement for CSR</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CSR strategy for implementation.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CSR training, orientation and communication ( internally and externally)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CSR reporting</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Use of external standards for evaluating CSR performance &amp; social auditing and accounting</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Incorporation of CSR as a business agenda</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals whether the company evolved CSR objectives, goals, indicators, performance standards, vision, mission and policy statements, CSR strategies, trainings, reporting criteria, use of external standards, incorporation of CSR as a business agenda. In that it is observed that, majority of the companies has defined short term and long term goals with 94(80.34%) responding yes and only 6(5.13%) responding no. Majority of the companies has defined input output outcome and impact indicators with 91(77.78%) responding yes and only 10(8.55%) responding no. Majority of the companies had also defined performance standards to evaluate work with 88(75.21%) responding yes and only 12(10.26%) responding no. Majority of the companies had also defined major objectives to be fulfilled with 91(77.78%) responding yes and only 10(8.55%) responding no. Almost 63(53.85%) responded yes to having CSR strategy for implementation and 37(31.62%) responded no. About 59(50.43%) responded yes to having CSR trainings, orientation and communication (internally and externally) and 40(34.19%) responded no, followed by CSR reporting with only 41(35.04%) responding yes and majority 58(49.57%) responding no. About 37(31.62%) responded yes to the use of external standards in CSR and incorporation of CSR as a business agenda and 57(48.72%) and 51(43.59%) responded negatively in the respective categories. The no responses varied from 16(13.68%) minimum to 29(24.79%) in the various categories discussed above.
### Table 53: Extent of use of various process in CSR by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Process Description</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Profiling &amp; Scooping of community needs &amp; issues.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stakeholder Need Analysis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information dissemination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Revision of Plans based on community Response &amp; feedback.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consultative meets for mobilization of people’s support.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transparency &amp; Clarity in communication &amp; Processes.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Acceptance of intervention plans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Close participation of people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Involvement &amp; onus of the project by people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Policy implementation with people’s initiative &amp; management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Development of faith, trust &amp; positive attitude in people for program Interventions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat
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The table reveals the extent to which various above mentioned processes were used in that profiling and scoping of community needs and issues were used to a greater extent with 44(37.61%) to a great extent, 12(10.26%) to a moderate extent and 21(17.94%) to some extent. Followed by community interaction and acceptance of interventions plans with 42(35.90%) responding to a great extent, 13(11.11%) and 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 22(18.80%) and 18(15.38%) responding to some extent. Other process used were development of faith, trust and positive attitude in people for programme intervention, transparency and clarity in communication and process, consultative meet for mobilization of peoples support & close participation of the people with 39(33.33%), 38(32.48%), 38(32.48%) & 38(32.48%) responding to a great extent, 12(10.26%), 11(9.40%), 13(11.11%) and 12(10.26%) responding to a moderate extent, and 17(14.52%), 23(19.65%), 23(19.65%) and 21(17.94%) responding to some extent. Amongst other less used processes were policy implementation with peoples initiative and management, involvement and onus of the project by people and policy communication with 31(26.50%), 20(17.09%), & 19(16.24%) responding to a great extent, 15(12.82%), 14(11.97%) and 13(11.11%) responding to a moderate extent, and 16(13.67%), 24(20.51%) and 21(17.94%) responding to some extent. Those minimally used were conducting stakeholder need analysis, ensuring stakeholder involvement and information dissemination as observed from the responses in the great extent and moderate extent category.
Table: 54 Major areas of distinct impact by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, awareness campaigns, Scholarships</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, clean drinking water, medical camps,</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health education &amp; Awareness, Blood donation camps, Railway station cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS awareness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Public utilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training, Empowerment &amp; Capacity Building</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern, Protection &amp; Conservation, Pollution control</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary services / Animal husbandry / New Approaches in Cattle Care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Support &amp; Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Rights, Awareness development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic needs fulfilment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development/Supporting Villages</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment distribution</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Development/Technical Assistance in Approaches for Irrigation/Farming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster management &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Training &amp; Education Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored &amp; Collaborative Programmes through NGOs / Academics / Other Organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table reveals multiple responses in the major areas where company has made an impact in that majority of the respondents opined education and school support as the major area with 10.29%(28) respondents, followed by health & community development with 9.19%(25) respondents, environment protection and conservation with 8.08%(22) vocational training and guidance/capacity building with 8.08%(22), basic need fulfilment with 5.96%(17) & infrastructure & Public utilities with 5.51(15) respondents, charity with 5.14% (14) respondents, as the major areas followed by other areas such as sponsored programmes with academia/NGOs, watershed development, women rights and awareness, equipment assistance to the needy and disabled, veterinary care and animal husbandry, technical assistance, social welfare, safety training and disaster management and rehabilitation amongst other major areas of impact.
Table: 55.1 Major areas of distinct impact by companies (Sector wise Analysis)

Sector: 1 Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of ITI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi skilling of workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need based community programme</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial help to employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on physically challenged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet basic requirements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of faith, trust, positive attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple Response)

The above table reveals the major areas where the engineering industries have made a distinct impact with major areas being health, need based community programmes, infrastructure and education amongst others.
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### Sector : 2 Chemical and Pharmaceutical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment distribution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of public places</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of life saving drugs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS awareness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical camps</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green revolution</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration programme</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition at various levels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social gathering</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster management and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple Response)
The table reveals that major areas where the companies made impact were health, clean drinking water, medical camps and education in the chemicals and pharmaceuticals followed by other areas as revealed in the table.

**Graph : 55.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector : 3 Petrochemicals</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of women</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal change in villagers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake holder's interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance of corporate image</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment concern</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public infrastructure [ Roads ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Multiple Response)
The table reveals major areas where the company made an impact were, clean drinking water, medical camps, environment concern and education followed by other areas in the petro chemicals industries as revealed in the table.

Graph: 55.3

In the Service Sector the table reveals that major areas where the company has made an impact were Disaster Management and health followed by other areas as revealed in the table.

Graph: 55.4

Table: Sector: 4 Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Disaster management    | 2     | 33.33%
| Health                 | 2     | 33.33%
| Posture training       | 1     | 16.67%
| Fire training          | 1     | 16.67%
| Total                  | 6     | 100%
## Sector: 5 Manufacturing & Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of school uniforms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean drinking water</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway station cleaning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood donation camps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Job Opportunities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment distribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income supplementation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahila Jagruti Maanch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support village economy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural innovations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New approaches on irrigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary services to rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New approaches in cattle care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic needs fulfilment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development / Collaboration for sponsor programme with academic/NGO/Other Organization</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Manufacture and other industry sector major areas where the companies made a distinct impact were education, technical assistance, vocational training, community development and disaster preparedness and education followed by other areas as revealed in the table 54.

Table : 56 Evaluation & Impact of CSR by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Has the company evaluated its impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>33.3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>43.6</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>23.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Can it be quantified &amp; measured</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Has the CSR function impacted the bottom line performance of the company</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals whether the impact can be quantified and measured and it is observed that 38(32.5%) responded yes and 52(44.4%) responded no. With reference to evaluating the impact of CSR by the company it is observed that majority i.e 51(43.6%) did not evaluate the impact and about 39(33.3%) evaluated the impact, about 27(23.1%) gave no responses in the above categories.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Graph : 56

□ Has the company evaluated its impact
- Yes 39 33.3
- No 51 43.6
- NR

□ Can it be quantified & measured
- Yes 38 32.5
- No 52 44.4
- NR

□ Has the CSR function impacted the bottom line performance of the company
- Yes 74 63.2
- No 13 11.1
- NR

Another major area is with reference to whether CSR function has impacted the bottom line performance of the company in that it is striking to note that majority i.e 74(63.2%) responded yes and 13(11.1%) responded no, and about 30(25.6%) did not respond.

Table : 57 Major areas of companies impact and measurement of quantitative & qualitative areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on the major impacted area which of the following &amp; to what extent can be measured quantitatively &amp; qualitatively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>57.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Health Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Education Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Community facilities &amp; Public infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Employment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Skill Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table elicits to what extent the impact in various quantitative and qualitative areas can be measured. A majority of the respondents opined that impact can be measured to a great extent in employment status and skill development, with 65 (55.56%) and 63 (53.85%) responding to a great extent, and 17 (14.53%) and 20 (17.09%) responding to a moderate extent. 10 (8.55%) and 20 (17.09%) responded to some extent in both categories. Improvement in economic status through assistance in income generation, micro credits schemes, formation of self help groups, etc., and improvement in education status through better enrollment rate, attendance in schools, dropout rate, educational infrastructure, quality of education, etc., with 47 (40.17%) and 46 (39.32%) responding to a great extent, 25 (21.37%) and 26 (22.22%) responding to a moderate extent, and 13 (11.11%) and 15 (12.82%) responding to some extent.

Amongst other quantitative areas where impact could be measured were improvement in health status, including infant mortality rate, maternal mortality rate, morbidity, immunization, disability, etc., and improvement in community facilities and public infrastructure, with 37 (31.62%) and 32 (27.35%) responding to a great extent, 31 (26.50%) and 28 (23.93%) responding to a moderate extent, and 20 (17.09%) and 18 (15.38%) responding to some extent.
Major areas of companies impact and measurement of quantitative & qualitative areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57.2</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in Family Functioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Attitude &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Modification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table elicits to what extent can the impact in various qualitative areas be measured in that majority of the respondents opined that impact can be measured to a great extent in almost all the areas as revealed through the table with major areas showing improvement are decision making skills with 39(33.33%), 29(24.79%), & 23(19.66%) quality of life with 36(30.77%), 31(26.50%), 20(17.09%)standard of living with 34 (29.06%), 34(29.06%) & 22(18.80%), behaviour modification with 34(29.06%)&32(27.35%), 18(15.38%), followed by change in thinking and attitude with 31 (26.50%),
34(29.06%), 22(18.80%) self awareness with 31 (26.50%), 35(29.91%)& 22(18.80%) in the great, moderate and some extent category respectively. A very minimal response was seen as far as the measurement of impact in improvement in family functioning is concerned with only 7(5.98%) responding to a great extent and 12(10.26%) responding to a moderate extent and 8(6.84%) responding to some extent.

Table: 58 Extent of decline in the incidences of social problems note by companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidences of Social Problems (whether a Decline in status is observed)</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Addiction</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Drug abuse</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Exploitation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Economic exploitation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As far as the incidence of Social problems is concerned the above table reveals to what extent a decline is observed with respect to above mentioned problems in that majority of the respondents opined in the not at all category since the companies are not directly addressing these problems, however a decline in economic & social exploitation is observed with 22(18.80%) & 18(15.38%) responding to a great extent, 5(4.27%) & 8(6.84%) responding to a moderate extent and 16(13.68%) &
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12(10.26%) responding to some extent. With respect to other social problems a decline in status was observed to some extent as revealed by the table however majority of them did not respond followed by response in the not at all category revealing minimum interventions and impact in these areas.
C – CSR Structure & Functions

Table: 59 Constitution of CSR in Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>CONSTITUTION</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the organization have CSR Policy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy is Written</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CSR Policy Includes Vision, Mission and values statement as integral part of business</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals details about the constitution in that it is observed that about 30(25.64%) have CSR policy, about 58(49.57%) do not have CSR policy, organizations have a CSR policy and about 29(24.78%) did not respond; it can be clearly observed that though many organizations are undertaking a variety of programmes in CSR not all organizations have a CSR policy as the programmes are undertaken as and when need arises or on demands of the community or special projects undertaken by the company to address social issues in the form of campaign or drives.

As far as a written policy on CSR is concerned, it is observed that only 19(16.23%) opined having a written policy on CSR whereas about 11(9.40%) opined no; however, a large number 80(74.35%) did not respond, revealing gaps in information or non-disclosure of information on the part of the company.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 60 CSR function of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the organization perform CSR function</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Directly by company</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  By corporate NGO</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  In partnership with voluntary Organization / Trust</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With respect to the implementation of CSR it is observed that 61(52.13%) perform CSR activities directly by the company, about 25(21.36%) by corporate NGOs which is observed as a low response and 29(24.78%) in partnership with voluntary organization, here multiple response were observed since many companies were found working directly, through their corporate NGOs and many a times in collaboration with voluntary trust.

Table : 61 CSR structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2</th>
<th>Does organization have a CSR structure ?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals that majority of the companies did not have a CSR structure with 51 (49.51%) responding No and 32 (31.07%).

### Table: Details of Social Responsibility Committee and Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Does the Company have an ethics / Social Responsibility Committee on their boards to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asses progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Offer guidance about emerging CSR issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have you identified which code conduct to be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are CSR indicators an integral part of running business operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is the company consistent in implementation of principles of ethical conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Have a few vital indicators been identified to ensure that CSR goals are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Are indicators based on stakeholders needs and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Are they representative business in which the company operate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: 62**
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The table reveals data on CSR structure in that it can be observed that 32(31.07%) organizations have CSR structures, about 51(49.51%) organizations do not have CSR structures whereas almost 34(33.01%) did not respond.

The above table reveals data on whether the company has an ethic/social responsibility committee on their boards in that it can be observed that 66(56.41%) organizations have ethic/social responsibility committee, about 21(17.95%) organizations do not have whereas almost 23(19.66%) did not respond.

The table further reveals that the committee reviews strategic plans, assesses progress and offers guidance about emerging CSR issues with 66(56.41%), 64(54.70%) & 61(52.14%) responding yes in the above mentioned categories, about 21(17.95%), 25(21.37%), 24(20.51%) responding no. About 23(19.66%), 23(19.66%), 26(22.22%) did not respond and a minimal response was observed in the not applicable category as seen in the table.

With reference to identification of the code to be used by companies it can be observed that 48(41.03%) responded yes, 35(29.91%) responded no, about 29(24.79%) did not respond and about 5(4.27%) were not applicable.

To the question are CSR indicators an integral part of running Business Operations about 40(34.19%) responded yes, 45(38.46%) responded no, about 26(22.22%) did not respond and about 6(5.13%) were not applicable.

To the question is the company consistent in the implementation of principles of ethical conduct about 48(41.03%) responded yes, 42(35.90%) responded no, about 27(23.07%) did not respond.

To the question have a few vital indicators been identified to ensure that CSR goals are met about 41(35.04%) responded yes, 38(32.48%) responded no, about 29(24.79%) did not respond about 9(7.69%) were not applicable.

The above data reveals that the indicators have been based on stakeholders needs and interests in that 36(30.77%) responded yes, 47(40.17%) responded no, about 27(23.08%) did not respond about 7(5.98%) were not applicable.

To the question are stakeholders representatives for the business which the company operates about 30(25.64%) responded yes, 43(36.75%) responded no, a large no i.e 38(32.48%) did not respond and 6(5.13%) answered in the not applicable category.
The above table reveals data through which dept in the organization is CSR function coordinated in that majority of the respondents opined that CSR is coordinated through HR dept with 72(61.54%) responding yes and about 19(16.24%) responded no, and 22(18.80%) did not respond about 30(25.64%) responded that it is coordinated by the personnel dept and about 43(36.75%) responded no, 40(34.19%) did not respond about 38(32.48%) responded that it is coordinated by the corporate communications dept and about 35(29.91%) responded no 38(32.48%) did not respond. About 12(10.26%) responded that it is coordinated by the personnel dept and about 43(36.75%) responded no, and a large majority 54(46.15%) did not respond.
**Table : 64**  
Annual budget allocated for CSR activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need based</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 % to 1 % of total profit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 to 1 Lakh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 Lakhs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 Lakhs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Lakhs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Lakhs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around 1 crore [ Birla Cellu. &amp; Tata chemicals, Mithapur ]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that majority of the companies allocate budget to the extent of 1-3 lacs with 24(20.51%) followed by allocation of budget on need basis, 9(7.69%), 5(4.27%) did not have fixed budget and 43(36.75%) did not respond due to the confidential nature of information.

**Graph : 64**
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The above table reveals that majority of the companies, 25 (21.36%) spent 1-3 lacs as expenditure on CSR activities, 18 (15.38%) with a budget of 0.5 to 1 lacs, and 10 (8.54%) stating that the budget on CSR activities is not fixed. It is striking to note that two big companies as revealed from the table, The Tatas and Birlas, spend round 1 crore which is a significant contribution in the field of CSR.
Table 66.1 Establishment of CSR structure in Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has the structure been audited / reviewed to evaluate its effectiveness</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data reveals that to a certain extent the CSR structures had been audited with 41(35.04%) responding yes and 49(41.88%) responding no, about 18(15.38%) did not respond and 9(7.69%) responses were in the not applicable category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has there been management buy in with regard to structure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data reveals that there has been management buy in with regard to the structure to some extent with 36(30.77%) responding yes and 46(39.32%) responding no, about 25(21.37%) did not respond and 10(8.55%) responses were in the not applicable category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was a business case presented ?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to presenting a business case it is clearly observed that very few respondents opined positively with 24(20.51%) responding yes and 60(51.28%) responding no, about 23(19.66%) did not respond and 10(8.55%) responses were in the not applicable category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have these been formally document</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further with reference to having a formal documentation of the business case it is observed that about 29(24.79%) responded yes, majority of the respondents opined no with 55(47.01%) about 23(19.66%) did not respond and about 10(8.55%) gave responses in the not applicable category.
Table 66.2 Management of CSR function in Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR function in company is managed by</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board governors / trustees</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General body</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive committee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance committee</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data reveals the management of CSR function in the company in that multiple responses have been observed and majority of the respondents opined that it is managed by general body with 45(38.46%) responding yes, followed by executive committee with 32(27.35%) responding yes, other bodies managing CSR function included finance committee with 30(25.64%) trustees with 26(22.22%) and the least opined for advisory group with 13(11.11%). A higher rate of no response was also observed in the above category due to confidential nature and non-disclosure of information.
The above set of data reveals important developments and related information in the area of CSR in that it is observed that majority of the organizations have an action plan been adopted/approved for creating a CSR structure which is extremely positive with 57(48.72%) responding yes and about 33(28.21%) responding no.

Further to the question whether it has been cross referenced to the corporate/strategic plan majority opined positively with 55(47.01%) responding yes about 31(26.50%) responding no and about 22(18.80) did not respond.

It is also observed that majority of the organizations have set targets with a majority 60(51.28%) responding yes and only 25(21.37%) responding no and about 28(23.93%) not responding.

With reference to monitoring or plan to monitor performance against these targets is concerned it is observed that majority of the respondents responded positively with 67(57.26%) in the yes category and about 19(16.24%) in the no category about 24(20.51%) did not respond.
Further with reference to development of policies 34(29.06%) responded yes and 49(41.88%) responded no and about 21(17.95%) did not respond.

### Overall responsibility of CSR in Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; A dept</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR cell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.L. Firm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General body</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to training received by management on CSR issues it can be clearly observed from the data that about 59(50.43%) responded that management had received the training, about 25(21.37%) responded negatively and about 24(20.51%) did not respond.
Further with reference to the type of training majority of the respondents opined that training was inhouse with 50(42.74%) whereas by an outside specialist were about 22(18.80%) however about 31(26.50%) did not respond.

9) Frequency of Training in CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Very Frequently</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Frequently</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Not So Frequently</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] No response</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above column reveals data on extent of understanding of management regarding CSR in that an extremely positive response is observed with 79(67.52%) responding yes and a very minor no. of respondents saying no with (7.69%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Do management / managers understand meaning of CSR</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the important question that is the establishment of a corporate social responsibility structure and the risk involved identified in the organization’s risk register about 46(39.32%) responded yes about 31926.50%0 responded no and as many as 34(29.06%) did not respond
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 67 CSR Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 What type of reports are published</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the type of reports published by the company in that about 28(23.93%) responded that special reports on CSR are published however 43(36.75%) responded they are not published and about 33(28.21%) did not respond.

Types of Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Magazine       | 8     | 8.33%
| Descriptive    | 25    | 21.36%|
| Monthly reports| 5     | 4.27%|
| Annual Report  | 11    | 9.40%
| Internal       | 5     | 4.27%|
| Others         | 23    | 19.65%|
| No Response    | 40    | 34.18%|
| Total          | 117   | 100% |

With reference to the company following any international / national standard or guideline for CSR reporting the table reveals that only 15(12.82%) responded yes and about 61(52.14%) responded no, as many as 30(25.64%) did not respond.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Has organization undertaken any activity that has aided the community or protected the environment.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals data on whether the organization has undertaken any type of activity that has aided the community or protected the environment. In that only 54 (46.15%) responded yes and only 4 (3.42%) responded no, majority of them i.e. 54 (46.15%) did not respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Has organization undertaken any kind of review on how this may have impacted on their reputation.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further with reference to undertaking a review on how this may have impacted upon their reputation it is observed majority of the organizations have undertaken a review with 77 (65.81%) responded yes and only 12 (10.26%) responded no also about 20 (17.09%) did not respond.
### Table: 68 Opinion on Preferred needs of the Community by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred needs of the people of the community are normally in terms of:</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Equipment, raw material and physical facilities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Financial assistance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Guideline and advice during project formulation and / or implementation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Vocational training and guidance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Education and training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Developing cohesion between different section of community</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Self development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table elicits the preferred needs of the people of the community in that majority of them opined education and training, vocational training and guidance and self development with 55 (47.01%), 40 (42.74%) and 40 (42.74%) responding to a great extent 19 (16.24%), 20 (17.09%) and 14 (11.97%) responding to a moderate extent and 4 (3.42%), 8 (6.84%) and 11 (9.40%) responding to some extent.
Other preferred needs included awareness development, raw materials and physical facilities with 47 (40.17%) and 43 (36.75%) responding to a great extent, 18 (15.38%) and 13 (11.11%) responding to a moderate extent, 9 (7.69%) and 20 (17.09%) responding to some extent, followed by least preferred needs such as guidance during project formulation and/or implementation, developing cohesion between different sections of the community and financial assistance with 25 (21.37%), 25 (21.37%), 15 (12.82%) responding to a great extent, 21 (17.95%), 11 (9.40%) and 25 (21.37%) responding to a moderate extent, and 19 (16.24%), 29 (24.79%) and 29 (24.79%) responding to some extent.
Table: 69 Opinion on Capabilities of Companies to meet preferred needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capabilities of the Company to meet preferred needs</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, since many preferred needs are out of tunes with corporate goals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate to fulfill selected needs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted but addiction capabilities can develop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate, but already committed to other project</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 69

The above table reflects the capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs in that majority of the respondents opined in that majority of the responses were positive in that majority of
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the respondents responded in the not at all with 19(16.24%)category opining that capabilities of the company are not restricted ,about 11(9.40%) opining that capabilities are restricted to some extent about 12(10.26%)were neutral,2(1.71%)opined it was to a moderate extent and about 7(5.98%) responded to a great extent, however a majority i.e 66(56.41%) did not respond. About 10(8.55%) responded that capabilities of the company to meet the preferred are adequate through response in the great extent category,9(7.69%)to moderate extent category, about 10(8.55%)being neutral and 12(10.26%)responding to some extent , about 10(8.55%)responded negatively. With reference to additional capabilities developed 10(8.55%)responded to a great extent,9(7.69%)responded to a moderate extent about 17(14.53%)were neutral and about 10(8.55%)responded to some extent. The higher rate of no response is due to confidential nature or non disclosure of information on the part of respondents.
Table 7: CSR Constituents defined and effectively deployed by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Constituents</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS related issues</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements of International conventions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment of disabled persons</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Rights</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic disparities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impact of organizations operations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rights / Human Rights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Volunteering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor rights</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Stakeholders Interests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non discrimination/equal opportunity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with business partners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable contributions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Practices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with all regulations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table provides details with reference to which CSR constituents have been clearly defined for effective deployment across the organization in that majority of the respondents opined health and safety, environment, compliance with regulations, employee welfare as the major constituents of CSR deployed in the company with 66 (56.41%), 62 (52.99%), 61 (52.14%) responding to a great extent, 10 (8.55%), 8 (6.84%), 12 (10.26%) and 15 (12.82%) responding to a moderate extent, and 14 (11.97%), 12 (10.26%), 13 (11.11%) and 14 (11.97%) responding to some extent. Other constituents effectively deployed are labour practices, customer relations, sustainable development and corporate volunteering with 49 (41.88%), 48 (41.03%), 41 (35.04%) and 38 (32.48%) responding to a great extent, 12 (10.26%), 11 (9.40%), 14 (11.97%) and 13 (11.11%) responding to a moderate extent and, 16 (13.68%), 12 (10.26%), 21 (17.94%) and 18 (15.38%) responding to some extent. Other constituents in order of decreasing response are non discrimination / equal opportunity, charitable contributions, relationship with business partners, ethics, community / human rights, protection of stakeholders interests, economic impact of organization operations with 31 (26.50%), 29 (24.79%), 28 (23.93%), 27 (23.08%), 16 (13.68%) and 12 (10.26%) responding to a great extent, 14 (11.97%), 12 (10.26%), 14 (11.97%), 9 (7.69%), 3 (2.56%) and 4 (3.42%) responding to a moderate extent and, 14 (11.97%), 16 (13.68%), 18 (15.38%), 23 (19.65%) and 23 (19.65%) responding to some extent followed by constituents viz investors rights, employment of disabled persons, socio economic disparities, requirement of international conventions, HIV/AIDS and gender rights. The no response rate has been higher as observed in the table.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

**Table: 71.1 CSR performance indicators of companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Place Indicators</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions /Health and Safety /pay and benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities in the workplace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64.96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: 71.1**

- □ Working Conditions /Health and Safety /pay and benefits
- □ Equal Opportunities in the workplace
- □ Training and professional development
- □ Industrial Relations
### Table 71.2 Market Place Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Product Stewardship</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5.13</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4.27</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5.98</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>11.97</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>63.25</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>9.40</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supply Chain relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph 71.2

Bar graph showing the market place indicators for Product Stewardship, Supply Chain relations, and Research and Development.
Table : 71.3 Environment Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Waste Management</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Activities</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>117.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph : 71.3

Table : 71.4 Community Development Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Giving and partnerships</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>59.59</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee involvement in community activities</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship and Employability</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>31.26</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table : 71.5  Ethical Indicators & Human Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13 Ethics</th>
<th>14 Human rights supporting interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals data on performance indicators as practised by various companies in that majority of the respondents have opined, industrial relations, training and professional development, sustainability and waste management, green activities, working conditions /health and safety/pay and benefits and research and development to be the major performance indicators with 88(75.21%), 87(74.36%), 84(71.79%), 83(70.94%), 83(70.94%), and 80 (68.38%) responding to a great extent, 11 (9.40%), 11 (9.40%), 15 (12.82%), 15 (12.82%), 16 (13.68%), and 11 (9.40%) responding to a moderate extent and 8 (6.84%), 9 (7.69%), 4 (3.42%), 4 (3.42%), 9 (7.69%), and 6 (5.13%) responding to some extent in the respective indicators. Followed by indicators viz. equal opportunities at workplace, product stewardship, supply chain relations, community giving and partnerships, and ethical policies and conduct with 76 (64.96%), 74 (63.25%), 74 (63.25%), 59 (50.43%), and 52 (44.44%) responding to a great extent, 22 (18.80%), 14 (11.97%), 15 (12.82%), 24 (20.51%), and 25 (21.37%) responding to a moderate extent, and 5 (4.27%), 5 (4.27%), 9 (7.69%), 13 (11.11%), and 17 (14.53%) responding to some extent. Other succeeding performance indicators practised to a lesser extent included employee involvement in...
community activities, entrepreneurship and employability, and human rights with 47(40.17%), 42(35.90%) and 28 (23.93%) responding to a great extent, 31(26.50%), 31(26.50%) and 35 (29.91%) responding to a moderate extent and 21(17.95%), 21(17.95%)and 22 (18.80%) responding to some extent

Table : 72 Stakeholders group / process having interest in companies CSR performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community Panels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Supplier Complaint Register</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Corporate Advisory panel on CSR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supplier Meet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.88</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Customer Complaint Register</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Investor Surveys</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Customer Meet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Unions/freedom of Association</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Employee Satisfaction Surveys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Investor Grievance redressal mechanism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Customer Satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Employee Grievance redressal mechanism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Customer feedback mechanism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals which stakeholder process/groups have an interests in the corporations CSR performance. It was observed that majority of the respondents did not respond since the importance attached, approach of the company and integration of CSR function with business varied from company to company, another reason being CSR function is gaining increasing significance and being slowly structured in the organization with better understanding and professional approach however business returns through CSR and understanding the triple bottom line approach for CSR performance is observed in very few companies. In that majority of the respondents opined community panels as important stakeholder group having an interests in corporations CSR performance due to a philanthropic approach with 35(29.91%) responding to a great extent, 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 8(6.84%) responding to some extent, followed by annual general meeting group/process with 31(26.50%) responding to a great extent, 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 5(4.27%) responding to some extent, followed by process of stakeholder engagement & employee grievance redressal mechanism & Unions/freedom of association with 11(9.40%) & 9(7.69%) responding to a great extent, 10(8.55%), 10(8.55%) and 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 5(4.27%), 5(4.27%) and 8(6.84%) responding to some extent in the respective categories. Other stakeholder process/groups having and interests in corporations CSR performance are employee satisfaction surveys, investors grievance redressal mechanisms, customer feedback mechanism with almost 8(6.84%) responding to a great extent in the respective areas. Other groups were customer.
meets, corporate advisory panel on CSR followed by supplier complaint register, supplier meets, customer complaints and investors survey among important stakeholder process /groups.

**Table 73: Consideration of Stakeholders issues in investment decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Issues</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 NGO/activists opposition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Charitable contributions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Strategic investments in causes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 National Community Opposition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Human Rights Condition in the firm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Global Community Opposition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Strategic Partnerships with Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Local Community Opposition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Location of the Site</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58.12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Social Reputation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Likely impact on Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Employee working conditions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Transparency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Business Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

:::313:::
The table reveals responses with references to factors influencing investment decisions in that majority of the respondents did not respond as observed in the table, amongst those who responded majority 33 (28.21%) opined transparency as an important factor with response in the great extent category, followed by social reputation with 29 (24.79%) in the great extent, 14 (11.97%) in the moderate extent and 5 (4.27%) in the some extent, followed by employee working conditions with 28 (23.93%) in the great extent, 11 (9.40%) in the moderate extent and 5 (4.27%) in the some extent, followed by likely impact on the environment with 23 (19.66%) in the great extent, 13 (11.11%) in the moderate extent and 7 (5.98%) in the some extent and business ethics with 19 (16.24%) in the great extent, 11 (9.40%) in the moderate extent and 9 (7.69%) in the some extent followed by other important factors such as location of the site, strategic partnership with communities, local community opposition, amongst factors opined as important to some extent only and not moderate and great extent were NGO activists opposition, charitable contributions, strategic investments in causes, National community opposition, human rights condition in the firm, and global community opposition.
The above table reveals whether professionals /specialist /experts collaborate with corporate in that majority of the respondents opined negatively with 11 (9.40%) responding no and only 23 (19.66%) responded yes and a majority did not respond 83 (70.94%) amongst those who did not respond and opined negatively major reasons cited were professionals/experts have not been identified and approached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If No because</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 They have not been identified and approached</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 There is not much awareness</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Opportunities for such people to contribute are virtually absent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professional / occupational groups do not respond to request</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Corporate lacks resources to pay such groups</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amongst those who did not respond and opined negatively major reasons cited were professionals/experts have not been identified and approached.

Table: 75  Use of Mass Media by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass media generally used for promoting CSR programme are</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  News magazines / news</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Corporate letters / bus mag</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Youth work journals etc</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Tele vision</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 74

□ They have not been identified
□ There is not much awareness
□ Opportunities are virtually absent
□ Prof groups do not respond
□ Corporate lacks resources to pay
The table reveals data on mass media generally used by the company in that it is observed that the response in the not at all is higher pointing low extent of usage of mass media or other sources of information dissemination for CSR in that news magazines/news letters were used to a great extent with 30(25.64%) responding to a great extent, 11(9.40%) responding to moderate extent, 16(13.68%) responding to some extent followed by corporate newsletters and business magazines 23(19.66%) responding to a great extent, 7(5.98%) responding to moderate extent, 17(14.53%) responding to some extent.

Table : 76 Focus Areas for support of Mass Media by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The agency has been using the support of mass media for:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Spreading awareness of activities and accomplishment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enhancing company image</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Attracting support from public / other agencies / attracting cooperation from beneficiaries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals reasons why companies are using support of mass media in that majority of the respondents responded that it is to enhance company's image with 39 (33.33%), 22 (18.80%), 14 (11.97%) in the great, moderate and some extent category followed by spreading awareness of activities, 34 (29.06%), 23 (19.66%), 15 (12.82%) followed by projecting its utility and attracting support from public and beneficiaries with 33 (28.21%), 23 (19.66%), 13 (11.11%) in the respective categories.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: Strategies employed by companies to deal with pressure groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure group [strategies employed to deal with pressure group]</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give them a patient hearing / respect their views</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid confrontation with group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt their domination by lobbies or other means of political support</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter them with a supportive group</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate with them for part of programme for some objectives, interest and modified programme strategies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights strategies employed to deal with pressure group in that majority of the respondents opined giving a patient hearing as a strategy to deal with the pressure group with 52 (44.44%) responding to a great extent, 11 (9.40%) to moderate extent and 10 (8.55%) to some extent followed by strategies like negotiating with them with 51 (44.44%) responding to a great extent, 11 (9.40%) to moderate extent and 10 (8.55%) to some extent, another major strategy highlighted is avoid confrontation with 32 (27.35%) responding to great extent, 18 (15.38%) responding to a moderate extent and 21 (17.95%) to some extent.

Table : 78 Trends in employees strength in CSR over past years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The employee strength in managing the CSR function over the past years (5 yrs.) has been</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Increasing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Decreasing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Almost stable</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There is a high turnover</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights that employee strength in CSR over the years in that it is very positive to note that majority of the respondents have opined that it is increasing with 26(22.22%) responding to a great extent, 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent, and 8(6.84%) responding to some extent, an equal number of respondents have opined that it is almost stable with 26(22.22%) responding to a great extent, 4(3.42%) responding to a moderate extent and 3(2.56%) responding to some extent. Thus a positive trend of employee involvement in CSR is clearly seen.
The capabilities, interests and training needs of functionaries/members are judged by their performance in field activities and the extent of accomplishment. The table highlights details of determination of CSR training needs and nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries in that majority did not respond when asked about the criteria for determining the capabilities, interests and training needs of functionaries with 98(83.76%) not responding, about 15(12.82%) positively responding in the yes category and 4(3.42%) responding negatively in the no category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries by the corporate are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries by the corporate are:</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Training should be provided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Special orientation sessions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Multiple modes of training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Proper development of staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CSR training enhances</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75.21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to the nature of training strategies provided majority of the respondents opined that multiple modes of training like on the job, courses field training, orientation etc) are employed with 62(52.99%)responding to a great extent, 11(9.40%)responding to a moderate extent, and 10(8.55%)responding to some extent, followed by 61(52.14%),16(13.68%)and 9(7.69%) stating that training should be provided for both technical and social skills development in CSR in the great, moderate and some extent respectively. Another major response is towards arranging special orientation sessions by experts in CSR with 58(49.57%)responding to a great extent,14(11.97%)responding to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%)responding to some extent followed by inputs like proper development of staff after training is a crucial follow up activity.
Table 81: Opinion on Problems Associated with training staff and functionaries of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems Associated with training staff and functionaries of CSR</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical expertise</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate time given</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs not prop identified</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up after training</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is attached low priority</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff is intensively involved</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The above table highlights problems associated with training staff and functionaries of CSR in that it is observed that a higher number of respondents responded in the not at all and no response...
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category revealing poor response and concern for training. Major problems highlighted were follow up
after training is neglected with 20(17.09%) responding to a great extent, 12(10.26%) responding to a
moderate extent and 21(17.95%) responding to some extent, followed by training attached low priority
with 20(17.09%) responding to great extent, 6(5.13%) responding to moderate extent and
21(17.95%) responding to some extent. Other major reasons included inadequate time given for training
programmes and lack of technical expertise with 18(15.38%), 16(13.68%) in the great extent,
7(5.98%), 5(4.27%) in the moderate extent and 21(17.95%) and 21(17.95%) to some extent in the
respective categories.

Table: 82 Opinion on need to improve mobilization strategies in CSR for community
support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it necessary to use or improve mobilization strategies in CSR for community support?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No Response</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on whether it is necessary to use or improve the mobilization strategies in CSR for community support it is striking to note that 77(74.76%) responded yes and only 5(4.85%) responded no, about 35(33.98%) did not respond.
### Table: 83 Opinion on This preferences of the company functionaries / members with regard to CSR programmes and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This preferences of the company functionaries / members with regard to CSR programmes and services are:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and sports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Cultural activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment and income generation programme</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and hygiene improvement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, adult literacy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With reference to the preferences of the company functionaries with regards to CSR programmes is concerned it is revealed from the table that majority of the respondents responded it is for protection of environment with 66(56.41%) to a great extent, 17(14.53%) to a moderate extent and 8(6.84) to some extent followed by self employment income generation programme and vocational training with 65(55.56%) and 60(51.28%) to a great extent, 11(9.40%) and 17(14.53%) to a moderate extent and 8(6.84%) and 11(9.40%) responding to some extent in the respective categories. Other preferences of the functionaries were in areas of cultural activities, sports, community infrastructure, health and hygiene improvement followed by education literacy and social action.

Table : 84  Companies opinion on CSR process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Planning and implementation of Services and programmes</th>
<th>Not %</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The plans formulated include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term perspective plans</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual plan which integrate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed action plan for</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With reference to CSR planning and implementation of services and programmes majority of the respondents responded in the not at all and no response category with respect to various categories revealing low importance attached to CSR programme and service. Majority of the respondents opined plan formulated include annual plan which integrate all on going and new programmes and services in CSR with 21(17.95%) responding to a great extent, 14(11.97%) responding to a moderate extent and 4(3.42%) responding.

Table: 85 Opinion on CSR planning by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Planning is done by involving:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% SE</th>
<th>% N</th>
<th>% ME</th>
<th>% GE</th>
<th>% NR</th>
<th>% T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Beneficiaries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Field functionaries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Funct at the corporate office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Certain experts in planning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The executive committee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The advisory group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Members of the implementing group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Community at large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights details of CSR planning in that majority of the respondents opined that CSR planning is done by involving the community at large with 49(41.88%) responding to a great extent, 10(8.55%) responding to a moderate extent and 6(5.13%) responding to some extent, followed by involvement of the beneficiaries with 48(41.03%) responding to a great extent, 13(11.11%) responding to a moderate extent and 13(11.11%) responding to some extent. The extent of involvement of functionaries has been as responded by the respondents 45(38.46%), 15(12.82%) and 9(7.69%) in the great, moderate and some extent followed by involvement of members of the implementing group, corporate office, executive committee, certain experts in planning and advisory group.
## Table: 86 Opinion on CSR communication by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating plan details to implementing staff is done by</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Holding meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ask leader of the implementing group within the corporate to explain employees</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Providing each member of the implementing group a copy of plan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 An expert / consultant from external agency</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Conducting a workshop in which details are discuss</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CSR communication is wide spread</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Top management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table highlights the communication plan details in that majority of the respondents opined that plans are communicated through holding meeting with 54(46.15%) responding to a great extent, 20(17.09%) responding to a moderate extent and 10(8.55%) responding to some extent, followed by communication methods conducting workshops in which details are shared with 36(30.77%) responding to a great extent, 14(11.97%) responding to a moderate extent and 5(4.27%) responding to some extent. Another ways of communicating plans are asking leader of the implementing group to share information with employees with 23(19.66%) responding to a great extent, 15(12.82%) responding to a moderate extent and 12(10.26%) responding to some extent.
The table also reveals amongst which cadre of employees is CSR communication widespread in that it is observed that it is widespread amongst the top management as responded by majority of the respondents with 64(54.70%) responding to a great extent, 11(9.40%) responding to a moderate extent and 3(2.56%) responding to some extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>SE %</th>
<th>E %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>ME %</th>
<th>G %</th>
<th>GE %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Meetings and discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Circulars and minutes of meeting, letters</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Telephone</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Newsletters, documents, handouts</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Suggestions boxes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Informal gatherings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Notes pasted at convenient places</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Word of mouth</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
The table reveals different modes of communication for facilitating CSR function in that it is observed that meetings and discussions are the main sources of CSR communication as responded by 70(59.83%) responding to a great extent, 20(17.09%) responding to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%) responding to some extent, another major mode of communication is informal meetings with 28(23.93%) responding to a great extent, 23(19.66%) responding to a moderate extent and 13(11.11%) responding to some extent. Other major modes of communication are suggestion boxes, followed by newsletters, documents, handouts, circulars, memo and letters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring of implementation (follow up) includes action like</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compare actual progress with plan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determining causes and corresponding remedies for major deviation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Noting and removing unforeseen factors which appear to hamper progress</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Checking whether suggested remedial majors for past delay have been implanted properly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Noting whether resources supplies are timely and resource utilised properly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the monitoring of implementation (or follow up) in that majority of the respondents responded it include actions like comparing actual progress with plans with majority of the respondents i.e 50(42.74%) responding to a great extent, 24(20.51%) responding to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%) responding to some extent followed by determining causes and corresponding remedies for major deviations with 43(36.75%) responding to a great extent, 28(23.93%) responding to a moderate extent and 10(8.55%) responding to some extent. Followed by checking whether suggested remedies for past delays have been appropriately implemented and noting whether resource supplies are timely and adequate and resource utilization is proper with 39(33.33%) & 31(26.50%) responding to a great extent, 18(15.38%) & 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%) & 18(15.38%) responding to some extent.
### Table: Opinion on external linkages with development agencies by companies

There exists a need to strengthen linkages with certain crucial agencies of the type indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Govt deal with youth, women, children and community work / other sector</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 District or village administration and management</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-government agencies working with development field</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Academics / experts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Agencies rendering specialize services</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pressure groups, activist agencies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Professional and professional group</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph:**
- Govt deal with youth, women, children and community work / other sector
- District or village administration and management
- Non-government agencies working with development field
- Academics / experts
- Agencies rendering specialize services
- Pressure groups, activist agencies
- Professional and professional group
The table elicits data on external linkages with development agencies and a very poor response is observed with majority of the respondents responding in the no response and not at all category highlighting low extent of linkages with Development agencies in that amongst those who responded majority opined that there exists a need to strengthen linkages with professionals and professional groups with 16(13.68%) responding to a great extent ,10(8.55%) responding to a moderate extent, and 11(9.40%) responding to some extent, about 13(11.11%) opined need to strengthen linkages with NGOs working in the development field with 13(11.11%) responding to a great extent, 14(11.97%) responding to a moderate and also to some extent, others opined linkages with govt agencies dealing with youth, women, children and community work, agencies rendering specialized services, with 12(10.26%) responding to a great extent in both the categories, 8(6.84%) and 12(10.26%) in the moderate extent category and 13(11.11%) responding to some extent in both the categories.

Table: 90 Opinion on Reasons for Poor Linkages with External Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linkage with significant external agencies are weak because</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 These agencies not easily accessible</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Problems of collaboration &amp; interaction have remain unresolved</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of authority to strengthen linkages</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 New and Innovative approaches to strengthen collaboration are necessary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Interaction mechanism &amp; interface structure are weak</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Receipt of recognition /awards by company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights reasons on why the linkages with significant external agencies are weak in that majority of the respondents 47(40.17%) opined that it is because it requires new and innovative approaches with 47(40.17%) responding to a great extent, 6(5.13%) responding to a moderate extent and 11(9.40%) responding to some extent, followed by reasons like these agencies are not easy accessible with 12(10.26%) responding to a great extent, 6(5.13%) responding to a moderate extent and 7(5.98%) responding to some extent. Other reasons with responses in the moderate and some extent are that interaction mechanism and interface are weak, problems of collaboration and interaction have remained unresolved, lack of authority to strengthen linkages and other reasons.

**Table: 91 **

| Professional and occupational groups involved in programmes and projects are: | Not | % | SE | % | N | % | ME | % | GE | % | NR | % | T | % |
| 1 | Technical expert / Specialist | 3 | 2.56 | 10 | 8.55 | 7 | 5.98 | 10 | 8.55 | 51 | 43.59 | 36 | 30.77 | 117 | 100 |
| 2 | Social workers | 5 | 4.27 | 8 | 6.84 | 8 | 6.84 | 9 | 7.69 | 58 | 49.57 | 29 | 24.79 | 117 | 100 |
| 3 | Managers | 7 | 5.98 | 18 | 15.38 | 8 | 6.84 | 12 | 10.26 | 43 | 36.75 | 29 | 24.79 | 117 | 100 |
| 4 | People with access to resources | 22 | 18.80 | 17 | 14.53 | 12 | 10.26 | 10 | 8.55 | 8 | 6.84 | 48 | 41.03 | 117 | 100 |
| 5 | People with influence | 24 | 20.51 | 11 | 9.40 | 13 | 11.11 | 13 | 11.11 | 10 | 8.55 | 46 | 39.32 | 117 | 100 |
| 6 | Trainers | 9 | 7.69 | 15 | 12.82 | 5 | 4.27 | 8 | 6.84 | 47 | 40.17 | 33 | 28.21 | 117 | 100 |
| 7 | Persons with rich past experience | 5 | 4.27 | 4 | 3.42 | 7 | 5.98 | 11 | 9.40 | 44 | 37.61 | 46 | 39.32 | 117 | 100 |

-::337::-
The table highlights professional and occupational groups involved in the project in that majority of the respondents responded social workers with 58(49.57%) responding to a great extent, 9(7.69%) responding to a moderate extent and 8(6.84%) responding to some extent followed by technical experts / specialists with 51(43.59%) responding to a great extent, 10(8.55%) responding to a moderate extent and 21(17.95%) responding to some extent followed by trainers, persons with rich past experience and managers with 47(40.17%), 44(37.61%) and 43(36.75%) in the great extent, 8(6.84%), 11(9.40%) and 12(10.26%) in the moderate extent and 5(4.27%), 4(3.42%) and 18(15.38%) and 43(36.75%) in the some extent.
# D - CSR Programme Effectiveness & Impact

## Table : 92  Opinion on Response on Beneficiaries by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes and services is assessed from information</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Periodic meetings &amp; feedback</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Records / Statistics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reports from field units</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Special evaluation studies</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Regular contact with beneficiaries</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals how the information of the beneficiaries to CSR programmes and services in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that they have periodic meetings and feedback with 64(54.70%) strongly agreed, 22(18.80%) agree followed by regular contact with the beneficiaries with 54(46.15%) strongly agreeing and 19(16.24%) agreeing, followed by special...
evaluation studies with 48(41.03%) strongly agreeing and 15(13.68%) agreeing, followed by records/statistics with 19(16.24%) agreeing and reports from field units with 17(14.53%) strongly agreeing and 18(15.38%) agreeing however as many as 21(17.95%) gave neutral and response in the disagree category.

Table: 93 Opinion on Degree of response of beneficiaries by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary response can be deemed to be consistently high or low in the following aspects of programme</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ensuring needs identification</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Beneficiary Identification</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Design of Strategies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Planning</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Implementation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Review of the work of Corporate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Influencing other beneficiaries</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph: 93

The above table reveals the response of the beneficiaries as perceived by the respondents in various aspects of the programme in that majority of the respondents have given positive feedback in that as far as ensuring need identification 86(73.50%) responded high and 10(8.55%) responded low,
beneficiary identification with 80(68.38%) responding high and 15(12.82%) responding low. 78(66.67%) responded high and 17(14.53%) responded low for design of the strategies. About 84(71.79%) responded high and 12(10.26%) responded low for planning. A strikingly positive response is observed for implementation with 85(72.65%) responding high and 10(8.55%) responding low. A comparatively low response is observed with reference to review of the work of the corporate with 50(42.74%) responding high and 39(33.33%) responding low. As far as influencing other beneficiaries is concerned 34(29.06%) responded high and 49(41.88%) responded low.

93.1 TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS USING PAIRED 'T' TEST

Null Hypothesis [ H2 ]: There is no significant difference between high & low beneficiary responses

Alternate hypothesis [ K2 ]: There is a significant difference between high & low beneficiary responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Aspects of programmes</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensuring needs Identification</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beneficiary Identification</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design of Strategies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review of the work of Corporate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Influencing other beneficiaries</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total no. of parameters = \( n = 7 \)

Average

- High : 71
- Low : 21.71

\( D' \text{ Bar} = \text{-49.28} \) [Average Difference obtained]

\( S = 36.225 \) [Sample standard deviation]

\( ' t ' \text{ Calculated} = 3.599 \) ' & ' \( ' t ' \text{ Tabulated} = 2.365 \)

Level of Significance = 5% = Alpha value

Findings: Since, \( ' t ' \text{ Calculated} \text{ value is > the ' t ' tabulated value, at 5% level of the Null Hypothesis [ H2 ]} \) & find that
There is a significant difference between High & Low beneficiary responses influencing other beneficiaries may be given utmost priority for obtaining positive results. For other areas, positive results are significantly received especially for statement No. 1 to 5

Table: 94 Opinion on Main causes of poor beneficiary response by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main causes of poor beneficiary response in some programmes are:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Weak linkages with beneficiaries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of involvement of benef</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Deficiencies in needs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Benef views not given importance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Progress of programme too slow</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lack of openness in the agency beneficiaries are not taken into confidence by the agency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Faulty/hasty prog implementation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Disturbances created by collabor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Local prejudice, local politics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Competition from another develop age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table reveals the main causes of poor beneficiary response in that majority opined lack of involvement of beneficiaries as a major reason with 25(21.37%) strongly agreeing. 29(24.79%) agreeing however overall a mixed response can be seen with almost 17(14.53%) neutral responses, 18(15.38%) & 15(12.82%) responses in the disagree category, followed by reasons like lack of openness of the beneficiaries not considered by the agency with 21(17.95%) strongly agreeing, 23(19.66%) agreeing however about 24(20.51%) gave neutral responses, about 20(17.09%) disagreed and 11(9.40%) strongly disagreed, deficiencies in needs-services match with 14(11.97%) responding as strongly agree, 22(18.80%) responding as agree however almost 26(22.22%) disagreed and 13(11.11%) strongly disagreed. Other causes were lack of openness of the beneficiaries with 21(17.95%) strongly agreeing, 23(19.66%) agreeing however about 20(17.09%) disagreeing and 11(9.40%) strongly disagreeing other causes were competition from another development agency, local prejudice, local politics and progress of the programme being too slow.
Table: 95 Opinion on Areas of Beneficiary Response noticed by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary gain noticed by:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Beneficiary expresses satisfaction openly</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community elders +ve feedback</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Beneficiaries willing to benefit</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Request for new projects</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Way of life of benef changes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Beneficiary eager to undertake own dev</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The above table reveals the opinion of respondents with respect to beneficiary gain in that majority of the respondents have responded positively as opined by the respondents beneficiary gain is noticed by beneficiaries expressing satisfaction openly with 67(57.26%) responses in the strongly agree category and 25(21.37%) response in the agree category and extremely low response in the disagree and strongly disagree category. Followed by change in the way of life of beneficiaries with
57(48.72\%) responses in the strongly agree category and 27(23.08\%) in the agree category, other gains noted are requests for new projects, beneficiaries willing to be associated even after the withdrawal of the agency from the project, etc.

### Table: Opinion on Response on Functionaries by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response on Functionaries</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>S %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Heads of divisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Beneficiaries</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other functionaries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Records / documents</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Self appraisal and analysis</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table elicits details of sources through which the response of the beneficiaries to various programmes and activities is determined in that majority of the respondents opined self appraisal and analysis with 54(46.15\%) strongly agreeing, 21(17.95\%) agreeing and a minimal response in the disagree category, followed by records and documents with 41(35.04\%) strongly agreeing and 28(23.93\%) agreeing, followed by response from beneficiaries with 34(29.06\%) responding in the...
strongly agree category, 23(19.66%) in the agree category other sources were information from other functionaries and heads of divisions

**Table : 97 Opinion on Reasons for poor response by Function by Companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor response by Functionaries to certain programmes can be attributed to</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lack of commitment or conviction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poor programme</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lack of role clarity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Poor leadership &amp; communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Poor match between func</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Functionaries’ views not respected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conflicts among groups , infrac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Very limited programme-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table highlights reasons for poor response by functionaries in that majority of them have opined poor programme and strategy selection with 13(11.11\%) response in the strongly agree category and 24(20.51\%) in the agree category, followed by reasons viz. very limited programmes mix and scope for functionary involvement with 13(11.11\%) strongly agreeing, 10(8.55\%) agreeing, other reasons are functionaries views not respected, lack of role clarity, poor leadership and communication, poor match between functionaries expectations and company's programmes.

**Table : 98 Opinion on Programme Accomplishment by Companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G) PROGRAMME ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Evaluation of programmes</td>
<td>27 23.08</td>
<td>43 36.75</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>43 36.75</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Extent to which programme</td>
<td>32 27.35</td>
<td>55 47.01</td>
<td>4 3.42</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>24 20.51</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feedback from beneficiaries</td>
<td>34 29.06</td>
<td>48 41.03</td>
<td>8 6.84</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>27 23.08</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feedback from functionaries</td>
<td>27 23.08</td>
<td>51 43.59</td>
<td>9 7.69</td>
<td>1 0.85</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>29 24.79</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Visible changes and development</td>
<td>37 31.62</td>
<td>48 41.03</td>
<td>7 5.98</td>
<td>1 0.85</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>24 20.51</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Continued gain even after</td>
<td>34 29.06</td>
<td>43 36.75</td>
<td>12 10.26</td>
<td>1 0.85</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>27 23.08</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Data generated via studies</td>
<td>30 25.64</td>
<td>44 37.61</td>
<td>13 11.11</td>
<td>4 3.42</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>26 22.22</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Resources deployed</td>
<td>30 25.64</td>
<td>46 39.32</td>
<td>14 11.97</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>25 21.37</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Requests for similar progr</td>
<td>32 27.35</td>
<td>38 32.48</td>
<td>17 14.53</td>
<td>4 3.42</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>26 22.22</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Requests form others</td>
<td>31 26.50</td>
<td>38 32.48</td>
<td>15 12.82</td>
<td>5 4.27</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>26 22.22</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Unanticipated gains and losses</td>
<td>29 24.79</td>
<td>39 33.33</td>
<td>15 12.82</td>
<td>5 4.27</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>29 24.79</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Community and bene</td>
<td>36 30.77</td>
<td>42 35.90</td>
<td>11 9.40</td>
<td>2 1.71</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>26 22.22</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Evidence of multiplier</td>
<td>29 24.79</td>
<td>31 26.50</td>
<td>11 9.40</td>
<td>1 0.85</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>45 38.46</td>
<td>117 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights details on programme accomplishment in that majority of the respondents opined that evaluation of the programmes and services is based on visible changes and development with 37(31.62%) strongly agreeing, 48(41.03%) agreeing community and beneficiary participation with 36(30.77%) responding strongly agree and 42(35.90%) agreeing, continued gain even after completion of programme and feedback from beneficiaries with 34(29.06%) strongly agreeing and 43(36.75%) and 48(41.03%) agreeing in the respective categories, the extent to which programme objectives are accomplished and requests for similar programmes with 32(27.35%) strongly agreeing and 55(47.01%) and 38(32.48%) agreeing in the respective categories, followed by requests from other agencies seeking collaborative ventures, data generated via studies, resources deployed, unanticipated gains and losses, evaluation of the programmes and feedback form the functionaries.
### Table 99: Opinion on The nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries used by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Training Strategies for Staff and Functionaries Used by Corporate</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Determining appropriate prog</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Evolving more effective strategies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Develop ideas for future improve</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Publicizing corporate performance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Modify agency/operative goals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Extending, curtailing programme</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Improving beneficiary selection</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Beneficiary needs identification</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Reviewing resources deploy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Effectiveness of linkages with agent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Performance appraisal of function</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Improving corporate climate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Improving CSR planning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bench marking CSR planning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights the nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries in that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that it is to develop ideas for future improvement with 47 (40.17%) strongly agreeing and 39 (33.33%) agreeing, 44 (37.61%) strongly agreed that it is for evolving more effective strategies and better beneficiary need identification and 40 (34.19%) and 35 (29.91%) in the agree category followed by effectiveness of linkage with collaborating agencies with 42 (35.90%) strongly agreeing and 41 (35.04%) agreeing and other areas being improving corporate climate, reviewing resources deployment, performance appraisal of functionaries, improving and benchmarking CSR planning, improving beneficiary selection, determining appropriate programmes and service mix, modifying agencies operative goals etc.
### Table: 100 Opinion on Evaluation of Programmes by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of programmes is usually done by</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. External stand emp for CSR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social auditing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The programme or project group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The executive, or group or rep</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A group of experts within agency</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A mixed group of people from agency</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A specially appointed committee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table highlights the process of evaluation of programmes in that majority of the respondents opined positively with 44(37.61%) strongly agreeing and 17(14.53%) agreeing that evaluation is done by a group of people from within the agency followed by evaluation by a group of people from agencies with 38(32.48%) strongly agreeing and 25(21.37%) agreeing, 30(25.64%) strongly...
agreed and 17 (14.53%) agreed that it is done through executive or group of representatives other process of evaluation includes social auditing, evaluation of external agency, evaluation by a specially appointed committee and external standards employed for CSR.

**Table 101 Opinion on Areas of specific gains by Beneficiaries by Companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>Specific gains obtained by beneficiaries groups from programmes and services of the agency are:</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>T %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>An enhancement in self-reliance</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Obtaining direct economic benefits</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development of technical/voc skills</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increased awareness and under</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greater confidence among</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emergence and development</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Better communication ability</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Greater participation in community dev</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problem solving skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cooperation and coop ventures</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights the specific gains obtained by beneficiaries group from programmes and services of the agency in that majority opined it is enhancement in self-reliance with 56(47.86%) strongly agreeing and 29(24.79%) agreeing, increased awareness and understanding of social realities & better communication abilities with 51(43.59%) strongly agreeing and 40(34.19%) & 34(29.06%) agreeing in the respective categories, greater confidence and greater participation in community development with 50(42.74%) responses in the strongly agree category and 36(30.77%) and 33(28.21%) in the agree category. Amongst other beneficiary gains were development of technical/vocational skills and cooperation and cooperative ventures with 45(38.46%) response in the strongly agree category and 40(34.19%) and 30(25.64%) in the agree category, other gains were in the form of problem solving skills, obtaining direct economic benefits etc.
Table : 102  Opinion on Strategies employed for Image Enhancement by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies employed for image enhancement are:</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Public relations</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sharing experience with related agencies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Using ‘word of mouth’ of beneficiaries</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ensuring programme and service relevance</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph : 102

The above table highlights the strategies employed for image enhancement in that majority of the respondents opined very positively in that public relations as a strategy received 58(49.57%) and 23(19.66%) in the strongly agree and agree category, followed by sharing of experiences with related agencies with 51(43.59%) and 28(23.93%) in the strongly agree and agree category and strategies like using word of mouth of beneficiaries and ensuring programme and service relevance received 44(37.61%) in the strongly agree and 35(29.91%) and 26(22.22%) in the respective categories.
Table : 103  Opinion on Resources utilization by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>Resource utilization [financial, physical , human]</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the extent of resource utilization in that about 58(49.57%) responded positively in the yes category and a minimal 5(4.85%) responded negatively however almost 49( %) did not respond due to non disclosure, confidentiality and other reasons.

Table : 104  Opinion on Accountability of CSR Functions by Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P) ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights the accountability of CSR functions in that majority of the respondent opined that it is through sharing of CSR activities in annual general body meeting with 49 (41.88%) in the strongly agree category and 27 (23.08%) in the agree category, followed by reporting to appropriate authorities and general circulation of reports with 22 (18.80%) strongly agreeing and 17 (14.53%) and 34 (29.06%) agreeing in the respective categories, other areas included arranging fact finding visits to project site for selected persons, sending audits reports, and providing agencies with copies of reports and asking for comments.
P Chart Analysis:

Using p chart on % positive responses obtained, the following are the control limit values in %:

[A] Excellent results above UCL
Upper Control Limit [ UCL ] --> 64.85 %

[B] Good results between UCL & average
Average ----> 41.48 %

[C] Scope for improvement areas
Lower Control Limit [ LCL ] --> 0.18%

[A] Excellent results above UCL

Part A

[Q] Do you feel that adoption of standards like ISO 9000 / ISO 14000 / SA - 8000 etc has
[1] Boosted domestic sales [ 82.91 %]
[2] Boosted exports [ 83.76 %]
[3] Enabled more efficient manufacturing [ 86.32 %]
[5] Brought indirect business returns [ 76.92 %]

[R] Your Quality Assurance standards are
[1] Your own internal standards [ 65.81 %]
[2] Individually agreed with customer [ 76.07 %]
[3] Established Indian Standards [ 77.78 %]
[4] Established overseas standards [ 77.78 %]

Part B

[I] Your suggestion to what extent you believe and may extend support to following areas
[1] Enhancing CSR function of company based on global needs and standards [ 69.23 %]
[5] Supporting education through technological assistance [ 70.94 %]
[7] Entrepreneurship training development [ 69.23 %]
[8] Community capacity building [ youth, woman, teachers, families ] [ 68.38 %]
[10] Promoting Research & Development in the area of community and social dept [ 66.67 %]

[K] Did the company evolve
[1] Major objectives to be fulfilled [ 74.36 %]
[2] Short term and long term goals [ 80.34 %]
[3] Input, output, outcome and impact indicators [ 77.78 %]
[4] Performance standards to evaluate work [ 75.21 %]

Part C

[D] How has the CSR structure been established?
[22] Do management / managers understand the meaning of CSR? [ 67.52 %]

[F] Special Activities
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

- Has the organization undertaken any kind of review on how this may have impacted upon their reputation? [65.81%]
- Is it necessary to use or improve mobilization strategies in CSR for community support? [74.76%]

[B] Good results above average but below UCL

Part A
- Are you familiar with the term CSR? [63.11%]
- Does your company contribute to community and social development? [56.31%]
- If your exporting
  - Special social standards [43.30%]

Part B
- Your suggestion to what extent you believe and may extend support to following areas
  - Benchmarking CSR practises [58.97%]
  - Preparing for achieving excellence in the area of CSR [58.97%]
  - Instituting a professional chair for community and social responsibility [54.70%]
  - Improving agricultural productivity [42.74%]

[J] How did the company plan and implement its community programmes?
- Overview of situation and general understanding [57.26%]
- Based on scientific need assessment [56.41%]

[K] Did the company evolve
- Vision, Mission and policy statement for CSR [49.57%]
- CSR strategy for implementation [53.85%]
- CSR training, orientation & communication [internally and externally] [50.43%]

[N] Has the CSR function impacted bottom line performance of the company? [63.20%]

Part C
[A1] Does the organization perform CSR function?
- Directly by the company [51.28%]

[B] Does the company have an ethics/social responsibility committee on their boards to
- Review strategic plans [56.41%]
- Assess progress [53.70%]
- Offer guidance about emerging CSR issue [52.14%]

[C] CSR function is coordinated by
- HR department [61.54%]

[D] How has the CSR structure been established?
- Has an action plan been adopted/approved for creating a CSR structure [48.72%]
- Is this cross referenced to the corporate/strategic plan? [47.01%]
- Have targets been set? [51.28%]
- Does the organization monitor/plan to monitor performance against these targets? [57.26%]
- Has management received training on CSR issues? [50.43%]
- Has training been provided inhouse or by outside specialist organization? [42.74%]

Part D
[L] Resources utilization [financial, physical, human] in CSR is adequate [42.72%]

The areas other than above may be considered as scope for improvement

---
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Majority of the respondents i.e. 81.20% (95) scored in both the age group high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. basic information on CSR and 18.80 (22) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. basic information on CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no strong association between the respondents age and knowledge on basic information.

Knowledge about the basic information of CSR in the company is observed to be higher in both the age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: 1</th>
<th>Respondents age and knowledge about Basic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assym. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: 2</th>
<th>Respondents designation and knowledge about Basic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assym. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents i.e 81.20%(95) scored high revealing a high extent of knowledge about basic information on CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and knowledge about basic information on CSR.

Table: 3  Respondents Experience and knowledge about Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>76.27%</td>
<td>23.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.21%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.20%</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  Assym. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square  1.296  1  0.255

Majority of the respondents i.e 81.20% (95) have scored high and 18.80%(22) have scored low revealing a positive response with reference to basic information on CSR.

The scores in the high and low count clearly indicate a minor difference with reference to various experience categories however responses in the high and low score reveal remarkable difference.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with reference to basic information on CSR.
Table 4: Respondents Age and Terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>83.64%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 4.533 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.033

Majority of the respondents i.e 73.50%(86) scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility and 26.50 (31) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant .Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. terms used for CSR.

Table 5: Respondents Designation and terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>31.40%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>75.64%</td>
<td>24.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>68.60%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.269 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.604
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Majority of the respondents i.e. 73.50%(86) have scored high and 26.50%(31) have scored low revealing a positive response with reference to different terms used for CSR.

The scores in the high and low count clearly indicate a minor difference with reference to various designation categories and responses in the high and low score reveal similar differences.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondent's designation and response with reference to different terms used for CSR.

| Table 6: Respondents Experience and terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Experience 2 to 14 years        | Count | High   | Low    | Total  |
|                                 | 42     | 17     | 59     |
| Row %                          | 71.19% | 28.81% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 48.84% | 51.16% | 100%   |
| Experience 15 to 40 years      | Count | 44     | 14     | 58     |
|                                 | 75.86% | 24.14% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 51.16% | 48.84% | 100%   |
| Total                          | 86     | 31     | 117    |
| Row %                          | 73.50% | 26.50% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 100%   | 100%   |        |

Majority of the respondents i.e 73.50%(86) have scored high and 26.50%(31) have scored low revealing a positive and high response with reference to different terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility.

The scores in the high and low count clearly indicate a minor difference with reference to various experience categories however responses in the high and low score reveal remarkable difference.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. different terms used for Corporate Social Responsibility.
Table: 7  Respondents age and response on Company's contribution to Community and Social Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
<td>67.27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>60.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  Pearson Chi-Square 8.418 1 0.00371

Majority of the respondents i.e 52.14%(61) scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. company's contribution to Community and Social Development and 47.86 (56) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. company's contribution to Community and Social Development.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a very strong association between the respondents age and response on Company's contribution to Community and Social Development.

Table: 8  Respondents Designation and Company's contribution to Community and Social Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
<td>55.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>70.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  Pearson Chi-Square 0.518 1 0.471
Majority of the respondents i.e 52.14%(61) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 47.86%(56) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to company contribution to Community and social development.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and companys contribution to community and social development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>0.0515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 52.14%(61) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 47.86%(56) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to company contribution to Community and social development.

The scores in the high and low count clearly indicate a minor difference with reference to various experience categories however responses in the high and low score reveal similar difference.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents Experience and companys contribution to community and social development.
Table 10: Respondents age and Need & Emergence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>3 to 8 years</th>
<th>Above 8 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.92%</td>
<td>48.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>43.08%</td>
<td>51.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents in both the age group responded time span for CSR between 3-8 years with 55.56% (65) response whereas 44.44% (52) responded time span above 8 years.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there is no association between the respondent's age and company's time span for CSR.

Table 11: Respondents Designation and Time Span for CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>3 to 8 years</th>
<th>Above 8 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>21.54%</td>
<td>48.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>78.46%</td>
<td>51.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents in both the designation group responded time span for CSR between 3-8 years with 55.56% (65) response whereas 44.44% (52) responded time span above 8 years.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents designation and response w.r.t. company contribution to Community and social development.

Table : 12 Respondent Experience and Time Span of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>3 to 8 years</th>
<th>Above 8 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.92%</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>43.08%</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sgl. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 1.919 1 0.166

Majority of the respondents in both the experience group responded time span for CSR between 3-8 years with 55.56% (65) response whereas 44.44% (52) responded time span above 8 years.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. company contribution to Community and social development.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: 13 Respondents age Factors which led to the Emergence of the need for community based programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.18%</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.88%</td>
<td>58.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 0.332 1 0.565

Majority of the respondents i.e 58.12% (68) have scored low revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. Factors which led to the Emergence of the need for community based programme and 41.88 (49) have scored high revealing positive extent of response w.r.t. Factors which led to the Emergence of the need for community based programme

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no strong association between the two age groups and Knowledge about Factors which led to the Emergence of the need for community based programme

Table: 14 Respondents Designation and Emergence of the Need for community based programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.73%</td>
<td>30.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.74%</td>
<td>60.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.27%</td>
<td>69.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.88%</td>
<td>58.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 0.215 1 0.642
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Majority of the respondents scored low with 58.12%(68) revealing low response on the factors whereas 41.88%(49) scored high revealing high response on the factors which led to the emergence of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists no association between the respondents designation and factors which led to emergence of CSR.

Table 15: Respondents Experience and Emergence of the Need for Community Based programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>49.15%</td>
<td>50.85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>59.18%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>65.52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.82%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                     |       |      |       |
| Count                     | 49    | 68   | 117   |
| Row %                     | 41.88%| 58.12%| 100%  |
| Column %                  | 100%  | 100% |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square 2.018 1 0.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e. 58.12%(68) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 41.88%(49) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to factors which led to the emergence of Community based programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. to factors which led to the emergence of Community based programmes.
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Table: 16  Respondents Age and Corporate Social Responsibility initiative in company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.50%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>83.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f. Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.00028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 65.81% (77) have scored low revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. about Comapny's contribution to Community and Social Development and 34.19 (40) have scored high revealing positive extent of response w.r.t. Comapny's contribution to Community and Social Development.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the two age groups and Corporate Social Responsibility initiative in company.

Table: 17  Respondents Designation and Corporate Social Responsibility initiative in company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.18%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f. Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>0.0000000000000000076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents 65.81%(77) scored low revealing lower extent of knowledge regarding CSR initiative and 34.19%(40) scored high revealing a high extent of knowledge about CSR initiative of the company.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondent's designation and CSR initiative of the Company.

### Table: 18 Respondents Experience and Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative in Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54.24%</td>
<td>45.76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>35.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>86.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>64.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 19.5 1 0.00001

Majority of the respondents i.e 65.81%(77) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 34.19%(40) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to company initiative for Corporate Social Responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. company's initiative for Corporate Social Responsibility. Respondents Designation and company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service.
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Table: 19  Respondents age and company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.13%</td>
<td>33.87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.93%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>23.64%</td>
<td>76.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 19.5 1 0.00001

Majority of the respondents i.e 53.85%(63) have scored low revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service and 46.15 (54) have scored high revealing positive extent of response w.r.t. company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and the company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service.

Table: 20  Respondents Designation and company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 20.47 1 6.1E-06
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Majority of the respondents 53.85%(63) scored low revealing a low extent of knowledge about regarding company's guiding philosophy behind CSR and 46.15%(54) respondents scored high revealing high extent of knowledge

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and knowledge about company's guiding philosophy behind CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table : 21</th>
<th>Respondents Experience and company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 53.85%(63) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 46.15%(54) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. company's guiding philosophy in rendering its social service
Table: 22 Respondents age and basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>62.69%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>37.31%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 5.04 1 0.02477

Majority of the respondents i.e 57.26%(67) have scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society and 42.74 (50) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response about the basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society.

Table: 23 Respondents Designation and Knowledge about basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.87%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>62.82%</td>
<td>37.18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>73.13%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 2.309 1 0.128
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Majority of the respondents i.e 57.26%(67) have scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society and 42.74 (50) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents Designation and extent of response about the basic goal of company in rendering its contribution to society.

Table: 24 Respondents Experience and basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.10%</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>58.21%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>41.79%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 3.104 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.078

Majority of the respondents 57.26%(67) in both the designation group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 42.74%(50) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society.
Majority of the respondents i.e 76.07% (89) in both the age group have scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t. belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices and 23.93% (28) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and knowledge about belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices.

Table : 26  
Respondents Designation and belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>29.21%</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>80.77%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.79%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>76.07%</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 2.119 1 0.145
Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the designation group scored high revealing a higher extent of response about corporate beliefs and practices of corporate values for CSR practice.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response about corporate beliefs and practices of corporate values for CSR practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>88.14%</td>
<td>11.86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>58.43%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.79%</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>41.57%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>76.07%</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 8.23 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.00412

Majority of the respondents i.e 76.07%(89) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 23.93%(28) have scored low revealing a low and negative with reference to belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. belief and practice of Corporate Values for CSR practices.
Table: 28  
**Respondents age and approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>80.65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>70.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>29.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f.**  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 20.28  
1  
0.0000067

 Majority of the respondents i.e 60.68%(71) in both the age group have scored low revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities and 39.32 (46) have scored high revealing high extent of response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age extent of response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.

Table: 29  
**Respondents Designation and Knowledge about the approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>38.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>61.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f.**  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 1.294  
1  
0.255
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Majority of the respondents 60.68% (71) in both the designation group scored low revealing lower extent of response about approach of company towards its corporate Social responsibility and 39.32% (46) scored high revealing higher extent of response about approach of the company towards corporate social responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response towards approach of company towards its corporate Social responsibility.

### Table: 30 Respondents Experience and approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.34%</td>
<td>79.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>66.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.91%</td>
<td>33.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.00005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e. 60.68% (71) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 39.32% (46) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 31  Respondents age and Motivational factors for involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>50.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 0.039 1 0.844

Majority of the respondents i.e 56.41% (66) in both the age group have scored high revealing a high extent of response w.r.t motivational factor for companies involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility and 43.59 (51) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t motivational factor for companys involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the two age groups and Respondents age and extent of response w.r.t motivational factor for companies involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility

Table : 32  Respondents Designation and Knowledge about Motivational factors for involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>58.97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.76%</td>
<td>54.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 4.732 1 0.0296

--- 377 ---
Majority of the respondents i.e. 56.42% (66) in both the designation group scored high revealing a high extent of knowledge about Motivational factors for involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility and 43.59% (51) scored low.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response on Motivational factors for involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility.

Table 33: Respondents experience and Motivational factors for involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.93%</td>
<td>44.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 56.41% (66) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 43.59% (51) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to motivational factors for companys involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with reference to motivational factors for companys involvement in Corporate Social Responsibility.
Table: 34  Respondents age and awareness of the external standards in CSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>96.77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>55.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>89.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>44.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 1.629 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.201

Majority of the respondents 93.16%(109) in both the age group have scored low revealing poor extent of response w.r.t. awareness of the external standards in CSR. 6.84%(8) have scored high revealing a high extent response with reference to awareness of the external standards in CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no strong association between respondents age and extent of awareness of the external standards in CSR.

Table: 35  Respondents Designation and awareness of the external standards in CSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>32.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>94.87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>67.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.419 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.517
Majority of the respondents 93.16%(109) in both the designation group have scored low revealing very low awareness on external standards in CSR and only 6.84%(8) have scored high revealing high extent of awareness in both the designation groups.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and awareness about external standards on CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table : 36</th>
<th>Respondents Experience and awareness of the external standards in CSR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Experience 15 to 40 years | **High** | **Low** | **Total** |
| Count  | 4 | 54 | 58 |
| Row %  | 6.90% | 93.10% | 100% |
| Column % | 50.00% | 49.54% |

| Total | **High** | **Low** | **Total** |
| Count  | 8 | 109 | 117 |
| Row %  | 6.84% | 93.16% | 100% |
| Column % | 100% | 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 6.84%(8) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 93.16%(109) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to extent of awareness on external standards in CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t extent of awareness on external standards in CSR.
Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response w.r.t. need to draw CSR code and 23.93%(28) have scored low revealing a low and negative response w.r.t. need to draw CSR code. The extent of awareness about the need to draw CSR code is higher in both the age groups.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age extent of response w.r.t. need to draw CSR code.
Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a very high extent of response w.r.t. to the need for drawing a CSR code. and only 23.93%(28) have scored low revealing low extent of response w.r.t. to the need for drawing a CSR code.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation extent of response w.r.t. to the need for drawing a CSR code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table : 39</th>
<th>Respondents Experience and Need to draw CSR code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td>Count 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row % 74.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column % 49.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row % 77.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column % 50.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row % 76.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column % 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 23.93%(28) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to need to draw CSR code.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 40 Respondents age and Bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>69.81%</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.19%</td>
<td>69.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
<td>54.30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.804</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 54.70%(64) in both the age group have scored low revealing low and negative extent of response w.r.t. Bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company and 45.30%(53) have scored high revealing a high extent of response with reference to Bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company.

Table : 41 Respondents Designation and Response on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>22.64%</td>
<td>42.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52.56%</td>
<td>47.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>77.36%</td>
<td>22.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 54.70% (64) in both the designation group scored low revealing a low extent of response on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company and 45.30% (53) have scored high revealing a high extent of response on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and response on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company.

| Table: 42 Respondents Experience and Response on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Experience 2 to 14 years         | Count  | High   | Low    | Total |
|                                  |        | 38     | 21     | 59    |
|                                  | Row %  | 64.41% | 35.59% | 100%  |
|                                  | Column%| 71.70% | 32.81% |       |
| Experience 15 to 40 years        | Count  | 15     | 43     | 58    |
|                                  | Row %  | 25.86% | 74.14% | 100%  |
|                                  | Column%| 28.30% | 67.19% |       |
| Total                            | Count  | 53     | 64     | 117   |
|                                  | Row %  | 45.30% | 54.70% | 100%  |
|                                  | Column%| 100%   | 100%   |       |
| Value                            | d.f.   | Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) | 0.000063 |
| Pearson Chi-Square               | 16.02  | 1      | 0.000063 |

Majority of the respondents i.e 54.70% (64) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative rating and 45.30% (53) have scored high revealing a high and positive rating with reference to rating on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company practices.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response with reference to rating on bottom line benefits of a socially responsible company practices.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 43 Respondents age and CSR focus with respect to internal dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>72.58%</td>
<td>27.42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 1.548 1 0.213

Majority of the respondents 66.67%(78) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 33.33%(39) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to CSR focus with respect to internal dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the respondents age group and extent of response about CSR focus with respect to internal dimension

Table : 44 Respondents Designation and CSR focus with respect to internal dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 0.043 1 0.835
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Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents 66.67%(78) in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response on CSR focus with respect to internal dimension and 33.33% (39) have scored low revealing a low extent of response on CSR focus with respect to internal dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response on CSR focus with respect to internal dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76.27%</td>
<td>23.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 4.107 1 Assym. Sig. (2 sided) 0.0427

Majority of the respondents i.e 66.67%(78) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 33.33%(39) have scored low revealing a low and negative response w.r.t. focus of CSR company in the internal dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. focus of CSR company in the internal dimension.
Majority of the respondents 78.63%(92) in both the age group have scored low revealing lower extent of response and 21.37%(25) have scored high revealing a higher extent of response with reference to CSR focus with respect to external dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and extent of response about CSR focus with respect to external dimension.

Table: 47  Respondents Designation  CSR focus with respect to external dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>27.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>72.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21.37%</td>
<td>78.63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 6.111 1 0.01344
Majority of the respondents 78.63%(92) in both the designation group scored low revealing a low extent of response on CSR focus with respect to external dimension and 21.37 % (25) have scored high revealing a high extent of response on CSR focus with respect to external dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation extent of response on CSR focus with respect to external dimension.

| Table : 48 Respondents Experience CSR focus with respect to external dimension |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
|                  | High | Low | Total |
| Experience 2 to 14 years | 18   | 41  | 59   |
| Row %             | 30.51% | 69.49% | 100% |
| Column %          | 72.00% | 44.57% |       |
| Experience 15 to 40 years | 7   | 51  | 58  |
| Row %             | 12.07% | 87.93% | 100% |
| Column %          | 28.00% | 55.43% |       |
| Total             | 25   | 92  | 117 |
| Row %             | 21.37% | 78.63% | 100% |
| Column %          | 100%  | 100%  |       |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.872 |     | 0.027 |

Majority of the respondents i.e 78.63%(92) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response revealing low and negative response w.r.t. to external dimension and 21.37%(25) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to focus of CSR company in the external dimension.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. focus of CSR company in the external dimension.
Table: 49  Respondents age and concept of corporate social responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>75.81%</td>
<td>24.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.63%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.63%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.63%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 70.94%(83) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response w.r.t. concept of CSR and 29.06%(34) have scored low revealing a low extent of knowledge w.r.t. concept of CSR.

Table: 50  Respondents Designation and knowledge about the concept of corporate social responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>28.92%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>75.64%</td>
<td>24.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>71.08%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.94%</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 70.94%(83) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a greater extent of knowledge on the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility and 29.06%...
(34) respondents have scored low revealing a low extent of knowledge on the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of knowledge on concept of Corporate Social Responsibility.

| Table: 51 Respondents Experience and knowledge about the concept of corporate social responsibility |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|----------|
| Experience 2 to 14 years                                      | Count   | High  | Low  | Total  |
| Row %                                                         | 77.97%  | 22.03%| 100% |
| Column %                                                      | 55.42%  | 38.24%| 100% |
| Experience 15 to 40 years                                     | Count   | High  | Low  | Total  |
| Row %                                                         | 63.79%  | 36.21%| 100% |
| Column %                                                      | 44.58%  | 61.76%| 100% |
| Total                                                         | Count   | High  | Low  | Total  |
| Row %                                                         | 70.94%  | 29.06%| 100% |
| Column %                                                      | 100%    | 100%  | 100% |

Majority of the respondents 70.94%(83) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high extent of knowledge and 29.06%(34) have scored low revealing a low extent of knowledge w.r.t. concept of corporate social responsibility.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and extent of knowledge w.r.t. concept of corporate social responsibility.
Majority of the respondents 74.36%(87) in both the age group have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. Company’s focus for CSR in the future and 25.64%(30) have scored high revealing a higher and positive extent of response with reference to Company’s focus for CSR in the future.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. Company’s focus for CSR in the future.

Table : 53   Respondents Designation and Knowledge about Company’s focus for CSR in the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21.79%</td>
<td>78.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square 1.261 1 0.2615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 74.36% (87) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a low extent/negative response about company's focus on CSR in the future and 25.64% (30) respondents have scored high revealing a high/positive response about company's focus on CSR in the future.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response about company's focus on CSR in the future.

**Table: 54  Respondents Experience and Company’s focus for CSR in the future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
<td>81.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32.76%</td>
<td>67.24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 74.36% (87) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 25.64% (30) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to Company's focus for CSR in the future.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Company's focus for CSR in the future.
Table 55: Respondents Age and Perceptions about Relevance of Social and HR Education for CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 1.532 1 0.215

Majority of the respondents 68.38%(80) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response Perceptions about relevance of Social and HR education for CSR and 31.62%(37) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to Perceptions about relevance of Social and HR education for CSR.

Referring to the above table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and Perceptions about relevance of Social and HR education for CSR.

Table 56: Respondents Designations and Perceptions about Relevance of Social and HR Education for CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 3.088 1 0.07887
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Majority of the respondents 68.38%(80) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response about company's focus on CSR in the future and 31.62% (37) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response about company's focus on CSR in the future.

The scores in the high and low count clearly indicate a minor difference in the designation categories however there is a significant difference in the high and low count within each designation category.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and Perceptions about relevance of Social and HR education for CSR.

Table: 57 Respondents Experience and Perceptions about relevance of Social and HR education for CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>77.97%</td>
<td>22.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.50%</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td>64.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>31.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  Pearson Chi-Square 4.207 1 0.042

Majority of the respondents i.e 60.38%(80) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 31.62%(37) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to perceptions on relevance of Social Work and HR Education for CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. perceptions on relevance of Social Work and HR Education for CSR.
Table: 58  Respondents age and CSR Imperatives for Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>77.42%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>53.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 0.351 1 0.553

Majority of the respondents 74.36%(87) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response w.r.t. CSR imperatives and 25.64%(30) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to CSR Imperatives.

Referring to the above table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and knowledge about CSR imperatives for companies.

Table: 59  Respondents Designation and CSR Imperatives for Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>80.77%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 4.085 1 0.04327

Majority of the respondents 74.36%(87) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response about CSR imperatives for the company and 25.64 % (30)
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respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response about CSR imperatives for the company.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and response about CSR imperatives for the company.

Table: 60 Respondents Experience and CSR Imperatives for Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.05%</td>
<td>16.95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.32%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.52%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.68%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 74.36%(87) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 25.64%(30) have scored low revealing a low and negative response w.r.t. opinion on CSR Imperatives.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. opinion on CSR Imperatives.
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Table: 61 Respondents age and need for CSR codification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.42%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.58%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.849</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 56.41% (66) in both the age group have scored high revealing high and positive response w.r.t. need for CSR codification and 43.59% (51) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to w.r.t. need for CSR codification.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents age and knowledge about the need for CSR codification.

Table: 62 Respondents Designation and need for CSR codification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>78.79%</td>
<td>50.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.798</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents 56.41%(66) in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. need for codification and 43.59%(51) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. need for codification.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation extent of response w.r.t. need for codification.

Table: 63 Respondents Experience and need for CSR codification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.42%</td>
<td>60.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.52%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.58%</td>
<td>39.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 3.18 1 0.074

Majority of the respondents 56.41%(66) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 43.59%(51) have scored low revealing a low and negative response w.r.t. need for CSR codification.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t need for CSR codification.
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Table: 64  Respondents Age and community scenario in the pre interventions stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.97%</td>
<td>79.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>50.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>87.27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>49.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.09%</td>
<td>82.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 0.876 1 0.349

Majority of the respondents 82.91%(97) in both the age group have scored low revealing poor negative and 17.09%(20) have scored high revealing a positive response with reference to community scenario in the pre intervention stage

Referring to the above table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age groups community scenario in the pre intervention stage

Table: 65  Respondents Designation and community scenario in the pre interventions stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>68.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.09%</td>
<td>82.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 0.188 1 0.6642
Majority of the respondents 82.91%(97) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a poor response about community scenario in the pre intervention stage and 17.09 % (20) respondents have scored high revealing a fair response about community scenario in the pre intervention stage

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation response about community scenario in the pre intervention stage

Table : 66 Respondents Experience and community scenario in the pre interventions stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
<td>81.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>49.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>84.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>50.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.09%</td>
<td>82.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. ( 2 sided) 0.041 1 0.838

Majority of the respondents 82.91%(77) in both the experience group have scored low low revealing poor response w.r.t. community scenario in the pre intervention stage 17.09%(20) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to community scenario in the pre intervention stage

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t community scenario in the pre intervention stage
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Majority of the respondents 70.09% (82) in both the age group have scored low revealing higher extent of negative response w.r.t. CSR impact and 29.91% (35) have scored high revealing lower extent of positive response with reference to CSR impact.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and response on the CSR impact.

Table : 68   Respondents designation and CSR Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>30.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.91%</td>
<td>70.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assym. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>4.015 0.0451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents 70.09% (82) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a low response about CSR impact and 29.91% (35) respondents have scored high revealing a high response about CSR impact.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and CSR impact.

Table: 69 Respondents Experience and CSR Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.98%</td>
<td>61.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>65.71%</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.66%</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.91%</td>
<td>70.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 3.837 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.05014

Majority of the respondents 70.09% (82) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and poor impact of CSR and 29.91% (35) have scored high revealing a high and positive response w.r.t. CSR impact.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. CSR Impact.
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Table 70: Respondents Age and Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>51.39%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>48.61%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value | d.f. | Assym. Sig. (2 sided) | 0.803
Pearson Chi-Square 0.062 1

Majority of the respondents 61.54%(72) in both the age group have scored high revealing higher extent of positive response w.r.t. major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR and 38.46%(45) have scored low revealing lower extent of negative response with reference to major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the age groups and extent of response with reference to major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR.

Table 71: Respondents designation and Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managars</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value | d.f. | Assym. Sig. (2 sided) | 0.84
Pearson Chi-Square 0.041 1

-# 403 #-
Majority of the respondents 61.54%(72) in both the designation group have scored high revealing greater extent of difficulties encountered and addressed in the process of CSR and 38.46 % (45) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of difficulties encountered and addressed in the process of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of difficulties encountered and addressed in the process of CSR.

Table: 72 Respondents Experience and Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>51.39%</td>
<td>48.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.34%</td>
<td>39.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>48.61%</td>
<td>51.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.9417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 61.54%(72) in both the experience group have scored high revealing Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR and 38.46%(45) have scored low revealing low extent of Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and extent of response w.r.t Major difficulties encountered & addressed in the process of CSR.
Table : 73  Respondents Age and CSR stages where difficulties were faced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 1.109 1 0.292

Majority of the respondents 65.81%(77) in both the age group have scored high revealing higher extent of positive response w.r.t. CSR stages where difficulties were faced and 34.19%(40) have scored low revealing lower extent of negative response with reference to CSR stages where difficulties were faced.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the age groups and extent of response with reference to CSR stages where difficulties were faced.

Table : 74  Respondents Designation and CSR stages where difficulties were faced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.51%</td>
<td>29.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>57.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 1.714 1 0.19045
Majority of the respondents 65.818\%(77) in both the designation group have scored high revealing greater extent of difficulties in various CSR stages and 34.19\%(40) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of difficulties in various CSR stages.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response on extent of difficulties in various CSR stages.

**Table : 75 Respondents Experience and CSR stages where difficulties were faced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>25.42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 65.81\%(77) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high extent of response w.r.t. CSR stages where difficulties were faced and 34.19\%(40) have scored low revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. CSR stages where difficulties were faced.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. CSR stages where difficulties were faced.
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Table : 76  **Respondents Age and extent of positive CSR impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.45%</td>
<td>43.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>40.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 8.983 1 0.00273

Majority of the respondents 57.26%(67) in both the age group have scored low revealing lower extent of positive response and 42.74%(50) have scored low revealing a lower extent of negative response with reference to basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society w.r.t. extent of positive CSR impact.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there is no association between respondents age and response w.r.t. extent of positive impact.

Table : 77  **Respondents Designation and extent of positive impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>43.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 5.977 1 0.0145
Majority of the respondents 57.26%(67) in both the designation group have scored low revealing low extent of positive impact. and 42.74%(50) respondents have scored high revealing high extent of positive impact. There exists a minor difference in the low and high scores.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of positive impact.

Table: 78  Respondents Experience and extent of positive impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.63%</td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>37.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>62.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value  d.f.  Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 9.593 1 0.00195

Majority of the respondents i.e 57.26%(67) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low response w.r.t. positive CSR impact and 42.74%(50) have scored high revealing a high response with reference w.r.t. positive CSR impact.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and extent response w.r.t. positive CSR impact.
Table 79: Respondents age and CSR Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 25 to 40 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.13%</td>
<td>33.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>78.85%</td>
<td>32.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 41 to 67 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>67.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square: 23.28  d.f.: 1  Assym. Sig. (2 sided): 0.0000014

Majority of the respondents 55.56%(65) in both the age group have scored low revealing negative response w.r.t. CSR process and 44.44%(52) have scored high revealing a positive response w.r.t. CSR process.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between Respondents age and CSR process.

Table 80: Respondents Designation and CSR Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>98.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square: 69.79  d.f.: 1  Assym. Sig. (2 sided): 0.000000000000000066

Majority of the respondents 55.56%(65) in both the designation group scored low revealing a low extent of use of various CSR process and 44.44%(52) respondents have scored high revealing high...
extent of use of various CSR process. Thus the difference is minor as far as extent of use of CSR process is concerned in both the categories.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of use of various CSR process.

Table: 81 Respondents Experience and CSR Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.49%</td>
<td>30.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.85%</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.97%</td>
<td>81.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>0.00000011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 55.56%(65) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. use of various CSR processes and 44.44%(52) have scored high revealing a high and positive response w.r.t. use of various CSR processes

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and extent of response w.r.t. use of various CSR processes.
Table: 82  Respondents age and Quantitative measurement of impact of CSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.01%</td>
<td>52.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided) | Pearson Chi-Square | 0.00193 |

Majority of the respondents 52.99%(62) in both the age group have scored low revealing negative response w.r.t. quantitative measurement of CSR and 47.01%(55) have scored high revealing a positive response w.r.t. quantitative measurement of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondent age and quantitative measurement of the impact of CSR.
Majority of the respondents 52.99% (62) in both the designation group have scored revealing lower extent of positive response w.r.t. to quantitative measurement of CSR and 47.01% (55) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of positive response w.r.t. to quantitative measurement of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation extent of response w.r.t. to quantitative measurement of CSR.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents i.e. 52.99% (62) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response however 47.01% (55) have scored high revealing a high and positive response w.r.t. Quantitative measurement of impact of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. Quantitative measurement of impact of CSR.

Table : 85 Respondents age and Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>44.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>78.18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>55.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assym. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 65.81% (77) in both the age group have scored low revealing negative response w.r.t. qualitative measurement of CSR and 34.19% (40) have scored high revealing a positive response w.r.t. qualitative measurement of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondent age and w.r.t. qualitative measurement of CSR.
### Table: 86 Respondents Designation and Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)**

\[
\text{Pearson Chi-Square} = 2.968 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad \text{Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)} = 0.0849
\]

Majority of the respondents 65.81% (77) in both the designation group have scored low revealing lower extent of positive response w.r.t. to qualitative measurement of CSR and 34.19% (40) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of positive response w.r.t. to qualitative measurement of impact of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation extent of response w.r.t. to qualitative measurement of impact of CSR.

### Table: 87 Respondents Experience and Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.66%</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)**

\[
\text{Pearson Chi-Square} = 8.163 \quad \text{d.f.} = 1 \quad \text{Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)} = 0.00428
\]
Majority of the respondents i.e 65.81% (77) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR and 34.19% (40) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. Qualitative measurement of impact of CSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>98.39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>53.98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>94.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>46.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) | 0.399 1 | 0.527 |

Majority of the respondents 96.58% (113) in both the age group have scored low revealing high extent of negative response and 3.42% (4) have scored high revealing a very low extent of positive response with reference to decline in the incidences of social problems.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square not significant. Hence there no association between the respondent age and extent of response w.r.t. decline in the incidence of social problems.
Table : 89  
Respondents Designation and Incidence of Social Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>94.87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>32.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>67.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 96.58%(113) in both the designation group have scored low revealing poor extent of response as far as decline in the incidence of social problems and only 3.42 % (4) respondents have scored high revealing a high extent of response as far as decline in the incidence of social problems.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response as far as decline in the incidence of social problems is concerned.

Table : 90  
Respondents Experience and Incidence of Social Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>94.92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>49.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>98.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>50.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>96.58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t, community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents i.e 96.58%(113) in both the experience group have scored low revealing a very low and negative response w.r.t. to decline in incidence of social problems and 3.42%(4) have scored high revealing a high and positive response w.r.t. to decline in incidence of social problems

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. to decline in incidence of social problems

Table : 91 Respondents age and Preferred Needs of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 25 to 40 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>44.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 41 to 67 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>78.18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>55.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.059</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 65.81%(77) in both the age group have scored low revealing higher extent of negative response and 34.19%(40) have scored high revealing a low extent of positive response as far as preferred needs of the community are concerned

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and response of the preferred needs of the community
Majority of the respondents 65.81%(77) in both the designation group have scored low revealing lower extent of response towards preferred needs of the community and 34.19 % (40) respondents have scored high revealing a higher extent of response towards preferred needs of the community.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response towards preferred needs of the community.

---

### Table: 92 Respondents Designation and Preferred Needs of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>32.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>67.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: 93 Respondents Experience and Preferred Needs of the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>40.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.163</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents i.e 65.81%(77) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. preferred needs of the community and 34.19%(40) have scored high revealing a high and positive response w.r.t. preferred needs of the community.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. preferred needs of the community.

**Table: 94 Respondents age and extent of capabilities of the company to meet preferred needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>95.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>53.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>46.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>94.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value** | d.f. | Assympt. Sig. (2 sided) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 94.02%(110) in both the experience group have scored high revealing a very high and positive extent of response with reference to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs of community and only 5.98%(7) have scored low.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and extent of response with reference to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs.
Majority of the respondents 94.02%(110) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a very high and positive extent of response with reference to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs of community and only 5.98%(7) have scored low

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs.

Table 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience 2 to 14 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>93.22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>94.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.0005 1 0.9813

Table 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>34.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>65.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>94.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.475 1 0.49
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents 94.02%(110) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response with respect to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs and 5.98%(7) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with respect to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect to capabilities of the company to meet the preferred needs.
Majority of the respondents 60.68%(71) in both the age group scored high revealing a greater extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization and 39.32%(46) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a very strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization.

Table : 98 Respondents designation and deployment of CSR constituents across the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 86.52 1 0.00000021

Table : 97 Respondents Age and deployment of CSR constituents across the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 24.77 1 0.00000065

---
Majority of the respondents 60.68% (71) in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization and 39.32% (46) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a very strong association between the respondents' designation and extent of response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.80%</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.96%</td>
<td>26.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>89.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>73.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square | 38.09 | Assym. Sig. (2 sided) | 0.000000000068

Majority of the respondents i.e. 60.68% (71) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response deployment of CSR constituents across the Organization and 39.32% (46) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to deployment of CSR constituents across the Organization.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and extent of response w.r.t. deployment of CSR constituents across the Organization.
Majority of the respondents 80.34%(94) in both the age group respondents scored high revealing a greater extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators and 19.66%(23) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators

Table: 100 Respondents Age and Work Place Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.26%</td>
<td>47.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.18%</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.74%</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.34%</td>
<td>19.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
<th>0.748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 101 Respondents Designation and Work Place Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.18%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.34%</td>
<td>43.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.34%</td>
<td>19.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
<th>0.017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.689</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 80.34%(94) in both the designation group respondents scored high revealing a greater extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators and 19.66%(23) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to work place performance indicators.

**Table: 102 Respondents Experience and Work Place Performance Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td>15.25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.19%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>75.86%</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.81%</td>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>80.34%</td>
<td>19.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 80.34%(94) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response with respect to Work Place Performance Indicator and 19.66%(23) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with respect to Work Place Performance Indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect to Work Place Performance Indicators.
Majority of the respondents 69.23% (81) in both the age group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response with reference to market place performance indicators and 30.77% (36) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to market place performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to market place performance indicators.

Table: 104  Respondents Designation and Market Place Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.045 1 0.831
Majority of the respondents 69.23% (81) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response with reference to market place performance indicators and 30.77% (36) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to market place performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to market place performance indicators.

| Table:105 Respondents Experience and Market Place Performance Indicators |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|
| Experience 2 to 14 years        | Count       | High 44   | Low 15 |
|                                 | Row %       | 74.58%    | 25.42% |
|                                 | Column %    | 54.32%    | 41.67% |
| Experience 15 to 40 years       | Count 37    | High 63.79%| Low 36.21%|
|                                 | Column %    | 45.68%    | 58.33% |
| Total                           | Count 81    | High 69.23%| Low 30.77%|
|                                 | Column %    | 100%      | 100%  |
| Value                           | d.f. 1      | Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.206 |
| Pearson Chi-Square              | 1.13        | 1         |

Majority of the respondents 69.23% (81) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response with respect to market Place Performance Indicator and 30.77% (36) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with respect to market Place Performance Indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect to market Place Performance Indicators.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: 106  Respondents Age and Environment Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>83.87%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>57.78%</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>42.22%</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 2.802 1 0.094

Majority of the respondents 76.92%(90) in both the age group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response with reference to environment performance indicators and 23.08 % (27) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to environment performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and response with reference to environment place performance indicators.

Table:107  Respondents Designation and Environment Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>78.21%</td>
<td>21.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>32.22%</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>67.78%</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 0.054 1 0.816
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Majority of the respondents 76.92%(90) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response with reference to environment performance indicators and 23.08% (27) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to environment performance indicators

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to environment place performance indicators

Table: 108 Respondents Experience and Environment Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td>15.25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.97%</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents in both the experience groups 76.92%(90) have scored high revealing high and positive response with respect to environment Performance Indicator and 23.08%(27) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with respect to environment Performance Indicators

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect to environment
Table: 109  Respondents Age and Community Development Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>69.64%</td>
<td>37.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
<td>69.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
<td>62.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 10.71 1 0.00107

Majority of the respondents 52.14% (61) in both the age group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to community development performance indicators and 47.86% (56) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to community development performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and response with reference to community development performance indicator.

Table: 110  Respondents Designation and Community Development Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>40.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>59.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 2.676 1 0.10188
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Majority of the respondents 52.14%(61) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to community development performance indicators and 47.86% (56) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to community development performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to community development performance indicator.

| Table : 111 Respondents Experience and Community Development Performance Indicators |
|---|---|---|---|
| Experience 2 to 14 years | Count | High | Low | Total |
| Experience 2 to 14 years | Row % | 64.41% | 35.59% | 100% |
| Experience 2 to 14 years | Column % | 67.86% | 34.43% | |
| Experience 15 to 40 years | Count | 60 | 38 | 100 |
| Experience 15 to 40 years | Row % | 31.03% | 68.97% | 100% |
| Experience 15 to 40 years | Column % | 32.14% | 65.57% | |
| Total | Count | 117 | 56 | 117 |
| Total | Row % | 47.86% | 52.14% | 100% |
| Total | Column % | 100% | 100% | |

Majority of the respondents in both the experience groups 52.14%(61) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response with respect to community development Performance Indicator and 47.86%(56) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with respect to community development Performance Indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect to community development performance indicator.
Majority of the respondents 55.56% (65) in both the age group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to ethical performance indicators and 44.44 % (52) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to ethical performance indicators

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to ethical performance indicators.

### Table: Respondents Age and Ethical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 25 to 40 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age 41 to 67 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43.64%</td>
<td>56.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Respondents Designation and Ethical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Majority of the respondents 55.56%(65) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to ethical performance indicators and 44.44% (52) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to ethical performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to ethical performance indicators.

Table:114 Respondents Experience and Ethical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count High</th>
<th>Count Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square value: 0.226, d.f. = 1, Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) = 0.634

Majority of the respondents in both the experience groups 55.56%(65) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response with respect to ethical Performance Indicator and 44.44%(52) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with respect to ethical Performance Indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect ethical performance indicator.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: 115 Respondents Age and Human Rights Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.97%</td>
<td>79.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>55.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>44.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>24.79%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymb. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 75.21% (88) in both the age group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to human rights performance indicators and 24.79% (29) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to human rights performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and response with reference to human rights performance indicators.

Table: 116 Respondents Designation and Human Rights Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>35.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>64.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>24.79%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymb. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-:- 434 :-:-
Majority of the respondents 75.21% (88) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a negative and low response with reference to human rights performance indicators and 24.79% (29) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response with reference to human rights performance indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and response with reference to human rights performance indicators.

| Table: 117 Respondents Experience and Human Rights Performance Indicators |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                             | High | Low | Total |
| Experience 2 to 14 years    |      |     |      |
| Count                       | 17   | 42  | 59   |
| Row %                       | 28.81% | 71.19% | 100% |
| Column %                    | 58.62% | 47.73% |      |
| Experience 15 to 40 years   |      |     |      |
| Count                       | 12   | 46  | 58   |
| Row %                       | 20.69% | 79.31% | 100% |
| Column %                    | 41.38% | 52.27% |      |
| Total                       |      |     |      |
| Count                       | 29   | 88  | 117  |
| Row %                       | 24.79% | 75.21% | 100% |
| Column %                    | 100% | 100% |      |

Pearson Chi-Square 0.645 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.421

Majority of the respondents in both the experience groups 75.21% (88) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response with respect to human rights Performance Indicator and 24.79% (29) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with respect to human rights Performance Indicators.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response with respect human rights performance indicator.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 118  Respondents age and Stakeholders interests in company CSR Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>82.14%</td>
<td>43.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>56.18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>75.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>0.00088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the age group scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. stakeholders interests in companys CSR performance and 23.93%(28)respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. stakeholders interests in companys CSR performance

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and response on extent of stakeholder interests in companys CSR performance

Table:119  Respondents Designation and Stakeholders interests in company CSR performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.97%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>82.14%</td>
<td>17.98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>93.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>82.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>76.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>0.0000000014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

::: 436 :::
Majority of the respondents 76.07%(89) in both the designation group scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. stakeholders interests in company's CSR performance and 23.93%(28) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. stakeholders interests in company's CSR performance.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and response on extent of stakeholder interests in company's CSR performance.

Table:120 Respondents Experience and Stakeholders interests in company CSR Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>57.63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.29%</td>
<td>38.20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>76.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square | 20.24 | 0.0000068 |

Majority of the respondents i.e 76.07%(89) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. Stakeholders interests in company CSR performance and 23.93%(28) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to Stakeholders interests in company CSR performance.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. Stakeholders interests in company CSR performance.
Table: Respondents age and views on stakeholders issues consideration in investment decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>42.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>96.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>57.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.37%</td>
<td>78.63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 17.48 1 0.000029

Majority of the respondents i.e 78.63% (92) in both the age group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 21.37% (25) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to views on stakeholders issues consideration in investment decisions.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents age and response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.
Majority of the respondents 78.63%(92) in both the designation group have scored low revealing very low response w.r.t. consideration of stakeholder issues in investment decision and 21.37%(25)respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. consideration of stakeholder issues in investment decision.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents designation and response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.
### Table: 123 Respondents Experience and views on stakeholders issues consideration in investment decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>40.68%</td>
<td>59.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>38.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>98.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>61.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>21.37%</td>
<td>78.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
<th>0.00000089</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 78.63%(92) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 21.37%(25) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to views on stakeholders issues consideration in investment decisions.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. approach of the company with respect to social responsibilities.

### Table: 124 Respondents Age and collaboration with Specialists and Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.68%</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.62%</td>
<td>52.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.18%</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.38%</td>
<td>53.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.97%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
<th>0.98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.006 1
Referring to the above table it is clear that 59.68%(37) in both the age group respondents in the age group of 25 to 40 years and 58.18%(32) respondents in the age group of 41-67 years have scored high.

In the lower count 45.32%(25) respondents in the age group of 25 to 40 years and 41.82%(23) respondents in the age group of 41-67 years have scored low.

The number of high count is significantly higher in both the age groups and number of low count is comparatively low in both the age groups revealing no major difference in the response with respect to the age category.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there is no association between age and respondents views on professionals/experts collaboration with the corporate.

| Table : 125 Respondents Designation and Collaboration with Specialists and Professionals |
|---------------------------------|----|----|-----|
|                                | High | Low | Total |
| Senior managers & above        | 17  | 22  | 39   |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 43.59% | 56.41% | 100% |
| Column %                       | 24.64% | 45.83% |      |
| Managers                       | 52  | 26  | 78   |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 66.67% | 33.33% | 100% |
| Column %                       | 75.36% | 54.17% |      |
| Total                          | 69  | 48  | 117  |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 58.97% | 41.03% | 100% |
| Column %                       | 100% | 100% |      |
| Value d.f.    |     |     |      |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.809 | 1  | 0.01675 |
| Value d.f.    |     |     |      |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 4.809 | 1  | 0.01675 |

Majority of the respondents 58.97%(69) in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response with reference to collaboration of specialists and professionals and 41.03%(48) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response with reference to collaboration of specialists and professionals.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 126 Respondents Experience and collaboration with Specialists and Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.62%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.38%</td>
<td>54.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.97%</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 0.411 1 0.521

Majority of the respondents 58.97%(69) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 41.03%(48) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to collaboration with Specialists and Professionals.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t collaboration with Specialists and Professionals.

Table : 127 Respondents age and Mass Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>95.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>55.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>87.27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>91.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 1.421 1 0.233

Majority of the respondents 91.45%(107) in both the age group have scored low revealing poor extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme and 8.55 % (10) respondents
have scored high revealing a high extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme

| Table: 128 Respondents Designation and Mass Media used for promoting CSR Programmes |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                | High | Low | Total |
| Senior managers & above        | 3    | 36  | 39    |
| Row %                          | 7.69%| 92.31%| 100% |
| Column %                       | 30.00%| 33.64%| 100% |
| Managers                       | 7    | 71  | 78    |
| Row %                          | 8.97%| 91.03%| 100% |
| Column %                       | 70.00%| 66.36%| 100% |
| Total                          | 10   | 107 | 117   |
| Row %                          | 8.55%| 91.45%| 100% |
| Column %                       | 100% | 100%| 100%  |

Majority of the respondents 91.45% (107) in both the designation group have scored low revealing revealing poor extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme and 8.55% (10) respondents have scored high revealing a revealing high extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of employment of mass media for promoting CSR programme

| Pearson Chi-Square | 0.014 | 1 | 0.907 |
Majority of the respondents 91.45% (107) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 8.55% (10) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to mass media for promoting CSR Programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t basic goal of your company in rendering its contribution to society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>93.22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>89.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>91.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.129

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.27%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.73%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 5.511

Table : 130  Respondents age and support of mass media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.27%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.73%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 5.511

Table : 129  Respondents Experience and Mass media for promoting CSR Programmes

Pearson Chi-Square 0.129

Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.7196
Majority of the respondents 68.38% (80) in both the age group have scored low revealing a low and negative response about extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes and 31.62 % (37) respondents have scored high revealing a positive response about extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes.

**Table: 131 Respondents Designation and mass media support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>33.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32.05%</td>
<td>67.95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>66.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 68.38% (80) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a low and negative response about extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes and 31.62% (37) respondents have scored high revealing a positive response about extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of mass media support in different areas for various programmes.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 132 Respondents Experience and areas of mass media support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.76%</td>
<td>54.24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.97%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.03%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 9.724 1 0.00182

Majority of the respondents i.e 68.38%(80) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 31.62%(37) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with respect to areas of mass media support.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. areas of mass media support.

Table : 133 Respondents Age and strategies to deal with pressure group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>93.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>46.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 0.037 1 0.848
Majority of the respondents 93.16%(109) in both the age group have scored low revealing a poor and negative extent of strategies deployed to deal with the pressure group and 6.84 % (8) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response w.r.t. to extent of strategies employed to deal with the pressure group.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and companys contribution to community and social development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table : 134</th>
<th>Respondents Designations and strategies to deal with pressure group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 93.16%(109) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a poor and negative extent of strategies deployed to deal with the pressure group and 6.84 % (8) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response w.r.t. to extent of strategies employed to deal with the pressure group.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and companys contribution to community and social development.
Table: 135 Respondents Experience and strategies to deal with pressure group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
<td>89.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>51.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 1.153 1 0.282

Majority of the respondents 93.16%(109) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 6.84%(8) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference strategies employed to deal with pressure group.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t strategies employed to deal with pressure group.

Table: 136 Respondents age and nature of Training Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>91.94%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>85.07%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 61.8 1 0.00000000000000084

::: 448 :::
Majority of the respondents 57.26% (67) in both the age group scored high revealing a greater extent of towards the nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries and 42.74%(50) respondents have scored low revealing a very low extent of response towards nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response towards nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: 137 Respondents Designation and nature of Training Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 57.26% (67) in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of towards the nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries and 42.74%(50) respondents have scored low revealing a very low extent of response towards nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response towards nature of training strategies employed for staff and functionaries

Pearson Chi-Square 27.25 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.00000018
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 138  Respondents Experience and nature of Training Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>96.61%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>85.07%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>14.93%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>72.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 57.26%(67) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 42.74%(50) have scored low revealing w.r.t. nature of training strategies for staff & functionaries by the corporate

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. nature of training strategies for staff & functionaries by the corporate

Table:139  Respondents Age and Extent of Problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>66.13%</td>
<td>33.87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.75%</td>
<td>45.65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.25%</td>
<td>54.35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 60.68%(71) in both the age group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR and 39.92 % (46) respondents have scored low revealing low extent of response with reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of response with reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.

Table : 140 Respondents Designation and Extent of Problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>29.58%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>70.42%</td>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 0.757 1 0.384

Majority of the respondents 60.68%(71) in both the designation group have scored high revealing a positive and higher response reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR and 39.92 % (46) respondents have scored low revealing low extent of response with reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response with reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.
### Table 141: Respondents Experience and Problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.11%</td>
<td>47.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.89%</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)**

- **Pearson Chi-Square**: 0.07 1 0.792

Majority of the respondents 60.68%(71) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 39.32%(46) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t problems associated with training of staff and functionaries of CSR.

### Table 142: Respondents Age and Preferences of Company functionaries to CSR Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.64%</td>
<td>56.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.36%</td>
<td>43.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.36%</td>
<td>47.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.01%</td>
<td>52.99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)**

- **Pearson Chi-Square**: 2.972 1 0.0847

---
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Majority of the respondents 52.99%(62) in both the age group scored low revealing low extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services and 47.01%(55) respondents have scored high revealing high extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services

| Table:143 Respondents Designation and Preferences of Company functionaries to CSR Programmes |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
|                                 | High| Low| Total |
| Senior managers & above         | 9   | 30  | 39   |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 23.08% | 76.92%  | 100% |
| Column %                       | 16.36% | 48.39%  |      |
| Managers                       | 46  | 32  | 78   |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 58.97% | 41.03%  | 100% |
| Column %                       | 83.64% | 51.61%  |      |
| Total                          | 55  | 62  | 117  |
| Count                          |     |     |      |
| Row %                          | 47.01% | 52.99%  | 100% |
| Column %                       | 100% | 100% |      |
| Value                          |     |     |      |
| d.f.                           |     |     |      |
| Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)         |     |     |      |
| Pearson Chi-Square             | 12.05 |       | 0.00052 |

Majority of the respondents 52.99%(62) in both the designation group scored low revealing low extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services and 47.01%(55) respondents have scored high revealing high extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to preferences of the company functionaries w.r.t. CSR programmes and services
### Table: 144 Respondents Experience and Preferences of Company functionaries to CSR Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.98%</td>
<td>61.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.18%</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.01%</td>
<td>52.99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 2.462 1 0.1166

Majority of the respondents 52.99%(62) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response and 47.01%(55) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to Preferences of Company functionaries to CSR Programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Preferences of Company functionaries to CSR Programmes.
Majority of the respondents 89.74% (105) in both the age group scored low revealing a low extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services and 10.26% (12) respondents have scored high revealing a high extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents' age and extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services.

Table: 146  Respondents Designation and CSR Planning & implementation of services and programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 12.64 1 0.00038
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Majority of the respondents 89.74%(105) in both the designation group scored low revealing a low extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services and 10.26%(12) respondents have scored high revealing a high extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response with reference to CSR planning and implementation of services.

Table: 147 Respondents Experience and CSR Planning & implementation of services and programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.34%</td>
<td>79.66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>44.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 11.03 1 0.0009

Majority of the respondents i.e 89.74%(105) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. CSR Planning & implementation of services and programmes and 10.26%(12) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to CSR Planning & implementation of services and programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. CSR Planning & implementation of services and programmes.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: Respondents age and Involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Row %</th>
<th>Column %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>53.23%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Chi-Square**

Value: 15.65

d.f.: 1

Assymp. Sig (2 sided): 0.000076

Majority of the respondents 64.10% (75) in both the age group scored low revealing low extent of involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning and 35.90% (42) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 149  Respondents Designation and Involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.81%</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Managers**          | Count  |       |       |
|                       | 11     | 67    | 78    |
|                       | Row %  |       |       |
|                       | 14.10% | 85.90%| 100%  |
|                       | Column % |       |       |
|                       | 26.19% | 89.33%|       |

| **Total**             | Count  |       |       |
|                       | 42     | 75    | 117   |
|                       | Row %  |       |       |
|                       | 35.90% | 64.10%| 100%  |
|                       | Column % |       |       |
|                       | 100%   | 100%  |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Value</strong></th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>0.0000000000015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 64.10%(75) in both the designation group scored low revealing low extent of involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning and 35.90% (42) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. involvement of stakeholders in CSR Planning

Table : 150  Respondents Experience and Involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience 2 to 14 years</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.93%</td>
<td>44.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>34.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Experience 15 to 40 years** | Count  |       |       |
|                             | 9      | 49    | 58    |
|                             | Row %  |       |       |
|                             | 15.52% | 84.48%| 100%  |
|                             | Column % |       |       |
|                             | 21.43% | 65.33%|       |

| **Total**                  | Count  |       |       |
|                           | 42     | 75    | 117   |
|                           | Row %  |       |       |
|                           | 35.90% | 64.10%| 100%  |
|                           | Column % |       |       |
|                           | 100%   | 100%  |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Value</strong></th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>0.000013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents i.e 64.10%(75) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. Involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning and 35.90%(42) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to Involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. involvement of Stakeholders in CSR Planning.

Table:151 Respondents age and CSR Communication to implementing staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>83.78%</td>
<td>38.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>89.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
<td>61.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 18.83 1 0.000014

Majority of the respondents 68.38%(80) in both the age group have scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff and 31.62%(37) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff.
Table: 152 Respondents Designation and CSR Communication to implementing staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>81.08%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>8.97%</td>
<td>91.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
<td>88.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td>0.0000000000000045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Chi-Square</strong></td>
<td>52.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 68.38%(80) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff and 31.62%(37)respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. CSR communication to implementing staff.
### Table 153  Respondents Experience and CSR Communication to implementing staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.63%</td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>91.89%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>31.62%</td>
<td>68.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value          | 34.83 | 1   | 0.0000000036 |

Majority of the respondents i.e 68.38%(80) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. CSR Communication to implementing staff and 31.62%(37) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to CSR Communication to implementing staff.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. CSR Communication to implementing staff.

### Table 154  Respondents age and Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>30.65%</td>
<td>69.35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>46.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>53.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value          | 7.035 | 1   | 0.008 |

---
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Majority of the respondents 79.49%(93) in both the age group have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. mode of communication for facilitating CSR function and 20.51%(24) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. mode of communication for facilitating CSR function.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. to mode of communication for facilitating CSR function.

Table: Respondents Designation and Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>21.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>93.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>78.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 79.49%(93) in both the designation group have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. mode of communication for facilitating CSR function and 20.51%(24) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. mode of communication for facilitating CSR function.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. to mode of communication for facilitating CSR function.
Majority of the respondents i.e 79.49%(93) in both the experience group have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function and 20.51%(24) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. Modes of communication for facilitating CSR function.

Table : 157 Respondents age and CSR Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
<th>0.004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 84.62% (99) in both the age group have scored low revealing a low extent of response with reference CSR Monitoring and 15.38% (18) respondents have scored high revealing a high extent of response with reference to CSR Monitoring.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age extent of response with reference to CSR Monitoring.

Table: Respondents Designation and CSR Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>32.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>67.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 0.074 1 0.785

Majority of the respondents 84.62% (99) in both the designation group have scored low revealing a low extent of response with reference CSR Monitoring and 15.38% (18) respondents have scored high revealing a high extent of response with reference to CSR Monitoring.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation extent of response with reference to CSR Monitoring.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of industries of Gujarat

Table: 159  Respondents Experience and CSR Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
<td>86.44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>51.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assympt. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 84.62%(99) in both the experience group have scored low revealing high and positive response w.r.t. CSR Monitoring and 15.38%(18) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to CSR Monitoring.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t CSR Monitoring.

Table: 160  Respondents Age and External Linkages with Development Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>14.52%</td>
<td>85.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>94.55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>49.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assympt. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 89.74%(105) in both the age group have scored lower revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies and 10.26%(12) respondents
have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents' age and extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies.

**Table:161 Respondents Designation and External Linkages with Development Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>96.15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 8.462 1 0.00463

Majority of the respondents 89.74%(105) in both the designation group have scored lower revealing a low extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies and 10.26%(12) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents' designation and extent of response w.r.t. external linkages with development agencies.
Majinity of the respondents i.e 10.26%(12) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 89.74%(105) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference External Linkages with Development Agencies

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. External Linkages with Development Agencies

### Table: Respondents Experience and External Linkages with Development Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
<td>81.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
<td>45.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>98.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>89.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 7.352 1 0.0067

### Table: Respondents Age and Reasons for Poor Linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>69.70%</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 4.258 1 0.039
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Majority of the respondents 71.79%(84) respondents have in both the age group scored low revealing a greater extent of negative response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages and 28.21%(33) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages.

Table : 164 Respondents Designations and Reasons for Poor Linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.68%</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.51%</td>
<td>29.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>74.32%</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi-Square 4.417 1 0.03558

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) respondents have in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages and 36.75%(43) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. various reasons for poor linkages.
Table: 165  Respondents Experience and Reasons for Poor Linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>61.02%</td>
<td>38.98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>48.66%</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.52%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
<td>46.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 0.098 1 0.754

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) in both the experience group have scored high revealing high and positive response and 36.75%(43) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to Reasons for Poor Linkages.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Reasons for Poor Linkages.

Table: 166  Respondents Age and Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes & services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>60.38%</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>39.62%</td>
<td>53.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 1.614 1 0.204

-:: 469 ::-
Majority of the respondents 54.70%(64) have in both the age group scored low revealing a low extent of response of beneficiaries and 45.30% (53) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high extent of response of beneficiaries

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of response of beneficiaries

**Table:170 Respondents Designation and Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes & services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>24.53%</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>75.47%</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)**

- Pearson Chi-Square 2.695 1 0.10068

Majority of the respondents 54.70%(64) have in both the designation group scored low revealing a low extent of response of beneficiaries and 45.30% (53) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high extent of response of beneficiaries

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response of beneficiaries
Table: 171 Respondents Experience and Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes & services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.07%</td>
<td>55.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>49.06%</td>
<td>51.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.55%</td>
<td>53.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>50.94%</td>
<td>49.06%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.007 1 Assym. Sig. (2 sided) 0.9329

Majority of the respondents 54.70%(64) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 45.30%(53) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes & services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Response by beneficiaries to CSR programmes & services.

Table: 168 Respondents Age and Involvement of professional and occupational groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>69.10%</td>
<td>30.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided) 0.00027

Pearson Chi-Square 13.25 1
Majority of the respondents i.e. 71.79% (84) have scored low, revealing low and negative response, and 28.21% (33) have scored high, revealing a high and positive response with reference to involvement of professional and occupational groups.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents' age and response w.r.t. involvement of occupational and professional groups.

| Table: 167 Respondents Designation and Involvement of professional and occupational groups |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **Senior managers & above**     | **High** | **Low** | **Total** |
| Count                          | 25      | 14     | 39        |
| Row %                          | 64.10%  | 35.90% | 100%      |
| Column %                       | 75.76%  | 16.67% | 100%      |
| **Managers**                   | **Count** | **Low** | **Total** |
| Count                          | 8       | 70     | 78        |
| Row %                          | 10.26%  | 89.74% | 100%      |
| Column %                       | 24.24%  | 83.33% | 100%      |
| **Total**                      | **Count** | **Low** | **Total** |
| Value                          | 33      | 84     | 117       |
| Pearson Chi-Square             | 34.62   |        | 0.000000004 |

Majority of the respondents 71.79% (84) have scored low, revealing low extent of involvement of professional and occupational groups and 28.21% (33) respondents have scored high, revealing higher extent of involvement of professional and occupational groups.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents' designation and extent of involvement of professional and occupational groups.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table 168: Respondents Experience and Involvement of professional and occupational groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.07%</td>
<td>55.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>78.79%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>87.93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e. 71.79% (84) have scored low revealing low and negative response and 28.21% (33) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to Involvement of professional and occupational groups.

Referring to the above Chi-square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. Involvement of professional and occupational groups.

Table 169: Respondents age and reasons for poor beneficiary response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.70%</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>73.50%</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- 473 ---
Majority of the respondents 73.50%(86) have scored high revealing a positive and higher response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response and 26.50 % (31) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. to reasons for poor beneficiary response

| Table: 173 Respondents Designation and reasons for poor beneficiary response |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
|                                | High   | Low  | Total |
| Senior managers & above        | Count  |      |       |
|                                | 28     | 11   | 39    |
| Row %                          | 71.79% | 28.21% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 32.56% | 35.48% |        |
| Managers                       | Count  |      |       |
|                                | 58     | 20   | 78    |
| Row %                          | 74.36% | 25.64% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 67.44% | 64.52% |        |
| Total                          | Count  |      |       |
|                                | 86     | 31   | 117   |
| Row %                          | 73.50% | 26.50% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 100%   | 100%  |        |

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 73.50%(86) have scored high revealing a positive and higher response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response and 26.50 % (31) respondents have scored low revealing a negative and low response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant .Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. to reasons for poor beneficiary response

| Table: 174 Respondents Experience and reasons for poor beneficiary response |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
|                                | High   | Low  | Total |
| Experience 2 to 14 years       | Count  |      |       |
|                                | 50     | 9    | 59    |
| Row %                          | 84.75% | 15.25% | 100%   |
| Column %                       | 58.14% | 29.03% |        |
Majority of the respondents i.e 73.50%(86) have scored high revealing high extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response and 26.50%(31) have scored low revealing low extent of response with reference reasons for poor beneficiary response.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response.

Table: 172 Respondents age and Beneficiary gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
<td>41.86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.54%</td>
<td>58.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Value | d.f. | Assym. Sig. (2 sided) | 2.712 | 1 | 0.0996 |

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain and 36.75%(43) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain.
Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table : 176 Respondents Designation and Beneficiary gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain and 36.75%(43) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. beneficiary gain.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: 177 Respondents Experience and Beneficiary gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.49%</td>
<td>30.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.41%</td>
<td>41.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.59%</td>
<td>56.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 1.492 1 0.222

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing high and positive response w.r.t. beneficiary gain and 36.75%(43) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to beneficiary gain.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t beneficiary gain.

Respondents

Table: 175 Respondents age and response on functionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>52.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>47.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 0.017 1 0.895
Majority of the respondents 61.54% (72) scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. functionaries and 38.46% (45) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. response on functionaries.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents’ age and extent of response w.r.t. to functionaries.

**Table: 179 Respondents Designation and response on functionaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>79.49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
<td>43.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.44%</td>
<td>52.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>82.22%</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value d.f.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 61.54% (72) scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. functionaries and 38.46% (45) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. response on functionaries.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents’ designation and extent of response w.r.t. to functionaries.
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Table: 180  Experience and response on functionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.98%</td>
<td>61.02%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.11%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.93%</td>
<td>62.07%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.86%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 0.005 1 0.941

Majority of the respondents 61.54%(72) have scored low revealing low and negative response w.r.t. to response on beneficiaries and 38.46%(45) have scored high revealing a high and positive response with reference to response on functionaries.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t response on functionaries.

Table: 178  Respondents age and Reasons for Poor functionary response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.26%</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.23%</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>52.73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>66.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f.  
Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi-Square 14.34 1 0.00015
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Majority of the respondents 65.81% (77) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response and 34.19% (40) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents and extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response.

**Table 1: 182 Respondents Designation and Reasons for Poor functionary response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>41.56%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>58.44%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Chi-Square</strong></td>
<td>5.817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 65.81% (77) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response and 34.19% (40) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. reasons for poor functionary response.
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Table: 183 Respondents Experience and Reasons for Poor functionary response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>86.44%</td>
<td>13.56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>66.23%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>33.77%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>34.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents i.e 65.81%(77) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 34.19%(40) respondents have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to reasons for poor beneficiary response.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between respondents experience and response w.r.t. reasons for poor beneficiary response.

Table: 181 Respondents Age and Programme Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.35%</td>
<td>30.65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>61.43%</td>
<td>40.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>38.57%</td>
<td>59.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.83%</td>
<td>40.17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.172</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents 59.83% (70) have in both the age group scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment and 40.17% (47) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: 185 Respondents Designation and Programme Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 7.473 1 Assymp. Sig (2 sided) 0.00626

Majority of the respondents 59.83% (70) have in both the designation group scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment and 40.17% (47) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. programme accomplishment.
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Table: 186  Respondents Experience and Programme Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 14 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.41%</td>
<td>35.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 40 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>45.71%</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>59.83%</td>
<td>40.17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assyms. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.689 1 0.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 59.83%(70) have in both the experience group scored high revealing high and positive response and 40.17%(47) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference programme accomplishment.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t programme accomplishment.

Table: 184  Respondents age and Nature of Training strategies for staff and Functionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 40 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>59.15%</td>
<td>43.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 67 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>52.73%</td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.85%</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assyms. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.161 1 0.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents 60.68% (71) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies and 39.32% (46) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies.

Table: 185 Respondent Designation and Nature of Training strategies for Staff and functionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 60.68% (71) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies and 39.32% (46) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. nature of training strategies.
Table: 189  Respondent Experience and Nature of Training strategies for staff and functionaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.49%</td>
<td>30.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.75%</td>
<td>39.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.25%</td>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.68%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assym. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 3.161 1 0.075

Majority of the respondents 60.68%(71) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 39.32%(46) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to nature of training strategies for staff and functionaries.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Nature of Training strategies for staff and functionaries.
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Table : 187 Respondents age and Evaluation of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td>52.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>23.64%</td>
<td>76.36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>55.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>24.79%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. ( 2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 0.003 1 0.954

Majority of the respondents 75.21% (88) have scored low revealing negative and lower response w.r.t. evaluation of programmes and 24.79 % (29) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response w.r.t. evaluation of programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. programme evaluation.

Table : 191 Respondents Designations and Evaluation of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior managers &amp; above</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.49%</td>
<td>70.51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>24.79%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. ( 2 sided) Pearson Chi-Square 2.069 1 0.15034

--- 486 ---
Majority of the respondents 75.21% (88) have scored low revealing negative and lower response w.r.t. evaluation of programmes and 24.79% (29) respondents have scored high revealing a positive and high response w.r.t. evaluation of programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the Respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. programme evaluation.

Table: 192 Respondents Experience and Evaluation of Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.73%</td>
<td>76.27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>51.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.86%</td>
<td>74.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.79%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square 0.003 d.f. 1 Assymp. Sig. (2 sided) 0.957

Majority of the respondents 75.21% (88) have scored low revealing low and negative and 24.79% (29) have scored high revealing positive extent of response with reference to evaluation of programmes.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t evaluation of programmes.
### Table 190: Respondents age and Specific Beneficiary gains from programmes and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>62.16%</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50.91%</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>37.84%</td>
<td>62.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>5.833</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services and 36.75%(43) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services.
### Table: 194 Respondents Designation and Specific Beneficiary gains from programmes and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers &amp; above</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.97%</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.08%</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.03%</td>
<td>48.84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>36.75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.498</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services and 36.75%(43) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi-Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. specific beneficiary gains from programmes and services.
Majority of the respondents 63.25%(74) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 36.75%(43) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to Specific Beneficiary gains from programmes and Services.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t Specific Beneficiary gains from programmes and Services

Table : 193    Respondents age and Image Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 40 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 to 67 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Majority of the respondents with 64.10%(75) high score responded positively to the strategies employed for image enhancement.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between the respondents age and image enhancement.

Table: 197 Respondents Designation & Image Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>22.67%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>77.33%</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.402</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents 64.10%(75) have scored high revealing a greater extent of response w.r.t. strategies for image enhancement and 35.90%(42) respondents have scored low revealing lower extent of response w.r.t. strategies for image enhancement.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. strategies for image enhancement.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table : 198 Respondents Experience & Image Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>71.19%</td>
<td>28.81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>40.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 15 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
<td>35.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. | Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
--- | ---
Pearson Chi-Square | 2.012 | 1 | 0.1561

Majority of the respondents 64.10%(75) have scored high revealing high and positive response and 35.90%(42) have scored low revealing a low and negative response with reference to strategies employed for image enhancement.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t strategies employed for image enhancement.

Table : 196 Respondents age and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 25 to 40 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 41 to 67 years</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>43.46%</td>
<td>56.54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. | Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)
--- | ---
Pearson Chi-Square | 0.458 | 1 | 0.498

-: 492 :-
Majority of the respondents 52.14%(61) have scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. accountability and 47.86%(56) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. accountability.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents age and extent of response w.r.t. accountability.

Table: 199 Respondents Designation and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers &amp; above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
<td>42.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>55.13%</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>76.79%</td>
<td>57.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 4.114 1 0.04252

Majority of the respondents 52.14%(61) have scored low revealing a lower extent of response w.r.t. accountability and 47.86%(56) respondents have scored high revealing higher extent of response w.r.t. accountability.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is highly significant at 0.05% level of confidence. Hence there exists a strong association between the respondents designation and extent of response w.r.t. accountability.
Impact Assessment of CSR w.r.t. community development programmes of Industries of Gujarat

Table: 200 Respondents Experience and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience 2 to 14 years</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>45.76%</td>
<td>54.24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>48.21%</td>
<td>52.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience 15 to 40 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>51.79%</td>
<td>47.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td>52.14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value d.f. Assymp. Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi-Square 0.075 1 0.784

Majority of the respondents 52.14%(61) have scored low revealing negative response and 47.86%(56) have scored high revealing a positive response with reference to accountability.

Referring to the above Chi square table it can be seen that Chi Square is not significant. Hence there exists no association between respondents experience and response w.r.t accountability.
## VARIABLE UNDER THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Brief description of parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meaning of CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Company's contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Need and emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Factors leading to the emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CSR initiative is attributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Company's guiding philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The basic goal of your company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To what extent corporate upholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The approach of co wrt social resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Factors motivating company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Aware of external standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [scandals]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rating bottom line benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Focus [ internal dimension ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Areas for future CSR focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Imperatives in your opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Needs for codification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community scenario in pre int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rate impact of Community prg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Major difficulties encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Major difficulties faced [stages ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Indirect positive impact noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>To what extent process were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Impact area measure [qualitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Incidence of social prb [ decline ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Preferred needs of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Capabilities to meet preferred needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>CSR consti clearly defined for eff dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Performance indicators [work place ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Performance indicators [environment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Performance indicators [comm deve]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Performance indicators [Ethics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Performance indicators [human rights]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stakeholder interest in CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do professionals, specialists collabor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Agency uses support of mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pressure group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Problems of training staff &amp; function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preferences of co-function wrt CSR program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>CSR planning &amp; implementation of service &amp; program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>CSR planning is done by involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Communicating plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modes of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>External linkages [development agencies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Agencies not keen to develop linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Professional and occupational groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Response by beneficiaries to CSR program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Main causes of poor beneficiary response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Beneficiary gain is noticed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Response on functionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Poor responses by functionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Programme accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Evaluation of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Specific gains obtained by beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Image enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parameterwise split up of significant chi square tables for agewise analysis

10.34%

89.66%
Area chart for Chi Square values above 3.841 [ Significant ] [ Experiencewise ]
Area chart for Chi Square values above 3.841 [Significant] [Designationwise]
Area chart for Chi Square values above 3.841 [Significant] [Age wise]

Parameter under consideration

Value of Chi Square Ratio
Area chart for Chi Square values above 3.841 [ Significant ] [ Designationwise ]

Parameter under consideration
Area chart for Chi Square values above 3.841 [ Significant ] [ Experiencewise ]

Value of Chi Square ratio

Parameter under consideration
At a glance status of Overall high % values of Chi Square tables

Range of % high values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Range of % high values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 - 10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 - 20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21 - 30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31 - 40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>41 - 50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>51 - 60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61 - 70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>71 - 80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-C</td>
<td>Meaning of CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-D</td>
<td>The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-E</td>
<td>Company's contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-F</td>
<td>Need and emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-Fb</td>
<td>Factors leading to the emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-G</td>
<td>CSR Initiative is attributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-H</td>
<td>Company's guiding philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-J</td>
<td>The basic goal of your company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-K</td>
<td>To what extent corporate values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-L</td>
<td>The approach of co wrt social resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A-M</td>
<td>Factors motivating company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A-O</td>
<td>Awareness of external standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A-T</td>
<td>Need to know CSR code [scandals]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A-W</td>
<td>Rating bottom line benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A-X</td>
<td>Company's contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A-X</td>
<td>Focus [internal dimension]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 A-Y</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A-Z</td>
<td>Areas for future CSR focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 A-Z1</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A-Z2</td>
<td>Imperative to your opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A-Z3</td>
<td>Needs for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 B-A</td>
<td>Community scenario in pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 B-E</td>
<td>Rate impact of Community prg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 B-F</td>
<td>Major difficulties encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 B-G</td>
<td>Major difficulties faced [stages ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 B-H</td>
<td>Indirect positive impact noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 B-I</td>
<td>To what extent process were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 B-J</td>
<td>Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 B-K</td>
<td>Impact area measure [qualitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 B-L</td>
<td>To what extent process were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 B-M</td>
<td>Impact area measure [qualitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 B-N</td>
<td>Incidence of social prb [ decline ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 C-F</td>
<td>Preferred needs of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 C-G</td>
<td>Capabilities to meet preferred needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 C-H</td>
<td>CSR initiatives clearly defined for eff dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [work place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [enforcement]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [source work]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [Ethics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [human rights]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [Sources work]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 C-I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-Fb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A-X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A-Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A-Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A-Z1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-Z2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A-Z3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>B-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>B-O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>B-O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C-F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>C-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>C-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>C-I1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>C-I2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>C-I3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>C-I4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>C-I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C-I6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>C-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>C-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>C-K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>C-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>C-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>C-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>C-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>C-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>C-U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>C-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>C-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>C-Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>C-Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>C-Z1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>C-Z2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>D-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>D-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>D-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>D-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>D-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>D-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>D-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>D-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>D-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>D-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI. No.</td>
<td>Area Brief description of parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Meaning of CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Company’s contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Need and emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>To what extent corporate upholdeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>The approach of co wt social resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>Factors motivating company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-17</td>
<td>Aware of external standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [scandals]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19</td>
<td>Rating bottom line benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Major difficulties encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>Major difficulties faced [langage]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>Induced positive impact noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-23</td>
<td>To what extent process were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-24</td>
<td>Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>Impact area measure [qualitative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-26</td>
<td>Persistence of social prs [ decline ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-27</td>
<td>Preferred needs of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-28</td>
<td>Capabilities to meet preferred needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-29</td>
<td>Csr constable clearly defined for off dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>Performance indicators [work place ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-31</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-32</td>
<td>Performance indicators [environment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-33</td>
<td>Performance indicators [comm dev]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-34</td>
<td>Performance indicators [Ethics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-35</td>
<td>Performance indicators [human rights]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-36</td>
<td>Basketization in CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-37</td>
<td>Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-38</td>
<td>Do professionals, specialists collab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-39</td>
<td>Preferences of staff &amp; func</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>Agency uses support of mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-41</td>
<td>Pressure group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-42</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-43</td>
<td>Problems of training staff &amp; func</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-44</td>
<td>Preferences of co funds w/ CSR pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-45</td>
<td>Csr planning &amp;imple of serv &amp; prng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-46</td>
<td>CSR planning is done by involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-47</td>
<td>Contributions plan details to start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-48</td>
<td>Mode of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-49</td>
<td>Monitoring of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>Ext linkages [ development agencies ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-51</td>
<td>Agendas not been to develop linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-52</td>
<td>Professional and occupational groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-53</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-54</td>
<td>Main causes of poor beneficary resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>Beneficiary gain is noticed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-56</td>
<td>Response on functionalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-57</td>
<td>Poor responses by functionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-58</td>
<td>Programme accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-59</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-60</td>
<td>Evaluation of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-61</td>
<td>Specific goals obtained by needful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-62</td>
<td>Image enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-63</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI. No.</td>
<td>Area Brief description of parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C-Q Nature of training strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C-H CSR core clearly defined for eff dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B-L To what extent process was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-L The approach of crs to social resp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-H Company’s guiding philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C-W Communicating plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C-K Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A-V CSR planning in line by involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B-F Poor responses by functionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A-G CSR initiative is attributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C-J Stakeholder interest in CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C-M Agency uses support of mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A-I The basic goal of your company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B-G Indirect positive impact noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A-R CSR planning &amp; implementation of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A-F Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C-L To what extent corporate upholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B-H Communication plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C-B Communication plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B-D Communication plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A-K To what extent corporate upholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B-B Communication plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A-B Communication plan details to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A-A The focus of CSR function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a glance status of age wise Chi Square analysis [ DESCENDING ORDER OF CHI SQUARE ]
Table: 04
### Table: 05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI. No.</th>
<th>Area Brief description of parameter</th>
<th>CHS Square value</th>
<th>Coeff of Association</th>
<th>Overall % positive</th>
<th>Significant positiveness observed when chi square is above 3.841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C - H CSR exists clearly defined for eff repo</td>
<td>-4.625</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B - L To what extent process were used</td>
<td>5.925</td>
<td>.9886</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A - G CSR initiative is attributed</td>
<td>5.925</td>
<td>.9788</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G - W Communicating plan details to staff</td>
<td>5.422</td>
<td>.9425</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C - V CSR planning is done by involving</td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>.9187</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>K - C Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
<td>36.66</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>J - C Stakeholder interest in CSR</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C - Z Professional and occupational groups</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>.8787</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>G - Q Nature of training strategies</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>.9898</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X - C Motes of communication</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>.8685</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A - H Company’s guiding philosophy</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>.7647</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U - C CSR planning &amp; imp of serv &amp; pr</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.8582</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T - C Preferences of co funds, wri CSR pr</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>.6547</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C - A Meaning of CSR</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>K - D Image enhancement</td>
<td>9.402</td>
<td>.5792</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A - Z1 Needs for codification</td>
<td>8.795</td>
<td>.5625</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>D - J Specific gains obtained by benefit</td>
<td>8.498</td>
<td>.5568</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C - Z Ext linkages [development agencies]</td>
<td>8.462</td>
<td>.7647</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A - F[ ] Needs &amp; emergency care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5428</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>D - G Programme accomplishment</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>.5277</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>D - E Response on functionaries</td>
<td>6.886</td>
<td>.5553</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>D - H Nature of training strategies</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>.4887</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B - H Indirect positive impact received</td>
<td>5.877</td>
<td>.5685</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>F - F Poor responses by functionaries</td>
<td>5.911</td>
<td>.5425</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>C - I Performance indicators [work place]</td>
<td>5.685</td>
<td>.5435</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>K - D Do professionals, specialists collaborate</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>.4426</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A - M Factors motivating company</td>
<td>4.732</td>
<td>.4393</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>C - Z1 Agencies not keen to develop linkages</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>.4374</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>D - B Specific gain is noted by</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>.0368</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>Designation: Sr Mgr &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A - W Rating bottom line benefits</td>
<td>4.141</td>
<td>.4272</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>D - M Accountability</td>
<td>4.114</td>
<td>.4215</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A - Z2 Imperatives in your opinion</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>.4483</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>B - O Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
<td>3.607</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A - Z1 Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
<td>3.005</td>
<td>.3829</td>
<td>66.36</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>C - Z2 Impact area measure [qualitative]</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>.3714</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>D - A Response by beneficiaries to CSR pr</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>.3599</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>B - J Performance indicators [comm cleve]</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>.3414</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A - J The basic goal of your company</td>
<td>2.309</td>
<td>.3269</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A - K To what extent corporate ulcers</td>
<td>2.175</td>
<td>.3546</td>
<td>76.07</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>D - J Evaluation of programs</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>.3592</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A - Y Your perceptions</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>.3199</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>D - G Major difficulties faced [stages]</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.2977</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A - L The approach of co wirt social resp</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>.2697</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A - Z Areas for future CSR focus</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>.2842</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>B - J Performance indicators [Ethics]</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>.2583</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>D - T Need to draw CSR code [scandals]</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.2653</td>
<td>76.07</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>C - R Problems of training staff &amp; funds</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>.2097</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>E - R Rate impact of Community pr</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A - E Company’s contribution</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>.1781</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C - G Capabilities to meet preferred needs</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>59.98</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A - D Awareness of external standards</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>.3575</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>C - R Performance indicators [human rights]</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>.1762</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>D - A The focus of CSR function</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>.1597</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>D - F Factors leading to the emergence</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>.1383</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A - B Community scenario in pre sit</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>.1733</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>C - Y Monitoring of implementation</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>.1425</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>C - I Performance indicators [environment]</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>.1081</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>C - J Performance indicators [market place]</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A - X1 Focus [internal dimension]</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>66.87</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>F - F Major difficulties encountered</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>P - P Incidence of social job [decent]</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>.3497</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>C - N Pressure group</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>.9777</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>C - L Mass media</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>.8389</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>C - M Agency uses support of mass media</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.2977</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>P - P Preferred needs of people</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.9686</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>C - C Main causes of poor beneficiary resp</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.9693</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Designation: Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Area Brief description of parameter</td>
<td>Chi Square value</td>
<td>Coeff of Association</td>
<td>Overall % positive</td>
<td>Significant positiveness observed [when chi square is above 3.841]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C · Q Nature of training strategies</td>
<td>72.08</td>
<td>98.55</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C · H CSR consult clearly defined for all steps</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C · W Coordinating plan details to staff</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>92.29</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B · L To what extent process were used</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>81.36</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C · K Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>95.01</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D · F Poor responses by functionaries</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>77.79</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C · J Stakeholder interest in CSR</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>86.19</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A · G CSR initiative is attributed</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>34.10</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C · V CSR planning is done by involving</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>74.72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C · X Modes of communication</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A · H Company's guiding philosophy</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>89.65</td>
<td>40.15</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A · L The approach of co wrt social resp</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>69.48</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Experience 15 - 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A · W Rating bottom line benefits</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C · Z2 Professional and occupational groups</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C · A Performance indicators [comm deve]</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C · U CSR planning &amp; impl of serv &amp; prg</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A · O1 Impact area measure [quantitve]</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C · A Performance indicators [commercial]</td>
<td>9.724</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B · L To what extent process were used</td>
<td>9.593</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C · V CSR planning is done by involving</td>
<td>8.872</td>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A · H Company's guiding philosophy</td>
<td>8.872</td>
<td>52.37</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A · L The approach of co wrt social resp</td>
<td>8.163</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>C · A Performance indicators [comm deve]</td>
<td>7.352</td>
<td>85.78</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C · A Performance indicators [commercial]</td>
<td>6.602</td>
<td>74.72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A · H Company's guiding philosophy</td>
<td>6.602</td>
<td>74.72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A · L The approach of co wrt social resp</td>
<td>6.602</td>
<td>74.72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>C · A Performance indicators [commercial]</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A · X2 Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>5.531</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A · X1 Focus [ interna! dimension ]</td>
<td>5.531</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A · X2 Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A · X1 Focus [ interna! dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A · X2 Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A · X1 Focus [ interna! dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A · X2 Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A · X1 Focus [ interna! dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A · X2 Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>5.218</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>Experience 2 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Brief description of parameter</td>
<td>Chi Square value</td>
<td>Coef of Association</td>
<td>Overall % positive</td>
<td>Significant positiveness observed when chi square is above 3.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A- C</td>
<td>Meaning of CSR</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-15.11</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 G-1</td>
<td>Performance indicators [work place]</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 G- B</td>
<td>Performance indicators [environment]</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>39.87</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- K</td>
<td>To what extent corporate upholds</td>
<td>7.571</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- T</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [scandals]</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- Z</td>
<td>Interactivities in your opinion</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- D</td>
<td>The basis of CSR function</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>-47.29</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 D- C</td>
<td>Men causes of poor beneficiary resp</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>-45.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- Y</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A- Q</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 A- Z</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A- X</td>
<td>Focus [ internal dimension ]</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 D- F</td>
<td>Poor responses by functionaries</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 G- L</td>
<td>Major difficulties faced [stages ]</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A- K</td>
<td>Image enhancement</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 D- J</td>
<td>Specific gains obtained by benefic</td>
<td>5.833</td>
<td>-46.98</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 D- D</td>
<td>Beneficiary gain is noticed by</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 G- Z</td>
<td>Agencies not keen to develop linkages</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 D- F</td>
<td>Prof May not join</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-8.36</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 D- H</td>
<td>Natural training strategies</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>60.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 C- R</td>
<td>Problems of training staff &amp; functi</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>23.87</td>
<td>60.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 D- G</td>
<td>Programme accomplishment</td>
<td>4.172</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 C- D</td>
<td>Do professionals, specialists collab</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 C- Q</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 C- J</td>
<td>The basic goal of your company</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 A- Z3</td>
<td>Needs for codification</td>
<td>5.849</td>
<td>-46.15</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 A- M</td>
<td>Factors motivating company</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 A- F[a]</td>
<td>Need and emergence</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>55.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 C- I</td>
<td>Performance indicators [comm dev]</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>58.25</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 A- C</td>
<td>Company's contribution</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 D- M</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 D- O1</td>
<td>Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
<td>9.614</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 C- T</td>
<td>Preferences of co functi wri CSR or</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>47.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A- H</td>
<td>Company's guiding philosophy</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>72.63</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A- F</td>
<td>Major difficulties encountered</td>
<td>9.604</td>
<td>56.59</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A- A</td>
<td>Response by benefic to CSR or</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A- B</td>
<td>The focus of CSR function</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 C- I5</td>
<td>Performance indicators [Ethics]</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 H- B</td>
<td>Indirect positive impact noticed</td>
<td>8.983</td>
<td>55.12</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 A- T[b]</td>
<td>Factors leading to the emergence</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 A- M</td>
<td>CSR codes clearly defined for off dep</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>80.59</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 A- L</td>
<td>The approach of co wrt social reso</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 A- D</td>
<td>Response on functionaries</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 C- V</td>
<td>CSR planning is done by involving</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 A- G</td>
<td>CSR initiative is attributed</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 B- O2</td>
<td>Impact area measure [quantitative]</td>
<td>6.059</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 A- P</td>
<td>Stakeholder needs of people</td>
<td>8.059</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 A- W</td>
<td>Communicating plan details to staff</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>78.18</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 A- M</td>
<td>Agency uses support of mass media</td>
<td>5.511</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 B- E</td>
<td>Rate impact of Community org</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 C- D2</td>
<td>Professional and occupational groups</td>
<td>4.258</td>
<td>45.26</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 A- Z</td>
<td>Areas for future CSR focus</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 C- R</td>
<td>Performance indicators [human rights]</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 D- O1</td>
<td>Evaluation of programmes</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 C- J</td>
<td>Stakeholder interest in CSR</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 C- K</td>
<td>Potential stakeholders issues factored</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>87.97</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 A- K2</td>
<td>Focus [ external dimension ]</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 B- X</td>
<td>Modes of communication</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 B- A</td>
<td>Community scenario in org int</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 C- Y</td>
<td>Monitoring of implementation</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 C- U</td>
<td>CSR planning &amp; mple of serv &amp; org</td>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 C- Z</td>
<td>Ext agencies [ development agencies ]</td>
<td>1.704</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 C- L</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>-48.28</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 A- O</td>
<td>Aware of external standards</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 A- N</td>
<td>Pressure group</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>-6.42</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 C- G</td>
<td>Capabilities to meet preferred needs</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-21.34</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 B- P</td>
<td>Incidence of sector att [decline]</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>-55.74</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Brief Description of parameter</td>
<td>Chi Square value</td>
<td>Coeff of Association</td>
<td>Overall % positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A-C</td>
<td>Meaning of CSR</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>-66.1</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C-I1</td>
<td>Performance indicators [work place]</td>
<td>5.689</td>
<td>-54.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C-I3</td>
<td>Performance indicators [environment]</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A-K</td>
<td>To what extent corporate upholds</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>-35.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [standards]</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A-Z2</td>
<td>Impeccability in your opinion</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>-44.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A D</td>
<td>The focus of CSR function</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D-C</td>
<td>Main causes of poor beneficiary response</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A-Y</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>-31.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C-I2</td>
<td>Performance indicators [market place]</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A-Z1</td>
<td>Your perceptions</td>
<td>3.068</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A-X1</td>
<td>Focus [ internal dimension ]</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D-F</td>
<td>Poor responses by functionaries</td>
<td>5.817</td>
<td>-54.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B-G</td>
<td>Major difficulties faced stages</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>-29.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>D-K</td>
<td>Image enhancement</td>
<td>9.402</td>
<td>-57.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>D-J</td>
<td>Specific gains obtained by benefit</td>
<td>8.498</td>
<td>-55.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A-Z12</td>
<td>Agencies not keen to develope linkages</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>-43.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [standards]</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [standards]</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A-Q</td>
<td>Nature of training strategies</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>-35.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A-T</td>
<td>Need to draw CSR code [standards]</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A-Z2</td>
<td>Impeccability in your opinion</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>-44.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>