

CORPORATE SOCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY ON CORPORATE FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Young Cho, Hanyang University

ABSTRACT

Previous research on related to big business social responsibility (CSR) has focused on related to big business reputation (CR) and related to big business related to managing money performance (CFP), showing a high relationship between both. While most people who work to find information mostly focus on CSR, our research examines the other side of the coin; related to big business social not caring about how your actions affect others (CSI) and provides findings that counter previous thought. We add/give to the existing books by showing that CSI has a nonsignificant hit/effect on related to big business related to managing money performance, as measured by market value, while at the same time/together being negatively strongly related to related to big business reputation. Further, we show social media, as measured by the Social Media the ability to keep something around, or keep something going Index (SMSI), a measure studied every once in a while, so far in the books, helps settle an argument the relationship between CSI and market value. This relationship between social media and related to managing money performance is further strengthened when companies actively start/work at other CSR activities that "fit" their image. From a practical standpoint, when companies "misbehave" our research shows/tells about how to lessen something bad those effects relating to/about related to managing money performance.

Keywords: CSI, Corporate Reputation, Market Value, Social Media, CSR fit, Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Maignan & Ferrell (2004) were one of the first to propose the importance of social responsibility to both the organization and its people who are interested in a project or business. Along with their solid basic structure on which bigger things can be built, much prior research (e.g., Robert & Dowling, 2002; Eberl & Schwaiger, 2005) has shown positive relationship between CR and CFP, with person who is interested in a project or business explanation of why something works or happens the way it does (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) being the foundation of many of these studies. Nikolaeva & Bicho (2011) showed that when companies publicly start/work at CSR activities they are more likely to adopt reporting rules that influence their reputation and CR is more than just a result of CSR; it is an important machine/method/way in the relationship between CFP and CSR (Fombrun, 1996). In spite of the oversupply/large amount of research on CSR and CR, more research is needed/demanded on the facts or conditions that surround someone and pathways through which these two important firm features may track in opposite or fighting against directions. What's more, while most research so far, has examined closely so the truth can be found CSR, few studies have examined closely so the truth can be found the hit/effect of CSI on CFP and CR. This honor/difference is important and one that needs/demands more act of asking questions and trying to find the truth about something. More than that, more acts of asking questions and trying to find the truth about something are needed into how social (Peloza & Shang, 2011) can establish or damage value for firms and their customers. Also, with new social media machines/methods/ways becoming more well-known/obvious, previous research has not explored the role social media plays in explaining CSI's hit/effect on CFP. In a time in history where social media has become existing all over a large area,

understanding the conditions and edges/borders, such as CSR fit, where social media's influence on CFP will be the strongest is important.

However, external voters/parts cannot always watch/ notice/ celebrate/ obey all action taken by managers to get a good reputation, this way, in many cases; they depend on experience-based thinking hints/signals in the health of the Earth/the surrounding conditions to signal the firm's overall unable to be touched value. When people who use a product or service have knowledge about companies, they give greater importance to honest and right behavior (Singh et al., 2008). Companies that claim high CSR behavior are seen as such, but dishonest and wrong behavior will harm their reputation.

REFERENCES

- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence and Implications? *Academy of Management Review*, 29(1), 65-91.
- Eberl, M., & Schwaiger, M. (2005). Corporate reputation: Disentangling the effects on financial performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(7/8), 838-854.
- Fombrun, C.J. (1996). Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O.C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: an integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3-19.
- Nikolaeva, R., & Bicho, M. (2011). The role of institutional and reputational factors in the voluntary adoption of corporate social responsibility reporting standards. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 136-157.
- Pelozo, J., & Shang, J. (2011). How can corporate social responsibility activities create value for stakeholders? A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 117-135.
- Robert, P.W., & Dowling, G.R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(September), 1077-1093.
- Singh, J., Salmons, S., & Bosque, I. (2008). Understanding corporate social responsibility and product perceptions in consumer markets: A cross-cultural evaluation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(3), 597-611.