EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION ABOUT CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP: AN AWARDED SAMPLE FROM TURKEY[1]

ÇALIŞANLARIN KURUMSAL VATANDAŞLIK İLE İLGİLİ ALGILARI: TÜRKİYE'DEN ÖDÜLLÜ BİR ÖRNEK

Yrd.Doç.Dr. Yasemin ÖZDEMİR[2]
Mustafa Abdül Metin DİNÇER[3]

ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is the responsibility of a business that has an effect on both the external environment and the employees. And Corporate Citizenship (CC) is caring for the well-being of others and the environment resulting in the creation of value for the business.

The perception of the employees is important if their employer has CSR practices, that suggest the business is a good citizenship to feel more motivated and committed, the business performance will be higher.

This study explores the perception of the employees about the corporate citizenship situation of a business that has CSR practices and was awarded for these practices. The research is a case study based on questionnaires conducted within the employees of the corporation in Turkey that has a CSR award. The research findings revealed that there is similarity between the corporation's CSR applications and employees' perception about general CSR applications and CSR dimensions thus discretionary dimension is less mentioned by the employees.

ÖZET

Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk (KSS), bir işletmenin dış çevresini ve çalışanlarını etkileyen sorumluluk türüdür. Kurumsal vatandaşlık (KV) ise işletme için değer yaratılmasına neden olacak şekilde başkalarının ve çevrenin refahı ile ilgilenmeyi ifade etmektedir.

İşverenin iyi bir kurumsal vatandaş olduğunu düşündüren KSS uygulamaları ile ilgili çalışanların algısı çalışanların daha fazla motive olmaları ve bağlılıklarının artması için oldukça önemlidir. Böylece işletme performansı daha yüksek olacaktır.

Bu çalışma, KSS uygulamaları olan ve bu konuda ödüllendirilen bir işletmenin kurumsal vatandaşlığı ile ilgili olarak çalışanlarının algısını incelemektedir. Araştırma, KSS ödüllü bir işletmenin çalışanların arasında uygulanan ankete dayalı bir örnek olay niteliği taşımaktadır. Araştırma bulguları, gönüllülük boyutu çalışan tarafından daha az vurgulanmış olmasına rağmen çalışanların genel KSS uygulamaları ve KSS boyutları ile ilgili algılarının işletmenin KSS uygulamaları ile benzer nitelikte olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Key Words: Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Citizenship, Employees' Perception.
Anahtar Kelimeler: Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, Kurumsal Vatandaşlık, Çalışan Algısı.

1. INTRODUCTION/THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Academic thinking about corporate social responsibility (CSR), variously termed corporate citizenship, corporate responsibility, corporate social performance, business citizenship, and corporate citizenship, as well as business ethics, stakeholder management (Waddock, 2004: 8). Some observers call it corporate social responsibility (CSR). Others refer to it as corporate ethics. More recently, businesses' social performance has been framed as "corporate citizenship (CC)" (Carroll, 1998: 1). According to Carroll (1999), CC is an extension to a lineage of work in conceptualizing the role of business in society in the management literature, a lineage most notably dominated by the notion of corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Matten & Crane, 2003: 2).The concept of corporate citizenship and social responsibility are defined broadly and often used interchangeably (Rondinelly and Berry, 2000: 73). So in this study both are used relatedly.

CSR is a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis (European Commission, 2012: 7). The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) defines CSR as ''the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development, working with employees, their families and the local communities'' (WBCSD, 2001; Jamali and Mirshak: 2007: 243-244).Sustainable business success and shareholder value cannot be achieve solely through maximizing short-term profits, but instead through market-oriented yet responsible behavior. Companies are aware that they can contribute to sustainable development by managing their operations in such a way as to enhance economic growth and increase competitiveness whilst ensuring environmental protection and promoting social responsibility, including consumer interests (European Commission, 2012: 7). More generally, CSR is a set of management practices that ensures the company maximizes the positive impacts of its operations on society or ''operating in a manner that meets and even exceeds the legal, ethical, commercial and public expectations that society has of business'' (BSR, 2001; Jamali and Mirshak:

2007: 244) Corporate Citizenship is identified as charitable donations and other forms of corporate philanthropy undertaken in the local community (Matten & Crane, 2003: 4). Corporate Citizenship is caring for the well-being of others and the environment resulting in the creation of value for the business (Glavas, 2009: 27). According to Sandra Waddock (2004: 9) "Corporate citizenship is manifested in the strategies and operating practices a company develops in operationalizing its relationships with and impacts on stake-holders and the natural environment". The literature on corporate social responsibility has identified four types of responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary (Carroll, 1979; Lewin et al. 1995; Wartick and Cochran 1985; Wood 1991). The economic dimension is defined as the responsibility to produce goods and to sell them for a profit – where increasing economic viability can be of benefit to society as well. The legal responsibility is defined by law. The ethical responsibilities are perhaps not as clear as the legal but are still widely known. As for discretionary expectations, these are all the other expectations society has of the responsibilities of a company that go beyond economic, legal, and ethical. Discretionary responsibilities are defined by social norms (Glavas, 2009: 14).

The CC literature has identified four faces of CC like CSR dimensions. These four faces consist of economic face, legal face, ethical face, and philanthropic face. Each "face, " aspect, or responsibility reveals an important facet that contributes to the whole. Just as private citizens are expected to fulfill these responsibilities, companies are as well. Stated differently, good corporate citizens are expected to: Be profitable (carry their own weight or fulfill their economic responsibilities). Obey the law (fulfill their legal responsibilities). Engage in ethical behavior (be responsive to their ethical responsibilities). Give back through philanthropy (engage in corporate contributions) (Carroll, 1998: 1-2). The term "good corporate citizenship" is actually a blanket one, often used indiscriminately to cover areas including environmental responsibility, consumer protection, workplace health, product safety, non-discrimination and equal employment opportunity (Murray-Gould, 1998; Fraser, Küskü ve Fraser, 1999: 293).

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), also called Corporate Responsibility or Sustainability or Sustainable Business Practices is about taking responsibility for the impact of a company's activities on the environment, the society and its employees while striving for economic success managing the economic, social and environmental impacts of business activities in balance, with the aim to divert risks and create new business opportunities (CSR Consulting Turkey, 2010: 4).

Corporate Social Responsibility not only provides better competitive advantages or corporations in the international market, better labor standards and conditions for workers and employees in the business sector (if that's what you mean), environmental protection and more collaboration between civil society and private sector; also it is very significant for the realization of sustainable development goals and for strengthening local communities and societies. In this regard every person and organization has a responsibility not

only to themselves but also to the stakeholders within society (CSR Turkey Baseline Report, 2010: 7)

With a few exceptions (e.g., Robin and Reidenbach, 1987), much of the conceptual work in this area has stemmed out of the management literature and has been scattered over four different research streams focusing on corporate social responsibility (e.g., Bowen, 1953; Eilbirt and Parket, 1973; Carroll, 1979; Sethi, 1979), corporate social responsiveness (e.g., Ackerman and Bauer, 1976; Frederick, 1978), corporate social performance (e.g., Carroll, 1979; Wood, 1991; Lewin et al., 1995), and stakeholder management (e.g., Clarkson, 1995; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Jones, 1995). A review of the research in these related areas suggests that corporate citizenship can be defined as the extent to which businesses assume the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibilities imposed on them by their stakeholders (Maignan and Ferrell, 2001: 38).

2. DIMENSIONS OF CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

The classification of corporate citizenships' dimensions has similarities with the dimensions of corporate social responsibility. In other words in some cases they are consistent with each other. Therefore, in this study there is a similar conceptualization.

In the definition of the Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Citizenship, there are many classifications in the literature about the dimensions of corporate citizenship, although in some cases using slightly different phrasing. For example, Maignan and his colleagues' (Maignan and Ferrell, 2000, 2001; Maignan et. al., 1999) have defined CSR dimensions as "the extent to which businesses meet the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary responsibilities imposed on them by their stakeholders". This is largely synonymous with Carroll's (1991) definition of CSR dimensions "economic responsibility, legal responsibility, ethical responsibility and philanthropic responsibility". The pyramid of corporate social responsibility portrays the four components of CSR, beginning with the basic building block notion that economic performance undergirds all else. At the same time, business is expected to obey the law because the law is society's codification of acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Next is business responsibility to be ethical. At its most fundamental level, this is the obligation to do what is right, just, and fair, and to avoid or minimize harm to stakeholders (employees, consumers, the environment, and others). Finally, business is expected to be a good corporate citizen. This is captured in the philanthropic responsibility, wherein business is expected to contribute financial and human resources to the community and to improve the quality of life. Regarding to philanthropic responsibility the discretionary responsibility has wider social and economic content. Although enterprises perform the social responsibility activities in these four different areas, in the social responsibility pyramid the size of the ethic and the discretionary activities increasing every day (Carrol, 1991: 42).

2.1. Economic Responsibilities

Before it was anything else, the business organization was the basic economic unit in our society. As such, its principal role was to produce goods and services that consumers needed and wanted and to make an acceptable profit in the process. At some point the idea of the profit motive got transformed into a notion of maximum profits, and this has been an enduring value ever since. All other business responsibilities are predicated upon the economic responsibility of the firm, because without it the others become moot considerations (Carrol, 1991: 40-41). From this point economic responsibilities include the obligations to be productive, to be profitable, and to meet consumption needs (Aupperle, 1982: 55).

According to Carrol's definition profit-making is not antithetical to good corporate citizenship. Indeed, it is required of good citizenship. Just as private individuals are expected to work and earn an income as part of participating in society and being good citizens, business organizations are expected to generate income sufficient to pay their bills and reward their investors. Good corporate citizens earn enough money that their investors receive a strong return on their investments and that other stakeholders are assured of the continuity of the business and the flow of products, services, jobs, and other benefits provided by the company (Carrol, 1998: 2).

2.2. Legal Responsibilities

Society has not only sanctioned business to operate according to the profit motive; at the same time business is expected to comply with the laws and regulations promulgated by federal, state, and local governments as the ground rules under which business must operate. As a partial fulfillment of the "social contract" between business and society, firms are expected to pursue their economic missions within the framework of the law (Carrol, 1991: 41).

Legal responsibilities require that businesses fulfill their economic mission within the framework of legal requirements (Maignan and Ferrell, 2000: 284). Good corporate citizens, like private individuals, are also expected to obey the law. One way of thinking about the law is to perceive it as codified ethics. If business ethics is about what is right, good, and just in the commercial realm, law is designed by our lawmakers to manifest these standards in terms of businesses' performance. Of particular concern to businesses wishing to be good corporate citizens are laws that are designed to govern their relationships with key stakeholders such as consumers, employees, the community, and the natural environment. Congress and the states promulgate laws to establish the basic ground rules for the game of business. If businesses wish to be regarded and admired as good corporate citizens, they abide by these laws and integrate legal compliance into their corporate strategies and operational management (Carrol, 1998: 2).

2.3. Ethical Responsibilities

Ethical responsibilities concern society's expectation that businesses follow established moral standards (Maignan and Ferrell, 2001: 39). Ethical responsibility encompasses activities that are not necessarily codified into law, but nevertheless are expected of business by societal members such as respecting people, avoiding social harm, and preventing social injury. Such responsibility is mainly rooted in religious convictions, humane principles and human rights commitment (Novak, 1996: 135).

Although economic and legal responsibilities embody ethical norms about fairness and justice, ethical responsibilities embrace those activities and practices that are expected or prohibited by societal members even though they are not codified into law. Ethical responsibilities embody those standards, norms, or expectations that reflect a concern for what consumers, employees, shareholders, and the community regard as fair, just, or in keeping with the respect or protection of stakeholders' moral rights (Carrol, 1991: 41).

Business ethics is concerned with the distinctions between corporate behavior that is good versus bad, fair versus unfair, or just versus unjust. Business ethics is concerned both with developing codes, concepts, and practices of acceptable business behavior and with carrying out these practices in all business dealings with its various stakeholders. Thus, two vital aspects of business ethics are "knowing ethics" and "doing ethics" (Carrol, 1998: 4).

2.4. Discretionary Responsibilities

Discretionary responsibilities reflect the desire to see businesses involved in the betterment of society beyond economic, legal and ethical responsibilities (Maignan et al, 1999: 56, 1979).

Philanthropy is commonly believed to be a desire to help humankind through acts of charity, whether done by private citizens, foundations, or corporations (Carrol, 1998: 5). The roots of this type of responsibility lie in the belief that business and society are intertwined in an organic way (Frederick, 1994). Philanthropic giving, frequently manifested through corporate contributions, is an activity that many in the business community loosely equate with corporate citizenship. That is, good corporate citizens "give back" to the communities in which they reside or maintain offices (Carrol, 1998: 5).

These responsibilities are the components of CSR and related with the all internal and external partners of the organizations. The results of an investigation about if the Turkish corporations are good citizens, revealed that these dimensions can be classified differently(Küskü and Erçek, 1999) and this will be detailed in the part CSR in Turkey.

3. EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION ABOUT CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND   CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

In order to measure the impact of corporate citizenship on employee behaviors, it was important to measure the employee's perception of whether they consider their corporation to be a good corporate citizen. Just because a corporation is publicly considered to be a good corporate citizen overall, it cannot be assumed that every individual employee will be positively affected. Employees need to be aware, feel, and/or think that their corporation is a good corporate citizen (Glavas, 2009: 31).

When employees perceive that "their" organization acts as a "true corporate citizen", they form positive images about it and increase their organizational identification. They feel proud to identify with such an organization, develop self-esteem, form affective bonds with the organization, develop a sense of loyalty, experience higher affective well-being, behave for sustaining/reinforcing such reputation (e.g., by speaking well about the organization in presence of outsiders) and make efforts to perform better and to benefit the whole organization (Dutton et al., 1994: 255).

For employees to be affected by perceived corporate citizenship, they need to feel that corporate citizenship is important to them. It is possible that people could have values which are more in line with self-enhancement and would not care as much about the corporate citizenship activities of a company (Schuler & Cording, 2006; Glavas, 2009: 1). In addition, according to need theory (Alderfer, 1972) and relative deprivation theory (Stouffer et. al., 1949; Glavas, 2009: 44), employees could find it more important just to have a job, no matter what the job is. For employees to become more engaged, creative, and have high-quality connections because of corporate citizenship, they need to perceive that their company is a good corporate citizen. In addition, even for those employees who do value corporate citizenship, it might vary in intensity. It is quite conceivable that employees vary in how much corporate citizenship is important to them (Glavas, 2009: 44).

When employees feel that the organization is committed to them (Robertson et al., 2007; Rego et al., 2007: 7), they tend to develop a sense of duty toward the organization, and are willing to reciprocate with more cooperative and supportive actions, and with greater loyalty, affective commitment, enthusiasm, work effort and productivity, thus performing their jobs better and contributing to organizational performance (Cameron et al., 2004; Eisenberger et al., 2001; Gavin and Mason, 2004; Kouzes and Posner, 1995; Settoon et al., 1996; Wright and Cropanzano, 2004; Rego et al, 2007: 7).

Also employees feel that the organization cares for and is helpful to the whole community (e.g., contributing adequately to charities; encouraging partnerships with local schools; supporting local sports and cultural activities;

encouraging employees to join civic organizations supporting community needs), they feel that they are performing meaningful work. So they start to bring their entire self (physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual) to the organization, assume work more as a mission than as a "job", which in turn makes them more affectively and normatively attached to their organizations and more committed to improving organizational performance (Gavin and Mason, 2004; Rego and Cunha, forthcoming; Sheep, 2006; Wright and Cropanzano, 2004; Rego et al., 2007: 7).

Thus, importance of corporate citizenship to the employee should be taken into consideration as a potential moderator (Glavas, 2009: 44).

4. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN TURKEY

In the last 50 years, the conditions of Turkey's political and economic structure under the influence of the military intervention, high inflation and fluctuations in an unstable economy and therefore making long-term plans to ensure sustainable development was not very favorable. In 1980s, Turkey has made significant progress for liberalizing the economy and up to level of the development countries to be competitive. But this process also brings with some disadvantages. Therefore intense competition, companies were under the price pressure to companies to be profitable and they were forced to postpone the CSR activities. The role of the government over the economy gradually declined in the last 30 years, but if compared with other EU countries, it is still very strong (Göcenoğlu and Onan, 2008: 7). However, in 2002 based on remarkable fiscal consolidation and improved macro-financial stability and led to uninterrupted strong growth and economic catching-up until the second half of 2008 (Macovei, 2009: 1), Turkey become fastest growing economy in Europe (www.hazine.org.tr, 2012). And in the last 5 years stable inflation and growth rates have caused a suitable atmosphere for companies to handle social issues (Göcenoğlu and Onan, 2008: 7).

The growing number of international treaties and campaigns were an important factor to increase the CSR consciousness level of Turkey. In 1996, the second Habitat Conference in Istanbul, Turkey, led to create an environment to discuss about the related issue of sustainable development. Following with these positive developments there has not been another event that affected the civil society, business world, government and other social stakeholder groups except the earth in 1999 in Marmara Region. In 1999 earthquake was activated the formation of both individual and corporate volunteers. For these reason, 1999 earthquake has a very important impact on the widespread of values such as volunteerism and participation in Turkey. Also the 2001 economic crisis showed that corporate governance, transparency and accountability are necessary to serve this purpose (Göcenoğlu and Onan, 2008: 7).

In 2005, Corporate Social Association of Turkey was founded to develop local and global corporate social responsibility (CSR) awareness for

sustainable development and social success is celebrating its 5th anniversary and create value with all stakeholders. This association prepared CSR Index to take into consideration of Turkey's economic, social, and environmental conditions and to be developed of managements' performances and to be measured of managements' performances in economic, social, environmental and reporting-audit areas. And also this index provides some opportunities to the managements which accept social responsibility such as a business strategy like social, economic and environmental plans (http: //www.csrturkey.org/faaliyetler.asp, 2012). CSR Turkey has been implementing "Accelerating CSR in Turkey Project" within the EU Civil Society Dialogue Program since July 2008. And in 2008, the association published the first report called 'Turkey Corporate Social Responsibility Baseline Report'. This report was an outcome of the project 'Accelerating CSR practices in the new EU member states and candidate countries as a vehicle for harmonization, competitiveness, and social cohesion in the EU. This report revealed that CSR applications of leading Turkish companies as well as Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (CSR Turkey Baseline Report, 2010: 3).

Since 25.06.2009, 160 institutions have signed Global Compact Network (GCN) in Turkey. Turkey has signed the Global Compact network for the first time in 2002 (Göcenoğlu and Onan, 2008: 20). The project which has been implemented in cooperation with CSR Europe covers CSR conferences along with workshops specially designed for articulating the relationship between the CSR and Media and CSR for SMEs. According to CSR Association in Turkey, companies should and can implement CSR practices and policies into their businesses (http: //www.csrturkey.org/faaliyetler.asp, 2012). operate in but also shall be beneficial for their business, as well as a profitable strategy for themselves (CSR Turkey Baseline Report, 2010). This is one of the main motives of having CSR applications.

Also another evaluation for Turkey can be about the different types of CSR or in other words, about the dimensions of CC. An investigation about if the Turkish corporations are good citizens revealed that the sub-dimensions of CC can be named as "collaborative-supporter, internal norms, external norms and social image". According to this classification "collaborative-supporter" takes part in discretionary responsibilities, The internal and external norms are the legal responsibilities. And the social image is related with the corporation's success. This classification about Turkey is a result of national culture and different managerial practices (Küskü and Erçek, 1999).

But the classification of CC dimensions of this study, that is about employees perception about CC in an awarded corporation for its CSR practice, is similar with scale (Maignan and Ferrell, 2001) used in this study.

5. A RESEARCH ABOUT THE EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION ABOUT CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP IN AN AWARDED CORPORATION IN TURKEY

In this section of the study, the research objectives, context, method and constraints of the study and also the findings of the research will be presented.

5.1. Objective of the research

This study explores if the perception of the employees is similar to the company that is awarded for its CSR project and so identifies itself as a good corporate citizen or not. In the literature, it is mentioned that it is important for employees that support CSR projects and evaluate the company as a good corporate citizen. Therefore the employees are the one of the main parts of CSR activities and dimensions which start in internal areas like procedures, standards, working conditions, salaries and then go on in the external environment. And also if the perception of the employees is important for the company, this can give an opinion to the organizations to consider their employees as the main component of their good corporate citizenship practices like the stakeholder that impose social responsibilities on them.

5.2. Research Methodology

This study constitutes a case study. Case study can be defined as a detailed method that performs with "single or small subject which has close relationship". Through this method can obtain detailed data about on a person, group or institution. In the case study method, surveyor use questionnaire, interview, observation and document analysis process. (Altunışık et. al., 2010: 66).

In this context, this study consists of two stages. At the first stage the data about the sample company, that is awarded for its CSR activities, is obtained by an interview with the responsible unit of the company and also the CSR Report of the company and company's website is analyzed. At the second stage of the research, standardized questionnaire is used as a mean of quantitative research. This questionnaire includes demographic variables, questions about general CC. The questionnaire is the corporate citizenship scale which was developed to define the dimensions of CC by Maignan and Ferrell (2001) and is used in some studies that questioned the CC behavior of Turkish corporations (Küskü and Erçek, 1999; Küskü and Zrkada-Fraset, 2004). So its validity and reliability of the scale have been tested previously.

Then the questionnaire was sent to the employees by making online survey via the responsible manager of the corporation.

The study of sample consists of 121 questionnaires. The accessed data from the questionnaires is analyzed by chi-square, independent sample t-test using SPSS 17.00.

5.3. Constraints of the Research

The study has some constraints about research process. There is an important problem about knowledge sharing. And also the research is conducted in only center of the corporation and in white collar employees. Therefore, the return rate is low and is not suitable for making general comments. And also the homogenous status of the data does not give the opportunity for evaluating the findings statistically.

5.4. Findings

The findings are classified as general findings about the corporation, corporation's CC activities and the employees' perception.

5.4.1. About the Corporation

In this part, the information about the corporation is summarized. The information is obtained from the CSR Report of the company and company's website (www.dogusotomotiv.com.tr, 2011) and also by an interview with the responsible unit of the company.

5.4.1.1. General Information about the Corporation

The corporation is established in 1994 in Istanbul. It is one of the leading automotive importer and the biggest distributors in Turkey. The corporation represents 14 international brands each of which is the leader of the following sectors: Automobiles, light commercial vehicles, heavy commercial vehicles, industrial and marine engines, cooling systems.

With its 1700 employees, it is one of the key players of automotive sector in Turkey. And also as it is mentioned above the research is only conducted in the corporation center.

The corporation shares were offered to public in 2004 and are traded under the ticker symbol "DOAS.IS" in İstanbul Stock Exchange (ISE) 30 index.

5.4.1.2. Information about the CSR Activities

The company does not believe that the success of a corporation is evaluated by its financial performance alone. They believe that they have responsibilities vis-à-vis their community, the people and common areas of public sphere. They hold that success is attainable via proliferation of living areas.

They are working in awareness of their corporate social responsibility; they seek to add greater value to the society by spreading this sense of awareness and responsibility through their business models and social stakeholders. They have devised their business plans in reliance on this understanding and they have taken bright steps. To this end, they signed the UN Global Compact in March 2010. By this signature, they pledged they would be committed to promoting the ten principles spelled on the said instrument on human rights, labor, environment and anti-corruption.

It is thought that participation of the corporation levels is important for CSR activities. Their performance, commitment and goals that comprise part of our 2009 Corporate Social Responsibility Report were gathered by the Company's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Team, their Key Stakeholders and the Material Issues related to their impact were determined using the methodology recommended by the AA1000SES (Stakeholder Engagement) Standards.

Two workshops, where the methods of the above standard were applied, were organized in March 2010 with the participation of the company's CSR Team. The company's CSR Work Group consists of the managers of units directly related to customer expectations.

5.4.2. Findings of the Research

The findings of the research will be presented in two parts. First is about the participants or in other words about the employees features. And the second part is about the employees' perceptions about the corporations CSR activities.

5.4.2.1. General Findings about the Participants

We can summarize the general findings about the employees' features as below;

- Most of the employees are male (70, 2 %).
- The employees ages are between 26-40 (26-30: 25, 6 %, 31-35: 28, 9 %, 36-40: 27, 3 %).
- Most of the employees are working at the medium level position (67, 8 %)
- Because of the corporation's sector, most of employees are working the marketing (16, 5%) and sales related departments (41, 8 %)
- Many of the employees are working for the corporation between 1-5 years (33, 1 %) and 11-15 years (31, 4 %).
- Most of the employees are graduated from university (71, 9 %) and most of them are graduated from engineering departments (25, 6 %) and business administration (19, 8 %).

5.4.2.2. Findings about the Employees' CSR Perception

The finding about the employees' perception about the CC dimensions that show the frequencies and the tendencies can be seen in the table below:

Table 1: Employees' perception about the CSR dimensions

Statements	0 No idea		1 Do not agree		2 Neither agree nor disagree		3 Agree		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Economic CC									**2, 69**
We have been successful at maximizing our profits.	5	4, 1	4	3, 3	6	5, 0	106	**87, 6**	2, 76
We strive to lower our operating costs.	5	4, 1	7	5, 8	11	9, 1	98	**81, 0**	2, 67
We closely monitor employees' productivity	1	0, 8	21	17, 4	37	30, 6	62	**51, 2**	2, 32
Top management establishes long-term strategies for our business	5	4, 1	12	9, 9	16	13, 2	88	**72, 7**	2, 55
Our business has a procedure in place to respond to every customer complaint	1	0, 8	4	3, 3	7	5, 8	109	**90, 1**	2, 85
We continually improve the quality of our products	1	0, 8	3	2, 5	9	7, 4	108	**89, 3**	2, 85
We use customer satisfaction as an indicator of our business performance.	1	0, 8	4	3, 3	9	7, 4	107	**88, 4**	2, 83
Legal									**2, 57**
The managers of this organization try to comply with the law.	3	2, 5	2	1, 7	3	2, 5	113	**93, 4**	2, 87
We are always informed about laws.	2	1, 7	16	13, 2	22	18, 2	81	**66, 9**	2, 50
Our company seeks to comply with all laws regulating hiring and employee benefits	2	1, 7	8	6, 6	8	6, 6	103	**85, 1**	2, 75
We have programs that encourage the diversity of our workforce (in terms of age, gender, or race).	16	13, 2	11	9, 1	36	29, 8	58	**47, 9**	2, 12
Internal policies prevent discrimination in employees' compensation and promotion.	12	9, 9	14	11, 6	28	23, 1	67	**55, 4**	2, 24
Managers are informed about relevant environmental laws	8	6, 6	17	14, 0	22	18, 2	74	**61, 2**	2, 34
All our products meet legal standards.	2	1, 7	1	0, 8	4	3, 3	114	**94, 2**	2, 90
Our contractual obligations are always honored.	4	3, 3	3	2, 5	6	5, 0	108	**89, 3**	2, 80
Ethic									**2, 60**
Our business has a comprehensive code of conduct.	5	4, 1	3	2, 5	14	11, 6	99	**81, 8**	2, 71
We are recognized as a trustworthy company.			2	1, 7			119	**98, 3**	2, 97
Fairness toward co-workers and business partners is an integral part of our employee evaluation process.	8	6, 6	9	7, 4	22	18, 2	82	**67, 8**	2, 47
A confidential procedure is in place for employees to report any misconduct at work (such as stealing or sexual harassment)	30	24, 8	2	1, 7	7	5, 8	82	**67, 8**	2, 17

	0 No idea		1 Do not agree		2 Neither agree nor disagree		3 Agree		Mean
Our salespersons and employees are required to provide full and accurate information to all customers.	3	2, 5	4	3, 3	8	6, 6	106	**87, 6**	2, 79
Members of our organization follow professional standards.	2	1, 7	8	6, 6	21	17, 4	90	**74, 4**	2, 64
Top managers monitor the potential negative impacts of our activities on our community.	14	11, 6	6	5, 0	11	9, 1	90	**74, 4**	2, 46
Discretionary									**2, 34**
We are recognized as a good corporate citizenship.	2	1, 7	3	2, 5	2	1, 7	114	**94, 2**	2, 88
Our business supports employees who acquire additional education.	5	4, 1	10	8, 3	15	12, 4	91	**75, 2**	2, 59
Flexible company policies enable employees to better coordinate work and personal life.	3	2, 5	29	24, 0	26	21, 5	63	**52, 1**	2, 23
Our business gives adequate contributions to charities.	21	17, 4	2	1, 7	7	5, 8	91	**75, 2**	2, 39
A program is in place to reduce the amount of energy and materials wasted in our business.	10	8, 3	9	7, 4	10	8, 3	92	**76, 0**	2, 52
We encourage partnerships with local foundations.	20	16, 5	4	3, 3	15	12, 4	82	**67, 8**	2, 31
We encourage partnerships with local businesses and schools.	12	9, 9	2	1, 7	9	7, 4	98	**81, 0**	2, 60
The salaries offered by our company are higher than industry averages	12	9, 9	45	**37, 2**	32	26, 4	32	26, 4	1, 69
Our business encourages employees to join civic organizations that support our community.	26	21, 5	20	16, 5	34	28, 1	41	**33, 9**	1, 74
Top managers believe that they have social responsibilities other than to ensure business profit.	6	5, 0	9	7, 4	8	6, 6	98	**81, 0**	2, 64
Our business supports local sports activities.	9	7, 4	17	14, 0	18	14, 9	77	**63, 6**	2, 35
Our business supports local cultural activities.	5	4, 1	8	6, 6	14	11, 6	94	**77, 7**	2, 63
We are recognized as a good corporation			2	1, 7	1	0, 8	118	**97, 5**	2, 96

The table 1 can be summarized as below:

- The evaluation of the employees' perception about the CSR dimensions are like that: The averages of the dimensions are as economic 2.69, legal 2.57, ethic 2.60 and discretionary 2.34. The positive perception of the employees' for ethic dimension is higher than the other dimensions and economic dimension is mentioned less than the other dimensions. Also the total average of CSR dimensions is 2.55. There is a difference between the corporation's and the employee's thought about the CSR dimensions. In the first stage of the research the company's manager mentioned all CSR dimensions strongly and the averages of all dimensions are 3. In other words, while the corporation's evaluation is so strong about the CSR components for all dimensions, the employees' thought is almost in a positive tendency but it is not so strong. And also the less mentioned dimension is discretionary.

- Almost all employees think that they work for a trustworthy (98, 3 %, mean=2.97) and good (97, 5 %, mean=2.96) company. And also they think that the company is a good corporate citizenship (94, 2 %, mean=2.96), all the products meet legal standards (94, 2 %, mean=2.90) and all managers try to comply with the law (93, 4 %, mean=2.87).

- The less mentioned items take part in discretionary dimensions. The 26, 4 % (mean=1.69) of the employees do not think that "The salaries offered by their company are higher than industry averages". And also the 33, 9 % (mean=1.74) of the employees do not think that "Our business encourages employees to join civic organizations that support our community."

Shortly, it can be said that the employees' perception is generally positive and similar with the manager's expressions. Though there is a difference about the discretionary dimension, it can be said the interaction, the feedback and CSR team played an important role in this similarity.

In addition to the employees' perception of CSR dimensions, their reviews of general CSR are also very important. Table 2 is prepared according to this purpose.

The accessed data from the questionnaires is analyzed by chi-square, independent sample t-test. And only there is a relationship between gender and "I would like to work for a company that cares for the well-being of people." according to independent sample t-test. (less than 0,05)So generally there is no statistically relationship between the employees' perceptions according to the CC dimensions and the features of the employees like gender, age, working years, position (all are more than 0,05). This is a result of the return rate of the questionnaires, the homogenous feature of the data, participation of the employees in the CC activities and the evaluation process of CC activities related with the employees perception in the corporation.

6. CONCLUSION

The four dimensions of CSR as economic, legal, ethical and discretionary are confirmed in this study and they are positively evaluated by the company and its employees. Additional to these dimensions, the overall evaluation, people, planet and profit aspects (Glavas, 2009) can be investigated in next studies. And also to get further information, to see different aspects of CSR, to gain detailed information about the reason of this perception, the context can be extended by using quantitative research methodology.

This study's findings show that CSR dimensions are stressed positively by both the company and its employees. Therefore, there is CSR team in the company that supports the participation of the employees for the CSR activities and the perception of the employees is investigated at least once a year.

But the corporation stresses all dimensions strongly. Also there are some differences for the components of CSR dimensions. The employees believe less in legal CSR dimension especially related with diversity management programmes and in discretionary CSR dimension related with salary level compared with the other companies. All these perceptions are related with employees. So it can be said the employee aspect of CSR activities needs to be improved. The size and homogeneous feature of the sample cause some constraints especially for making statistical based analysis and evaluations.

These results can not be generalized. So, many other researches with larger samples is required to make general decisions and find the reasons of difference between the corporation's evaluation and the employees' perception about some components of CSR dimensions. Also CSR and CC support the employer branding positively and it is important to investigate the other related subjects like organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour, intention to leave.

REFERENCES

1. ALTUNIŞIK, Remzi., Recai Coşkun, Serkan Bayraktaroğlu and Engin Yıldırım (2010). Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri SPSS Uygulamalı, 5. Baskı, SakaryaKitabevi, Sakarya.

2. AUPPERLE, Kenneth E. (1982). 'An Empirical Inquiry into the Social Responsibilities as Defined by Corporations: An Examination of Various Models and Relationships' (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1982).

3. CARROLL, Archie B.. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. Academy of Management Review, 4, 497-505.

4. CARROLL, Archie B. (1991). 'The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organiza- tional Stakeholders', Business Horizons, 34(July/August), pp. 39–48.

5. CARROLL, Archie B. (1998). 'The Four Faces of Corporate Citizenship', Business and Society Review, 100/101, pp. 1–7.

6. CARROLL, Archie B. (1999). 'Corporate Social Responsibility', Business and Society, 38(3), pp. 268–295.

7. CARROLL, Archie B. (2000). A Commentary and an Overview of Key Questions on Corporate Social Performance Measurement, Business & Society, 39, 466-478.

8. CSR Consulting Turkey (2010) CSR Principles in International Business, Consulate General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Istanbul. http: //www.kssd.org/dl/CSR_Booklet.pdf, E.T: 10/04/2012

9. CSR Turkey Baseline Report (2010) April, http: //www.kssd.org/dl/csrbaselinereport.pdf , E.T: 10/04/2012

10. DIRK, Matten. & Andrew Crane (2003) Corporate Citizenship: Towards an extended theoretical conceptualization, Research Paper Series International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility, nternational Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility Nottingham University Business School

11. DUTTON, Jane E., Janet M. Dukerich and Celia V. Harquail, (1994). Organizational images and member identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 39, 239-263.

12. EKIN, M. G. Serap. and Hande S. Tezölmez (1999) "Business Ethics in Turkey: An Empirical Investigation with Special Emphasis on Gender", Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 8, ss. 583-595.

13. ERDEM, Ferda. (1996) İşletme Kültürü, Friedrich-Naumann Vakfı ve Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Ankara.

14. European Commission (2012), Corporate social responsibility A business contribution to sustainable development, Employment & social affairs, Industrial relations and industrial change, Directorate-General for Employment , and Social Affairs, Unit D.1, Manuscript completed in July 2002

15. Frederick, William C., (1994) "From CSR1 to CSR2", Business and Society 33(2), 150–164.

16. GLAVAS , Ante, (2009) Effects Of Corporate Citizenshıp On Employees: Why Does Doıng Good Matter? Department Of Organizational Behavior, Case Western Reserve Unıversıty, Phd Thesis, August.

17. GÖCENOĞLU, Ceyhun and Işın Onan (2008) "Customer Social Responsibility Report in Turkey", Ankara.

18. Hazine Kontrolleri Derneği: http: //www.hazine.org.tr/ekonomi.php, E.T: 04/04/2021

19. HOFSTEDE, Geert, (1983). "The Cultural Relativity to Organizational Practices and Theories", Journal of International Business Studies, Fall.

20. http: //www.csrturkey.org/faaliyetler.asp, (E.T: 02/05/2012)

21. http: //www.dogusotomotiv.com.tr/tr/hakkimizda/dogus-grubu.aspx

22. http: //www.dogusotomotiv.com.tr/tr/kurumsal-sorumluluk/kurumsal-sorumluluk/kurumsal-sorumluluk-anlayisi.aspx (E.T. 16.12.2011)

23. KÜSKÜ, Fatma and Anna Zarkada-Fraser (2004) "An Empirical Investigation of Corporate Citizenship in Australia and Turkey", British Journal of Management, Vol. 15, pp. 57-72.

24. KÜSKÜ, Fatma and Mehmet Erçek (1999) "Vatandaş Kuruluş Kavramı: Türk Kuruluşları İyi Birer Vatandaş mı?", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Cilt. 33, No. 3, ss. 79-95.

25. JAMALI, Dima. Mirshak R., (2007) Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Theory and Practice in a Developing Country Context, Journal of Business Ethics 72, 243–262

26. MACOVEI, Mihai, (2009), Growth and economic crises in Turkey: leaving behind a turbulent past? European Communities, Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs Publications

27. MAIGNAN, Isabelle and O.C. Ferrell (2001). Antecedents and Benefits of Corparate Citizenship: An Investigation of French Businesses. Journal of Human Resources. 51. 37-51.

28. MAIGNAN, Isabelle and O. C Ferrell, . (2000).Measuring corporate citizenship in two countries: The case of the United States and France. Journal of Business Ethics, 23, 283-297.

29. MAIGNAN Isabelle, O. C Ferrell and G. Tomas Hult, . (1999).Corporate citizenship: Cultural antecedents and business benefits. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27, 455-469.

30. MAIGNAN, Isabelle, & Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Corporate citizenship as a marketing instrument. European Journal of Marketing, 35, 457-484.

31. McHugh, Francis P (1992) TUSIAD: Ethics-In Business Now, Detay Basım Ltd.

32. MENGÜÇ, Bülent. (1998) "Organizational Consequences, Marketing Ethics and Salesforce Supervision: Further Empirical Evidence", Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 333-352.

33. NOVAK, M. (1996) Business as a Calling: Work and the Examined Life, The Free Press, New York, NY.

34. ORHANER, Berkay and Feride Doğan., (2010) CSR Turkey Baseline Report, Corporate Social Responsibility Association of Turkey.

35. ÖĞÜT, Adem. and Esra G. Kaygısız (2009) "Küresel İlkeler Sözleşmesi Kapsamında Kurumsal Vatandaşlık Kavramının Türkiye'de Uygulanması", 2.Ulusal Yönetim ve Ekonomi Bilimleri Konferansı, 24-25 Eylül, İzmir, ss. 129-142.

36. ÖZGEN, Hüseyin., Azmi Yalçın and Azim Öztürk, (1994) "Çağdaş İşletmelerde İş Ahlakı ve Sosyal Sorumluluk Anlayışı", II. Yönetim Kongresi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Yayınları, Kuşadası, ss. 396-413.

37. REGO, Arménio ., Susana Leal, Miguel Pina and Cunha , Jorge Faria, (2007) How Employees' Perceptions of Corporate Citizenship Predict their Organizational Commitment , Área Científica de Gestão, Pages 1-30

38. RONDINELLI Dennis A. and Michael A. Berry., (2000)Environmental Citizenship In Multinational Corporations: Social Responsibility And Sustainable Development , European Management Journal, Volume 18, Issue 1, February, Pages 70-84

39. TUGIAD (1992) Business Ethics in Turkey, Simge Ofis Matbaacılık.

40. ZARKADA-Fraser, Anna, Fatma Küskü and ChambellFraser., (1999), "Can Corporate Citizenship Measures be Culturally Transferable?", Proceedings of the 1999 Annual Conference of the Australia- New Zealand International Business Academy, (Edited by: S.L. McGaughey, S.J.Gray and W.R.Purcell, Sydney, Avustralya, 30 September-2 October 1999, pp.286-298.

41. WADDOCK, Sandra. (2004). Parallel Universes: Companies, Academics, and the Progress of Corporate Citizenship. Business and Society Review, 109, 5-42.