EPRA International Journal of Socio-Economic and Environmental Outlook (SEEO) ISSN: 2348-4101
Volume: 9 | Issue: 11 | November 2022 | SJIF Impact Factor: 7.426 | Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0314 | Peer-Reviewed Journal

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MARKETING PERFORMANCE OF OIL AND GAS FIRMS IN RIVERS STATE

Onyeka Chinedu[1], Dr. Haniel Eke[2], Prof. Chinedu Ogbuji[3]

[1]DBA Student University of Port Harcourt Business School, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
[2]Department of Marketing, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria
[3]Department of Marketing, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Corporate Image and Marketing Performance have become attractive research topics in the business literature, but not much is known about their interrelationships. This study seeks to investigate the relationships between social responsibility and the marketing performance of oil and gas firms in Rivers State. The purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample size of two thousand, seven hundred and fifty-two (2,752) from seven (7) selected oil companies. The instrument used was a questionnaire. The Krejcie and Morgan were used to get a sample size of 378. The results indicate a positive direct effect of Social Responsibility and Marketing Performance. Findings indicate that Social Responsibility did enhance the marketing performance of oil and gas firms in Rivers State. Thus, the result positions social responsibility as the primary mechanism through which the beneficial effects of marketing performance are realized. The study recommends that behavior of social responsibility of the organization should be adapted and patterned towards the features or attributes that characterize the environment or context of the organization.

1. INTRODUCTION

The marketplace today is very dynamic, vibrant, and competitive. The customers are smarter, more informed, and have an access to many channels and choices which they take little time to exercise. Customers can easily defect to competitors who promise better offerings at lower prices (Bhardwaj, 2007). Present-day business environments are characterized by increasingly saturated markets, caused by changes like competition and an ever-growing imperative to attain a comprehensive appreciation of customer needs. Matching the growing complexity of the business environment has led to an ever-more diversified and demanding customer base (Barnes, Fox, & Morris, 2004). In an ever-expanding and rapidly changing environment, companies cannot maintain attitudes characterized by attracting customers or expanding in new markets. The key success factor to survive in mature markets relies on sustaining long-term relationships with stakeholders (De Madariaga & Valor, 2007). The challenge all marketers face today is in finding ways of increasing customer loyalty and retention. Transforming different customers into loyal ones and establishing long-term relationships with customers is critical for organizational success. (Bhardwaj, 2007; Alrubaiee & Al-Nazer, 2010).

Nevertheless, in a highly competitive environment, companies oriented their efforts to achieve corporate social responsibility to gain sustainable development. It has been also found that companies aspire to achieve marketing performance by improving different marketing strategies to create a competitive advantage. However, according to Klink and Smith (2001), the corporate image creates a competitive advantage for the firm by successful differentiation from competitors and thereby increases marketing performance. Likewise, Worcester (2009) found that corporate social responsibility has been acknowledged as one of the most important factors in determining corporate reputation, and an antecedent of corporate image. While, Narver and Slater (2000) posited that customer value has become one of the main interests of scholars and managers, and is considered the next source of competitive advantage to improve their performance. As well, Khalifa (2004) stated that creating and delivering customer value is a cornerstone of marketing and competitive strategy, to maximize marketing performance.

According to Rose and Thomsen (2004), social responsibility is an intangible asset of a company, which affects its financial performance directly or indirectly. Conversely, a company's financial performance can also affect its reputation. According to Ali & Zia (2011), social responsibility includes key factors that are perceived by stakeholders objectively. These factors include (1) brand reputation, (2) corporate image, (3) social contribution value, and (4) operational transparency. Previous studies mentioned that companies must be

profitable before they can improve performance by enhancing their social responsibility. This means that they should first fulfill their commitments to shareholders and investors, to create the necessary resources to support non-economic activities (e.g. charity) for corporate social responsibility goals. These activities are considered a strategic tool to improve the organization's reputation (Porter & Kramer, 2002; Walsh et al., 2009).

Corporate social responsibility and its effect on Marketing Performance has become a subject of debate and discussion over the years. And because of this, many researchers have argued the significance of companies' engagement. According to Singh, Sanchez, and Bosque (2007) in Bilikova (2015), the traditional view of the business of maximizing profits is no longer sufficient, and companies have to realize that they have responsibilities that go beyond their legal and economic obligations. And one of these responsibilities is carrying other stakeholders along together with the shareholders. Social responsibility holds that firms in maximizing shareholders' profit, should also identify and carry along different stakeholders that have an interest in the activities of the firm. While profit maximization is important in business, they believe that firms should endeavor to be society-oriented. In support of this, Servaes and Tamayo (2012), noted that many corporations dedicate a section of their annual reports and corporate websites to CSR activities, illustrating the importance they attach to such activities. To Adeneye and Ahmed (2015), corporate social responsibility defines the voluntary services given by a company to society. And it is this voluntary service that will help the company to create a good image and increase purchasing behavior of their customers.

In recent years, the concept of corporate social responsibility has been studied widely in academic research as well as in the business environment. Organizations are using social responsibility to develop competitive advantage and establish symbiotic relationships with stakeholders. In developed countries, the concept of social responsibility is very familiar and the implementation of corporate social responsibility is an indispensable activity to maintain the ecosystem for sustainable development, which is good for society, the environment, stakeholders, and business. In developing countries, the concept of corporate social responsibility is gradually becoming popular; however, the implementation of social responsibility in a business environment is not entirely voluntary because the potential benefits of social responsibility are less emphasized, particularly in Nigeria. This study examines the effect of social responsibility on the marketing performance of oil and gas firms in Rivers State.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social Responsibility

Corporate engagement with society, also termed social responsibility or corporate social responsibility (CSR), has become a commonly used term in contemporary society and refers to one process by which an organization expresses and develops its 'corporate culture' and social consciousness (Rupp et al, 2006; Calderon, 2011). Social responsibility has been receiving lots of attention from various backgrounds of researchers worldwide (Ismail 2011), it has attracted a great deal of attention over the past decade (Zu & Song 2008) and according to some researchers, has gathered great momentum over the past number of years and is now regarded to be at its most prevalent (Sweeney 2007). Therefore, business leaders, government officials, and academics are focusing more and more attention on the concept of "social responsibility" (Reinhardt et al 2008). Almost all corporate websites/ policies/reports talk about their endeavors for social responsibility, which has become a way of ensuring that the organization is fulfilling all its obligations towards society and thus is eligible for the license to operate. It assures that the organization can grow on a sustainable basis (Sharma et al. 2009).

There are also societal pressures with respect to social issues such as human rights and the environment on the corporations and social responsibility is widely regarded as the response of corporations to this pressure (Miller & Guthrie 2007) and according to Bénabou & Tirole (2009), responding to such pressure, business leaders, governments and academics are now also emphasizing the notion of social responsibility. In corporate social responsibility, the central issue is the appropriate role of business that overlaps, almost completely, with its reference area (Reinhardt et al, 2008; Borza, 2011) and now business organizations have waked up to the need for being committed towards CSR (Sharma et al. 2009) because the role of businesses in society is no longer focused on creating wealth alone but is also focused on acting responsibly towards stakeholders (Abd Rahim, et al, 2011). Corporate social responsibility, which was previously referred to as social responsibility (SR) and today some often call it corporate responsibility (CR) (Ismail, 2011) over the years has gained unprecedented momentum in the business and public debate and has become a strategic issue crossing the departmental boundaries, and affecting the way in which a company does business (Sharma et al. 2009).

Ismail (2011) argued that business has a wider responsibility as it is not limited to shareholders only but extends to various stakeholders. It is supported by the case whereby the government alone definitely cannot afford to have sole responsibility for improving the lives of their people as it exceeds their capabilities. If the

government is unable to fulfill the increasing demand of their people thus this is where the corporations should support the government. Bénabou & Tirole (2009) asserted that social responsibility is somewhat of a "catch-all" phrase for an array of different concepts. An analysis of social responsibility must therefore clarify its exact meaning, and in particular the presumed impact of social responsibility on the cost of capital. Some social responsibility advocates argue that there is a business case for good corporate behavior, while others discuss it in terms of sacrificing some profit in the quest for the social good. Abd Rahim, et al (2011) quoted that social responsibility is a concept whereby organizations consider the interests of society by taking responsibility for the impact of their activities on stakeholders as well as the environment. This obligation is seen to extend beyond the statutory obligation to comply with legislation and sees organizations voluntarily taking further steps to improve the quality of life of employees and their families as well as the local community and society at large.

According to Borza (2011), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is one of the newest and most modern concepts identified at the societal and company levels worldwide Thus, given that society is evolving in a fast rhythm with visible results in economic and social terms, respectively in attitudes and consumption preferences behavior, we consider the reorientation to a development direction which promotes the maintaining resources at a quantitative and qualitative guaranteed level and he concerns manifestation related to protecting the limited natural space in which people are obliged to act and live together, is a series of responsibilities that the companies must assume, given that they are a permanent and active intermediary between social and economic environment. Koestoer (2007) asserted in a research report about Indonesia that value creation on the triple bottom line (profit, people, and planet) is very fundamental to the concept of CSR. However, the process of improving corporate social and environmental performance undoubtedly encompasses broader cultural and societal change.

2.2 Marketing Performance

Marketing metrics are internal and external quantitative performance indicators that can either be financial or non-financial and that are subject to monitoring by top management (Ambler 2003; Ambler et al. 2001). It is obvious that metrics facilitate the cycle of marketing analysis, planning, and control, help evaluate past performance, and make it possible to compare the success of the firm within the sector to the success of competitors (Bennett 2007). Performance metrics can be classified into two: financial and non-financial. Profitability, sales, and cash flow have, for a long time, been among the financial metrics frequently used for the evaluation of marketing performance. Market share, considered to be an antecedent of cash flow and profitability, is another metric frequently used both by scholars and practitioners (Ambler et al. 2001). Although conventional performance metrics are based on the system of financial accounting, interest in the use of non-financial measurement tools for the assessment of marketing success started to increase in the 1980s (Seggie et al. 2007; Meyer 2004; Yeniyurt 2003)

Marketing performance measurement is the assessment of "the relationship between marketing activities and business performance" (Clark & Ambler 2001). Because the problem in question is the inability to account for marketing activities, our specific interest is in marketing's ability to assess this relationship. Given that the goal of MPM research is to demonstrate the value of the marketing activities, in line with the work of Rust and colleagues(2004), our focus is on marketing not the "underlying products, pricing, or customer relationships" (Rust et al.2004) but rather as the "marketing activities" them-selves, which we define as marketing communication, promotion, and other activities that represent the bulk of the typical marketing budget. As a result, both the number and diversity of measurement tools have increased (Good 1992). According to Meyer (2004), the number of metrics selected should not be too many, and three financial and three non-financial metrics would suffice.

Marketing capabilities play an important role in achieving business success. Some studies examine the effects of the marketing capabilities of a firm on its performance in comparison to the effects of other functional capabilities (Krasnikov, Jayachandran 2008; Acar, Zehir 2010). In their meta-analysis study, Krasnikov and Jayachandran (2008) highlighted that marketing capabilities have a larger positive effect on performance compared to R&D and production capabilities. In their study on technology-producing firms in Taiwan, Feng et al. (2009) achieved results similar to those of Krasnikov and Jayachandran (2008). Vorhies and Morgan (2005) argue that benchmarking is frequently used in management as a mechanism of learning, but there are few empirical studies on benchmarking marketing capabilities as a tool for acquiring sustainable competitive advantage. They identify eight different marketing capabilities, demonstrate how they have a positive effect on business performance, and conclude that these marketing capabilities can be used as benchmarking criteria. In

terms of the motto, "What you do depends on what you measure", the monitoring and assessment of marketing capabilities should result in the improvement of these marketing capabilities and in higher performance.

Marketing performance measurement research can be divided into three research streams: measurement of marketing productivity (e.g., Morgan, Clark, & Gooner 2002; Rust, Lemon, & Zeithaml 2004), identification of metrics in use (e.g., Barwise & Farley 2003; Winer 2000), and measurement of brand equity (e.g., Aaker & Jacobson2001; Ailawadi, Lehmann, & Neslin 2002). However, that which constitutes a superior marketing performance may differ between businesses (Vorhies & Morgan 2003). Because the effectiveness and efficiency dimensions of performance may not converge and may even be inversely related in the short term (Bhargava, Dubelaar, & Ramaswami 1994), firms tend to make important decisions that reflect a trade-off between emphasizing either effectiveness or efficiency in the setting of their marketing goals and allocation of resources (Walker & Ruekert 1987). Following on the approach used by Homburg (2007), marketing performance is herein defined as: "…the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization's marketing activities with regard to market-related goals, such as revenues, growth, and market share…". Ambler (2000) also points out a lack of precision in the terminology used to describe marketing performance. He proposes the adoption of the word 'metric' to capture a top-level measure of marketing performance (Shaw & White 1999).

2.2.1 Market Efficiency

Efficiency on the other hand is the productivity of estimated effects; specifically, productivity without any form of waste. This has to do with workers' abilities to work productively with minimum waste in terms of energy, time, and cost. Efficiency is more or less a contrast between the use of inputs in a clearly defined process and generated outputs. However, if it generates lesser than what it is estimated to generate it is said to be inefficient. As such efficiency stems from the correlation between inputs and outputs and is referred to basically as the degree to which outputs are produced while minimizing manufacturing costs (Harris, 2001). Several researchers have defined the concept of market efficiency in terms of various factors. There is an essential definition that reflects the common belief that considers the market as being totally efficient before the occurrence of recent anomalies (Angelovska, 2018; Ghazani & Ebrahimi, 2019; Kharbanda & Singh, 2018).

Therefore, it can be seen from Malkiel and Fama's definition that the stock market might be unbeatable. In addition, investors do not have the ability to obtain unusually high profits (Hirano et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2020). Furthermore, Malkiel (2003) and Singer (2018) emphasize that traders are unable to obtain high profits by stating that investors cannot gain abnormal profits without facing a high degree of risk. Thus, it is clear that in order for investors to obtain above-rate profits, they have to accept a high degree of challenge. Another point of view with regard to the concept of market efficiency can be seen in Arnold (2012) as he implies that it is not sufficient to consider previous information when it comes to predicting the future prices of stocks. Brealey et al. (2020) stress that the first form might be due to the possibility of determining the stock price from the data with regard to historical prices. There are many arguments about market efficiency in the weak form. A large number of empirical tests have been conducted by various economists in different periods and in several countries, in order to test this form and to discover whether the market is efficient or inefficient.

In contrast, it could be noticed from other several beliefs on the part of a number of economists, that markets in this form are likely to be efficient. As Brealey and Richard (2016) state, the market in the weak form tends to be efficient which might be a result of the impossibility of investors estimating the future price of a security by basing it on historical statements. Therefore, none of the traders will be able to have the opportunity to earn abnormal profits. Thus, one of the essential reasons behind considering the efficiency of the market is that past values do not affect future prices. This view is also emphasized by Malafeyev et al. (2017) when they point out that "markets have no memory". By this, they suggest that future stock prices might take various paths in terms of what they were previously. In addition, historical information does not have any impact on future values. Consequently, traders are unable to obtain any information with regard to future prices based on the sequence of historical prices.

Furthermore, Rahman et al. (2016) imply that when a company intends to issue new statements, for example, with regard to the merging of two firms or any other action that might affect security prices, the senior managers or some insiders will be the first to obtain this information before public investors do and even before this information has been announced. Moreover, they will predict the movement of future share prices by analyzing this information. Thus, this might create a kind of lack of confidence on the part of traders, because they will start to feel that the insider is obtaining a profit more than they are. Eventually, this will lead normal investors to lose their confidence in the stock market which could cause suffering in the community. However, it should be noticed that some efforts have been made in certain countries to prevent and prohibit insiders and managers from trading in the stock market.

2.2.2 Marketing Effectiveness

In general, effectiveness is referred to as the degree to which set objectives are accomplished and policies achieve what they were designed to achieve. It focuses on affecting the purpose which is achieving the required or projected results. A program or service is said to be effective if such a program is able to accomplish set objectives or estimated outcomes. As regards workers, it is a measure of how well workers' productivity levels meet set goals and objectives of the organization (Yesufu, 2000). Therefore, an employee is said to be effective when he/she is able to achieve desired results in line with organizational goals and objectives. Marketing effectiveness has attracted a great deal of attention in academic and managerial circles (e.g., Appiah-Adu, Fyall, & Singh 2001; Homburg, Grozdanovic, & Klarmann 2007; Vorhies & Morgan 2003).

The concept of marketing effectiveness has been extensively discussed because of its strong association with many valuable organizational outcomes such as stable, long-term growth, enhanced customer satisfaction, a competitive advantage and a strong marketing orientation (Nwokah & Ahiauzu, 2009). Despite the avalanches of studies on marketing effectiveness, there seems to exist a scarce literature on its conceptual measures. Nwokah (2008) in his study on Marketing in governance: leader-managerial practices for efficiency in competency-based administration and transformational marketing model argue that marketing effectiveness of a firm is achievable if the firm has suitable staff to enable it perform marketing analysis, planning and implementation. Sequentially, marketing effectiveness calls for management to have sufficient information for the purpose of planning and effective resource allocation to varying markets, products and territories (Nwokah & Ahiauzu, 2008, 2009). Marketing effectiveness is also contingent upon the adeptness of managers to deliver profitable strategies from its philosophy, organization and information resources.

Hacioglu and Gök (2013) note that marketing effectiveness is not synonymous with profitability. The premise is that levels of return on investment, sales, market share and others depend on marketing effectiveness. Therefore, our purpose in this study is to examine the relationship between marketing effectiveness and Business performance. Marketing effectiveness has attracted a great deal of attention in academic and managerial circles (Nwokah, Ahiauzu, 2008; Nwokah, Ahiauzu, 2009; Gao, 2010; Halim, 2010; Solcansky, Simberova, 2010; Žostautienė, Vaičiulėnaitė, 2010). Marketing effectiveness calls for managers to have sufficient information for the purposes of planning and effective resource allocated to varying markets, products, and territories. Marketing effectiveness is also contingent upon the adeptness of managers to deliver profitable strategies from its philosophy, organization, and information resources. Ultimately, marketing effectiveness depends upon the ability to implement marketing plans successfully at various levels of the organization (Adu et al, 2001).

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The Dynamic Capability Theory

The Dynamic capability theory was put forward by Teece and Pisano (1994). This theory explains how firms achieve and sustain competitiveness based on the processes that take place in a firm to match the dynamic, volatile environment. The emergency of the theory was necessitated by the shortcoming of the resource-based and action-based theories in addressing dynamic economies. The Dynamic capability paradigm embraces entrepreneurship, innovation, organizational learning, and knowledge and change management (Teece, 2010). The ability of a firm to adjust to changes in the market through innovation is crucial for its competitiveness of firms. It is argued that the fundamental impulse that drives capitalism stems from the innovation of new products, new methods of production, new markets, and new forms of industrial organization (Schumpeter, 1942).

Dynamic capabilities refer to a "firm's capability that allows it to develop new products and processes in response to dynamic market situations" (Teece & Pisano, 1997). Dynamic capabilities include skills, procedures, organizational structures, and decision rules that can be employed by firms to create and capture value. The capabilities may stem from change routines, product development, and innovative managerial capabilities. They enable the firm to align its distinctive resources/competencies to the changing business environment. Dynamic capabilities are critical to the long-term profitability of firms (Teece, 2007). Dynamic capabilities enable firms to profitably organize their resources, competencies, and other assets if the firm is to sustain itself in changing environments and markets (Teece, 2009). The capabilities are crucial in a dynamic environment of rapid change, prevailing in a growing of industries (Teece, 2007; Teece, 2009).

Innovation is acknowledged as one of the critical firm capabilities that affect a firm's sustained competitive advantage and superior performance (Albaladejo & Romjin, 2000). Innovation capability allows firms to use current resources to create new resources, products, processes, and systems as well as devise new ways of using new resources to gain a competitive advantage (Teece & Pisano, 1997). Innovation capability can

be enhanced through learning and training, R&D, processes, firm organization, and associations with other players that include customers, suppliers, public and research institutes, and industry associations. Possession of dynamic capabilities also signifies a firm's capability to solve market problems and to achieve a new and innovative form of competitive advantage (Teece, et al., 2007) The approach emphasizes the capacity of a firm to renew competence as well as to integrate and reconfigure resources to match and create market change through innovation (Teece & Pisano, 1997; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000)

This theory informed the study of the relevance of a firm's dynamic capabilities which are crucial in achieving competitiveness in a dynamic volatile environment. Manufacturing SMEs operate in such environments and developing their dynamic capabilities that include innovation is critical for their survival and growth. The dynamic capability approach reflects a firm's ability to solve market problems and achieve competitiveness (Teece et.al, 1997). The concept of dynamic capabilities provides a broader framework to help us understand how firms create value for competitiveness in a dynamic environment. This is essential owing to changes in consumer needs, products, technology the competitive forces of other firms which can threaten a firm's existing position or open the possibility of a new or better one.

2.4 Social Responsibility and Marketing Performance

Nwachukwu, (2018) examined the effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on the marketing performance (MP) of a manufacturing company-Aluminum Extrusion (ALEX) Industries PLC Nigeria. Data were generated from the company's internal and annual reports from 2009 to 2015. Using SPSS version 21, stated hypotheses were tested with linear regression analysis. The findings revealed that CSR only has a strong positive relationship with one variable of MP-Market Share. The other two variables (Financial Performance and Sales Growth) were all negatively associated with CSR. Based on these, the study concludes that the negative effect CSR has on the profitability and sales growth of the company is a result of the inconsistent practice of CSR by the company. Therefore, the study recommends among others, that firms should be consistent in the implementation of their CSR projects in other to understand its effect on the company's marketing performance.

Rahman, Rodríguez-Serrano, & Lambkin, (2017) examined the link between corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives and company performance has been researched extensively, but the findings have been inconclusive or even conflicting. The link between CSR and marketing performance-one the dimensions of company performance has not been investigated so far, however. This study examines the relationship between CSR activities (in particular, corporate community and environmental activities) and marketing performance (measured by market share) and uncovers a positive relationship. The findings of this study demonstrate that the level of advertising intensity positively moderates the relationship between CSR and market share.

Tiep, Ngo, & Tran, (2021) Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a growing issue in emerging markets. This study aims to evaluate the impact of CSR on firms' performance by exploring the role of mediating variables such as corporate reputation (CR) and customers' purchasing intention (CPI). We use the quantitative technique of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques to analyze the data of the small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) from Southern Vietnam in 2020. The findings suggest a positive and significant impact of corporate/ social responsibility on firms' performance through mediating role of CR and CPI. This study contributes to the literature on corporate social responsibility and firms' performance of SMEs in the emerging country context. The outcomes of this study can be used by entrepreneurs and top management as an attempt to boost the performance of SMEs in emerging markets by applying CSR measures for sustainable competitive advantage. A mediating role of corporate reputation (CR) and customers' purchasing intention (CPI) as a value-added contribution to this study.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study will adopt the cross-sectional form of the quasi-experimental research design. A preliminary investigation shows that a total of 23 oil and gas companies exist and operate in Port Harcourt, the study will however focus on 7 oil and gas companies with deep water operations. Two thousand, seven hundred and fifty-two (2,752) full-time employees are in the (7) selected oil companies (see appendix), the firms were selected on the basis that they have operations in Nigerian deep waters. The determination of the sample size was done using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table and the result was 378. The purposive sampling technique was adopted largely because of the nature and characteristics of the respondents. Taking into account the different sizes of the firms, we used Bowley's formula to proportionately allocate the 378 cases to the 7 firms. The questionnaire was administered by hand and electronic system by the researcher and two research assistants.

Due to the distance between the two locations of the firms, the respondents were given time within which to fill out the questionnaire. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze the data obtained from the

4. ANALYSIS & RESULTS

Out of the 378 questionnaire copies distributed only 344 copies were successfully retrieved. All retrieved copies were further cleaned, coded, and assessed for outliers, missing values, and other error issues likely to bias the outcomes of the analysis. Assessment results revealed that all retrieved 344 copies were considered admissible in the analysis of the study. The analysis of the univariate distribution of the variables – community relations, and productivity, focused on assessing the manifestations and evidence of the variables within the context of the study.

Social Responsibility

Table 4.1 Distribution of Properties of Social Responsibility

		Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Responsibility X = 4.1320 SD = 0.09489	The organization has a corporate engagement with the society	4.0000	.00000
	Have made donations in recent years	3.9797	1.42331
	Engagement in actions that appear to further social good	3.6744	.46927
	Waste treatment and disposal beyond legal obligations	4.3401	.47444
	Partaking in charitable activities and events	4.6657	.47243

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The distribution for the indicators of social responsibility as expressed above are all scaled on 5 item instruments with each expressed in the table above. Distributions demonstrate high and evident distributions for items for social responsibility involvement, suggesting variations in experiences and perspectives of participants with regards to the manifestation of social responsibility. The evidence demonstrates practices or actions geared toward social responsibility.

Marketing Performance

Table 4.2 Distribution for Properties of Marketing Performance

		Mean	Std. Deviation
Marketing Efficiency X = 4.2663 SD = 0.18897	Management recognizes the importance of designing the company to serve the needs and wants of chosen markets.	3.6657	.47243
	Management develops different offerings and marketing plans for different segments of the market	4.3256	.46927
	Management develops an annual marketing plan and a careful long-range plan that is updated annually.	4.3343	.47243
	The quality of current marketing strategy is clear, innovative, data-based and well-reasoned	4.6657	.47243
	Effort is expanded to measure the cost-effectiveness of different marketing expenditures.	4.3401	.47444
Marketing Effectiveness X = 4.4692 SD = 0.25137	Market effectiveness is associated with long-term growth and enhanced customer satisfaction	4.6744	.46927
	Having a strong marketing orientation gives the organization higher competitive advantage	4.3401	.47444
	Managers are adept in delivering profitable market strategies.	5.0000	.04412
	High Integration and control of the major marketing functions	4.0000	.03230
	Management takes a whole marketing system view (suppliers, channels, competitors, customer, and environment) in planning its business.	4.3314	.94487

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The distribution for the indicators of marketing performance is expressed above. Measures adopted in the assessment and operationalization of marketing performance for which indicators are drawn comprise marketing

efficiency and marketing effectiveness. The evidence generated from the assessment demonstrates evidence disparity in the views of respondents with regard to the marketing performance of the organizations – with a majority of the participants affirming to the manifestations of the indicators.

Test of Hypotheses

H0$_1$. There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and market efficiency.

Table 4.3: The relationship between social responsibility and marketing efficiency

		Social Responsibility	Marketing Efficiency
Social Responsibility	Pearson Correlation	1	.868**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	344	344
Marketing Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	.868**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	344	344

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The test on test for relationship between social responsibility and marketing efficiency was revealed to be significant. Results indicate that at a rho = 0.868 and P = 0.000; social responsibility significantly contributes towards marketing efficiency. On this basis, previously stated hypotheses are rejected as the study reveals as follows:

i. There is a significant relationship between social responsibility and marketing efficiency.

H0$_2$. There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and market effectiveness.

Table 4.4: The relationship between social responsibility and marketing effectiveness

		Social Responsibility	Marketing Effectiveness
Social Responsibility	Pearson Correlation	1	.982**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	344	344
Marketing Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	.982**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	344	344

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The test on the test for the relationship between social responsibility and marketing effectiveness revealed to be significant. Results indicate that at a rho = 0.982 and P = 0.000; social responsibility significantly contributes towards marketing effectiveness. On this basis, previously stated hypotheses are rejected as the study reveals as follows:

i. There is a significant relationship between social responsibility and marketing effectiveness.

The relationship between social responsibility and the measures of marketing performance is revealed to be positive and significant. The findings demonstrate the significance of social responsibility to the behaviour and market disposition of the organization. According to Srour (2005), capitalist countries and companies navigate with ease through morally ambiguous situations, as self-interest is usually regarded as the engine of the economy. In this context, Scour reanimates the ideas of Weber's ethics when he discusses two alternative approaches: conviction and responsibility (Srour, 2005). The ethics of belief is interpreted as being based on principles and moral standards and ideals. More recent data on most developing markets show that there is a trend toward growth in the social services sector, which is reflected in more marketing and social responsibility programs and the application of their associated tools (Flammer & Luo, 2016). This is a paradigm shift that must take place if organizations are genuinely seeking to cultivate corporate social responsibility within their values, culture, mission, and vision.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study has identified social responsibility as a significant predictor of marketing performance, thus concluding that

i. Social responsibility allows for the focus on social actions of the organizations in a way that is responsive and as such contributes towards its performance and leads to outcomes such as market efficiency, marketing effectiveness, and productivity.

The following recommendations are put forward: Actions or behavior of social responsibility of the organization should be adapted and patterned towards the features or attributes that characterize the environment or context of the organization. This action would further advance its level of flexibility and responsiveness in line with the changes of such an environment or market especially since its features and forms are anchored and linked to that of the environment.

REFERENCES

1. *Aaker, D.A. & Jacobson, R. (2001). The Value Relevance of Brand Attitude in High-Technology Markets, Journal of Marketing Research. 38, 4, 485-493*
2. *Abd Rahim, R., Jalaludin, F.W., & Tajuddin, K., (2011) "The Importance of Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Behavior in Malaysia", Asian Academy of Management Journal, 16(1), 119–139*
3. *Acar, A.Z., & Zehir, C. (2010). The harmonized effects of generic strategies and business capabilities on business performance, Journal of Business Economics and Management 11(4): 689–711. http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2010.34*
4. *Adu, K. A., Fyall, A. & Singh, S. (2001). "Marketing effectiveness and Business performance in the financial services industry." journal of services marketing, 15(1), 18-34.*
5. *Ailawadi, K.L., Donald, R.L., & Scott A.N., (2002), "A Product-Market-Based Measure of Brand Equity," Working Paper No. 02-102, Marketing Science Institute*
6. *Ali, I., & Zia, M. (2011b). Corporate reputation influences consumer satisfaction and loyalty: Evidence from a cellular industry of Pakistan. International Conference on Challenges for Knowledge Society, 15-16 April 2011 Bucharest, Romania.*
7. *Alrubaiee, L., & Al-Nazer, N. (2010). Investigate the Impact of Relationship Marketing Orientation on customer loyalty: The Customer's Perspective. International Journal of Marketing Studies, 2 (1), 155-174.*
8. *Ambler, T. (2000), Marketing and the bottom line, Pearson Education, London.*
9. *Ambler, T. (2003). Marketing and the Bottom Line; London: FT: Prentice Hall.*
10. *Ambler, T., Kokkinaki, F., Puntoni, S., & Riley, D. (2001). Assessing Market Performance: The Current State of Metrics, London Business School, Centre for Marketing Working Paper. 01-903*
11. *Angelovska, J. (2018). Testing weak form of stock market efficiency at the Macedonian stock exchange. UTMS Journal of Economics, 9(2), 133-144*
12. *Appiah-Adu, K., Fyall, A., & Singh, S. (2001). Marketing Effectiveness and Business Performance in the Financial Services Industry, The Journal of Services Marketing. 15(1), 18-34.*
13. *Arnold, G. (2012). Modern Financial Markets & Institutions. Pearson Higher Ed.*
14. *Barnes, B.R., Fox, M.T., & Morris, D.S. (2004). Exploring the Linkage between Internal Marketing, Relationship Marketing and Service Quality: a Case Study of a Consulting Organization. Total Quality Management, 15 (5-6), 593-601*
15. *Barwise, P. & Farley, J.U. (2004). Marketing Metrics: Status of Six Metrics in Five Countries, European Management Journal. 22, 3, pp. 257-262.*
16. *Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J., (2009) "Individual and Corporate Social Responsibility" WP, 09-109, Research Group: Behavioral and Experimental Economics November 11, 2009, Toulouse School of Economics*
17. *Bennett, R. (2007). The use of marketing metrics by British fundraising charities: a survey of current practice, Journal of Marketing Management 23(9): 959–989. http://dx.doi.org/10.1362/026725707X250421*
18. *Bhardwaj, D. (2007). Relationship Marketing in Context to the IT Industry. The Journal of Business Perspective, 11 (2), 57-66*
19. *Bhargava, M., Dubelaar, C., & Ramaswami, S. (1994). Reconciling Diverse Measures of Performance: A Conceptual Framework and Test of a Methodology, Journal of Business Research. 31, 2-3, pp. 235-246.*
20. *Bilikova, N. (2015). Consumers' perceptions of corporate social responsibility in the Czech Republic. University of Huddersfield Business School.*
21. *Borza M., (2011) "Some Considerations Regarding the Corporate Social Responsibility Models in Romania", International Journal of Business and Management Studies 3(2), 2011, pp. 191-200*
22. *Brealey, A., & Richard. A., (2016). Principles of Corporate Finance. 12th ed. New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.*
23. *Brealey, R. A., Cooper, I. A., & Habib, M. A. (2020). Cost of capital and valuation in the public and private sectors: Tax, risk, and debt capacity. Journal of Business Finance & Accounting, 47(1–2), 163–187*
24. *Calderon, Mario (2011) "CSR in Latin America and South East Asia Analysis of the Corporate Communication of Top Local Companies", International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 2(3)*

25. Clark, B.H. & Ambler, T. (2001). Marketing Performance Measurement: Evolution of Research and Practice, International Journal of Business Performance Management. 3, Winter, pp. 231-244.
26. De Madariaga, G., & Valor, C. (2007). Stakeholders Management Systems: Empirical Insights from Relationship Marketing and Market Orientation Perspectives. Journal of Business Ethics, 71, 425-439
27. Feng, Y.Y., Pan, W.H., Huang, Y.C., & Chen, Y.K. (2009). The effects of firms' resources and capabilities on their performance in the IC design industry in Taiwan, Information Technology Journal 8(5): 688–697. http://dx.doi.org/10.3923/itj.2009.688.697
28. Gao, Y. (2010). Measuring marketing performance: a review and a framework. In: The Marketing Review, 10(1): 25–40.
29. Ghazani, M.M., & Ebrahimi, S.B. (2019). Testing the adaptive market hypothesis as an evolutionary perspective on market efficiency: Evidence from the crude oil prices. Finance Research Letters, 30, 60–68.
30. Halim, R. E. (2010). Marketing productivity and profitability of Indonesian public listed manufacturing firms. In: Benchmarking: An International Journal, 6(17): 842–857.
31. Harris, P. (2001). The impact of working life on health behavior: The effect of job strain on the cognitive predictors of exercise. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7, 342-353
32. Hirano, Y., Pichl, L., Eom, C., & Kaizoji, T. (2018). Analysis Of Bitcoin Market Efficiency by Using Machine Learning. CBU International Conference Proceedings, 6, 175–180
33. Homburg, C., Grozdanovic, M., & Klarmann, M. (2007). Responsiveness to Customers and Competitors: The Role of Affective and Cognitive Organizational Systems, Journal of Marketing. 71(3). 18-38.
34. Ismail, T., & Nooriani, T., (2011) "Corporate Social Responsibility: The Influence of the Silver Book", International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 3(2) 371-383
35. Kharbanda, V., & Singh, A. (2018). Futures market efficiency and effectiveness of hedge in the Indian currency market. International Journal of Emerging Markets. 13(6), 2001-2027
36. Koestoer, Y.T., (2007) "Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia Building internal corporate values to address challenges in CSR Implementation", Paper presented at the Seminar on Good Corporate and Social Governance in Promoting ASEAN's Regional Integration, 17 January 2007, ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta, Indonesia
37. Krasnikov, A., & Jayachandran, S. (2008). The relative impact of marketing, research and development, and operations capabilities on firm performance, Journal of Marketing 72(4): 1–11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.72.4.1
38. Malafeyev, O., Awasthi, A., & Kambekar, K.S. (2017). Random walks and Market Efficiency in Chinese and Indian equity markets. Retrieved from https://ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:1709.04059
39. Malkiel, B. (2003). The Efficient Market Hypothesis and its Critics. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17, 59-82.
40. Meyer, M.W., (2004). Finding performance: the new discipline in management, in A. Neely (Ed.). Business Performance Measurement. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 51–62.
41. Miller, J.I., & Guthrie, D., (2007) "The Rise of Corporate Social Responsibility: An Institutional Response to Labor, Legal, and Shareholder Environments", Institutional Determinants of CSR, Stern School of Business, New York University, 40 W. 4th St., 7-22, New York, NY 10012
42. Morgan, N.A., Clark, B.H. & Gooner, R. (2002), 'Marketing Productivity, Marketing Audits, and Systems for Marketing Performance Assessment. Integrating Multiple Perspectives, Journal of Business Research, 55, pp. 363-375
43. Nwachukwu, A.N., (2018) Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Marketing Performance of a Nigerian Manufacturing Company: An Insight From Alex Industries PLC. Journal of Economics and Management Sciences; 1(3)
44. Nwokah, N. G. & Ahiauzu, A.I. (2008). Managerial competencies and marketing effectiveness in corporate organizations in Nigeria. In: Journal of Management Development, 27(8): 858–878.
45. Nwokah, N.G., & Ahiauzu, A.I. (2009). Emotional intelligence and marketing effectiveness. In: Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 7(27): 864–881.
46. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. Harvard Business Review, 80(12), 56–68.
47. Rahman, M. S., Simon, H. M., & Hossain, M. M. (2016). An empirical analysis of weak form market efficiency: Evidence from Chittagong stock exchange (CSE) of Bangladesh. Journal of Statistics Applications & Probability. 5(3), 535–542.
48. Rahman, M., Rodríguez-Serrano, M. & Lambkin, M., (2017). Corporate Social Responsibility And Marketing Performance: The Moderating Role Of Advertising Intensity. Journal of Advertising Research. 57. 368-378. 10.2501/JAR-2017-047.
49. Reinhardt, F.L., Stavins, R.N. & Vietor, R.H.K. (2008) "Corporate Social Responsibility Through an Economic Lens" Resources for the Future, April 2008, RFF - DP 08-12, 1616 P St. NW Washington, DC 20036, 202-328-5000 www.rff.org
50. Rose, C., & Thomsen, S. (2004). The impact of corporate reputation on performance: Some Danish evidence. European Management Journal, 22(2), 201–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2004.01.012

51. *Rupp, D.E.; Ganapathi, J.; Aguilera, R.V, and Williams, C.A, (2006) "Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework", Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27, 537–543 (2006), Wiley Inter Science www.interscience.wiley.com*
52. *Rust, R.T., Tim, A., Gregory, S., Carpenter, V.K/. & Rajendra K.S., (2004), "Measuring Marketing Productivity: Current Knowledge and Future Directions," Journal of Marketing, 68 (October), 76–90.*
53. *Seggie, S.H.; Cavusgil, E.; & Phelan, S.E. (2007). Measurement of return on marketing investment: a conceptual framework and the future of marketing metrics, Industrial Marketing Management 36(6): 834–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2006.11.001*
54. *Sharma S., Sharma J. & Devi A. (2009) "Corporate Social Responsibility: The Key Role of Human Resource Management", Business Intelligence Journal, January 2009*
55. *Shaw, R. and White, C. (1999). Improving Marketing Accountability through Better Management of the Market Research Process, Journal of Marketing Management. 15, pp. 857-880.*
56. *Singer, A. (2018). Justice failure: Efficiency and equality in business ethics. Journal of Business Ethics, 149(1), 97–115.*
57. *Solcansky, M., & Simberiova, I. (2010) Measurement of marketing effectiveness. In: Ekonomika ir vadyba, 15: 755–759.*
58. *Sweeney, L., (2007) "Corporate social responsibility in Ireland: Barriers and Opportunities Experienced by SMEs when Undertaking CSR" Corporate Governance, 7(4), 516-523, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1472-0701*
59. *Tiep L.T., Ngo Q.H., & Tran T.T.H., (2021) Effects of corporate social responsibility on SMEs' performance in an emerging market, Cogent Business & Management, 8:1, 1878978,*
60. *Vorhies, D.W. & Morgan, N.A. (2003). A Configuration Theory Assessment of Marketing Organization Fit with Business Strategy and Its Relationship with Marketing Performance, Journal of Marketing. 67, January, pp. 100-115.*
61. *Vorhies, D.W., & Morgan, N.A., (2005), "Benchmarking Marketing Capabilities for Sustainable Competitive Advantage," Journal of Marketing, 69 (January), 80–94*
62. *Walker, J.O. & Ruekert, R.W. (1987). Marketing's Role in the Implementation of Business Strategies: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework, Journal of Marketing. 51, July, pp. 15-33.*
63. *Walsh, G., Mitchell, V.W., Jackson, P. R., & Beatty, S. E. (2009). Examining the antecedent consequences of corporate reputation: A customer perspective. British Journal of Management, 20(2), 187–203.*
64. *Yeniyurt, S. (2003). A literature review and integrative performance measurement framework for multinational companies, Marketing Intelligence & Planning 21(3): 134–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02634500310474957*
65. *Yesufu T. M. (2000). The human factor in national development. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited*
66. *Zhang, Y., Chan, S., Chu, J., & Sulieman, H. (2020). On the Market Efficiency and Liquidity of High-Frequency Cryptocurrencies in a Bull and Bear Market. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(1), 8-17.*
67. *Žostautienė, D., & Vaičiulėnaitė, L. (2010). Coherence model between marketing culture and marketing effectiveness. In: Ekonomika ir vadyba, 15: 874–879.*
68. *Zu, L., & Song, L., (2008) "Determinants of Managerial Values on Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from China", IZA Discussion Paper No. 3449, April 2008 Forschungsinstitut, Zur Zukunft der Arbeit, Institute for the Study of Labor*