

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: MALAYSIAN CORPORATE LEADERS' UNDERSTANDING

¹Eric Balan, ²Mohammad Saeed

¹Graduate School of Business, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak,
50400, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

²Former Professor, Minot State University, North Dakota, USA

¹eric@unirazak.edu.my, ²saeed145@yahoo.com

Abstract

Corporate Social Responsibility commonly known as CSR has been defined by many world organizations and at present its definition has been practiced and adopted by corporations based on individual's belief and understanding. Every corporation has its own definition of CSR and what is deemed CSR has always been philanthropy, cause-related marketing, green, community outreach or piecemeal solution. This paper will examine the understanding of CSR between the current and future corporate leaders and to analyze the challenges of its applications and implications in Malaysia. Through interviews and surveys, we analyze how CSR is perceived and how the dynamics are influenced by the interest of a corporation itself. In this paper we hope to highlight that the future of CSR is in the hands of the younger generation as they take on the role of corporate leaders. The corporate leaders of today's economy will have a distinctive role in accompanying the younger generation into the arena of CSR to establish a foundation for the future of CSR in Malaysia that will take shape as a culture and identity. In conclusion, based on the Malaysian understanding of CSR, the authors suggest CSR approaches that will respond to the needs of communities in emerging economies.

Keywords: *corporate culture, corporate identity, corporate social responsibility, future leadership, Malaysian leaders'*

INTRODUCTION

November 2010, the long-awaited document from the International Organization for Standardization globally launched the ISO 26000 Standard – Guidance to Social Responsibility (Roger Frost, 2010). In that document, it does not define the purpose of being socially responsible but rather it emphasizes on concepts that governs the understanding of ISO 26000. It's simply impossible to put a clear definition of being socially rounded when human factors on rectitude of conduct (Shoghi Effendi, 1938), manner of approaches and clarity of vision are involved in the process of being and doing good. However, having an unclear and an undefined purpose to what social responsibility is will affect the manner social responsibility is being practice.

The International Organization for Standardization has assumed the role of governing the global standards for quality, environment, and management. It propounds the fact that standards are to be regulated and strictly adhered to ensure a shared global understanding and coherence among industries and corporate leaders (Standardization, 2011). A very distinct and clear vision has been set and implemented to see through global recognition. All these efforts for a global vision for standards bring about best practices and compliances. In the approach to maintain order globally, it should also include the vision that will shape and bring about a culture to be more socially responsible by considering human factors. The definition of social responsibility has been defined by

many world organizations and at present its definition has been practiced and adopted by corporations based on individual's belief and understanding. One key aspect of social responsibility is Corporate Social Responsibility. Malaysia has its own share of initiatives and in 2007 the Bursa conducted a survey to investigate the status of corporate social responsibility practices among Malaysia's Public Listed Companies. The findings revealed poor corporate social responsibility engagement by Malaysian corporations. On average, the surveyed demonstrated lack of knowledge and awareness of social responsibility. The overall findings indicated a greater need for corporations to improve their corporate social responsibility disclosure and enhance understanding of the key concepts. However, there are various concepts and definitions of (Berhad, 2007).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Specific to the subject matter of this paper, we reviewed the following documents, journals, blueprints, and articles to ensure coherence in content and methodology approaches. Based on the findings we are suggesting valuable insights and learning that will act as an addendum or to be considered in future documentations in the scope of social responsibility.

The international community has become familiar with certain documents that had the power to change the mindset of today's leaders. To a certain degree, these documents have left a level of perplexity in the implementation of the processes where the understanding has shifted from its original to what is deemed to be right. Among the documentations we reviewed that governed the global leaders to be socially responsible were Agenda 21 and ISO 26000. Three years prior to the launch of ISO 26000, in a press release in September of 2007 by the Malaysian Employer Federation, it stated that the document has adverse impact pertaining to the inbound-outbound investment advantages in Malaysia, which directly affects trade competitiveness. To link the ISO 26000 to trade and investment would be a concern for corporations operating in Malaysia. Businesses in Malaysia would see challenges and complexities should the principles and conventions of the document be ratified and be adopted as regulatory references. Adopting these proposed principles would then be the prerogative of the government and not by the employers. Social responsibility has a much wider capacity than just ordinary CSR projects. It necessitates the integration of social responsibility to issues in the operations of the companies. It is beyond the general philanthropy reach and it encompasses an integration of all, directly and indirectly, positively, or negatively impacted stakeholders (within and out of the companies) and the government. The ISO 26000 presents some far-reaching aftereffects, and it will impact the competitiveness of developing economies (Federation, 2007).

It is clear that the vision of the document has not reached its consensus of the people who are involved in the proceeding of the documents let alone the government agencies that are involved. How can we expect a unison and seamless vision of social responsibility be grasped by those implementing it when the authorities are struggling to manage adopting such policies? This will in fact impact the country's economy...how is this so? Does this mean that engaging in the broader spectrum of social responsibility will stifle productivity and revenue? If this is the case, then why embark on a global policy. Upon the launch of the ISO 26000, it was well accepted by Standards Malaysia but at its session and seminars of disseminating these new guidelines there were queries of its feasibility to adhere. How then can we prepare to be more responsible?

In support to our paper, we reviewed an article that was published in June of 2011. In this article, the authors touched on the vision, differences of opinion and preferences in being socially responsible. The perceptions of social responsibility are based upon our ethical consideration and understanding, which varies in individuals and companies. These perceptions are formed based on family upbringing, experiences, consciousness, background, education, religious belief, culture, and behavior of the individual and of those in close contacts. These factors are different for all and to all and it is often the that the differences become the source of conflict and ethical positions. Often enough that tolerance plays a pivotal role, and it does not seem as a problem, but when we are considering social responsibility there are many positions which are right or can be considered as right. One feature of social responsibility is conflicting expectations. But not all efforts of social responsibility are possible, and therefore we need to prioritize them, collectively. And a socially responsible environment must let us choose and must let us accept the choice of others. As choices are made and decided on it creates a nature of ethical dilemmas considering socially responsible behavior. It presents a question and a challenge on how to manage social responsibility responsibly and collectively (Crowthe, 2011).

As we embarked further, we are able to point out that an important element is always left out in documenting policies or standards. The element of the human spirit and conduct is nowhere seen in these documents where it should depict how humans are involved. The very basis of any standards and policies are carried out by human beings. This is indeed an essential dilemma regarding social responsibility. Human beings are the ones who make up an organization or corporations and if we are not empowered to take on this challenge then what is the fate of social responsibility in the future? For this paper we want to be able to answer what is the vision of corporate social responsibility in Malaysia, what is the understanding does Malaysians have towards corporate social responsibility and what is the future of corporate social responsibility. One key advantage that Malaysia has is its diversity in culture. Having said this, the human element has always been our identity for tolerance and harmony. There is no doubt that Malaysia can spearhead the understanding of corporate social responsibility and implement any policy from a human perspective rather than a dogmatic approach.

The Vision

For any venture embarked, planned, designed or implemented, it begins with a vision in mind. The vision would include queries on the purpose of such ventures, the approach involved, the activities that will take place and so forth to establish some direction and guidelines of seeing through the venture successfully. We have witnessed over the past thirty years a series of approaches to the growth of corporate social responsibility each suited to specific circumstances and Malaysia is no exception to these series.

One of the early pioneers of social good exercised was through a *partnership between Marriott Corporation and March of Dimes in 1976 deemed Cause-Related marketing* (Raines, 2011) as a way forward for businesses to make profits and at the same time become the champion of a cause. *Bruce Burtch who went on to become a national catalyst for cause marketing programs was credited when he coined "Doing Well by Doing Good"* (Salvesen, 2010). Such an approach of monetary assistance by corporations fulfilled the ideology of being responsible. We learn over the years that consumerism is the key to economic growth. Decades ago, the demands on consumer buying power were

low and distributorships and manufacturers were limited to a pool of those who have the capital expenditure. With a single sales channel, it's total monopoly of an industry and customer loyalty was guaranteed, hence the recipient of social good indulges into continues stream of funding. Now with demands rising and the sales channeled are diversified, customer loyalty is questionable. Cause-Related Marketing may not be at best as a means of being socially responsible. Monetary assistances are stifled due to high competitions among the industry giants and customers. Where does this leave the recipients of such approach of social good?

The second wave of social responsibility sprung in 1990's and it was a move from philanthropy to something more sustainable. The second wave preparation began in 1962 detailing on the understanding of "sustainable". The global community was learning to what extent and strategies were needed to be implemented for Social Responsibility to be sustainable. Agenda 21 was launched in 1992 by the United Nations as a standard understanding towards sustainable development. Although Agenda 21 was the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, it was a document depicted to improve the livelihood of humanity (Development, 1992). Once again, we are introduced to a new set of guidelines and directions but with no purpose. Agenda 21 did not detail out the core duties and purpose why and how the global community should embark on sustainable development. There was no vision of what it means to be sustainable and what sustainable development would mean in decades to come.

In 2000, a two decades ago, corporations and businesses witnessed a new wave, a latest in the series of approach towards social responsibility. Given the time it needs to mature and to settle in, the new economic models would then realize that progress, growth, and sustainability requires a pro-active role played by governments, companies, communities, and individuals in a process aimed at balancing economic prospects with environmental demands and social cohesion. With this fundamental shift of thought the issues of corporate social responsibility and social entrepreneurship would gain increased popularity, organically. Their emergence is from the same philosophy of the building blocks sustainability (Embaye, 2007).

The increase in younger generations hoisting the call for change and being in the forefront to promote and to become agents of social change is beginning to create a sense of identity and culture in the involvement of being responsible. Such an approach borne to the idea of giving back and making profits brought about the concept of Social Entrepreneur and it is catching on. We view social entrepreneurship broadly, as a process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change and/or address social needs. Having lived through a series of economic crisis many young people are bending against corporate employment to pursue what is best for them, making profits and being socially responsible. Young Malaysian are now getting themselves involved with such to bring about societal transformation but at the stage of infancy, social entrepreneurs are in need of a push or support to amplify its needs to different communities and different needs as reported in the Star Newspaper (MAHALINGAM, 2010). Through social media sites and with the power of technology, very often we hear calls for donations to support the work which is being carried out. A fraction of that donation is used to support their own livelihood and the majority of the funds go to the work that they embark on with communities around the world. A good example of this is Water.org.

Inevitably, any manner of approach taken is building towards the development of an ever-advancing civilization. What we need to note is the vision of being socially

responsible collectively. If we leave the standards to be defined and governed by any authority of our choosing, then the vision from the top should trickle down to the grassroots who are continuously laboring in the arena of social responsibility. What needs to be cleared is that the human heart is involved, and authoritative commands and rigid methodology will not help in the progress of being responsible. Vision is accompanied with empowerment. We are in a race to save humanity and it starts with a vision of shared understanding.

RESEARCH METHOD

The Malaysian Understanding

A qualitative and quantitative research method was taken, and this allowed us to get close to leaders and students to comprehend their realities and to generate a more rounded understanding of social responsibility by their perspectives. Interviews were arranged and questionnaires distributed for data collection. The interviews involved asking open ended questions and emotional inquisitions wherever necessary to obtain data and information deemed to be useful in grounding a crisp understanding of social responsibility. This presented flexibility to follow different paths opened by the respondent's answers, and the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee stimulated ideas and associations thus creating a dynamic process of reflection. The results were surprising. The large disparity in understanding and implementing are questionable to the future of social responsibility in Malaysia.

The corporations of Malaysia, from the telecommunications giants, to the financial institutions of the country to the anchors of food and beverages are all involved in Corporate Social Responsibility in their own respective ways. We may not hear about it as loud as their products and services are advertised but it's there. How effectively the manner carried out is documented in their yearly report. Each industry organization has their mind set to what they perceive to be socially good. Malaysian corporations have and are still actively involved in philanthropy, one-off piecemeal solutions, yearly workshops, event bazaars to raise consciousness, cause-related and are in the process of finding out about sustainability. The current leaders of Malaysia's economy are spearheading to the best of their ability to ensure that Corporate Social Responsibility is in every agenda of business ventures. The level of depth differs from the individuals' enthusiasm for championing social responsibility in gaining the corporation support. In a keynote address by the Chairman of the Securities Commission made it apparent that capitalism and altruism were seen and are still seen as two separate pursuits. The business world embraces and thrives on the idea of 'self-interest' but delegates 'sympathy' for others to labour (Anwar, 2006). When businesses show concern for societal development as part of its social obligation, it bows under external pressures to demonstrate their social responsibility engagement first. In recent years, there have been a shift from social responsibility obligation to social responsibility strategy. Many corporations continue their commitments and efforts to substantially portion off company's profits and individual's net worth for a global corporate philanthropy cause. More and more companies are moving beyond mere philanthropy and are integrating corporate social responsibility into their core business strategy and practice.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Current Corporate Leaders' Understanding

For this paper, we carried out interviews and survey to various corporate leaders and judging from their response, we are quite pleased with the outcome. Potential corporate leaders who are in the middle management were also targeted and their feedback was quite daunting. It goes to show how far along does the corporations' identity and culture of corporate social responsibility is shared and is it trickled down to each and every employee?

We began our survey and interview by asking what Corporate Social Responsibility means to them and in the context of their organization. We wanted to establish a foundation of an understanding that we could constantly refer to in answering other queries. By this way, it will build on a framework that will guide and shape the current approach and understanding on the organization. We tend to agree that in the current movement of corporate social responsibility, branding, profit, and reputation are considered to be factors why corporations are involve in social responsibility. We asked if corporate social responsibility has a direct or indirect correlation to an organizations production or profit. Here, the answer will determine the direction and vision of the corporation who are involved and being socially responsible. We pursued further to seek how much importance and empowerment does employees have in an organization and what are employee's role in this respect. In the matter of stakeholders' engagement, we asked how they are involved and what their influence in a corporation endeavour to be socially responsibility are. Finally, we ask if organizations and employees are for or against legislation making it compulsory for organizations to participate in corporate social responsibility endeavours.

Questions as such may seem to be simple to answer and answers are usually posted based on individuals feeling or believes around the organizations mission and vision statement but having asked what social responsibility really mean to the individual have now become something personal and those answering draws into their conscious mind and reveal their raw personality because a question as such touches on the individual perception which in turn raises and gives a sense of empowerment that comes through as answers are uttered. It is really interesting to observe that current leaders have a strong drive to be more socially responsible, but organizations direction and movement stifles such growth. As individuals they are passionate to give back but as a whole or as a community of professional profit driven instruments, they are bounded by the rules of the game. Stakeholders who are involved in the directions of organizations corporate social responsibility endeavours are also staggered to contribute and to be of service. The complexity lies in the decision that takes place in the boardroom. What is actually stopping this? What is the motivation to digress away from being socially good? Why as individuals they are passionate about the subject but as a union of great minds, why do they stray? Is the vision clear? Is everyone empowered to take the change to a greater level? From an employee's perspective, it is evident that they are left unknown to such endeavours and in the marketplace and the community social responsibility has become the responsibility of the corporate communication department of an organization. In 2006, Bursa Malaysia in a statement to the Malaysian Public Listed Companies mentioned that everything that the company does for its staff's wellbeing needs to be socially responsible, be it basic employee rights, gender issues, promotions, workload, etc. A quality work environment with health and safety are utmost natural and are obvious considerations, is

the way in inculcating in employees the values which businesses holds dear to (Malaysia, 2006). This is not the case when organizations are manufactured to generate revenue and employees are caught in the rut of clients to produce for profit. How are such organizations complying to what Bursa Malaysia wishes to achieve?

By nature, individuals make up a community and the higher nature of a human being is to show forth attributes of goodness but somehow being professional bring out the lower nature of human beings to be competitive and greed and we show little emphasis when dealing with other human being. The motivation of business deals in nature is to seek gain be it morally depraved or morally noble. When we post the question if organizations and employees are for or against legislation making it compulsory for organizations to participate in corporate social responsibility endeavours most of the answers were against for simply and practically adopting the theorem of capitalism. To our surprise this question was answered by those middle management and not C Level management. We analysed and made a guesstimate that the vision and language used is different from each strata level of an organization when it comes to being socially responsible. We fall back to Maslow Hierarchy of Needs and found that middle or senior management resides on the fourth level of the hierarchy which is the Esteem level. The motivation here is to compete, to be the best, to be recognized, to be respected and to achieve greatness all for the motivation to climb the corporate ladder. Most C Level management who has achieve what is there to achieve are now being more sensitive towards being socially responsible and are therefore in support to legislation making corporate social responsibility compulsory.

When there is a mix feeling in approaches how then will the vision and thoughts be aligned to the purpose of what corporate social responsibility means. In order to sustain, C Level management has more than what it takes to do to ensure that this vision is shared to all and is being implemented for the sole purpose for the future of the organization. Here, one end of the spectrum has its issues to resolve on the understanding, the applications, and the implication of Corporate Social Responsibility. What is then the fate of the future leader?

Future Corporate Leaders Understanding

With students, we asked knowledge-based questions to gauge their understanding of the subject and to see if they have a sense of giving. Across all fields of study, we asked if they have heard about Corporate Social Responsibility. From a sample size of 100 students, 60% never heard of the term but when explained to them, they immediately understood the concept. This raised an alarm of how “Corporate Social Responsibility” will be termed in the future? Interestingly, 2 out of the 100 said that the term “CSR” is not proper and should be changed to something more people friendly, since its people driven and people diversity. The term “CSR” carries a connotation of segregation of those who leads in an organization to those operating the organization and of those who are end-of-the-line of the organization. The 2 shared sentiments that corporate social responsibility has now become organization-centric rather than people-centric. Here the focus is on branding, profit, and reputation. We continue asking if the topic on corporate social responsibility is being taught or touched in any of their subjects and if they knew whether their chosen higher institute of learning is involved in being socially responsible. We pressed on by asking if they have strong desire towards being socially responsible and the role as student can play. From a commercial perspective, we asked them to name three organization that they know of who are actively involved in corporate

social responsibility and what are their insights to the current practices of corporate social responsibility. Our final question is to see if they, now as students who are to become future leaders, would adopt and practice the approaches of corporate social responsibility in the future.

From our interviews and questionnaires to students, 40% have heard about corporate social responsibility but may not comprehend the full extent of its concept. 10 students or 4% of the lot associate's corporate social responsibility to charity. They are baffled to the factors of social responsibility in the marketplace, workplace, community, and the environment. When questioned, is corporate social responsibility made part of a subject, to our disbelief it was not. The subject is talked about when the tutor is willing to explain out of the context of the syllabus where else it is not obligated to make mention of it. We know that higher institutions of learning to a certain extent are involved in socially responsible activities but from the students' perspective it is not made apparent or to deem such activities as corporate social responsibility. Our question is, what are students learning about Corporate Social Responsibility in order to be aligned to what is wished by Bursa Malaysia? If they are to be the future corporate leaders and with poor understanding of its concepts, then what is the faith and the future of Corporate Social Responsibility in Malaysia? Where are we heading with future leaders who have no sense of purpose and vision to be socially responsible? All 100 students responded that they would want to learn more about corporate social responsibility. Having the lack of knowledge in the subject subjugates them from being empowered to render an important role in the transformation of being socially responsibility. 80% of the total could not response to the question on the current practises of corporate social responsibility as they are unaware.

Culturally, Malaysians are ethical judging from the upbringing, family integrity and spirituality believes. We have seen evidence of breach and depravity in business dealings and it is being sensationalized by the media. Instead of condemning the act, we tend to condemn the person who commits the act. How has the media shown to be socially responsible is this? Due to the inadequate publicity of social responsibility activities, when asked students to name organizations that they know of who are actively involved in corporate social responsibility, it is only the major conglomerates are named – from telecommunication, airlines, healthcare, food and beverage and media. The examples given are commercial bound projects that are profit driven, piecemeal solutions, branding, charity, and cause-related marketing. These are what students know as Corporate Social Responsibility. A direct interpretation of corporate social responsibility is “corporation doing something good for society”. It is not a wrong interpretation, but it is not complete. The frustration is when charity is equated to corporate social responsibility. How do we intend to change the mind-sets of future leaders to be more aware and to be inclined with this societal transformation where corporations contradicting their endeavours? How are the current leaders accompanying the future leaders to shape the understanding of what is deemed to be socially responsible?

Clearly, this end of the spectrum has its challenges and is in need of a resolution to ensure a sustainable approach towards socially responsible. No doubt our sample size for this research is small but it is enough to make an inference to raise an alert and to assume the role corporate social responsibility will play in the future. Leaving it to chance that current and future corporate leader will be ethical individually as well as professionally is questionable when factors of their surroundings will shape and alter their perspective of what is to be socially responsible.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study has addressed concerns on the purpose, vision, clarity of thought, the manner of approach, the understanding, the application, and the implication of Corporate Social Responsibility. Over the course of our research, we found a grey area where aspects of corporate social responsibility are not dwelled upon due to the inadequate knowledge of the area and the limited number of expertise who can share concepts to and from all levels of an organization. With both ends of the spectrum dealing with issues of vision and knowledge in the subject, there is no balance, and the problem perpetuates and takes on its own ecology that creates apathy and raises the insistent self within us. We now know that the vision and purpose of being socially responsible is not shared to all in the corporate world, the foundation of a sound understanding in tertiary education is not established, the dynamics to be socially good is being tested and the approaches in social responsibility activities are not sustainable. We learnt from our research that the language used to describe what is Corporate Social Responsibility differs from the source, the one adopting, the one practicing and the one receiving.

Through our recommendations to the subject on Corporate Social Responsibility, we hope that Malaysia can balance out the spectrum of a shared understanding and spearhead in establishing a framework that includes the aspect of spirituality in order to be socially good and socially responsible. Nothing was mentioned in the documents of ISO 26000 from the International Organization of Standardization, Agenda 21 or in other documents depicting social transformation incorporating spirituality into the framework. Malaysia has the advantage to do so from its extensive and diverse background, a country that understands tolerance and reciprocity to become an example to the region and Asia as a leader in Corporate Social Responsibility.

To ensure sustainability and the future of Malaysian businesses ethical approaches, what is needed is a system that bridges the gap between corporations' vision and students' knowledge that will inculcate empowerment and accountability in individuals that will create a balanced business ecosystem. A key element is spirituality that governs our conscious to act and react responsibly. Our recommendation includes the three protagonists of social responsibility, the individual, the community and the institution. We will reflect on the implication that drives us as Malaysian to be socially responsible, the elements that shape our understanding and approaches and elements that sustain a corporate social responsibility endeavour.

Recommendations

The development and advancement of culture and identity goes beyond the individual and the professional believes in becoming socially responsible. The advancement of such a culture is marked by the rise in capacity to think in terms of a process in becoming and in executing social responsibilities. The preceding sections of the paper we included aspects of spirituality that shapes our mind and actions to be aligned with the vision that we have set as Malaysian in becoming the bearers of social wellbeing and justice. From the outset, those involved and those attempting to be involved in Corporate Social Responsibility outreach are asked to be conscious of the broad processes that defines their work. However, in an environment focused increasingly on the promotion of events or projects, with a mind-set that derive satisfaction from the sense of expectation and excitement it generates, maintaining a level of dedication required for long term action demands considerable effort. Corporate Social Responsibility should be viewed in terms

of two large processes, Expansion and Consolidation. The expansion and consolidation of corporate social responsibility encompasses a number of interacting processes, each of which contributes its share in the movement of people towards a single vision.

The lines of action associated with any given process provides for the organization of occasional events, and from time to time, activities take the shape of a project with a clear beginning and a definite end. If, however, events are imposed on the natural unfoldment of a process, they will disrupt its sound evolution. If the projects undertaken in an organization are not made subordinate to the explicit needs of the processes unfolding there, they will yield little fruit. The nature of the interacting processes is vital to the successful execution of the ideology of Corporate Social Responsibility. In our efforts to further such understanding, every level of organizations is encouraged to bear in mind a concept that lies at the foundation of the current global effort in social responsibility. At the very heart of every stage of the process, progress is achieved through the development of the three protagonists, – the individual, the community, and the institution. Interactions among these three have been fraught with difficulties at every turn, with the individual clamouring for freedom, the community claiming precedence, and the institution demanding submission. The relationship that is binding these three is undergoing a profound transformation, bringing into the realm of existence a civilization of building powers which can only be released through conformity of a clear understanding. At a fundamental level, these relationships are characterized by cooperation and reciprocity (Justice, 2010).

a. Corporate Social Responsibility – A continuous educational process

The key factor is people and social responsibility is people orientated. The three protagonists are made up of people. The current practise and the future of corporate social responsibility will depend on people and their understanding of the approaches that need to be taken to ensure business dealings are ethical and spiritual in nature. Corporate Social Responsibility is not about how much an organization can make from society but rather what values can an organization bring to society to make a change. It is never about the money. It is about the human spirit.

To have this vision and culture that defines our identity, we should understand why we are embarking in becoming socially responsible, how it applies to ones live and the lives of the people surrounding us and the implications that reflects ones being and doing of social consciousness as Malaysians. An educational process of such can only begin and be acquired from the grassroots of our spiritual embodiment and cultural upbringing. Morally guided and conscious to what we are doing through constant consultation, action, and reflection to be free and released of the insistent self.

In any form of development or social endeavour that involves the human heart, our focus, sincerity, and motivation are key elements that will build upon or wreck the identity of responsibility. We believe that the involvement of any social responsibility aspect needs to address Five Factors of Development (STATES, 2005); Consultation, Participatory Learning, Organic Growth, Moral Development and Unity, Equity and Justice. Be it the workplace, marketplace, community and environment, these Five Factors of Development serve as the guiding principles in all business dealings and social responsibility endeavour.

Consultation

A process of collective decision making and action, devoid of adversarial posturing while dispassionate and democratic in spirit, is an indispensable feature of every corporate social responsibility undertaking.

Participatory Learning

Promoting collective learning and organizational capacity-building ensures the sustainability of social responsibility projects.

Organic Growth

Successful social initiatives best begin with simple actions at the local community level that gradually grows in complexity.

Moral Development

Creating moral awareness and moral responsibility is a prerequisite to enlightened and just action.

Unity, Equity and Justice

True social advancement is made possible when every member of society can trust that they are protected by standards and assured of benefits that apply equally to all. The realization of justice is dependent upon participation by all social actors.

b. Corporate Social Responsibility – Concepts, Attitudes and Abilities

We would like to end this paper with a reflection of ourselves that governs our approach towards corporate social responsibility. Let us begin by examining the concepts of motivation. Practitioners of social responsibility are questionable if the motivation is not at the right place. How to maintain a high level of enthusiasm in an organization will be often questioned. We will face with challenges to motivate all levels in an organization to be fully involved in being socially responsible. Based on our research findings, we anticipate organizations top priority is to create the drive and enthusiasm in employees to become part of an organization's Corporate Social Responsibility. As an initial step, we may divide factors to motivate people into two categories: transitory and permanent. It is either to excite people momentarily or to generate motivation with roots deep in a person's heart.

The zeal and vigour with which we approach our duties will help motivate an organization ideology which will shape the identity of the organization practice of corporate social responsibility. The enthusiasm of an organization is not to be understood as mere excitement and superficial emotions. It is a natural expression of inner joy, a joy that is the quality of one's soul and not the result of passing circumstances. As organizations strive to assist each other in becoming socially responsible they will become increasingly convinced that understanding is in itself the greatest of all motivation. There is a longing in every human heart for meaning, there is a natural craving for knowledge and education alone can address these longings. An organizations ability to assess understanding will require a continual development of attributes of sensitivity, detachment, and generosity to draw on the powers of perception and intuition. The environment that an organization creates is vital. A force of attraction is generated within an organization of those who are working together in any socially responsible endeavour or ethical business dealings. What is utmost important is our own attitude towards the subject of social responsibility is another factor that will contribute to the atmosphere of the organization. Behaviour can be beautiful and can therefore have the power to attract. There is a beauty in respect for others.

Social Responsibility is a lifelong educational process. The expansion and consolidation of business dealing, or social endeavours will be defined by our manner and method of approach. Whatever fancy name that it is called, social responsibility is all about good moral portrayal and what it is to be a human being. The understanding of Corporate Social Responsibility between the current and future corporate leaders in Malaysia will depend on how strong our identity and culture as Malaysian is. It is the duty of the current leaders of today's Malaysian economy to have a change in mindset and to accompany and orientate the future leaders of Malaysia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anwar, K. A. (2006, October 17). Corporate Social Responsibility – Infusing New Spirit into the Business World. Kuala Lumpur, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.
- Berhad, B. M. (2007). *Status Report - Corporate Social Responsibility in Malaysian PLCs*. Kuala Lumpur: Bursa Malaysia Berhad.
- Crowthe, S. S. (2011, June). *Anticipating social responsibility*. Retrieved from What does social responsibility mean to you?: <http://thesro.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Anticipating-social-responsibility.pdf>
- Development, U. N. (1992). *Agenda 21*. Rio de Janeiro: United Nations Conference on Environment & Development.
- Effendi, S. (1938). The Advent of Divine Justice. In S. Effendi, *The Advent of Divine Justice* (p. 22). Wilmette, Illinois, USA: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.
- Embaye, A. (2007). Nurturing Social Entrepreneurship through . *ICCA CSR Briefing Notes*, 1-2.
- Federation, M. E. (2007, September 21). *ISO 26000 impact on Malaysian economy*. Retrieved from Press Release: http://www.mef.org.my/Att_PressRelease/PR070921.PDF
- Institute, T. R. (1996, 3 18). *Noble Creation*. Retrieved from The Baha'i Computer and Communications Association: <http://www.bcca.org/services/lists/noble-creation/ruhi.html>
- Justice, T. U. (2010, 12 28). Conference of the Continental Boards of Counsellors. p. 15.
- Mahalingam, E. (2010, November 6). *The Star Online*. Retrieved from Push needed for social entrepreneurship: <http://biz.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/11/6/business/7372284>
- Malaysia, B. (2006). *Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Framework For Malaysian Public Listed Companies*. Retrieved from KLSE CSR Writeup: http://www.klse.com.my/website/bm/about_us/the_organisation/csr/downloads/csr_writeup.pdf
- Raines, L. (2011, July 13). *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. Retrieved from More companies match marketing, good cause: <http://www.ajc.com/business/more-companies-match-marketing-1014311.html>

- Roger Frost. (2010, November 2). *ISO 26000 Social Responsibility launch event*. Retrieved August 16, 2011, from ISO launches ISO 26000 guidance standard on social responsibility: <http://www.iso.org/sites/iso26000launch/index.html>
- Salvesen, A. (2010, February 28). *The Cause Marketing Catalyst*. Retrieved from Philanthro Post: <http://philanthropost.wordpress.com/2010/02/>
- Shoghi Effendi. (1938). *The Advent of Divine Justice*. Wilmette, Illinois, USA: Bahá'í Publishing Trust.
- Standardization, I. O. (2011). *Discover ISO*. Retrieved from Why Standards Matter: http://www.iso.org/iso/about/discover-iso_why-standards-matter.htm
- States, T. N. (2005). In Service to the Common Good. *Bahá'í Youth in Their Own Words*, 6.x. (677o).