This paper aims to examine the performance measurement using the CSR Balanced Scorecard system in SMEs firms in Malaysia. It investigates the relationships of the four perspectives of CSR Balanced Scorecard system toward performance measurement. The purpose of this paper is to investigate whether or not the improvement of the non-financial CSR measures will lead to the improvement of performance measures. To test these relationships, data were collected using the four perspectives approach introduced by Utting (2007). The finding indicates that the organizational business performance can be greatly increased by putting greater emphasis to CSR measures. The results also reveal that the increases of firms customer’s satisfaction is caused by the increase implementation of CSR measurement. At the end of the article, the implications of this study for SME industries and some suggestions are discussed for future studies.
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According to Utting (2007), corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a tool utilized by business entities to enable the distribution of wealth for the betterment of their stakeholders through the implementation and integration of ethical systems and sustainable management practices. Lockett, A., Moon, J., and Wisser, W. (2006) argued that the concept of CSR holds that companies should be responsible to more than just their owners. They explained that there are multiple dimensions that should affect a company’s actions, and specifically mentioned five perspectives of CSR namely environmental, social, economic, stakeholder, and voluntariness. These CSR definitions describe a phenomenon, but fail to present any guidance on how to manage the challenges within this phenomenon. Therefore, the challenge for business is not only limited to define CSR, but also to understand how CSR is a socially constructed phenomenon in a specific context and how to consider this when business strategies are developed. SME firms are the engine that contributes towards the growth of the development Malaysian economy, as SMEs in Malaysia contribute 32.5 percent GDP (National SME Development Council, 2012).

This study aims to develop the role of a CSR Balanced Scorecard system affecting a SME’s business performance. This research relies on the underlying theory of Utting (2007) and his four perspectives of CSR, such as the social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution social networks that can enhance performance measurements. The evolution of the CSR Balanced Scorecard could enhance Malaysian SME productivity and performances. CSR Balanced Scorecard awareness can influences the values, orientations, and practices of organisations through nationality-based work values, beliefs and orientations of the SME owners and managers of firms.

However, Kang, J., Chiang, S., Huangthanapan, K., and Downing, S. (2015) had conducted a research to find empirical support for the benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to family-owned hotels by identifying paths through which CSR influences business. They used the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard (SBSC) concept to assess the perceived importance of relationships between CSR and business performances in supporting the goals of the case hotels. Their SBSC broke the business down into five dimensions namely; Financial, Customer, Internal Business, Learning & Growth and Non-Market Perspective, which is the CSR measurement.

Hence, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ 1: What is the relationship of a SMEs performance between the four perspectives (the social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution social networks) in CSR Balanced Scorecard systems?

RQ 2: What are the recommendations to enhance the Malaysian SMEs and CSR dimensions to enhance business performance?

The CSR Balanced Scorecard system provides insights for SMEs to face future challenges. It is necessary for SMEs to understand the effective
role of the CSR Balanced Scorecard system to reach their organizational goals. The research questions have objective to examine the relationship of SME performances between the four perspectives (social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution social networks) in the CSR Balance Scorecard Systems.

The aim of this study is to better understand the direct and indirect effects of the multidimensional and continuous operationalization imposed upon a CSR Balanced Scorecard system and their business performance in the context of Malaysian SMEs firms. Theoretically, this will help our understanding of how the varying degrees of CSR Balanced Scorecard systems influence business performance and set the firms future research direction.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Organisational Performance Measurement
Performance is the action of company to achieve objectives and targets based on the earlier decisions made. Lebas (1995) mentioned that the main objective of an organization is to reach targets within the time required and using preference ordering to achieve the target. Performance measurement is the tool to ensure accurate and timely strategy in an organization. Kennerly and Neely (2003) defined a performance measurement system as an individual performance or a set of people, methods, and tools that used internal and external factors to generate, analyze, and diagnose data. Hence, a performance measurement system is not capable of providing accurate information for an organization in order to continuously meet customers and stakeholders’ demands.

This study is significant because it shall provide some insights into the dimensions of CSR culture and the way it might assist in having better organizational performance. A prime motivation of this study is driven by the assumption that certain dimensions of CSR culture leads to superior organizational performance. The findings of this study shall be useful to fine tune business and marketing strategies to tackle these CSR culture dimension issues.

Balanced Scorecard on CSR Activity
Kaplan and Norton (2001) recognized the shortcomings of using traditional performance measurement systems and introduced The Balanced Scorecard to combine financial and non-financial measure of performance. According to Utting (2007), the Balanced Scorecard is claimed to be a world leading performance measurement system. Although Balanced Scorecards have been implemented by a number of organizations worldwide, and widely cited in the previous literature, there are very few articles published in journals that examine The Balanced Scorecard in CSR activities by SMEs firms in Malaysia.

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) introduced by Kaplan and Norton in 1992 is a new framework which assesses company’s past and future performances towards a company’s objectives by integrating financial measures with three additional non-financial measures namely customers, internal processes, and long-term learning and growth perspectives. This new Bal-
anced Scorecard is a communication tool to translate company’s goals, values, and beliefs into a tangible set of performance measures (Malina and Selto, 2001).

**CSR Balanced Scorecard System on Corporate Social Responsibility**

Peter Utting argued that corporate social responsibility is a business system that enables the production and distribution of wealth for the betterment of its stakeholders through the implementation and integration of ethical systems and sustainable management practices. He believes that there are also many available definitions of CSR and they are consistently referring to five dimensions. He further mentions that although CSR apply different phrases, the definitions are predominantly congruent, making the lack of one universally accepted definition less problematic than it might seem at first glance. As a result, the CSR definitions are descriptive, but fail to present any guidance on how to manage the challenges within this description. Therefore, the challenge for business is not so much to define CSR, as it is to understand how CSR is socially constructed in a specific context and how to consider this when business strategies are developed (Utting, 2007).

**Social Network Theory on Social Protection**

Peter Utting is widely respected amongst CSR scholars for his Social Network Theory which contrasts with the type of sociological theory that defines society as built up of individuals. He argued that the social network theory starts from the relations between individuals and models of society networks that made up of sets of the relations or ties between the nodes. Peter Utting also identified that the fundamental principles of social protections models built using Social Network Theory must be independence of actors, relations or ties (Utting, 2007).

The perspective of Social Network Analysis—which comprises the resources that might include social support, emotional support, companionship, time, information, expertise, money, business transactions, shared activity, and so on. Utting (2007) also argued that many of the world largest corporation and business associations are actively promoting CSR. This is because CSR attempts to curb specific types of malpractice and improve selected aspects of social performance without questioning various contradictory policies and practices that can have perverse consequences in terms of equality and equity. These observations suggest the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis H1: There is a significant relationship between social protection perspective and performance measurement.

**CSR Balanced Scorecard System on Social Right**

According to Utting (2007), the literature of social rights is distinct from social equality and equity theory. He mentioned that social rights can be explained by social group behavior in terms of equality and equity. Petter Utting (2007) regarded advanced social right as a conceptual tool for explaining and resolving the recognition and realization of the rights of workers, women, children, indigenous peoples
and other groups that have historically been oppressed, exploited and marginalized. Although social rights is different from social equality, his theory on sociological refers to that the actions of people that are governed by norms, rules, and obligations. Utting (2007) further mentioned that from the point of economics view, under social right system people are independent and self-interested and act to maximize their own utility.

According to Ahmad and Ramayah (2012), the rise in ethical and social responsibility awareness in SMEs businesses has led to assumptions that the associated behaviors under social right system would enable competitive advantage to be attained as a firm distinguishes itself from its competitors through such practices. These observations suggest the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis H2: There is a significant relationship between social right perspective and performance measurement.

**CSR Balanced Scorecard System on Empowerment**

Empowerment is something to be given, to promote a certain type of economic agent that becomes dependent on capital (Hamann, 2003). Local people are not encouraged to become politically empowered, nor within this framework as right holders. Protestors, concerned employees, and communities within a space with few avenues to voice issues, or effect change.

According to Utting (2007) CSR works to gloss over the complexity of issues, such as inexperienced workers, conflict zones, local custom and cultural differences, conflicting laws and influence of management experts. He also commented that CSR has incredible discursive power which constructs the predominate framework for viewing society and corporate relationships, and therefore transforms the relations of power between communities and corporations. Such patterns of force empower the increasing productivity and performance of an organization. These observations suggest the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis H3: There is a significant relationship between higher empowerment perspective and performance measurement.

**CSR Balanced Scorecard System on the Redistribution Network**

According to Smith (2005), the purpose of the corporation is to produce and distribute wealth to stakeholders, ?. Both renowned economists and management experts agree that the role of the corporation needs to be elevated in society for economic activity to flourish. Profits are essential, but the corporation has so many more contributions that it can make to benefit their stakeholders.

The principles of capitalism can create and distribute wealth for all countries in every continent if governments are willing to accept proven forms of economic development. Although it is unlikely that capitalism will succeed on a global scale, the CSR definition presented helps to make capitalism less “evil” and more broadly accept-
In SME firms. Based on this theoretical framework, 4 hypotheses have been developed for this research model which includes 4 independent variables and 1 dependent variable.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The basic purpose of this research is to examine whether the four CSR perspectives of independent variables influence performance of SMEs firms such as social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution social network that include demographic variables. The targeted sample were executive, manager, or Managing Director of SMEs firms. A questionnaire was designed based on discussion with SMEs Managing Director. Based on the pre-test result, several items on the questionnaire were revised. The final version of the questionnaire was sent to all respondents using the survey method. The distribution of self-administered questionnaires was adopting the non-probability sampling method, specifically the convenience

---

**Figure 1. Theoretical Framework**

By integrating the purpose of the corporation with stakeholder management, ethical systems, and sustainable management practices, created here is a CSR system that generates economic prosperity. Distributing wealth, ethical performance by the corporation and sustainable management practices improves the ability of the corporation to manage these key constituents globally and create a competitive advantage. These observations suggest the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis H4: There is a significant relationship between higher redistribution perspective and performance measurement.

Figure 1 provides the theoretical framework used to test the relationship of the CSR Balanced Scorecard to performance measurement. The framework is designed to examine the significance of the CSR Balanced Scorecard in linking four perspectives in SME firms. Based on this theoretical framework, 4 hypotheses have been developed for this research model which includes 4 independent variables and 1 dependent variable.
cause data used in this study were collected through an anonymous survey questionnaire, it was assumed that respondents were truthful towards their firms CSR measurements. The value of the findings would be increased considerably if the effects of the CSR measurements increase firms’ customers satisfaction due to the increase implementation of CSR measurement.

This study focuses on SMEs firms in services industry in Malaysia. Services industry has been chosen because there were not many empirical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/Certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Assistant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/General Manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/Managing Director/Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Years and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50 Employees</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 150 Employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 150 Employees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and kurtosis values. When data is normally distributed, the value of skewness and kurtosis are zero, as values outside the range of +2 or -2 demonstrate considerable degrees of non-normality (Gosselin, 2005). In this study most of skewness and kurtosis values for all the variables are within the range of +2 or -2 (refer table 2), thus data distribution for the sample is considered normal.

Table 2 also shows the results of statistical tests for social protection perspective, rights perspective, empowerment perspective, redistribution perspective, and performance measurement. The mean of average value is the most commonly used measure of tendency. Skewness shows the tendency of the deviation from the mean to be larger in one direction than in the other. The skewness values negative for all variables. The negative value means that the distribution is flatter than Normal. Moreover, the Kurtosis is a measure of the relative peakness or flatness. The kurtosis of a normal distribution is zero. Here, most of the variable’s kurtosis values are negative. The negative value means that the distribution is flatter than a normal distribution.

Table 2. Test of normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social protection perspective</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights perspective</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment perspective</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution perspective</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Reliability of measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Cronbach’s</th>
<th>Measure of Items</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social protection perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution perspective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test

According to Gosselin (2005), the normality of all the variables tested was conducted by assessing the skewness and kurtosis values. When data is normally distributed, the value of skewness and kurtosis are zero, as values outside the range of +2 or -2 demonstrate considerable degrees of non-normality (Gosselin, 2005). In this study most of skewness and kurtosis values for all the variables are within the range of +2 or -2 (refer table 2), thus data distribution for the sample is considered normal.

This demographic information of the respondents was considered one of the most important factors. A total of 200 questionnaires were randomly distributed to the target population and the response rate of 17.5 percent produced 35 questionnaires, while 3 incomplete questionnaires were excluded from the data analysis. Therefore, a total of 31 questionnaires were accepted for the final data analysis. Table 1 shows the results of the descriptive statistics for the respondents are presented as follows:

Table 2. Test of normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social protection perspective</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights perspective</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment perspective</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution perspective</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Reliability of measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Cronbach’s</th>
<th>Measure of Items</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social protection perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution perspective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tives and empowerment perspectives \(r=0.82, p=0.01\). However, there is significant and positive correlation between all variables and dimensions.

Multiple regression analysis was performed to further explore the correlation between the variables and the predictive power of the independent over the dependent variable in the study which is performance measurement. The test was used to identify how well a set of variable predict a particular outcome. In multiple regression analysis the independent variable that has high predictive power on the dependent variable can be identified and if this variable account for high variance, managers can give more focus to that particular variable in order to improve the performance of the firms.

Table 4 shows the correlation between each variable (the Pearson Correlation coefficient \(r\) between dimensions of social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution with performance measurement).

Table 4. Pearson Correlation coefficient (r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social protection perspective</th>
<th>Rights perspective</th>
<th>Empowerment perspective</th>
<th>Redistribution perspective</th>
<th>Performance measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social protection perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights perspective</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment perspective</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution perspective</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measurement</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Reliability Test

In this research, the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used to measure the internal consistency of scale (as its value ranges from 0-1) (Handler, 1989). Reliability testing on all measures was necessary. Table 3 summarized the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for each measure. A scale is reliable if the coefficient value is more than 0.600 (Handler, 1989). All the measures in this study are reliable as the scale has the highest coefficient alpha value of 0.87. The measure having reliability coefficients lower than 0.700 was normative commitment.

According to Sidin and Zawawi (2002) the Pearson Correlation coefficient indicates the strength of relationship between the variables. Hence, a correlation coefficient between 0.10 and 0.29 indicates a small correlation, while a coefficient between 0.30 and 0.49 indicates a medium correlation and a coefficient between 0.50 and 1.0 indicate a large correlation.

Table 4 shows the correlations between all the independent and dependent variables. The purpose of correlations analysis is to measure and to interpret the strength of a linear or non-linear relationship between two continuous variables. The highest correlation is between the redistribution perspective and empowerment perspectives \(r=0.82, p=0.01\). However, there is significant and positive correlation between all variables and dimensions.
Table 5. Multiple regression analysis of model H1, H2, H3, H4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.82a</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>59.17</td>
<td>0.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.65a</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>0.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.37a</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.04a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.38a</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.03a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that social protection perspective has a significant positive correlation with performance measurement \(r = 0.82, p < 0.00\). Here, it was found that social protection perspective explained 66\% (Adjusted R Square). The analysis also showed the significance effect on performance measurement, as indicted by F value from the ANOVA table with \(F = 59.17, p = 0.000 < .05\). Therefore, hypothesis 1 is accepted.

The regression analysis result in Table 4 shows that right perspective has a significant positive correlation with performance measurement \(r = 0.65, p < 0.00\). Here, it was found that social protection perspective explained 40\% (Adjusted R Square) of the variance associated with performance measurement. The analysis also showed high significance, as indicted by F value from the ANOVA table with \(F = 21.24, p = 0.000 < .05\). Therefore, hypothesis 2 is accepted.

The findings from this study have revealed that by integrating the construct with the perspectives of social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution social networks activities, a CSR Balanced Scorecard system is created that generates economic pros-
manage these key constituents globally and create competitive advantage. The role of CSR Balanced Scorecard system in SMEs performance development is important because it gives coherence in today’s business culture.

In addition, the above finding is consistent to Garg, A. K. (2013) findings where he stated that social responsibility is an ethical theory that an entity, be it an organization or individual, has an obligation to act to benefit society at large. He mentioned that social responsibility is a duty every individual or organization has to perform so as to maintain a balance between the economy and the ecosystem. His model of the Balanced Corporate Responsibility (BCR) aimed at how an organization learns from the past to align Individual Social Responsibility (ISR) of employer to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and to run the business by incorporating Balanced Scorecard (BSC). As a result CSR became the chant of every business organization today (Garg, 2013).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings derived from this study, a few proposed recommendations are presented in terms of pragmatism. Firstly, this paper has examined the performance measurement using CSR Balanced Scorecard in four perspectives. The results interpret that SMEs firms in Malaysia emphasis the usage of non-financial measurement will experience the improvement in performance. Hence, this study conveys the message that SMEs management should pay attention to the dimensions of social protection, rights, empowerment, and redistribution measurements as they have consider-

To recap, this study was conducted to determine the relationship of performance measurement using the CSR Balanced Scorecard system in SMEs firms in Malaysia. The cause-and-effect relationships of the non-financial measures would lead to the improvement performances. Surprisingly, the finding indicates that the non-financial measure is significant to performance measurement and would lead to the improvement of the business performance. This is also consistent with the research from Costa, R. and Menichini, T. (2013) which it investigates the business returns from corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices, such as customers loyalty and company reputation, depend heavily on how stakeholders perceive the company social behavior, making the measure of stakeholder perception a key issue in the process of CSR assessment. In their paper, the analysis of CSR activities, as perceived by stakeholders, is realized utilizing global reporting initiative (GRI) indicators structured under balanced scorecard (BSC) perspectives and sustainability dimensions (Costa & Menichini, 2013).

By integrating the construct with the perspectives of social protection, rights, empowerment and redistribution social networks activities, a CSR Balanced Scorecard system generates economic prosperity. Distributing wealth, ethical performance by SMEs and sustainable management practices improves the ability of SMEs to manage these key constituents globally and create competitive advantage. The role of CSR Balanced Scorecard system in SMEs performance development is important because it gives coherence in today’s business culture.

The findings could assist Malaysian SMEs management to further understand the management’s insights in improving business performances.

Here, it is considered that the findings could assist Malaysian SMEs management to further understand the management’s insights in improving business performances.
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It is also important to stress that the application of CSR Balanced Scorecard in Malaysian SME firms is only at the preliminary stage and the research done by previous researchers were very limited. Therefore, there is limited experience in this area in Malaysia. In addition, the sample size of the study was relatively small and not comprehensive. The target sample was limited to management level and above as executive level may not possess sufficient knowledge and the whole operational view of SME firm’s performance is measurement. Moreover, the moderating factors to the performance measures have not taken into consideration in this study. The relationship of financial and non-financial measures toward the performance measurement can be changed due to moderating factors such the cultural, age, innovation technology, and so on.

SME firms are encouraged to identify the role of the CSR Balanced Scorecard as a performance measurement tool. Based on the findings, this study foresees a greater emphasis of non-financial measures as a performance measurement tool in Malaysian SMEs. It is suggested that future research should examine larger sample size and include public listed company as well.


Smith, R. (2005). *Defining corporate social responsibility. University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences*, Submitted to the Program of Organizational Dynamics in the Graduate Division of the School of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania USA.

### Questionnaires

**Part 1 (About firms and respondents information)**

**Respondents Details**
1. Name (optional)
2. Gender
3. Education level
4. Position held

**Business Details**
5. Name of the company/ Country
6. Number of years in operations
7. Size of the company

**Part 2 (Performance measurement practices related questions)**

**Section I: Construct social protection measures**
1. Social protection measures: Does the company use the following Social protection measures?

   (please tick - Scales: 1=Always, 2=Often, 3=Sometime, 4=Rarely, 5=Never)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct of social protection measures</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ accessibility to social support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ accessibility to emotional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the company has establish an independent counseling department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction on shared activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ accessibility to money support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section II: Construct of social right**
1. Construct of social right measures: Does the company use the following workers right campaign, job harassment campaign, women right campaign and other human fight related measures?

   (please tick - Scales: 1=Always, 2=Often, 3=Sometime, 4=Rarely, 5=Never)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct of social right measures</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ accessibility to job training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realisation of the rights of workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating of changes in labour law to staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the company has establish an independent complaining department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction on working environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Construct of empowerment measurement: Does the company use the following empowerment measures?
(Please tick - Scales: 1=Always, 2=Often, 3=Sometime, 4=Rarely, 5=Never)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct of empowerment measures</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to provide workers with information and support on cultural difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers attitude toward management support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve issues for inexperience workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of workers who complaint (among all workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Construct of redistribution social network measures: Does the company use the following redistribution social network measures?
(Please tick - Scales: 1=Always, 2=Often, 3=Sometime, 4=Rarely, 5=Never)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct of redistribution social network measures</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to provide with information on company’s ethical best practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to provide with information on stakeholder management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular assessment of effectiveness sustainable management practices within the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether stakeholder relationship with management has changes in the operation flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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