

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORPORATE SOCIAL PERFORMANCE AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS IN INDIA

<sup>1</sup>Dhanasekar Dhamotharan, <sup>2</sup>Murugesan Selvam, <sup>3</sup>Marxia Oli Sigo, <sup>4</sup>V. Ramasamy

***ABSTRACT**--The effects of Corporate Social Performance on the performance of firms, have been brought out by many studies. But this study proposes to examine the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance of private sector banks in India. The sample for this study consisted of only top 10 private sector banks. Four variables of Corporate Social Performance and four variables of Corporate Financial Performance were used in this study. The study found that there was positive relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in private banks of India. In other words, the social performance activities could be improved with the help of financial performance of private sector banks in India.*

***Keywords**--Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance M14, G3*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been intensely discussed over several decades. While **Bowen and Johnson (1953)** coined the modern phrase of Corporate Social Responsibility, the discussion of the social responsibilities of business could be traced back to the late 1920s (**Barnard, 1938 and Kreps, 1940**). Besides, **Carroll and Shabana (2010)** stressed the need for more academically derived definitions for CSR. Though there were some differences in emphasis, common themes did exist in these definitions, such as in emphasizing the needs of stakeholders and the need for creating awareness about social, economic and environmental issues and their effects on the performance of firms (**Murray and Dainty, 2008**). Corporate Social Performance (CSP) had also been often observed in the literature. In the words of **Wood (1991)**, the CSP is a business organization's configuration of principles of social responsibility, process of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships. According to **Carroll, 1991**, CSR strongly emphasizes the obligations and accountability to society while CSP emphasizes the outcomes and results. **Marom (2006)** suggested that CSP is the best way of measuring the CSR, as it is put into practice by firms. **Van Beurden and G€ossling (2008)** pointed out that CSR is not a measurable variable and therefore, it is impossible to measure

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D Research Scholar in Management, Department of Commerce and Financial Studies, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India.

<sup>2</sup> Dean Faculty of Management, Professor and Head, Department of Commerce and Financial Studies, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India.

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, National Institute of Technology, Sikkim, India.

<sup>4</sup> Founder and Consultant, AR Investment Training and Consultancy, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

it in perfect term but CSP, though difficult to measure too, could be surrogated by the use of proxy measurable variables.

As per performance measurement system approach, CSP is treated as the way of applying CSR to practice (Marom, 2006, Van Beurden and Gfossling, 2008). Some researchers have used these two terms, CSR and CSP, interchangeably in empirical studies (Margolis et al., 2007). The Corporate Social Responsibility stands for the principles and responsibilities behind social responsible actions, activities or strategies of the firms but Corporate Social Performance is used as its outcomes and a measurable surrogate of Corporate Social Responsibility.

The Corporate Social Performance (CSP) implies that every firm needs to do something extra to its stakeholders, beyond fulfilling their usual expectations and requirements, as required by law (Doane, 2005). In the recent past, CSR has become increasingly relevant and duties of the managers at all levels in the changed environment, and it is an attractive field of study, with a number of valid research questions still to be answered (Aguinis, H 2012). The majority of research studies have investigated the relationship between CSP and the financial performance of firms. Williams and Siegel (2000) proved that CSR was positively correlated with financial performance. Few other research studies also have corroborated the finding that there was correlation between financial performance and corporate social performance (Hongdi Wang et al., 2016, Hull and Rothenberg, 2008).

### *Corporate Social Performance*

Girerd-Potin et al. (2014) pointed out that CSP could be assessed from three perspectives: first, business stakeholders (employees, customers, and suppliers), secondly, societal stakeholders (environment and society) and finally, financial stakeholders (stockholders, debt holders and other lenders). Mishra and Modi (2013) divided CSP into positive and negative types, according to their differing effects on the firm's idiosyncratic risks. It is to be noted that the Global Reporting Initiative has already set out minimum requirements of key CSP aspects and companies have already started reporting in accordance with these requirements. By adhering to these processes, CSP could be identified and measured. Post (1991) suggested four broad CSP categories of 1) CSP disclosure, 2) CSP reputation rating, 3) Social Audits, CSP processes and observable outcomes, and 4) Managerial CSP principles and values. Matten and Moon (2008) proposed the concept of "implicit" and "explicit" as a theoretical approach for understanding comparative CSR in different economies. Nevertheless, the studies that explored the empirical CSP-CFP link often circumvented the measurement problems by adopting a more pragmatic approach. Based on these assumptions, the reputations are good presentations of CSP values and behaviours and at present, the CSP reputation rating is considered as the most popular measure.

### *Corporate Financial Performance*

Corporate Financial Performance (CFP) means different things to different stakeholders as their expectations also differ. Orlitzky et al. (2003) proposed three different financial measures, namely, market-based measures, accounting-based measures and perceptual based measures. The market-based measures of CFP, such as price per share or share price appreciation, reflect the notion that shareholders are the primary stakeholder group (Cochran and Wood, 1984). Van Beurden and Gfossling (2008) suggested more market based measures in their review work, including stock performance, market return, market value to book value, and others. On the other hand,

accounting-based measures consist of profitability measures, asset utilization, asset turnover and growth measures (Wu, 2006). Besides, Cochran and Wood (1984) argued that accounting based measures, such as the firm's return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), or earnings per share (EPS), capture a firm's internal efficiency in some way. Lastly, perceptual measures of CFP is the survey among stakeholder respondents, to provide subjective estimates of firms' financial performance, like soundness of financial position, best use of corporate assets or achievements of financial goal relative to competitors etc (Conine and Madden; 1987, Reimann, 1975 and Wartick, 1988).

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The previous research studies, relating to Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance, have been briefly reviewed.

Preston and O'Bannon (1997) examined the relationship between CSP and CFP and found that there could be three levels of relationship, namely, positive, neutral and negative. Igalens and Gond (2005) identified five different approaches towards measuring CSP of firms. The first four approaches are based on the analysis of annual reports or other published documents, survey among directors and managers and corporate reputation indicators. The last approach depends on the data relating to multi-dimensional indicators, to construct their own quantification model and rating. Branco, M.C. and Rodrigues, L.L. (2006) identified select previous studies that analysed the impact of CSP on the CFP, of firms with higher CSP, differentiating themselves from their competitors through the production of internal and external benefits. Maon, F. et al. (2009) stated that CSR has been an area in which the companies were not only expected to passively report the results, relating to their core activities but also expected that the firms must manage CSR as a specific area of performance on its own. Chih et al. (2010) reported that financial performance of firms did not influence CSP levels in the past and rejected CFP as a determinant of CSP. On the other hand, CSP was also positively influenced by the intensity of competition in the respective sector. Du, S. et al., (2011) examined the external benefits of corporate social responsibility that could have impact on corporate reputation, resulting in the promotion of better relations with external key business supporters, such as public administration and investors. Wu and Shen (2013) reported that there was relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in the banking sector. According to authors, only limited studies analyzed the relationship between CSP and CFP, in the Banking Industry. They also found that sample banks, with the highest level of CSP, obtained better CFP when CSR policies were used as a strategy. Girerd-Potin et al., (2014) explained that CSP could be assessed from three perspectives: business stakeholders (employees, customers, and suppliers), societal stakeholders (environment and society) and financial stakeholders (stockholders and debt holders). Shen et al. (2016) found that ROE and ROA were higher in banks with greater corporate social performance. Dhanasekar et al., (2020) found that there was positive impact of Corporate Social Performance on Financial Performance and Research and Development.

The above studies provided an overview about the impact of Corporate Social Performance on Corporate Financial Performance of entities in the banking sector. But this study proposes to examine empirical evidences, related to the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in private sector banks in India.

### ***Statement of the Problem***

It is not easy to identify and use correct measure of corporate social performance. At the same time, the subject of measuring corporate social performance is an emerging issue in India. There are clear evidences that the public sector banks do provide more benefits to segments different of society. The research question before us is that while private sector banks are also getting more benefits from Government, whether these private sector banks in India contribute to the society. Hence the importance of measurement of CSP accurately, from the point view of different types of stakeholders. Against this background, this study attempts to measure the corporate social performance in private sector banks and to examine the relationship between corporate social performance and corporate financial performance of private sector banks in India.

### ***Need of the Study***

The previous studies have concentrated only on the relationship between CSP and CFP for listed companies or top ranking companies. But this study proposes to examine relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in private sector banks in India. This study fulfills the gap in the measurement of corporate social performance and its impact on Corporate Financial Performance in private sector banks. This study would be useful to the executives of private banks, to plan their social activities to the society. This study also proposes to identify the correct variables to measure CSP and CFP.

## **III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The aim of this study was to analyse the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in Private Sector Banks in India.

### ***Hypotheses of the Study***

- **NH1-** There is no significance of data relating to Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in Private Sector Banks in India.
- **NH2-** There is no relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in Private Sector Banks in India.

## **IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### ***a. Sample Selection***

As stated earlier, the aim of this study was to find out the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance of Private Sector Banks in India. For the purpose of this study, the top ten banks listed in BSE ([www.bseindia.com](http://www.bseindia.com)) were selected on the basis of market capitalization. The top 10 Private Sector Banks, included in the sample, were 1) Axis Bank; 2) HDFC Bank; 3) ICICI Banks; 4) Yes Bank 5) Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd; 6) Indusind Bank; 7) Federal Bank; 8) Standard Chartered Bank; 9) Jammu and Kashmir Bank and 10) South Indian Bank.

### ***b. Sources of the Data***

The study was based entirely on Secondary data. The data for sample variables of corporate social performance were collected from the website of [www.nationalscrportal.com](http://www.nationalscrportal.com) and from the annual reports of the sample banks. The data for financial performance variables were collected from PROWESS database and reputed websites, namely, [www.moneycontrol.com](http://www.moneycontrol.com) and [www.ndtvprofit.com](http://www.ndtvprofit.com). The other relevant data for this study were collected from various books, journals, magazines and websites, etc.

### ***c. Period of the Study***

For the purpose of collecting required data, the present study covered a period of five years from 2015 to 2019.

### ***d. Tools Used for the Analysis***

The identified to measure variables, for Corporate Social Performance, were Donation, Education, Health and Social Welfare while the variables for Corporate Financial Performance were ROA, ROE, EPS and Net Profit.

- Descriptive Statistics (for analyzing the significance of data)
- Correlation (to find out relationship between CSP and CFP sample variables)

*The analysis of this study was made, with the help software packages, namely, SPSS -20 and E-Views-7.*

## **V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### ***I. Descriptive Statistics of Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance of Private Banks in India***

The results of descriptive statistics for sample banks, in respect of Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance, during the study period from 2015 to 2019 are displayed in **Table-1**. As stated earlier, the corporate social performance variables included Donation, Education, Health and Social Welfare and while the Corporate Financial Performance variables like ROA, ROE, EPS and Net Profit were used in this study, to examine significance of data. According to **Table-1**, the mean values of all the sample variables, for all sample banks were positive during the study period. The detailed analysis of the Table revealed that the HDFC Bank Limited registered a mean value, for the CSP variable, namely, education at 8.313 while the Standard Chartered Bank Limited received the lowest mean value, for the Corporate Social Performance variable, Donation, at 0.930. The third largest private sector bank in India, namely, Axis Bank of India recorded the highest value for a CFP variable, namely, Net Profit at 63.310 while the leading private sector bank, namely, ICICI Bank registered the lowest mean value for the CFP variable, namely, Return On Equity at -127.52 during the study period. It is interesting to note that among India's largest private sector lender by assets, HDFC Bank Ltd recorded the highest median value at 8.902, for Education variable of CSP. The Yes Bank Ltd registered the lowest median value of a CSP variable, namely, Donation, recorded at 0.606. The Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd received the highest median value of a CFP variable Earnings Per Share, at 243.92 while the India's foremost private sector bank, namely, Southern Bank Ltd recorded the lowest value for ROA at 0.97. The Axis Bank Ltd registered the highest standard deviation value for the CSP variable, namely Social Welfare, at 3.926 and the lowest value for the CSP variable,

Social Welfare, recorded at 0.076 during the study period. The Jammu and Kashmir Bank had reported the highest standard deviation value for the CFP variable, Earnings Per Share at 66.032 while the lowest value for the CFP variable, Return on Assets, was recorded at 0.019 during the study period. It is to be noted that all the values of descriptive statistics, for all the variables in the case of all sample banks, were positive, which indicated that there was significance of data relating to sample variables during the study period. Therefore, the null hypothesis – (NH1), There is no significance of data relating to Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in Private Sector Banks in India, was rejected.

## ***II. Relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance of Private Banks in India***

The main objective of this study was to find out the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in private sector banks in India. The results of correlation analysis, for BSE listed private banks, during the study period from 2015 to 2019 are displayed in **Table-2**. The positive correlation between Corporate Social Performance and Financial Performance was recorded for the Axis Bank Ltd. Besides, positive correlation values were recorded, for Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance variables like ROA at 0.333 and ROE at 0.289, EPS at 0.987 and Net Profit at 0.996, during the study period. Regarding HDFC Bank Ltd, the relationship between CSP and CFP (ROA at 0.601 and ROE at 0.910) was positive, but for other CFP variables, the relationship was negative (EPS with a value of -0.709 and Net Profit with a value of -0.743), during the study period. The correlation analysis for another sample bank, namely, ICICI Bank indicated that the relationship between Corporate Social Performance and two variables of CFP (namely ROA and ROE) was positive (at 0.577 and 0.730 respectively). For Yes Bank Ltd, correlation between CSP and a variable of CFP (namely ROE) was recorded at positive, with a value of 0.611 and relationship of other three variables of CFP was negative with CSP (ROA, EPS and Net Profit), during the study period. Regarding Kotak Mahindra Bank, the analysis of correlation between CSP and all the variables of CFP was positive (with values of 0.236 for ROA, 0.427 for ROE, 0.197 for EPS and 0.236 for Net Profit), during the study period. It is interesting to note that for the first among the new generation private banks in India, namely, Indusind Bank, the correlation between CSP and a variable of CFP (namely ROA) was positive at 0.197 while three variables (namely ROE, EPS and Net Profit) were negatively correlated during the study period. As far as the Federal Bank Ltd was concerned, there was negative relationship between CSP and CFP variables. Regarding Standard Chartered Bank Ltd, the relationship between CSP and all the variables of CFP was negative. In the case of Jammu and Kashmir Bank, the relationship between CSP and CFP variables (namely ROA, and ROE) was positive, with the values of 0.245 and 0.237 respectively. The first scheduled bank in the private sector in Kerala, namely, South Indian Bank Ltd, the relationship between CSP and CFP variables (namely ROA, ROE, EPS and Net Profit) was positive, with values of 0.959, 0.965, 0.979 and 0.309 respectively, during the study period. The overall analysis indicated that the correlation between CSP and CFP was positive. Hence the Null Hypothesis - (NH2), There is no relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance in private sector banks in India, was not accepted.

## **VI. CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY**

This study found that there was significant and positive relationship between Corporate Social Performance and the Financial Performance in the case of sample private sector banks in India. The banks in India have been generally contributing, as much as they could, for the social well being of the society, improving the living standards by providing better financial services and protecting environment from hazardous changes. The results of this study clearly revealed that sample private banks also started providing different economic benefits by rendering their CSR performance in all dimensions in a better way. It is to be noted that good corporate governance is the positive step towards corporate financial performance. In the light of the analysis of this study, it is recommended that private banks should evolve a more relational business model, in which the real needs of customers could be met, with appropriate and innovative products and services and delivered with better advice and accurate information. This study also found evidences for better responsible relationship with the social welfare activities by private banks. The socio-ethical assessments have gained importance for investors and hence, private banks should pay more attention to their relations with the community in the near future, by developing better business ethics compliance. It is felt from the findings of this research study that development of effective comprehensive measures of CSP would be valuable, though practically difficult. The future research could introduce other mediating and moderating variables, such as customers or employees CSP awareness, customer trust in banks, cross-national context factors, the institutional environment, and the strategic integration of CSR policies by top managers. The major conclusion is that regarding private banks in India, the financial performance variables strongly correlated with CSP variables like Donation, Education, Health, and Social Welfare. The sample private banks have spent their earnings for the well being of the society. The people of developed economies have information about the activities of banks and stakeholders of banks and they put pressure on the banks to act as socially responsible firms. Such a demand from customers must arise in India also, for better banking services, by both public and private sector banks.

## VII. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

- The study covered only top ten private sector banks from BSE index based on market capitalization.
- The study covered only a period of five years from 2015 to 2019.
- The reliability of data for CSP variables (like Donation, Education, Health and Social Welfare) and the financial performance variables (namely ROA, ROE, EPS and Net Profit) depended on secondary sources.
- This study used only limited tools (Descriptive Statistics and Correlation analysis).

**Table 1:** The Results of Descriptive Statistics for Private Sector Banks in respect of sample variables during the study period from 2015-2019

Descriptive Statistics	Corporate Social Performance				Corporate Financial Performance			
	DON	EDU	HEL	SW	ROA	ROE	EPS	NP
<b>Axis Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	3.721202	6.322816	3.927407	4.362354	1.435	14.6875	53.3125	63.310
<b>Median</b>	3.352118	6.690106	3.884925	4.300208	1.68	17.12	30.775	32.655

<b>Maximum</b>	5.048954	7.463893	8.793651	8.718668	1.74	17.75	132.34	138.33
<b>Minimum</b>	3.131619	4.447158	-0.85387	0.130334	0.64	6.76	13.21	15.36
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	0.892529	1.311281	4.370427	3.926208	0.531758	5.299386	53.33959	59.36465
<b>HDFC Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	1.436596	8.313007	8.080894	6.925675	48.38	45.38	1.8625	19.215
<b>Median</b>	0.830449	8.30401	8.049269	6.920523	45.54	44.7	1.87	18.815
<b>Maximum</b>	5.109393	8.615845	8.365301	7.004321	56.34	54.78	1.9	21.28
<b>Minimum</b>	0.176091	8.028164	7.859739	6.857332	35.34	38.40	1.81	17.95
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	2.448666	0.252572	0.235795	0.076273	9.3583	8.365305	0.04113	1.505601
<b>ICICI Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	1.01183	7.34807	6.91693	5.30362	1.565	12.715	34.445	56.675
<b>Median</b>	0.82594	7.29216	7.07800	6.07993	1.343	14.565	18.055	67.045
<b>Maximum</b>	1.67117	7.83947	7.55750	8.65321	1.8	14.55	84.94	66.75
<b>Minimum</b>	0.72427	6.96848	5.95424	0.40140	1.31	10.66	16.73	15.699
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	0.44245	0.39167	0.71929	3.66383	0.23699	1.86819	33.6839	37.6765
<b>YES Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	6.766711	7.658	0.65282	7.54793	21.2175	1.655	56.55	59.34
<b>Median</b>	7.952683	7.686	0.60675	7.498527	20.635	1.66	54.2	59.332
<b>Maximum</b>	8.04454	8.381	0.99122	7.805501	25.02	1.75	72.95	79.43
<b>Minimum</b>	3.11694	6.876	0.40654	7.389166	18.58	1.55	44.86	45.70
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	2.434355	0.632	0.25587	0.188682	2.772488	0.0834	12.823	15.570
<b>Kotak Mahindra Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	1.677164	7.232575	6.311002	5.408655	1.69	13.04	18.3975	1.69
<b>Median</b>	1.256363	7.324043	6.351215	5.96976	1.715	13.53	19.02	1.715
<b>Maximum</b>	3.080987	8.078094	6.462398	8.820038	1.93	14.13	24.16	1.93
<b>Minimum</b>	1.114944	6.20412	6.079181	0.875061	1.4	10.97	11.39	1.4
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	0.938363	0.870358	0.181021	3.33197	0.220151	1.429825	5.277837	22.0151
<b>Indusind Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	1.500423	5.546814	5.287306	2.559774	1.785	17.11	36.765	36.7625
<b>Median</b>	1.162655	6.881714	7.120798	1.277574	1.79	17.08	36.155	38.155
<b>Maximum</b>	3.245019	7.260071	7.235528	6.838849	1.8	19.01	47.95	41.95
<b>Minimum</b>	0.431364	1.163758	-0.32790	0.845098	1.76	15.27	26.8	36.545
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	1.282412	2.931276	3.744226	2.860124	0.019149	1.576727	8.86004	8.456
<b>Federal Bank</b>								
<b>Mean</b>	1.050725	7.991504	7.049938	5.127635	0.80	10.52	5.454	7.285
<b>Median</b>	1.089021	8.902935	7.100507	6.780551	0.97	11.185	7.315	6.323
<b>Maximum</b>	1.352761	8.079904	7.227887	7.139879	1.28	13.7	11.74	13.332
<b>Minimum</b>	0.672098	7.880242	6.770852	0.19044	0.54	6.01	2.77	6.47
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	0.281377	0.092166	0.22145	3.549526	0.337738	3.435025	4.190628	4.43438



Standard Chartered Bank								
Mean	0.9301	6.0780	2.4307	2.046027	-100.52	-127.52	-123.3	4.95
Median	1.5654	6.1478	2.8154	0.733718	1.95	1.80	0.88	6.295
Maximum	1.6919	6.2531	5.5237	6.380211	3.099	3.443	1.12	7.21
Minimum	0.11394	5.7634	-1.4317	0.33646	-16.98	-24.76	-188.3	0.00
Std. Dev.	0.674416	0.21761	3.24224	2.897416	54.6409	57.800	2.54.67	3.35878
Jammu and Kashmir Bank								
Mean	4.748629	7.101209	7.24849	6.978164	0.17	1.6725	57.35	57.905
Median	4.920474	7.2088	7.208869	7.261277	0.585	7.395	9.535	9.535
Maximum	8.454599	7.622214	8.136721	8.23325	1.5	20.65	243.92	240.36
Minimum	0.69897	6.36502	6.439501	5.156852	-1.99	-28.75	-33.59	-31.3
Std. Dev.	4.225949	0.609242	0.725997	1.515855	1.50446	21.23581	66.0328	45.4515
South Indian Bank								
Mean	2.180966	5.279719	3.826971	4.559928	0.655	11.1275	2.6775	-3.0425
Median	1.466443	6.50935	3.973079	5.517579	0.555	9.345	2.375	4.76
Maximum	5.429252	7.238046	7.000000	6.146128	0.97	16.63	3.78	17.78
Minimum	0.361728	0.862131	0.361728	1.058426	0.54	9.19	2.18	-39.47
Std. Dev.	2.251449	2.965272	3.587743	2.385805	0.210476	3.669172	0.74776	25.23208

Source: Data collection from www.nationalsrportal.com and www.moneycontrol.com, Computed from E-views.

Note: **DON**-Donation, **EDU**-Education, **HEL**-Health, **SW**-Social Welfare, **ROA**- Return on Assets, **ROE**-Return on Equity, **EPS**- Earning per Share, **NP**- Net Profit.

**Table 2:** Relationship between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance of Private Sector Banks during the study period 2015-2018

Variables	Corporate Social Performance				Corporate Financial Performance			
	DON	EDU	HEL	S W	ROA	ROE	EPS	NP
Axis Bank Ltd								
DON	1	0.333	0.758	0.786	0.385	0.289	0.987	0.996
EDU	0.333	1	0.303	0.703	1.000	0.996	0.588	0.479
HEL	0.758	0.303	1	0.357	0.303	0.321	0.737	0.779
SW	0.786	0.703	0.357	1	0.703	0.642	0.862	0.967
ROA	0.333	1.000	0.303	0.703	1	0.996	0.479	0.508
ROE	0.289	0.996	0.321	0.642	0.996	1	0.435	0.450
EPS	0.987	0.479	0.737	0.862	0.479	0.435	1	0.870
NP	0.996	0.588	0.779	0.967	0.508	0.450	0.870	1
HDFC Bank								
DON	1	-0.267	-0.618	0.460	0.601	0.910	-0.709	-0.743
EDU	-0.267	1	0.700	0.034	-0.922	-0.637	0.861	0.960

<b>HEL</b>	-0.618	0.700	1	0.293	-0.744	-0.827	0.763	0.800
<b>SW</b>	0.460	0.034	0.293	1	0.251	0.292	-0.309	-0.350
<b>ROA</b>	0.601	-0.922	-0.744	0.251	1	0.862	-0.990	-1.000
<b>ROE</b>	0.910	-0.637	-0.827	0.292	0.862	1	-0.922	-0.950
<b>EPS</b>	-0.709	0.861	0.763	-0.309	-0.990	-0.922	1	0.989
<b>NP</b>	-0.743	0.960	0.800	-0.350	-1.000	-0.950	0.989	1
<b>ICICI Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	-0.333	-0.816	0.647	0.577	0.730	-0.307	-0.354
<b>EDU</b>	-0.333	1	0.000	0.302	0.577	0.365	1.000	0.1325
<b>HEL</b>	-0.816	0.000	1	-0.423	-0.707	-0.671	-0.024	-0.043
<b>SW</b>	0.647	0.302	-0.423	1	0.822	0.945	0.324	0.436
<b>ROA</b>	0.577	0.577	-0.707	0.822	1	0.949	0.600	0.654
<b>ROE</b>	0.730	0.365	-0.671	0.945	0.949	1	0.390	0.400
<b>EPS</b>	-0.307	1.000	-0.024	0.324	0.600	0.390	1	0.285
<b>NP</b>	-0.354	0.1325	-0.043	0.436	0.654	0.400	0.285	1
<b>YES Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	-0.217	-0.894	-0.922	-0.740	0.611	-0.843	-0.843
<b>EDU</b>	-0.217	1	-0.015	0.083	0.410	-0.403	0.599	0.605
<b>HEL</b>	-0.894	-0.015	1	0.995	0.362	-0.196	0.533	0.580
<b>SW</b>	-0.922	0.083	0.995	1	0.422	-0.258	0.604	0.648
<b>ROA</b>	-0.740	0.410	0.362	0.422	1	-0.0984	0.937	0.950
<b>ROE</b>	0.611	-0.403	-0.196	-0.258	-0.984	1	-0.877	-0.900
<b>EPS</b>	-0.843	0.599	0.533	0.604	0.937	-0.877	1	1.000
<b>NP</b>	-0.850	0.605	0.580	0.648	0.950	-0.900	1.000	1
<b>Kodak Mahindra Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	0.471	0.439	-0.049	0.236	0.427	0.197	0.236
<b>EDU</b>	0.471	1	-0.254	-0.717	-0.181	0.088	-0.171	-0.181
<b>HEL</b>	0.439	-0.254	1	0.839	-0.391	-0.400	-0.440	-0.391
<b>SW</b>	-0.049	-0.717	0.839	1	-0.312	-0.470	-0.348	-0.312
<b>ROA</b>	0.236	-0.181	-0.391	-0.312	1	0.961	0.999	1.000
<b>ROE</b>	0.427	0.088	-0.400	-0.470	0.961	1	0.958	0.961
<b>EPS</b>	0.197	-0.171	-0.440	-0.348	0.999	0.958	1	0.999
<b>NP</b>	0.236	-0.181	-0.391	-0.312	1.000	0.961	0.999	1
<b>Indusind Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	-0.081	0.446	-0.501	0.197	-0.075	-0.244	-0.300
<b>EDU</b>	-0.081	1	-0.244	0.237	0.838	-0.268	0.796	0.780
<b>HEL</b>	0.446	-0.244	1	-0.998	-0.506	-0.811	0.231	0.348
<b>SW</b>	-0.501	0.237	-0.998	1	0.472	0.792	-0.211	-0.298
<b>ROA</b>	0.197	0.838	-0.506	0.472	1	0.208	0.344	0.365

<b>ROE</b>	-0.075	-0.268	-0.811	0.792	0.208	1	-0.749	-0.800
<b>EPS</b>	-0.244	0.796	0.231	-0.211	0.344	-0.749	1	0.657
<b>NP</b>	-0.300	0.780	0.348	-0.298	0.365	-0.800	0.657	1
<b>Federal Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	0.895	-0.503	-0.130	-0.676	-0.710	-0.632	-0.765
<b>EDU</b>	0.895	1	-0.827	-0.474	-0.869	-0.843	-0.867	-0.890
<b>HEL</b>	-0.503	-0.827	1	0.849	0.760	0.656	0.818	0.865
<b>SW</b>	-0.130	-0.474	0.849	1	0.305	0.159	0.399	0.400
<b>ROA</b>	-0.676	-0.869	0.760	0.305	1	0.988	0.994	0.145
<b>ROE</b>	-0.710	-0.843	0.656	0.159	0.988	1	0.965	0.654
<b>EPS</b>	-0.632	-0.867	0.818	0.399	0.994	0.965	1	1.000
<b>NP</b>	-0.765	-0.890	0.865	0.400	0.145	0.654	1.000	1
<b>Standard Chartered Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	0.460	-0.886	-0.848	-0.265	-0.149	-0.267	-.345
<b>EDU</b>	0.460	1	-0.818	0.033	-0.326	-0.401	-0.328	-.387
<b>HEL</b>	-0.886	-0.818	1	0.520	0.299	0.263	0.301	0.350
<b>SW</b>	-0.848	0.033	0.520	1	0.331	0.159	0.332	0.338
<b>ROA</b>	-0.265	-0.326	0.299	0.331	1	0.983	1.000	0.976
<b>ROE</b>	-0.149	-0.401	0.263	0.159	0.983	1	0.982	0.987
<b>EPS</b>	-0.267	-0.328	0.301	0.332	1.000	0.982	1	0.654
<b>NP</b>	-0.345	-0.387	0.350	0.338	0.976	0.987	0.654	1
<b>Jammu and Kashmir Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	0.970	-0.134	0.972	0.245	0.237	-0.506	-0.513
<b>EDU</b>	0.970	1	-0.369	0.999	0.002	-0.006	-0.700	-0.705
<b>HEL</b>	-0.134	-0.369	1	-0.353	0.896	0.897	0.887	0.884
<b>SW</b>	0.972	0.999	-0.353	1	0.011	0.003	-0.694	-0.700
<b>ROA</b>	0.245	0.002	0.896	0.011	1	1.000	0.712	0.706
<b>ROE</b>	0.237	-0.006	0.897	0.003	1.000	1	0.718	0.712
<b>EPS</b>	-0.506	-0.700	0.887	-0.694	0.712	0.718	1	1.000
<b>NP</b>	-0.513	-0.705	0.884	-0.700	0.706	0.712	1.000	1
<b>South Indian Bank</b>								
<b>DON</b>	1	0.292	0.750	0.192	0.959	0.965	0.979	0.309
<b>EDU</b>	0.292	1	0.545	-0.247	0.201	0.251	0.391	-0.495
<b>HEL</b>	0.750	0.545	1	-0.491	0.537	0.565	0.674	0.436
<b>SW</b>	0.192	-0.247	-0.491	1	0.462	0.437	0.313	-0.423
<b>ROA</b>	0.959	0.201	0.537	0.462	1	0.999	0.976	0.149
<b>ROE</b>	0.965	0.251	0.565	0.437	0.999	1	0.986	0.129
<b>EPS</b>	0.979	0.391	0.674	0.313	0.976	0.986	1	0.111
<b>NP</b>	0.309	-0.495	0.436	-0.423	0.149	0.129	0.111	1

Source: Data collection from www.nationalcsrportal.com and www.moneycontrol.com, Computed from E-views.

**Note:** **DON**-Donation, **EDU**-Education, **HEL**-Health, **SW**-Social Welfare, **ROA**- Return on Assets, **ROE**-Return on Equity, **EPS**- Earning per Share, **NP**- Net Profit.

## REFERENCES

1. Aguinis, H., Glavas, A. (2012), "What We Know and Don't Know About Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review and Research Agenda". *Journal of Management*, 38, 932–968.
2. Barnard, C.I., (1938). "The Functions of the Executive". Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
3. Bowen, H.R., Johnson, F.E., (1953). "Social Responsibility of the Businessman", *Ethics and Economics of Society*, New York, Harper.
4. Branco, M.C., Rodrigues, L.L. (2006), "Corporate Social Responsibility and Resource-Based Perspectives". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69, 111–132.
5. Carroll, A.B., (1991), "The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders", *Business Horizons*, 34 (4), 39-4.
6. Carroll, A.B., Shabana, K.M., (2010). "The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice". *International Journal of Management Review*, 12 (1), 85-105.
7. Chien-Ming Chen and Magali Delmas. (2011). "Measuring Corporate Social Performance: An Efficiency Perspective". *Production and Operations Management*, 20 (6), 789-804.
8. Chung-Hua Shen, Meng-Wen Wu, Ting-Hsuan Chen, Hao Fang and Hao Fang, (2016), "To Engage or not to Engage in Corporate Social Responsibility: Empirical Evidence from Global Banking Sector", *Economic Modelling*, 55,207-225.
9. Cochran, P.L., Wood, R.A., (1984). "Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance". *Academy of Management Journal*, 27 (1), 42-56.
10. Dhamotharan Dhanasekar, Murugesan Selvam and Vadivel Thanikachalam. (2019). "Correlation between Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance: Evidence from Indian Companies". *International Journal of Basic and Applied Research*, 9 (2), 472-490.
11. Dhanasekar, D., Selvam, M., Amrutha, P., (2019), "Relationship between Corporate Social Performance, Corporate Financial Performance and Financial Risk in Indian Firms", *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8 (3S3), 121-128.
12. Dhanasekar, D., Selvam, M., Raja, M., and Gayathri, J., (2020). "The Mediating Effect of Research and Development and Financial Resource on Corporate Social Performance in Asian Countries Companies". *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(4s), 1428 - 1437.
13. Doane, D. (2005), "The myth of CSR - The Problem with Assuming that Companies Can do well also Doing Good is that Markets Do Not Really Work That Way". *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 21–29.
14. Du, S.; Bhattacharya, C.; Sen, S. (2011), "Corporate Social Responsibility and Competitive Advantage: Overcoming the Trust Barrier". *Management Science*, 57, 1528–1545.
15. Girerd-Potin, I., Jimenez-Garces, S., Louvet, P., (2014). "Which Dimensions of Social Responsibility Concern Financial Investors?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121 (4), 559-576.

16. Hongdi Wang, Weisheng Lu, Meng Ye, Chau, K.W., Xiaoling Zhang (2016), "The curvilinear relationship between corporate social performance and corporate financial performance: Evidence from the international construction industry". *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 137, 1313-1322
17. Hull, C.E.; Rothenberg, S. (2008), "Firm performance: The Interactions of Corporate Social Performance with Innovation and Industry Differentiation". *Strategic Management Journal*, 29, 781-789.
18. Igalens, J., Gond, J. (2005). "Measuring Corporate Social Performance in France: A Critical and Empirical Analysis of ARESE Data". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 56, 131-148.
19. Kreps, T.J., (1940). "Measurement of the Social Performance of Business. In: An Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power for the Temporary National Economic Committee", (Monograph No. 7). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
20. Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., Swaen, V. (2009), "Designing and Implementing Corporate Social Responsibility: An Integrative Framework Grounded in Theory and Practice". *Journal of Business and Ethics*, 87, 71-89.
21. Margolis, J.D., Walsh, J.P., (2001). "People and Profits?: the Search for a Link between a Company's Social and Financial Performance". Psychology Press.
22. Marom, I.Y., (2006). "Toward a unified theory of the CSP-CFP link". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67 (2), 191-200.
23. Matten, D., Moon, J., (2008). "Implicit and Explicit CSR: a Conceptual Framework for a Comparative Understanding of Corporate Social Responsibility". *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (2), 404-424.
24. McWilliams, A.; Siegel, D. (2000), "Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: Correlation or Misspecification?." *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 603-609.
25. Mishra, S., Modi, S.B., (2013). "Positive and Negative Corporate Social Responsibility, Financial Leverage, and Idiosyncratic Risk". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117 (2), 431-448.
26. Murray, M., Dainty, A., Murray, M. (Ed.), & Dainty, A. (Ed.) (2008). "Corporate Social Responsibility in the Construction Industry". Abingdon, UK.
27. Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F.L., Rynes, S.L., (2003). "Corporate Social and Financial Performance: a Meta-Analysis". *Organisation Studies*. 24 (3), 403-441.
28. Post, James E., (1991). "Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy", 12. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
29. Preston, L.E.; O'Bannon, D.P. (1997), "The Corporate Social-Financial Performance Relationship: A Typology and Analysis". *Business and Society*, 36, 419-429.
30. Reimann, B.C., (1975). "Organizational Effectiveness and Management Public Values: A Canonical Analysis". *Academy of Management Journal*. 18, 224-241.
31. Van Beurden, P., Gössling, T., (2008). "The Worth of Values a Literature Review on the Relation between Corporate Social and Financial Performance". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82 (2), 407-424.
32. Wartick, S.L., (1988). "How Issues Management Contributes to Corporate Performance". *Business Forum*, 13, 16-22.
33. Wu, M.L., (2006). "Corporate Social Performance, Corporate Financial Performance, and Firm Size: A Meta-Analysis". *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 8 (1), 163-171.
34. Wood, D.J. (1991), "Corporate Social Performance Revisited". *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691-718.