CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE IN CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.

Maxwell Nwinye
Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt.

Abstract
This study examined corporate social responsibility and organizational resilience in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria. The researcher formulated three objectives and tested the three hypotheses. A descriptive survey was adopted and population of the study was 151 employees selected from seven construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. The researcher used random sampling technique and Taro Yamane's formula to determine the sample size which was 110. Both Primary and secondary data were utilized for the study through a structured questionnaire. Spearman rank correlation was used to test the hypotheses and descriptive statistics applied for the analysis of research questions. The findings discovered a positive significant relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness. The researcher concluded that work environment-related corporate social responsibility influences growth strategy. It was recommended that construction companies should use workforce-related corporate social responsibility as organizational culture by training employees to acquire competent skills and knowledge to achieve innovativeness.
Keywords*: Corporate social responsibility, workforce, organizational resilience.*

Introduction

Business environment from all indications is perceived to have daily challenges disturbing the activities of organizations. The volatile situation made organizations to face complex issues arising from regulatory disruptions, economic recessions, and sporadic technologies. Ordinarily, organizations ought to be competitive and resilient to manage uncertainties in business (Hamel, 2003). Notable researchers have acknowledged that resilience refers to organization´s capability to renew itself over time and the ability to tolerate unexpected changes, discontinuity, adapting to environmental risks, and effectively aligning strategies, operations, management systems and governance structure to guide decision making (Blanco & Montes-Botella, 2017; Pal, 2011). This assumption is consistent with Markman and Venzin (2014) who defined organizational resilience as the ability of a company to take measures in advance to handle disputes. Similarly, organizational resilience signifies the fitness of a company to survive difficulties, government policies, changes, and adopt strategies that create liveliness to organization. It is through the intervention of organizational resilience that most companies could successfully overcome crises. Indeed, there is overwhelming evidence that resilient organizations have the ability to adapt to market changes that are more likely to remain relevant or responsive to environmental (Gao et al., 2017). Resilience is otherwise considered as the long-

term development of organizations (Coutu, 2002). When an organization plans to maintain superior performance over time, the resilient company has to exploit the opportunities and control the negative impacts emanating from environmental changes. In this face of remarkable environmental changes, there is need for organization to be more resilient in their daily activities in other to achieve set goals.

Teixeira and Werther (2013) declared that organizations that promote resilience are capable of fulfilling the needs of stakeholders and recover from negative experiences by adapting to the business environment. In the event of confusions and disorder it becomes necessary for organizations to use resilient trajectory as a potential remedy to move beyond survival to organizational prosperity and success. When related organizations and construction companies engage in corporate social responsibility there is the possibility that the project plays a key role in providing social support that could prevent disruptions (Afsheen, 2015). Corporate social responsibility denotes gleaming business practice that goes with exaltation of host communities, ethical values, compliance with legal requirements, and other components of the environment (Chandler, 2001). Basically, corporate social responsibility relates to the willingness of a firm to manage the proceeds to create harmony between the shareholders and stakeholders. Reduction of poverty and sustainable development are main factors that organizations or government need to give urgent attention because of persistent low standard of living. The private sectors acceptability of corporate social responsibility contributed to the improvement of quality of work-life to the employees and the entire society. Folajin et al. (2014) illustrated that corporate social responsibility is an obligation that produces positive impact on the society as well as pursuing long term goals that are good for the people. Apparently, corporate social responsibility encompasses a lot of activities such as environmental stewardship, corporate governance, ethics, health and safety, industrial relations, and customer satisfaction (Friedman, 1970).

Organizations unveil corporate social responsibility as a realistic measure to demonstrate adherence to principles of fair competition, transparency, reward, and performance reporting. It is also an avenue where companies assimilate social, environmental, and economic elements into their culture, strategy, values, and decision making to create wealth thereby establishes better practices. Relying on the importance of corporate social responsibility, Bhattacharya et al. (2009) explained that corporate social responsibility assists business organizations to give attention to the people by ensuring that the environment and stakeholders like host communities, employees, suppliers, customers, and shareholders benefit from their operations. In the same vein, the outcome of this policy objective fortifies the relationship of business with different stakeholders in ensuring minimum conflicts and maximum loyalty from all stakeholders of the company (Imran et al., 2010). However, corporate social responsibility initiative may provide shields and supports to absorb

surprises, undertake appropriate responses when a company suffers from crises and thus mitigating negative impacts and financial instability (Shiu & Yang, 2017; Godfrey et al., 2009). Furthermore, corporate social responsibility CSR is a condition for improving organizational resilience. Improving the performance of an organization does not only necessitate fulfilling the need of its shareholders or investors but also the need of its host community and the entire society. The priority of managers is not only focus on the organization's interests but also consider the interests of parties outside the organization. Moreover, over the years the construction companies have been blamed for negligence in providing some basic social responsibility specifically to their host communities. This led to disruption of the company's activities by the community protest. For that reason, this study attempts to examine corporate social responsibility and organizational resilience in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

In the demand for rapid urbanization and industrial development, construction companies are facing a challenge of how to balance their economic objectives with social and environmental responsibilities while ensuring resilience in the context of various internal and external disorders. Over the years the unsettled changes affecting these organizations range from regulatory disturbances, economic recessions, competitors, and discontinuous technologies. Ordinarily, most of these companies have deliberately failed to impact positively on their immediate environments as well as the nation in which they operate. They pay little wages to their employees, render poor services by constructing non-durable roads and evade operational guidelines. Conversely, there is a lack of comprehensive understanding and strategic alliance between CSR practices and organizational resilience strategies within the construction sector in Rivers State. This contributed to a situation where companies may not be maximizing their positive impact on host communities and environments while also exposing their activities to increased weakness and risks. Corporate social responsibility ignored by a firm in an attempt to make immediate profit could result in loss and corporate image of the firm.

Limited integration of corporate social responsibility CSR and organizational resilience could lead to wasted opportunities for sustainable development and environmental or economic disruptions. The construction industry in Rivers State especially the small firms may not have the resources to implement corporate social responsibility which also has implications for long-term organizational resilience. The reluctant of organizations to implement sustainable corporate social responsibility and adapt to environmental changes may lead to high operational risks and potential conflicts with local communities. However, even when the organization has enforced corporate social responsibility it may not stop the local communities from demanding other opportunities like inclusive supply. The expenditure on corporate social responsibility appears to have short term contrary

effect on net profit but in the long run it may provide better earnings. Indeed, there are conflicting views regarding the relevance of corporate social responsibility on organizational resilience, which informed this study to fill the gap by expanding the knowledge of corporate social responsibility and the relationship with organizational resilience in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

The objectives are to determine the relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria; to examine the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria; and to ascertain the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. What is the relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria? What is the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria? What is the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria?

Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

Review of Related Literature

Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate social responsibility symbolizes voluntary corporate actions designed to improve social or environment conditions (Mackey et al., 2007). Similarly, Shaista and Sara (2014) opined that corporate social responsibility is a set of practices which displays the role of good management, business activities, and more about transparency of the organization to stakeholders. Corporate social responsibility refers to people oriented projects or social necessities that companies provide to address shareholders and stakeholders expectations. Although, corporate social responsibility CSR is not compulsory by law, the basic thing is that it generates social good which brings business benefits. When organizations have reciprocity-

based collaboration with stakeholders is essential to build organizational resilience. The basic relationship between a resilient organization and its external environment is built on trust and reciprocity. Reeves et al. (2016) stated that for a firm to avoid being excluded and opposed by stakeholders in the business setting, companies are expected to provide business benefit to the local communities and environment. Apparently, if construction companies engage in corporate social responsibility activities which establish a good relationship with various stakeholders, identifying environmental changes, and obtains the necessary resources to support the accomplishment of their organizational resilience (Shaista & Sara, 2014).

Corporate social responsibility occurs when business behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the standard of living of employees, families, host community, and society (Gilbert, 2008). Organizations are influenced by the institutional environment in which they operate and corporate social responsibility also creates harmony between the shareholders and stakeholders. Corporate social responsibility emphasizes on capacity building for sustainable welfare of society. If the interest of stakeholders such as customers, government, employees, suppliers, and the society are neglected, it could have harmful effect on the long-term interests of the company. Effective corporate social responsibility involves a strong performance ethic framework leading to commitment of basic principles as integrity, fairness, and respect (Matama & Rogers, 2006). Corporate reputation may work as a defense mechanism which assists companies to cushion disruptions and creates value. The engagement in corporate social responsibility aids a firm to build its reputation and deep social foundation to promote predictable business resources like capital, technology, and labour that are essential in overcoming environmental shocks (Odetayo et al., 2014). To concur with this assumption Lee (2008) proclaimed that corporate social responsibility contributes to building a wide network of knowledge and resources that provide flexibility, efficiency, for organizational resilience and innovation.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) intervention creates opportunities for business initiatives that could internally increase employee satisfaction and commitment. Consequently, organizations that strategically engage in corporate social responsibility are likely to transform their products and process to fulfill stakeholders' needs, which attracts competitive advantages for long-term performance growth (Beurden & Gossling, 2008). Moreover, the good reputation brought by corporate social responsibility generates more customer satisfaction and decreasing social constraints in business operations. The disclosure of external CSR improves investment efficiency, corporate governance, reduces information lopsidedness, and increases confidence in capital market (Asgary & Li, 2016). Ordinarily, corporate social responsibility is the social practice where the organization adjusts and conducts discretionary business investments that support resilience, social causes, to protect the environment and improve community

satisfaction. It is also a capacity building for sustainable livelihoods that provide business to enhance the skills of workers, the community, and the government. Carroll (1991) mentioned two measures of corporate social responsibility as workforce-related corporate social responsibility and work environment- related corporate social responsibility.

Workforce-Related Corporate Social Responsibility

Freeman (1984) stipulates that workforce-related corporate social responsibility entails the actions of organizations to fulfill workers' expectations by ensuring work safety, impartiality, and employees progress. Studies have demonstrated that workforce-related corporate social responsibility comprises employees comfort, training, workplace safety, and transparency (Schaefer et al., 2020; Carroll 1991; Farooq et al., 2017). Consequently, workforce-related corporate social responsibility signifies a policy of company that implements career development, staff welfare, and work-life balance. Apparently, workforce-related corporate social responsibility is associated with internal CSR which includes employees, board of directors, managers, and treating employees as internal customers have relevant impact on organizational performance (Lee & Raschke, 2020). When an organization has exciting working conditions with quality workforce it becomes an important source of competitive advantage. Adequate workplace practice such as investment in employee salaries and benefits are inevitable aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR). The survival of organizations depends on their ability to entice, motivate, and retain brilliant employees. Where employees exhibit their skills, knowledge, and experiences to accomplish organizations' performance and resilience, the organization in turn has to reward the workers. Indeed, Shen and Benson (2016) narrated that workforce-related corporate social responsibility could reveal employees' positive and creative working behaviours which eventually contribute to organizational innovation.

Workforce-related corporate social responsibility concentrates on investing on the improvement of workers skills, abilities, knowledge, through training, education, and work experience to develop them with the competencies needed to deal with environmental changes (Demmer et al., 2011). A resilient organization that has workforce-related corporate social responsibility favours employees with empowerment, trust, caring, which foster job satisfaction and profitable interests. (Asgary & Li, 2016). Inspite of the difficult situations, workforce-related corporate social responsibility inculcates employee loyalty and moral solidarity which are essential for companies to successfully respond to crises or challenges.

Work Environment-Related Corporate Social Responsibility

Work environment-related corporate social responsibility (CSR) entails a practice where organizations voluntarily protect their business environment by fulfilling mandatory requirements such as creating environmental friendly urban relationship, payment of taxes to government, maintain work standard, waste reduction, financing clean energy development programs, and green innovation (Zhang & Cheng, 2022). Consequently, Carroll (1991) insisted that environment-related corporate social responsibility is a strategic action engaged by an organization to improve the impact of its business operations on the natural environment and innovativeness. In addition, work environment-related corporate social responsibility signifies stewardship initiative created by organizations to have environmentally friendly operation that reduces harmful practices and sustain resources. The engagements of firms in work environment-related CSR activities contribute to increasing corporate value. When companies minimize the use of carbon emissions, natural materials, energy consumption, and waste they are likely to acquire notable competitive advantages in the future. Winston (2014) stated that the high price of scarce resources and severe ecological imbalances in the natural environment could make companies more flexible and resilient.

Active participation in work environment-related corporate social responsibility activities may assist a company or construction firms to cut down its expenditures, evade the risk of natural environment changes, and generate financial benefits (Le & Hoang, 2022). Environment-related corporate social responsibility could also help organizations to create a green image which attracts high patronage from the public particularly the stakeholders. Furthermore, Cho et al. (2013) claimed that a firm with environment-related CSR enhances investor confidence in the capital market giving companies opportunities for investment, self-adjustment, and support to increase resilience.

Organizational Resilience

Folke (2006) clarified resilience as the ability of a system to recover from disruptions or disturbances and succeed beyond its original state. In collaboration with this presumption, Pal (2011) explained organizational resilience as the positive performance result when an organization undergoes environmental changes. Similarly, organizational resilience connotes the capability of organization to respond to threat, danger, unexpected occurrences, and engage in transformative activities (Lampel et al., 2014). Indeed, organizational resilience is the potentials that an organization has to recover from adversity and move on to achieve growth in the face of discontinuity or crisis. Organization is assumed to be resilient when it could maintain a desirable performance level under changing environment and bounce into stable operation. Organization is resilient when there is uninterrupted

capability to manage their resources during and after disasters. A resilient company may prosper in a disordered and competitive environment. Resilience is demonstrated when a firm or community recovers from external setback. Organizational resilience contains set of attributes like bounce back quickly from hindrances, correcting mistakes; adapt to change, as well as innovativeness and sales growth measures (Teixeira & Werther, 2013). Organizations that are resilient in handling rapid shifts in consumer preferences, regulatory disorders, and technological gaps, are capable of reducing their business failures and accomplish long-term survival. Winston (2014) claimed that to avoid criticism or conflict from the stakeholders in the business network, companies including construction firms have to be resilient against disruptive environmental changes. Resilient behaviour permits companies to learn for implementation of new routines and effective use of its resources in uncertainty conditions.

Innovativeness

Oliveira et al. (2016) considered innovativeness as a business strategy that triggers creativity, economic growth, and transformation foundations. In supporting this assumption, Wastell et al. (2007) outlined innovativeness as the process of knowledge transformation where new products, process, and systems are created for the benefit of firm and its stakeholders. Innovativeness is an inductive element that uses individual as economic agent for obtaining profit and market positioning. Innovativeness helps in creation and maintenance of businesses (Fagerberg et al., 2004). Innovation has a positive effect on profitability and organizational resilience (Shen & Benson, 2016). Innovation is a function of performance which adopts new ideas in maintaining sustainability in business. Apparently, innovation contributes to economic development of a firm and nation. The enforcement of innovation in companies brings about success in market-leading and higher financial performance. Moreover, technological changes have increased the speed of communication which obliges organizations to scrutinize and respond to the changes. Indeed, organizations and firms in construction industry are to be innovative in order to remain in dynamic and changing environment (Oliveira et al., 2016).

Organizational innovation is very crucial in survival of a competitive environment hence it could lead to improving the quality of existing products or reduces production costs. It may be a misnomer when a company is resilient without innovation trajectory. Innovation is recognized as the discovery of new opportunities that adds value to business as well as new methods of commercialization.

Growth strategy

Growth strategy represents stable duration of a business and financial performance in which businesses are sustained (Bachtiar & Amin, 2019). In a different view, Lampel et al. (2014) stated that business growth is the complementary element to organizational resilience with positive administrative policy and excellence. Blanco and

Montes-Botella (2017) pronounced that growth strategy entails creativity, leadership, control, resilience, and collaboration. In another perspective, growth strategy relates to market expansion, profit generation, market penetration, and notable experience in business. Growth is an essential measure of business survival. Ordinarily, for an organization to attain growth it needs to pay more attentions to the declining phase and develops strategic plans to avoid failures. Organizational growth occurs when there is sales growth, quality performance, maturity, and sustainability (Folke, 2006). Growth strategy helps to identify the starting point, visions, and the objectives of business (Demmer, et al., 2011). Growth strategy focuses on achieving long term profitability and accomplishing the goals of a company.

Theoretical Framework

Stakeholder Theory

This theory states that organizations should engage in corporate social responsibilities that could benefit the host communities, employees, employers, and the shareholders (Freeman, 1984). According to the opinion of the scholar, the goal of companies is to maximize shareholders wealth. Stakeholder theory provides that organizations are responsible **to** different stakeholders such as employees, community, customers, shareholders, and society (Friedman, 1970). The theory indicates that companies may be considered successful when they deliver value to the majority of their stakeholders. Stakeholder theory emphasizes on business ethics, morals, values, and provision of the needs of the stakeholders. This theory also seeks to optimize relations with corporate social responsibilities thereby improving productivity and performance in the organization (Asgary & Li, 2016). Indeed, stakeholder theory is essential in managing the expectations of stakeholders and for the success of any project or company (Freeman, 1984). It provides a framework of peaceful relationship between stakeholders and organizations. If a company practices stakeholder theory the job satisfaction increases and the commitment of the workforce also improved (Farooq et al., 2017). Furthermore, when a construction company provides the needs of workers and the community it may enjoy successful work environment and high productivity. However, Schaefer et al. (2020) insisted that stakeholder theory is awkward where the interests of various stakeholders are not equal. The organization may not satisfy all the stakeholders especially when the company is small in size or capital.

Empirical Review

Chapple and Moon (2005) conducted a study on corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A seven country study of CSR. The objective of the study was to investigate the differences in CSR practices among seven Asian countries. The researchers were concerned with the website reporting of CSR, and the findings from the study indicated that there was no single pattern of CSR in Asia. The results also showed that corporate social responsibility has significant impact on companies and

each Asian country. However, the study was limited to few countries in Asian which is not sufficient for generalization. Actually, the previous study in Chapple and Moon (2005) is consistent with the current study as it tends to find out the effect of corporate social responsibility on organizational resilience.

Chen and Wang (2011) investigated corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance in China: An empirical research from Chinese firms. The basic objective of the study was to examine the relationship between corporate social responsibility and performance of firms in China. The researchers employed survey design with the population size of 141 Chinese firms over the 2007-2008 periods. The results proved that disparities in corporate social responsibility and performance influence each other significantly. The findings indicated that corporate social responsibility activities may improve the performance of firms. The researchers concluded that corporate social responsibility has a significant relationship with the performance of firms in China. Nevertheless, this study contains few population of the study that may not represent other companies. The current study is related to the previous study in Chen and Wang (2011) through research design and the positive significant relationship between the variables under study.

Methodology

Research design is a blue-print used in collecting data. Thus, the researcher applied descriptive survey which helps to provide systematic approach to analyze data and facilitates business decisions.

The population of this study resides on seven selected construction companies in Rivers State, Nigeria as well as 151 selected employees from the listed companies. The number of companies and employees were collected from Rivers State government statistics 2024 on the ground that they operated for more than eight years. The researcher employed random sampling technique which gave the participants such as the senior staff and junior staff equal opportunities. A sample size of 110 employees was carefully chosen through Taro Yamane's formula.

Table 1

Participant Population

	Construction Companies	Senior Staff	Junior Staff	Number of Employees
1	Monier Construction Company	12	16	28
2	Lubrik Construction Company	10	15	25
3	Fisancol Transcontinental Services Ltd	8	12	20
4	Kaymex Limited	7	14	21
5	Dmkj Nigeria Limited	10	12	22
6	Zubeltech Resources Ltd	6	11	17
7	Ib-Tech Engineering Limited	5	13	18
	TOTAL	**58**	**93**	**151**

Source: Rivers State Government Statistics 2024

The researcher designed the questionnaire on corporate social responsibility and organizational resilience. Data were collected through primary data and secondary data. The primary data in this study were received from copies of questionnaire administered to selected employees. Questionnaire is necessary to provide solutions to research questions. Moreover, secondary data were collected from human resources data and Rivers State government statistics 2024. Selection of primary data was informed by the validity and reliability of data source and where the alpha value of 0.7 and above was considered as reliable and acceptable. Two measures of corporate social responsibility namely workforce-related corporate social responsibility and work environment-related corporate social responsibility were investigated. The researcher adopted ordinal and 5-point Likert scale elucidated as: 5 = strongly agree (SA), 4 = agree (A), 3 = undecided (U), 2 = disagree (D), 1 = strongly disagree (SD). This questionnaire was classified into three segments namely part A, B, and C. Thus, Section A covered demographic profile of the participants. The section B epitomized independent variable and section C represented the dependent variable. Furthermore, for this study to have ethical value all the information given by participants were undisclosed.

The analysis of research questions was completed with the aid of descriptive statistics using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Spearman rank correlation was used to test the hypotheses.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of Research Questions

Research question one: What is the relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria?

Table 2

Mean Score of Respondents on Workforce-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Innovativeness

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Workforce-related corporate social responsibility focuses on improving workers skills and knowledge.	110	1	5	4.40	1.068
Raises staff awareness and efficiency.	110	1	5	4.34	1.060
Workers received trust and empowerment through innovativeness.	110	1	5	4.40	1.135
Employees respond to environmental changes.	110	1	5	4.56	.914
Workforce-related CSR creates job satisfaction.	110	1	5	4.44	1.088
Valid N (listwise)	110				

The Table 2 unveiled the mean score of respondents on workforce-related corporate social responsibility as a measure of corporate social responsibility The grand mean score of the five statements was 4.4. This indicated that majority of the employees in construction companies agreed that workers received trust and empowerment through innovativeness and workforce-related corporate social responsibility creates job satisfaction.

Research question two: What is the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria?

Table 3

Mean Score of Respondents on Work Environment-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Growth Strategy

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work environment-related CSR boosts investor confidence.	110	1	5	4.45	1.028
This company uses environment-related corporate social responsibility to protect business environment.	110	1	5	4.51	.946
Work environment-related corporate social responsibility helps a firm to cut down its resource costs and reduces risks of disruption.	110	1	5	4.63	.811
Implementing environment-related CSR projects contribute to high corporate value.	110	1	5	4.23	1.089
Work environment-related CSR enables this company to lessen the negative effects of environmental changes.	110	1	5	4.32	1.075
Valid N (listwise)	110				

The results in Table 3 exposed the position of most employees who agreed that work environment-related CSR boosts investor confidence and contributes to high corporate value. The data revealed a grand mean score of 4.4 which proved that work environment-related corporate social responsibility influences growth strategy in construction companies.

Research question three: What is the relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria?

Table 4

Mean Score of Respondents on Work Environment-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Innovativeness

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work environment-related corporate social responsibility creates the capacity to encourage the application of new ideas.	110	1	5	4.34	1.060
This organization encourages employees to adapt to new technologies.	110	1	5	4.50	.896
Work environment-related corporate social responsibility reduces harmful practices.	110	1	5	4.54	.885
Organizations ought to be innovative to remain in the dynamic and changing environment.	110	1	5	4.44	1.105
Survival of a company depends on its ability to engage in innovation and work environment-related CSR.	110	1	5	4.34	1.060
Valid N (listwise)	110				

In Table 4 majority of the workers agreed that survival of a company depends on its ability to engage in innovation and work environment-related CSR. The reactions of the employees generated a grand mean score of 4.4. This indicated that work environment-related corporate social responsibility has significant relationship with innovativeness.

Test of Hypotheses

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

HA_1: There is significant relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

Table 5

Spearman Rank Correlation of Workforce-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Innovativeness

Correlations

			Workforce-related CSR	Innovativeness
Spearman's rho	Workforce-related CSR	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.998**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	110	110
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.998**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	110	110

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

The results in Table 5 clearly indicated the correlation between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness. The results specified a positive significant relationship existed between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness. Where $r = .998$ and $p = .000$ which showed that $p < .005$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative accepted.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

HA_2: There is significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

Table 6

Spearman Rank Correlation of Work Environment-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Growth Strategy

Correlations

			Work environment-related CSR	Growth strategy
Spearman's rho	Work environment-related CSR	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.901**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	110	110
	Growth strategy	Correlation Coefficient	.901**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	110	110

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

In Table 6, the results revealed positive significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy. This proved that $r = .901$ and $p = .000$ which showed that $p < .005$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative accepted.

Ho_3: There is no significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

HA_3: There is significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria.

Table 7

Spearman Rank Correlation of Work Environment-Related Corporate Social Responsibility and Innovativeness

Correlations

			Work environment -related CSR	Innovative ness
Spearman's rho	Work environment-related CSR	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.929**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	110	110
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.929**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	110	110

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

The results in Table 7 demonstrated a positive significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility CSR and innovativeness in construction companies. Thus, $r = .929$ and $p = .000$ which was less than .005. This means the null hypothesis is rejected while alternative hypothesis rejected. The outcome of this data disclosed that work environment-related corporate social responsibility contributes to growth strategy.

Discussion of Findings

The findings in hypothesis one shows that there is significant relationship between workforce-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria. This suggests that workforce-related corporate social responsibility focuses on improving workers skills and knowledge. This finding is in agreement with Demmer et al. (2011) who claims that workforce-related corporate social responsibility concentrates on investing on the improvement of workers skills, abilities, knowledge, training, education, and work experience to

develop them with the competencies needed to deal with environmental changes. Hypothesis two findings affirm the positive significant relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and growth strategy in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria. This elucidates that work environment-related corporate social responsibility helps a firm to cut down its resource costs and reduces risks of disruption. This finding is consistent with Le and Hoang (2022) who insists that active participation in work environment-related corporate social responsibility may assist a company or construction firms to cut down its expenditures, evade the risk of natural environment changes, and generate financial benefits. The third hypothesis shows that there is a significant positive relationship between work environment-related corporate social responsibility and innovativeness in construction companies Rivers State, Nigeria. This advocates that organizations must be innovative to remain in the dynamic and changing environment. This finding concurs with Carroll (1991) who contends that environment-related corporate social responsibility is a strategic action engaged by an organization to improve the impact of its business operations on the natural environment and innovativeness.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The construction companies are to be resilient in order to remain in operation despite environmental changes. The researcher concluded that workforce-related corporate social responsibility (CSR) significantly played active roles in the achievement of firm innovativeness. Work environment-related corporate social responsibility has significant relationship with innovativeness and contributes to business growth.

The recommendations:

1. Construction companies should use workforce-related corporate social responsibility as organizational culture by training employees to acquire competent skills and knowledge to achieve innovativeness.
2. Managements of construction companies should implement work environment-related corporate social responsibility to protect the company and establish a formidable peaceful relationship with the community, customers, and government. This could increase the firm's growth strategy.
3. Construction companies should practice work environment-related corporate social responsibility that may promote innovativeness and resilience.
4. Managements of various construction companies should be resilient by rising above difficulties and environmental challenges and employ innovative or growth strategy to achieve high performance.

References

Afsheen, S. (2015). Impact of corporate social responsibility on firm's performance. *In Proceeding for Journal of Finance and Bank Management, 3*(7), 1-5.

Asgary, N., & Li, G. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: Its economic impact and link to the bullwhip effect. *Journal of Business Ethics,135*, 665–681.

Beurden, P., & Gossling, T. (2008). The worth of values: A literature review on the relation between corporate social and financial performance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82*, 407-424.

Bhattacharya, C. B., Korschun, D., & Sen, S. (2009). Strengthening stakeholder company relationships through mutually beneficial corporate social responsibility initiatives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 85*(2), 257-272.

Blanco, J. M. M., & Montes-Botella, J. L. (2017). Exploring nurtured company resilience through human capital and human resource development findings from Spanish manufacturing companies. *International Journal Manpower, 38*, 661–674.

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, *34*, 39-48.

Chapple, W., & Moon, J. (2005). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A sevencountry study of CSR. *Business & Society, 44* (4), 415-441.

Chen, H., & Wang, X. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance in China: An empirical research from Chinese firms. *Corporate Governance, 11*(4), 361-370.

Cho, S. Y., Lee, C., & Pfeiffer, R. J. (2013). Corporate social responsibility performance and information asymmetry. *Journal of Accounting Public Policy, 32*, 71–83.

Coutu, D. L. (2002). How resilience works. *Harvard Business Review, 80*, 46–54.

Demmer, W. A., Vickery, S. K., & Calantone, R. (2011). Engendering resilience in small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs): A case study of demmer corporation. *International Journal Production Resources, 49*, 5395–5413.

Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D., & Nelson, R. (2004). *The oxford handbook of innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Farooq O., Rupp D. E., & Farooq M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifocal outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *The Academy of Management Journal, 60*(3), 954-985.

Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. *Global Environment Change, 16*, 253–267.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Friedman (1970) Emerald article: The social responsibility of corporate management and classical critique. *American Journal of Businesses, 18* (1), 15-24.

Folajin, O. O., Ibitoye, O. T., & Dunsin, A. T. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and organizational profitability: An empirical investigation of United Bank for Africa (UBA) Plc. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4*(8), 205-214.

Gao, C., Zuzul, T., Jones, G., & Khanna, T. (2017). Overcoming institutional voids: A reputation-based view of long-run survival. *Strategic Management Journal, 38*, 2147–2167.

Gilbert, V. E. (2008). *An insight into corporate social responsibility in Kenya*. [Master's Thesis]. University of Nottingham.

Godfrey, P. C., Merrill, C. B., & Hansen, J. M. 2009. The relationship between corporate social responsibility and shareholder value: An empirical test of the risk management hypothesis. *Strategic Management Journal 30,* 425–445.

Hamel, G. V. L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review, 81,* 52–63.

Imran, A., Kashif, U. R., Syed, I. A., Jamil, Y., & Maria, Z. (2010). Corporate social responsibility influences, employee commitment and organizational performance. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(12), 2796-2801.

Lampel, J.; Bhalla, A.; & Jha, P.P. (2014). Does governance confer organisational resilience? Evidence from UK employee owned businesses. *European Management Journal, 32,* 66–72.

Le, H. T., & Hoang, D. P. (2022). Economic sanctions and environmental performance: The moderating roles of financial market development and institutional quality. *Environmental Science Pollution Resources, 29*(13), 19657–19678. http.//doi:10. 1007/s11356-021-17103-3 stakeholders' shared understanding: The secret sauce to performance with a purpose. *Journal of Business Research, 108,* 20-28.

Mackey, A., Mackey, T. B., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and firm

Lee, M. P. (2008). Review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 10*(1), 53-73.

Lee, M. T., & Raschke, R. L. (2020). Innovative sustainability and performance: Investor preferences and corporate strategies. *Academy Management Revision, 32,* 817–835.

Markman, G. M., & Venzin, M. (2014). Resilience: Lessons from banks that have braved the economic crisis and from those that have not. *International Business Review. 23,* 1096–1107.

Odetayo, T. A., Adeyemi, A. Z., & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2014). Impact of corporate social responsibility on profitability of Nigeria Banks. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4*(8), 252-263.

Oliveira, J. M., Laranja, M., Lahorgue, M. A., & Born, H. F. (2016). Cross innovation approach and the creative industries: A case study in the city of Lisbon, Portugal. *International Journal of Innovation, 4*(1), 1–12. http://doi.org/10.5585/iji.v4i1.68.

Pal, R. (2011). Organizational resilience and health of business systems. *International Journal of Business Continuous Risk Management. 2,* 372–398.

Reeves, M., Levin, S., & Ueda, D. (2016). The biology of corporate survival. *Harvard Business Revision, 94,* 47–55.

Reinmoeller, P., & van Baardwijk, N. (2005). The link between diversity and resilience. *MIT Sloan Management Review. 46,* 61–65.

Teixeira, E. D., & Werther, W. B. (2013). Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages. *Business Horizon 56,* 333–342.

Schaefer, S. D., Terlutter R., & Diehl, S. (2020). Talking about CSR matters: Employees' perception of and reaction to their company's CSR communication in four different CSR domains. *International Journal of Advertising, 39*(2), 191-212.

Shaista, S., & Sara, J. (2014). Impact of corporate social responsibility on organizational performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *6*(27), 40-46.

Shen, J., & Benson, J. (2016). When corporate social responsibility is a social norm: How socially responsible human resource management affects employee work behavior. *Journal of Management, 42,* 1723–1746.

Shiu, Y. M., & Yang, S. L. (2017). Does engagement in corporate social responsibility provide strategic insurance-like effects? *Strategic Management Journal*, *38*, 455–470.

Wastell, D.G., McMaster, T., & Kawalek, P. (2007). The rise of the phoenix: Methodological innovation as a discourse of renewal. *Journal Information Technology*, *22*, 59–68.

Winston, A. (2014). Resilience in a hotter world. *Harvard Business Revision*, *92*, 56–64.

Zhang, C., & Cheng, J. (2022). Environmental regulation and corporate cash holdings: Evidence from China's new environmental protection law. *Frontline Environmental Science*, *10*, 835301. http.//doi:10.3389/fenvs.2022.835301.