

Blešić, Ivana; Dragin, Aleksandra; Markovic, Jelica; and Lukrecija Deri, Slobodan Cerovic

## Article

# Relationships among Shopping Quality and Corporate Social Responsibility of Shopping Centers and Consumer Satisfaction: Case from Novi Sad (Serbia)

Amfiteatru Economic Journal

## Provided in Cooperation with:

The Bucharest University of Economic Studies

*Suggested Citation:* Blešić, Ivana; Dragin, Aleksandra; Markovic, Jelica; and Lukrecija Deri, Slobodan Cerovic (2014) : Relationships among Shopping Quality and Corporate Social Responsibility of Shopping Centers and Consumer Satisfaction: Case from Novi Sad (Serbia), Amfiteatru Economic Journal, ISSN 2247-9104, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Vol. 16, Iss. 35, pp. 415-430

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/168833>

### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

### Terms of use:

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SHOPPING QUALITY AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF SHOPPING CENTERS AND CONSUMER SATISFACTION: CASE FROM NOVI SAD (SERBIA)

Ivana Blešić<sup>1</sup>, Aleksandra Dragin<sup>2</sup>, Jelica Marković<sup>3</sup>, Slobodan Čerović<sup>4\*</sup>  
and Lukrecija Deri<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1) 2) 3) 5)</sup> *Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management,  
Faculty of Sciences, University of Novi Sad, Serbia*

<sup>4)</sup> *Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management  
Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia*

---

### Abstract

Taking into consideration satisfied customer as necessary for business maintenance, companies are trying to discover determinants which have the biggest influence on their consumer satisfaction. Here are presented two factors that have influence on consumer satisfaction in shopping centers: quality of shopping and corporate social responsibility. In this research, each of these factors had six elements. The results of the regression analysis are that "Value for money in stores" ( $\beta=0.387$ ,  $p=0.000$ ) has the greatest impact on satisfaction when shopping quality performance is concerned, and that "Retailer support for (national/local) cultural and sport events" ( $\beta=0.333$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) has the greatest impact on satisfaction in the case of CSR performance. Further analysis showed the difference in consumer perception of corporate social responsibility, depending on their occupation and level of education. It is also important to mention that consumers with environment and empathic concern have higher scores perception of CSR. However, there is not statistically important difference in consumer perception of shopping quality in shopping centers.

**Keywords:** Corporate social responsibility, Shopping centers, Shopping quality, Consumer satisfaction.

**JEL Classification:** M14

---

### Introduction

The concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been widely discussed in the last fifty years and was defined in different ways. It was given broad definition, such as the behavior that involves social improvement, beyond the interest of a company, to a more narrow view focusing on economic benefits to shareholders of a company (McWilliams and Siegel, 2007). CSR has traditionally been conceptualized rather broadly as "the managerial

---

\* Corresponding author: Slobodan Čerović, [scerovic@singidunum.ac.rs](mailto:scerovic@singidunum.ac.rs)

obligation to take action to protect and improve both the welfare of society as a whole and the interest of organizations” (Davis and Blomstrom, 1975, p. 6). Also, the notion of corporate social responsibility is concerned with “bringing corporate behavior up to a level where it is in congruence with currently prevailing social norms, values, and performance expectations” (Sethi, 1979, p. 66). Based on these definitions, a socially responsible organization must try to make a profit as well as obey the law and be ethical.

Adopting the wider concept of CSR, Carroll (1979) argued that CSR needs to include four types of responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. Economic responsibilities require businesses to be profitable and produce goods and services which are desirable in society. Legal responsibilities correspond to society’s expectation to see businesses meet their economic duties within the framework of the law. Ethical responsibilities require that businesses follow the modes of conduct considered as morally right. Finally, philanthropic responsibilities reflect the common desire to see businesses get actively involved in the betterment of society beyond their economic, legal, and ethical responsibilities (Carroll, 1991). His categorization was widely accepted and applied in numerous researches (e.g. Wartick and Cochran, 1985; Wood, 1991; Lewin et al., 1995; Swanson, 1995). Further on, in the analysis of the definitions of corporate social responsibility, Dahlsrud (2006) recognizes five most popular dimensions: environmental dimension, social dimension, economic dimension, stakeholder dimension and voluntariness dimension.

A comprehensive summary of the different CSR actions is part of *Socrates: The Corporate Social Ratings Monitor* (Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co. Inc., 1999), a database that describes and rates more than 600 companies in terms of their CSR records. This database reduces the CSR initiatives undertaken by these companies into six broad domains: (1) community support (e.g. support of arts and health programs, educational and housing initiatives for the economically disadvantaged, generous/innovative giving), (2) diversity (e.g. sex-, race-, family-, sexual orientation-, and disability based diversity record and initiatives) (3) employee support (e.g. concern for safety, job security, profit sharing, union relations, employee involvement), (4) environment (e.g. environment-friendly products, hazardous-waste management, use of ozone-depleting chemicals, animal testing, pollution control, recycling), (5) non-U.S. operations (e.g. overseas labor practices, including sweatshops, operations in countries with human rights violations), and (6) product (e.g., product safety, research and development/innovation, marketing/contracting controversies, antitrust disputes).

The ISO 26000 Standard, Guidelines for social responsibility, provides the guidelines for social responsibility for private sector enterprises and public sector organizations. This standard creates an international consensus regarding the definition of social responsibility (Dinu, 2011). According to ISO, this standard is addressed to organizations of all types in both public and private sectors, in developed and developing countries (Smeureanu et al, 2011).

### **1. Literature review**

Previous studies have attempted to examine the potential determinants of CSR behaviors and the attitudes toward CSR (Aldag and Jackson, 1977; Arlow, 1991; Thomas and Simerly, 1994; Schlegelmilch and Robertson, 1995; Burton and Hegarty, 1999; Quazi, 2003). Mainly, the determinants supported by previous studies have fallen into four

conceptual areas: 1) the characteristics of the organizations, 2) the characteristics of the manager, 3) corporate ethical values, and 4) the perceived importance of ethics and social responsibility.

Although the concept of CSR has been generally applied to a broad spectrum of industries, previous research has argued that the practices of CSR may be approached very differently within each industry (Spender, 1989). Also, Beliveau, Cottrill and O'Neill (1994) suggested that behavioral patterns within an industry may be similar, but differ across industries. Thus, they suggested examining how CSR is affected within different industries.

Also, scholars have suggested that corporations engage in socially responsible activities because of the recognition of various benefits, such as an increase in positive image and the likelihood of hiring top quality employees, as well as a positive effect on the company's bottom line (Marrewijk, 2003; Henriques and Richardson, 2004).

A thorough review of the literature suggests that personal characteristics of employees may also affect attitudes toward CSR. These characteristics include gender (Arlow, 1991; Burton and Hegarty, 1999), age (Arlow, 1991), education (Hage, 1980; Kidwell, Stevens and Bethke, 1987; Serwinek, 1992; Quazi, 2003), length of work experience (Aldag and Jackson, 1984; Arlow, 1991), managerial work experience, and international work experience (Quazi, 2003).

Firstly, the findings related to the influence of gender on CSR are inconsistent. Some researchers have argued that females have a tendency to be less supportive of unethical behaviors than males (Ruegger and King, 1992). However, some scholars have found that gender does not play a role in ethical attitudes (Dawson, 1997; McDonald and Kan, 1997). Secondly, regarding the role of age on CSR, generally, the studies suggested attitudes toward CSR varied by age based on the assumption that older people are more conservative. For example, Longnsecker, McKinney and Moore (1989) found that younger people tended to be less sensitive in their moral judgment than older people. Similarly Serwinek (1992) revealed the older employees are stricter regarding ethical rules than younger people. Third, regarding the effect of education on CSR, Hage (1980) found that managers with higher educational levels tended to have more liberal attitudes.

Likewise, Quazi (2003) reported that the higher the level of education the more likely respondents were to understand the issues of CSR. Regarding length of work experience, while most studies found that an employee with more work experience might exhibit greater ethical tendencies, other studies have found no relationship. While Harris (1990) argued that the workers with ten or more years work experience in an organization are less tolerant of unethical behaviors, Arlow (1991) found no significant relationship between the length of work experience and attitudes toward social responsibility.

The starting point in organizing CSR activities is identifying the social needs that a company decides to be involved in. The presence of CSR can be determined by: companies responsibilities towards suppliers; companies responsibilities towards shareholders; towards customers (product quality and product safety); towards employee (employee health and safety; employee welfare, employee development, equal opportunity for all employees, its systems of contract, promotion, evaluation and dismissal) (Smeureanu et al, 2011). Some issues are focused on the analysis of the way companies develop CSR activities and the way they understand how to draw social references and communicate their content (Obrad et al., 2011).

Smith and Alcorn (1991) and Creyer and Ross (1997) demonstrate that consumers are willing to pay higher prices for products made by an ethical company or by a company that makes donations to non-profit organizations or supports charitable causes. Having this in mind, the attention for CSR has increased significantly during the last decade (Zaharia et al, 2010) and many firms decided to start reporting their interest in ethics, society and environment.

This study attempts to examine the extent of CRS understanding in Serbia. According to the research conducted in Serbia in 2005, public is not familiar with the values of corporate social responsibility and our consumers' awareness is not developed enough. However, a need for more developed context suitable for corporate social responsibility appeared. The results are several international initiatives whose goal is to improve corporate social responsibility on the national level (Smart Kolektiv, 2007). Shopping centers in Serbia are among the starting points of CRS development.

One of the purposes of this study was to examine the state of social awareness of consumers after the period of eight years. We evaluated the state of perception of consumers in the context of CRS performance in shopping centers in Serbia. Since the literature review determined the differences in the perception of CSR among employees depending on the social-demographic characteristics, this study sought to determine whether they exist among consumers too. Also, researchers of this paper assumed that consumers who concern about the environment and about other people (empathic concern) are more sensitive about CSR performance and perceive it differently. Since one of the main reasons for visiting shopping centers is shopping, authors of this research include the factor of shopping quality in order to examine its influence on consumer satisfaction. It is determined by performative actions such as product offering, price level and accessibility. The other factor is CSR performance of shopping centers. So, four main hypotheses can be identified:

H1: Consumer satisfaction with shopping quality in shopping centers depends on consumer perceptions of performative attributes such as product offering, price level and accessibility.

H2: Consumer satisfaction with CSR performance of shopping centers depends on consumer perceptions of CSR actions.

H3: According to socio-demographic characteristics of consumers, perceptions differences exist regarding CSR performance and don't exist regarding shopping quality in shopping centers.

H4: According to environment and empathic concern of consumers, perceptions differences exist regarding CSR performance and don't exist regarding shopping quality in shopping centers.

## **2. Methodology**

### **2.1. Measurement and sampling**

Gathering data on shopping quality performance and CSR performance of shopping centers in Novi Sad (Serbia) was realized by surveying shopping centers' consumers. The survey was conducted in July and August in 2013. Total of 300 questionnaires was handed out, of which 160 were analyzed. The rest of them (140) were incomplete due to consumers not being familiar with CRS. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part was

based on socio-demographical characteristics of respondents. In the second part, respondents answered the questions about their environment and empathic concern, while the third one comprised questions concerning shopping quality performance and CSR performance of shopping centers.

List of performative and CSR attributes of shopping centers was taken from the article of Oppewal, Alexander and Sullivan (2006), with one additional item in the part of socially responsible activities (Table no. 1). The above mentioned item is "Concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP, ISO 26000) implementation".

**Table no. 1: Performative and CSR attributes and consumer satisfaction**

---

|   |
|---|
| Q1. Choice of exclusive and service-oriented stores   |
| Q2. Choice of cheap stores  |
| Q3. Value for money in stores   |
| Q4. Range of services like library, post office, banks, hair dressers, travel agents, pharmacies, advice bureau |
| Q5. Street lay-out and ambience   |
| Q6. Parking facilities and access   |
| SShQ. Consumer satisfaction with shopping quality performance of shopping centers                               |
| CSR1. Concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP, ISO 26000) implementation                         |
| CSR2. Retailer support for better work conditions (in local industry/world-wide in industry)                    |
| CSR3. Concern for (global/local) natural environment  |
| CSR4. Retailer support for (natural/local) cultural and sport events  |
| CSR5. Provision of support for schools (in this area/in Serbia)   |
| CSR6. Retailer efforts to help (local people in need/people in need in other countries).                        |
| SCSR. Consumer satisfaction with CSR performance of shopping centers  |

---

Shopping quality performance consists of six items and CSR performance of shopping centers consists of six items, as well. Five-point Likert scale was used for measuring perception, from 1 meaning "I completely disagree" to 5 meaning "I completely agree". Measuring consumer satisfaction with shopping quality performance of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction with CSR performance of shopping centers was done through one general question measured by five-point interval scale as well, where 1 meant "I completely disagree", and 5 "I completely agree".

## 2.2. Data analysis

Data analysis was performed in software called SPSS 11.0. Descriptive statistics was used to present the results of socio-demographical characteristics and environment and empathic concern of consumers. Alpha coefficient was introduced for measuring reliability of the model. The correlation between items in the model was determined by Pearson correlation coefficient. Regression model was used for measuring the influence of shopping quality performance and CSR performance of shopping centers on consumer satisfaction. Potential differences in consumer perception in shopping quality performance and CSR performance of shopping centers depending on socio-demographical characteristics and environment and empathic concern of consumers were determined by T-test and variance analysis One way ANOVA.

**3. Research Results**

**3.1. Sample description**

The sample consisted of slightly more male (58.8%) than female respondents (41.3%) (Table no. 2). Most of respondents belong to 21-40 age group (56.9%) and most of them are employed (72.5%). As far as the level of education is concerned, most of them finished high school (33.8%), while some of them are university graduates (25.6%) or finished college (21.3%). The majority of respondents receives from 151 € to 300 € (29.4%) monthly, and 25.0% of them has from 301 € to 500 € per month. 54.4% of the respondents have children.

**Table no. 2: Socio-demographical characteristics of respondents (N=160)**

| Socio-demographical characteristics | Percentage | Socio-demographical characteristics | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Sex:</b>                         |            | <b>Do you have children?</b>        |            |
| Male                                | 58.8       | Yes                                 | 54.4       |
| Female                              | 41.3       | No                                  | 45.6       |
| <b>Age:</b>                         |            | <b>Occupation:</b>                  |            |
| Up to 20                            | 3.8        | Student                             | 11.9       |
| 21-40                               | 56.9       | Employed                            | 72.5       |
| 41-60                               | 28.1       | Unemployed                          | 6.3        |
| More than 60                        | 11.3       | Retired                             | 9.4        |
| <b>Education:</b>                   |            | <b>Monthly income:</b>              |            |
| Elementary school                   | 0.0        | Do 150 €                            | 10.0       |
| High school                         | 33.8       | 151-300 €                           | 29.4       |
| College                             | 21.3       | 301-500 €                           | 25.0       |
| University diploma                  | 25.6       | 501-750 €                           | 21.9       |
| MA studies                          | 11.9       | Over 750 €                          | 13.8       |
| PhD studies                         | 7.5        |                                     |            |

The sample comprised 33.1% of blood donors and 50% of charity participants. Most of them are non-smokers (63.1%). 45% of them recycle their waste and 47.5% does some sport regularly (Table no. 3).

**Table no. 3: Environment and empathic concern of respondents (N=160)**

| Social responsibility of consumers | Percentage | Social responsibility of consumers         | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|------------|
| <b>Are you a blood donor?</b>      |            | <b>Do you participate in charities?</b>    |            |
| Yes                                | 33.1       | Yes  | 50.0       |
| No                                 | 66.9       | No   | 50.0       |
| <b>Do you smoke?</b>               |            | <b>Do you recycle your waste material?</b> |            |
| Yes                                | 36.9       | Yes  | 45.0       |
| No                                 | 63.1       | No   | 55.0       |
| <b>Do you do sport regularly?</b>  |            |  |            |
| Yes                                | 47.5       |  |            |
| No                                 | 52.5       |  |            |

### 3.2. Descriptive statistics and reliability

Descriptive statistics for all variables of the model is shown in Table no. 4 and Table no. 5. At the perceived shopping quality of shopping centers the highest marks were given to the items "Parking facilities and access" (M=4.35) and "Street lay-out and ambience" (M=4.21), while the lowest mark were attached to the items "Choice of cheap stores" and "Value for money in stores" (M=3.51).

**Table no 4: Mean scores of perceived shopping quality of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction**

|      | Items   | Mean | Std. D. |
|------|---|------|---------|
| Q1   | Choice of exclusive and service-oriented stores   | 3.61 | 1.160   |
| Q2   | Choice of cheap stores  | 3.47 | 1.312   |
| Q3   | Value for money in stores   | 3.51 | 1.110   |
| Q4   | Range of services like library, post office, banks, hair dressers, travel agency, pharmacy, advice bureau | 3.86 | 1.104   |
| Q5   | Street lay-out and ambience   | 4.21 | 0.948   |
| Q6   | Parking facilities and access   | 4.35 | 0.885   |
| SShQ | Consumer satisfaction with shopping quality performance of shopping centers                               | 3.78 | 0.868   |

At socially responsible activities of shopping centers the highest marks were given to the items "Concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP, ISO 26000) implementation" (M=3.92) and "Concern for (global/local) natural environment" (M=3.85), while the worst marks were given to the items "Provision of support for schools (in this area/in Serbia)" (M=3.42) and "Retailer support for better work conditions (in local industry/world-wide in industry)" (M=3.54). Overall consumer satisfaction with quality of shopping centers had the average value of M=3.78, and their overall satisfaction with corporate social responsibility of shopping centers was M=3.88.

**Table no. 5: Mean scores of perceived CSR actions of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction**

|      | Items  | Mean | Std. D. |
|------|--|------|---------|
| CSR1 | Concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP. ISO 26000) implementation      | 3.92 | 1.133   |
| CSR2 | Retailer support for better work conditions (in local industry/world-wide in industry) | 3.54 | 1.086   |
| CSR3 | Concern for (global/local) natural environment   | 3.85 | 1.065   |
| CSR4 | Retailer support for (natural/local) cultural and sport events                         | 3.77 | 1.077   |
| CSR5 | Provision of support for schools (in this area/in Serbia)                              | 3.42 | 1.256   |
| CSR6 | Retailer efforts to help (local people in need/people in need in other countries).     | 3.57 | 1.247   |
| SCSR | Consumer satisfaction with CSR performance of shopping centers                         | 3.88 | 1.063   |



Reliability analysis (Cronbach alpha) was conducted to test the internal reliability of shopping quality and CSR attributes. For shopping quality attributes Cronbach alpha was 0.7404, and for CSR attributes 0.9410, which confirms reliability.

**3.3. The impact of shopping quality performance and CSR performance of shopping centers on consumer satisfaction**

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to examine connection between variables of quality of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction. The results showed that all the variables are in positive correlation of medium intensity with consumer satisfaction (Table no. 6).

**Table no. 6: Pearson correlation coefficient between performative attributes of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction**

|                      | Q1               | Q2               | Q3               | Q4               | Q5               | Q6               |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Q1                   | 1                |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Q2                   | 0.043<br>0.588   | 1                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Q3                   | 0.707**<br>0.000 | 0.268**<br>0.001 | 1                |                  |                  |                  |
| Q4                   | 0.192*<br>0.015  | 0.386**<br>0.000 | 0.343**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |                  |
| Q5                   | 0.264**<br>0.001 | 0.212**<br>0.007 | 0.404**<br>0.000 | 0.625**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |
| Q6                   | 0.207**<br>0.009 | 0.035<br>0.633   | 0.290**<br>0.000 | 0.458**<br>0.000 | 0.706<br>0.000** | 1                |
| Satisfaction<br>SShQ | 0.506**<br>0.000 | 0.409**<br>0.000 | 0.694**<br>0.000 | 0.576**<br>0.000 | 0.624**<br>0.000 | 0.545**<br>0.000 |

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

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

Pearson correlation coefficient also showed that positive correlation between variables of socially responsible activities and consumer satisfaction has strong intensity (Table no. 7). Taking that into consideration, regression model was applied in order to further examine that connection.

**Table no. 7: Pearson correlation coefficient between CSR attributes of shopping centers and consumer satisfaction**

|                      | CSR1             | CSR2             | CSR3             | CSR4             | CSR5             | CSR6             |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| CSR1                 | 1                |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| CSR2                 | 0.706**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| CSR3                 | 0.688**<br>0.000 | 0.701**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |                  |                  |
| CSR4                 | 0.670**<br>0.000 | 0.753**<br>0.000 | 0.841**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |                  |
| CSR5                 | 0.546**<br>0.000 | 0.657**<br>0.000 | 0.766**<br>0.000 | 0.834**<br>0.000 | 1                |                  |
| CSR6                 | 0.621**<br>0.000 | 0.713**<br>0.000 | 0.756**<br>0.000 | 0.848**<br>0.000 | 0.863**<br>0.000 | 1                |
| Satisfaction<br>SCSR | 0.681**<br>0.000 | 0.757**<br>0.000 | 0.784**<br>0.000 | 0.854**<br>0.000 | 0.789**<br>0.000 | 0.813**<br>0.000 |

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

Regression model was used for testing the level at which consumer satisfaction with shopping quality of shopping centers can be predicted based on six examined quality variables (Table no. 8). Dependent variable was consumer satisfaction and independent variable attributes of quality of a shopping center. Regression analysis showed significant influence ( $F=62,098$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Six observed variables together predict 70% of variability of the consumer satisfaction. The biggest contribution has the variable "Value for money in stores" ( $\beta=0.387$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), followed by "Parking facilities and access" ( $\beta=0.243$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), "Choice of cheap stores" ( $\beta=0.207$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and "Range of services like library, post office, banks, hair dressers, travel agents, pharmacies, advice bureau" ( $\beta=0.207$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). The other two variables are not at the level of statistical significance.

**Table no. 8: Relative importance of shopping quality attributes in predicting the consumer satisfaction**

| Independent variables  | Beta  | t     | Sig.         |
|--|-------|-------|--------------|
| Choice of exclusive and service-oriented stores  | 0.110 | 1,750 | 0.082        |
| Choice of cheap stores   | 0.207 | 4,137 | <b>0.000</b> |
| Value for money in stores  | 0.387 | 5,676 | <b>0.000</b> |
| Range of services like library, post office, banks, hair dressers, travel agents, pharmacies, advice bureau  | 0.151 | 2,533 | <b>0.012</b> |
| Street lay-out and ambience  | 0.129 | 1,800 | 0.074        |
| Parking facilities and access  | 0.243 | 3.869 | <b>0.000</b> |
| R=0.842, R <sup>2</sup> =0.709, Adjusted R=0.697,<br>F=62.098, Sig =. 0.000<br>Dependant variable: Overall consumer satisfaction with shopping quality performance<br>Independent variables: 6 items representing the components of perceived quality performance of shopping center |       |       |              |

The second regression analysis was conducted in order to examine the level at which consumer satisfaction with social responsibility of shopping centers can be predicted based on six variables of socially responsible activities of shopping centers (Table no. 9). Therefore, dependent variable was consumer satisfaction with social responsibility of shopping centers while the independent variable was CSR activities. This regression analysis also showed a significant influence ( $F=96.019$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). The model predicts 79% variability of consumer satisfaction. The strongest influence comes from the following variables: "Retailer support for (national/local) cultural and sport events" ( $\beta=0.333$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), "Retailer efforts to help (local people in need/people in need in other countries)" ( $\beta=0.167$ ,  $p=0.05$ ) and "Retailer support for better work conditions (in local industry/world-wide in industry)" ( $\beta=0.161$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). The other three variables are not at the level of statistical significance.

**Table no. 9: Relative importance of CSR attributes in predicting the consumer satisfaction**

| <b>Independent variables</b>  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>t</b> | <b>Sig.</b>  |
|---|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP, ISO 26000) implementation   | 0.107       | 1,864    | 0.064        |
| Retailer support for better work conditions (in local industry/world-wide in industry)  | 0.161       | 2,570    | <b>0.011</b> |
| Concern for (global/local) natural environment  | 0.085       | 1,148    | 0.253        |
| Retailer support for (national/local) cultural and sport events   | 0.333       | 3,631    | <b>0.000</b> |
| Provision of support for schools (in this area/in Serbia)   | 0.137       | 1,670    | 0.097        |
| Retailer efforts to help (local people in need/people in need in other countries).  | 0.167       | 1,976    | <b>0.050</b> |
| R=0.889, R <sup>2</sup> =0.790, Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> =0.782<br>F=96,019, Sig = 0.000<br>Dependant variable: Overall consumer satisfaction with corporate social responsibility<br>Independent variables: 6 items representing the components of corporate social responsibility activities |             |          |              |

**3.4. Differences in consumer perception depending on socio-demographic characteristics and their environment and empathic concern**

During the research, authors tried to determine differences in consumer perception depending on their socio-demographic characteristics. Sex of the respondents did not result in any perception differences. It is interesting to notice that there were no differences in results depending on the age and presence and absence of children. The perception differences were detected depending on educational level (Table no. 10 and Table no.11) and occupation (Table no. 12 and Table no. 13) as far as the perception of social responsibility of shopping centers is concerned.

**Table no. 10: Differences in consumer perception depending on educational level**

| <b>Educational level</b>               |                | <b>Sum of Squares</b> | <b>df</b> | <b>Mean Square</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>Sig.</b>  |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|
| Quality of shopping in shopping centre | Between Groups | 3.958                 | 4         | 0.989              | 1.939    | 0.107        |
|  | Within Groups  | 79.069                | 155       | 0.510              |          |              |
|  | Total          | 83.026                | 159       |                    |          |              |
| Corporate Social responsibility        | Between Groups | 35.928                | 4         | 8.982              | 11.087   | <b>0.000</b> |
|  | Within Groups  | 125.578               | 155       | 0.810              |          |              |
|  | Total          | 161.507               | 159       |                    |          |              |

Since the difference in consumer perception depending on educational level was noticed, post hoc test (LSD) was applied to determine the categories of educational level which make the difference.

There are differences between respondents who finished high school and those belonging to the other educational level. The above mentioned respondents (with high school diploma) give lower marks to socially responsible behavior of shopping centers. There are, also, differences between respondents with university diplomas and those with college diplomas, and MA diplomas. The respondents who finished university gave higher marks to social responsibility of shopping centers.

**Table no. 11: Post Hoc test (LSD) for educational level**

| Dependent variable              | (I) Educational level | (J) Educational level | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig.  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------|
| Corporate social responsibility | High school           | College or university | -0.6752               | 0.19706    | 0.001 |
|                                 |                       | Graduate studies      | -1.2276               | 0.18645    | 0.000 |
|                                 |                       | MA studies            | -0.6737               | 0.24009    | 0.006 |
|                                 |                       | PhD studies           | -0.6744               | 0.28726    | 0.020 |
| Corporate social responsibility | University degree     | College or university | 0.5524                | 0.20878    | 0.009 |
|                                 |                       | MA studies            | 0.5539                | 0.24980    | 0.028 |

As far as consumer occupation is concerned, there are significant differences in perception of CSR performance of shopping centers. Therefore, students give lower marks than the employed and unemployed.

**Table no. 12: Differences in consumer perception depending on occupation**

| Occupation                              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.         |
|---|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|--------------|
| Quality of shopping in shopping centers | Between Groups | 3.389          | 3   | 1.130       | 2.213 | 0.089        |
|   | Within Groups  | 79.637         | 156 | 0.510       |       |              |
|   | Total          | 83.026         | 159 |             |       |              |
| Corporate social responsibility         | Between Groups | 8.046          | 3   | 2.682       | 2.726 | <b>0.046</b> |
|   | Within Groups  | 153.461        | 156 | 0.984       |       |              |
|   | Total          | 161.507        | 159 |             |       |              |

**Table no.13: Post Hoc test (LSD) for occupations**

| Dependent variable              | (I) Occupation | (J) Occupation | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig.  |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|-------|
| Corporate social responsibility | Student        | Employed       | -0.6575(*)            | 0.24547    | 0.008 |
|                                 |                | Unemployed     | -0.8026(*)            | 0.38749    | 0.040 |

One of our goals was to determine the existence of significant differences in consumer perception depending on their own socially responsible behavior. Determinants of socially responsible behavior of the respondents were: "Are you a blood donor?", "Are you a

smoker?”, “Do you participate in charities?”, “Do you recycle waste material?” and “Do you do sport regularly?” (Table no. 14) . The differences in respondents’ perception of quality in shopping centers were not noticed, although there were notable differences in the perception of social responsibility of shopping centers, as it was presumed. Namely, statistically important difference appeared in all determinants except in “Are you a smoker?”. Respondents who have environment and emphatic concern give significantly higher marks to socially responsible activities of shopping centers.

**Table no. 14: Differences in consumer perception depending on their environment and emphatic concern**

| Question                         | Answer | Factor                       | Mean   | Std. D. | t      | Sig.         |
|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| Are you a blood donor?           | Yes    | Shopping quality performance | 3.8428 | 0.66218 | 0.077  | 0.938        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.8333 | 0.75375 |        |              |
|                                  | Yes    | CSR performance              | 4.0786 | 0.87743 | 3.674  | <b>0.000</b> |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.4798 | 1.01294 |        |              |
| Do you participate in charities? | Yes    | Shopping quality performance | 3.8687 | 0.75412 | 0.564  | 0.574        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.8042 | 0.69293 |        |              |
|                                  | Yes    | Social responsibility        | 3.9438 | 1.10330 | 3.446  | <b>0.001</b> |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.4125 | 0.82718 |        |              |
| Are you a smoker?                | Yes    | Shopping quality performance | 3.8644 | 0.83533 | 0.373  | 0.710        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.8201 | 0.65179 |        |              |
|                                  | Yes    | CSR performance              | 3.5791 | 1.00447 | -0.950 | 0.344        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.7360 | 1.01030 |        |              |
| Do you recycle waste material?   | Yes    | Shopping quality performance | 3.9051 | 0.69134 | 1.087  | 0.279        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.7803 | 0.74645 |        |              |
|                                  | Yes    | CSR performance              | 3.9190 | 0.93698 | 2.792  | <b>0.006</b> |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.4811 | 1.02598 |        |              |
| Do you do sport regularly?       | Yes    | Shopping quality performance | 3.9189 | 0.70946 | 1.376  | 0.171        |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.7619 | 0.73052 |        |              |
|                                  | Yes    | CSR performance              | 3.8706 | 1.07724 | 2.311  | <b>0.022</b> |
|                                  | No     |                              | 3.5040 | 0.91250 |        |              |

**Conclusion**

The primary purpose of this study was to understand relationships among shopping quality in shopping centers, corporate social responsibility and consumer satisfaction. The secondary purpose was to examine differences in consumer perceptions toward shopping quality in shopping centers and CSR, depending on socio-demographic characteristics and environment and empathic concern of consumers. According to this, we proposed four hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that consumer satisfaction with quality of shopping in shopping centre depends on performative actions perceptions such as product offering, price level and accessibility. Performative attributes of shopping centers were taken from the study of the authors Oppewal, Alexander and Sullivan (2006). This hypothesis was confirmed employing multiple regression analysis. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ )

shows that the consumer satisfaction with quality of shopping in the centre is at 70% determined by the values of six performative attributes. The largest contributions have “value for many in stores” and “parking facilities and access.”

Secondly, it was hypothesized that consumer satisfaction with CSR performance of shopping centre depends on CSR actions perceptions. Five CSR attributes of shopping centers were also taken from the work of the authors Oppewal, Alexander and Sullivan (2006). The attribute, which refers to “concern for consumers through quality standards (HACCP, ISO 26000) implementation”, was added by the authors of this study. Multiple regression analysis indicated that six CSR attributes predicted 79% of the variation in consumer satisfaction with CSR performance. The largest contribution has „retailer support for (national/local) cultural and sport events.”

The following phenomena that were tested were consumer perceptions differences toward shopping quality performance and CSR performance in the centers depending on socio-demographic characteristics of consumers (hypothesis 3). This hypothesis was only partly confirmed. There are no perceptions differences toward shopping quality performance, but the consumer perceptions differences toward CSR performance exist only regarding the education level and occupation. There are no differences in terms of gender, age, income and having children, which is opposite to the assumed.

The fourth hypothesis stated that consumer perceptions differences in terms of environment and empathic concern of consumers exist toward CSR performance and do not exist toward shopping quality in the center. This hypothesis was not confirmed only in the consumer perceptions differences toward CSR performance in terms of „smokers“. It was found that there are no perceptions differences toward CSR performance between people who smoke and people who do not do that. In all other determinants consumer perceptions differences were found toward CSR performance.

To sum it up the results from this study tell us that performative and CSR attributes of shopping centers have high influence on consumer satisfaction and that consumer perceptions toward CSR performance differ depending on education level and occupation and environment and empathic concern of consumers.

Apart from theoretical confirmation of model reliability, the implication of the results suggests practical contribution for shopping centers managers. If they want to improve consumer satisfaction, they should focus on improving performative and CSR attributes suggested in this model, especially “value for many in stores” and “parking facilities and access” in terms of quality of shopping in the center and “retailer support for (national/local) cultural and sport events“ in terms of CSR performance.

Interviewers' experience tell us that consumers in Serbia are not familiar with CSR, which confirms large number of unused questionnaires. The state of social awareness of consumers after the period of eight years didn't change a lot. People are still not well informed about CSR and have low level of social responsibility consciousness. This was research limitation, but also valuable information for companies, which put into effect social responsibility. They must take more aggressive promotional campaigns about CSR, in order to inform consumers and differentiate themselves from competitors. Further researches can focus on discovering promotion activities that best influence raising awareness of CSR among consumers. Also, it could be measured whether CSR performance can induce people to become more socially responsible.

**References**

- Aldag, J.A. and Jackson, D.W., 1984. Measurement and Correlates of Social Attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3, pp. 142-151.
- Aldag, R.J. and Jackson, D.W., 1977. Assessment of Attitudes toward Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Administration*, 8, pp. 65-80.
- Arlow, P., 1991. Personal Characteristics in College Students' Evaluations of Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, pp. 63-69.
- Beliveau, B., Cottrill, M. and O'Neill, H.M., 1994. Predicting Corporate Social Responsiveness: A Model Drawn from Three Perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, pp. 731-738.
- Burton, B.K. and Hegarty, W.H., 1999. Some Determinants of Student Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation. *Business and Society*, 38, pp. 88-205.
- Caroll, A.B., 1979. A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4 (4), pp. 497-505.
- Carroll, A.B., 1991. The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, pp. 39-48.
- Creyer, E.H. and Ross, W.T., 1997. The influence of firm behavior of purchase motive: Do consumers really care about business ethics? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 14(6), pp. 421-432.
- Dahlsrud, A., 2008. How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), pp. 1-13
- Davis, K. and Blomstrom, R.L., 1975. *Business and society: environment and responsibility*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dawson, L.M., 1997. Ethical differences between men and women in the sales profession. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, pp. 1143-1152.
- Dinu, V., 2011. Corporate Social Responsibility – Opportunity for Reconciliation Between Economical Interests and Social and Environmental Interests. *Amfiteatru Economic*, XIII (29), pp. 6-7.
- Hage, J., 1980. *Theories in Organizations: Form, Process and Transformation*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Henriques, A., 2004. CSR, sustainability and the triple bottom line, In *The Triple Bottom Line: Does it all add up?* edited by A. Henriques and J. Richardson. London: Earthscan. pp. 26-33.
- Kidwell, J.M., Stevens, R.E. and Bethke, A.L., 1987. Differences in the Ethical Perceptions between Male and Female Managers: Myth or Reality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6, pp. 489-493.
- Kinder Lydenberg, Domini & Co. Inc., 1999. *Socrates: The Corporate Social Ratings Monitor*, Cambridge, MA: Kinder Lydenberg and Domini & Co. Inc.
- Lewin, A.Y., Sakano, T., Stevens, C.U. and Victor, B., 1995. Corporate citizenship in Japan: survey from Japanese firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(2), pp. 83- 101.
- Longnecker, J. G., McKinney, J.A. and Moore, C.W., 1989. Do Smaller Firms Have Higher Ethics? *Business and Society Review*, fall, pp. 19-21.

- Marrewijk, M., 2003. Concepts and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, pp. 95-105.
- McDonald, G.M. and Kan, P.C., 1997. Ethical Perception of Expatriate and Local Managers in Hong Kong. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, pp. 1605-1623.
- McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D., 2001. Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), pp. 117-127.
- Obrad, C., Petcu, D., Gherheș, V. and Suci, S., 2011. Corporate Social Responsibility in Romanian Companies – Between Perceptions and Reality. *Amfiteatru Economic*, XIII (29), pp. 43-55.
- Oppewal, H., Alexander, A. and Sullivan, P., 2006. Consumer perceptions of corporate social responsibility in town shopping centres and their influence on shopping evaluations. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 13, pp. 261-274.
- Quazi, A.M., 2003. Identifying the Determinants of Corporate Manger's Perceived Social Obligations. *Management Decision*, 41(9), pp. 822-831.
- Ruegger, D. and King, E.W., 1992. A study of the Effect of Age and Gender upon Student Business Ethics. *Journals of Business Ethics*, 11, pp. 179-186.
- Schlegelmilch, B.B., and Robertson, D.C., 1995. The Influence of Country and Industry on Ethical Perceptions of Senior Executives in the US and Europe. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26(4), pp. 859-879.
- Serwinek, P.J., 1992. Demographics and Related Differences in Ethical Views among Businesses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, pp. 555-566.
- Sethi, P.S., 1979. A Conceptual Framework for Environmental Analysis of Social Issues and Evaluation of Business Response Patterns. *Academy of Management Review*, 4 (1), pp. 63-74.
- Smart Kolektiv 2007. *Development of CSR*, Smart Kolektiv.
- Smeureanu, I., Dioșteanu, A., Delcea, C. and Cofas, L., 2011. Business Ontology for Evaluating Corporate Social Responsibility. *Amfiteatru Economic*, XIII (29), pp. 28-42.
- Smith, S.M. and Alcorn, D.S., 1991. Cause marketing: A new direction in the marketing of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 8(3), pp. 19-35.
- Spender, J. C., 1989. *Industry Recipes: An Inquiry into the Nature and Sources of Managerial Judgement*, Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Swanson, D.L., 1995. Addressing a theoretical problem by reorienting the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), pp. 43-64.
- Thomas, A.S., and Simerly, R.L., 1994. The Chief Executive Officers and Corporate Social Performance: An Interdisciplinary Examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3, pp. 959-968.
- Wartick, S.L. and Cochran, P.L., 1985. The evolution of the corporate social performance Model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), pp. 758-769.
- Wood, D.J., 1991. Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(4), pp. 691-718.
- Zaharia, R.M., Stancu, A., Stoian, C. and Diaconu, M., 2010. Commercial Activity's Contribution to Sustainable Development By Social Responsibility Actions: A Vision of SMEs. *Amfiteatru Economic*, XI (27), pp. 155-167.