

**CORPORATE SOCIAL PERFORMANCE:
A case study for Hopkins and Wood's framework in Brazilian confessional universities**

Eliseu V Machado Jr

Goiás Federal University (Universidade Federal de Goiás)
Rua Itália, Qd. 5, Lt. 5/6, Jardim Bandeirante, Goiás-GO, Brazil, Zip Code: 75083-040
E-mail: eliseumachadojr@hotmail.com

Eliseu V Machado Jr (Corresponding Author)

Goiás Federal University (Universidade Federal de Goiás)
Rua Itália, Qd. 5, Lt. 5/6, Jardim Bandeirante, Goiás-GO, Brazil, Zip Code: 75083-040
E-mail: eliseumachadojr@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The social responsibility field in the organizations has become recently a subject scholars have debated. There is a confusion related to "social actions," this way reducing the social responsibility scope as a philanthropic activity. This reductionism is inadequate, distorting the essence of what is supposed to be a socially responsible conduct. The present proposal intends to evaluate enterprises in the Corporate Social Responsibility – CSR. This research will investigate confessional universities in Brazil. These universities are skilled in financial reporting, but they have no good process for evaluating and reporting on the programs, activities, and outcomes that relate more directly to their educational and service missions. The research was developed by utilizing the multiple case study method. From the results, the framework should be refined. Also, the universities, according to this study case seem to align the social activities and projects to their strategies, once their strategic planning have consistent elements related to social responsibility.

Keywords: *Corporate Social Responsibility; Corporate Social Performance; Brazilian Confessional Universities; Case Study Method; Wood and Hopkins' Framework.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Scholars have spent a lot of energy and time trying to develop models on the social responsibility field, showing increasing concerns about social issues (Gregory, Tharyan, & Whittaker, 2014; Kang & Liu, 2014; Koh, Qian, & Wang, 2014). These concerns have arisen in relation to most activities, products, process and services in all different kinds of organizational environments. For example, how a firm should accommodate social actions and what really matters on these actions. Then, this project will investigate how to measure those social actions in organizations.

To find out how organizations measure the impact of their social deeds, the author decided to consider higher education organizations in Brazil. Among these institutions the confessional universities were chosen, which are organizations in higher education that have a relationship with a specific church(s) or religion and are ordinarily dependent upon that religion, through sponsorship and/or board oversight. Another consistent reason for selecting these universities is the privileged spot they have on the social responsibility field, once their mission and philanthropic activities are intrinsic to their nature and routine. The majority of confessional universities in Brazil are considered to be philanthropies and thus are required by law to use part of their income to help low-income communities and to assist students who cannot afford tuition. These universities are skilled in financial reporting, but they have no good process for evaluating and reporting on the programs, activities, and outcomes that relate more directly to their educational and service missions (Brazil, 1993).

There are many projects related to social activities developed by these universities in Brazil. Things happen, services and/or projects are provided, but the universities do not assess whether desired outcomes are achieved, service recipients are satisfied, or real needs are being met (Machado, 2009). For example, do these services meet the people's real needs? Is it seen as a valuable, worthwhile service? The university would like to think so, but without good measures, it is impossible to tell. Hence, this paper will construct and defend a framework and a methodology for these universities to begin reporting on their social responsibility goals and achievements.

The current paper was built upon the following sections. First, the research question will be disclosed followed by a justification of the method used. Next, a brief discussion on social performance indicators will take place. After that and still dealing with the methodology, the empirical study will be presented, the research methods will be established and the sample process will be explained. Before going to the results a section will bring about an overview about the Brazilian higher education system, then, the proposed data collection and results will follow. Finally, from those outcomes, a complete discussion on findings and scholarly implications and also conclusions for practical and social studies will be detailed.

2. RESEARCH QUESTION AND THE CASE STUDY METHOD

As mentioned before the research question for the sake of this paper will be: *How Brazilian confessional universities are measuring social actions?*

The research was developed by utilizing the multiple case study method (Yin, 1994). This type of method allows the researcher to observe issues in different contexts, because of the phenomenon replication, with no need to consider the sample rationale. Also, it allows an in-depth observation of the phenomenon. The qualitative research is adequate where a theory construction is desired. In the other hand, quantitative methods are better off for investigating theories. According to Bonoma (1985) if the goal is building up theories, the qualitative methods allow to comprehend the phenomenon in a deep way, considering the context itself. Yin (1994) reinforces the idea that the case study is a powerful research method used for understanding a social and complex phenomenon.

This method assumes that there is a higher level of details between individuals and organizations relationships. Also, it considers the interface with the environment where the phenomenon is happening. Another important aspect related to the case study method is the time consideration (Thiétart *et al.*, 2001). Contemporaneous events are seen to be analyzed by this method, showing that it is a more powerful tool than the historical analysis method. Pettigrew (1985) emphasizes that new research areas in social science have looking for general aspects of the problem analyzed, and that certainly calls for a more contextual approach itself. Following this direction it can be said that case study is applicable when the researcher wants to reach analytical generalization, not statistical, and this may contribute to build a theoretical model and/or concepts. Therefore, the author decided for the study case method that will provide a comprehensively understanding of the phenomenon.

3. SOCIAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The literature treats the performance indicators, or adequately named performance management, as the environment where corporate and functional strategies are implemented and managed in the organizations, business or operations. The central subsystem of management performance system are the indicators systems or performance measuring, that may, as its main objective, provide necessary and sufficient information to the manager who is the decision maker (Bititci, Carrie, & McDevitt, 1997); a measuring system that works effectively is considered the base for the performance management system. Then, it is very important for the decision making process to be effective provide what method or framework will be able to minimize the subjectivity that may come out from the decision process.

The majority of indicators developed are related to the financial field. The general term used for scholars to address measures on the social ground is known as CSP, which stands for Corporate Social Performance. Wartick and Cochran's (1985) and Wood (1991) produced a definition of CSP as "a business organization's configuration of principles of social responsibility, processes of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships" (Wood, 1991, p. 693). It can accommodate the wide variety of motives, behaviors, and outcomes actually found in business organizations. It does not isolate corporate social performance as something completely distinct from business performance. Also, it permits CSP to be seen not as something that is implicitly good in itself and "desirable" for firms "to have," or that is linked to particular but unspoken values, but as a construct for evaluating business outputs that must be used in conjunction with explicit values about appropriate business-society relationships.

Wood (1991) proposed a model that considers 3 dimensions: legitimacy, public responsibility, and managerial discretion. Legitimacy is a societal-level concept and describes the responsibility of business as a social institution that must avoid abusing its power (Davis, 1973; Wood, 1991)

Public responsibility refers to "the functions of organizational management within the specific context of public policy" (Preston & Post, 1975, p. 10), which is defined broadly as "the principles that guide action relating to society as a whole" (1975, p. 11).

The principle of managerial discretion is premised on the following ideas “(a) managers exist in an organization and societal environment that is full of choices, (b) managers’ actions are not totally prescribed by corporate procedures, formal job definitions, resource availabilities, or technologies, and (c) managers are moral actors on the job as well as in other domains of their lives” (Wood, 1991, p. 699).

Hopkins (1997, 1999) turn Wood’s model into a framework named *Corporate Social Performance Framework*. It was developed to assess socially responsible enterprises. There are nine elements from an analytical model that “allow the visualization of dimensions and relationships of a socially responsible enterprise” (Queiroz, 2005, p. 95). From each element was extracted and classified some indicators of social responsibility. The indicators are standard, meaning that they would be able to fit different types of companies.

For each indicator, Hopkins (1997, 1999) suggests a specific measure format. The indicator goal is to provide ground to a social auditing and also to contribute to a general social ranking system that allows comparisons among companies. Therefore, this paper will investigate Brazilian Universities based on Hopkins framework.

4. EMPIRICAL STUDY

The decision for confessional universities – which are organizations in higher education that have a relationship with a specific church(s) or religion and are ordinarily dependent upon that religion, through sponsorship and/or board oversight – had basically three reasons: 1) Because they provide services; 2) Because of their complexity as an organization, since they have all parts an industry does plus a complex structure to manage the academic area; and 3) Because of their social identity, which means the privileged spot they have on the social responsibility field, once their mission and philanthropic activities are intrinsic to their nature and routine.

The author interviewed the head of each university visited. Before the interview took place the researcher sent to the interviewee the entire questionnaire by electronic mail, to give the respondent time to analyze and be prepared for the interview. The person interviewed in the university organizational structure represents the one who is in charge of the university as a whole, the highest level in the hierarchy.

The majority of Brazilian confessional universities are philanthropic. There are about 50 in Brazil. The author contacted eight confessional universities randomly, but only four responded. Then he set the appointment for the interview. The research data collection was developed by utilizing personal interviews with the Head of the university. The instrument was a semi-structured questionnaire with open-ended questions distributed into three sections. The first section was intended to understand the organization, and then questions about the structure, amount of employees and the kind were done. This section is called *University Profile*. The next one is related to *Performance Indicators*. The purpose was to identify the performance indicators used. Also, it was desired to comprehend the formulation process of those indicators. The last section is related to the *Hopkins Framework* (Hopkins, 1997, 1999) and how the organization responds to it. The case studies investigated the interviewees perception about the way those universities assess their social performance.

Each interviewee was assured that the information gathered would be handled in a strictly confidential manner. Confidentiality was considered critical because of the sensitive nature of the topic and because of the importance of obtaining candid, honest information. Each interviewee granted permission to audiotape the interviews. The files from the interview were transformed to an mp3 format that was possible because a digital voice recorder was used. These files were later transcribed.

In order to keep the confidentiality the universities were identified as A, B, C, and D. **Table 1** below shows the main features for the four universities:

Table 1 – Universities main features

5. BRAZILIAN HIGHER EDUCATION OVERVIEW

There is tons of legislation on higher education in Brazil. For the sake of this paper it will be touched only some important characteristics in order to provide an overview. First, in Brazil there are basically three types of “pure” higher education organizations. The whole concept has to do with autonomy. The first level or category is identified as *Faculty*. They are generally organizations with few graduation courses, sometime in a specific field, such as business and technology (Brazil, 1988). They are also very dependent on the Ministry of Education - MEC (Department of Education) for any kind of concession, for instance the establishment of an under-graduate course. The majority of those do not carry graduate programs, nor research areas. The next category is called *University Center*. These organizations are recognized sometimes as the intermediary step between “Faculty” and “University”. They have more autonomy than faculties, for example they are able to

establish the majority of under-graduate courses by themselves. In addition, they might have graduate programs, mainly masters programs and also research areas. The last category is the *University*. They have the highest level of autonomy in the Brazilian Higher Education System. They also carry graduate programs, and research areas and centers. They are obliged by the MEC to fulfill several quotas, for example the percentage of their faculty members has to hold a masters or doctorate degree (Brazil, 2006). There is also a distinction between private and public sectors, and if they belong to a municipal, state, or federal sphere. Hence, this analysis will not be developed in this paper.

Therefore, the author chose the universities, mainly because their complexity as an organization.

5.1. Categories

According to the present Brazilian legislation (Brazil, 1996) private education institutions have the following categories: a) private institutions; b) communitary institutions; c) confessional institutions; and d) philanthropic institutions. Communitary Institutions have to encompass in their board people from the community. Confessional universities have to be both somehow connected to a religious body or ideology and be a communitary institution. The philanthropic institutions have requirements by a specific law (Brazil, 1993). The private institutions are the ones that do not belong to any other category already mentioned.

5.2. Philanthropic Certificate

In Brazil to be philanthropic the organizations has to receive a certificate from the Social Development Ministry (SDM). All interviewee in some sense mentioned the problem among three ministries on the Federal sphere in Brazil: education, social development, and social security ministries. To be considered a Philanthropic organization the SDM, through a council (CNAS – Social Assistance National Council), issues the certificate. In order to get that certificate the university sent a report to CNAS showing that 20% (at minimum) has to be designated to social assistance (for free). The Social Security Ministry, that is responsible to collect the taxes, always disagree with SDM and sue the organization because there is no agreement between these two government areas (Brazil, 1993).

6. PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION AND RESULTS

The interview had three parts. The first one was designed to better understand the university profile. Then, in a semi-structured questionnaire, a group of open-ended questions was addressed. The items asked were:

1. Strategic planning (mainly mission and vision);
2. Research area;
3. Community extension programs; and,
4. Any other relevant information the Head would like to share.

The next part was related to performance indicators. The intention here was also to comprehend how these universities deal with this issue. In other words, what are the performance indicators utilized by the university? How are they developed? And the like.

The last part was about the Hopkins framework (Hopkins, 1997, 1999). The respondent was supposed to answer the questions from the model. Three universities (except A) also indicated suggestions about Hopkins Framework.

Next, the part 1 and 2, which were related to profile and indicators and also relevant information considered by the head, will be presented for each university.

Table 2 displays three elements related to the universities profile, they are: strategic planning, research, and community extension programs.

Table 2 – Universities profile

All four universities have their strategic planning formally. They have been changing their mission to accommodate present perspectives, social responsibility field, and financial context. In some way all four has established the focus on social actions or activities as one of their main strategies.

Research as mentioned by one university is immune to management changes. This is justified by the legal request the government agency that controls and accredits the universities requires. Two universities are in the process of internationalizing the research area.

The majority of the extension programs are not systematized yet. All four reinforced the idea that these programs in some way are their dorsal spinal, meaning their commitment to the society; one said that they are the *differentiator element* the universities have. Because of the social trend that is going on nowadays, they are getting more attention. One interesting thing about these programs is that they are generally voluntary; meaning no payment for those, then the commitment to them to take place is somewhat difficult.

About the performance indicators, none has a global system; they basically use financial measures and also those indicators requested by the accredited government agency (Brazil, 2004). The government agency requires for each university to have an autonomous committee. When this research took place three universities were developing or working on the system that will fit the most on their demands and/or in a new performance measures.

The Hopkins framework will be analyzed next (Hopkins, 1997, 1999). **Table 3** provides the responds given by the universities.

Table 3 – Hopkins Framework

The first level – **principles of social responsibility**, *legitimacy* basically evaluates the code of ethics. None of the universities analyzed publish or distribute their code of ethics. Also, they do not have an independent group monitoring their code. All four universities believe that the regiment has the majority of contents for a code of ethics; therefore, no university has a document named code of ethics. The regiment has disciplinary procedures that include duties and rights for everyone in the organization. There is also a research committee that supervises all human and animal researches. All documents are available on the internet.

Public responsibility is the next item. They all responded the same way. None of them have litigation or fines. They all have budget designated to innovation, which is under Research and Development area. They do not mention the percentage designated. Also they mention very low turnover and highly job stability. All four showed an extremely low turnover, then it was learned that this phenomenon, since they have low growing rate, creates only few jobs. On the other hand, they all have several programs to assist students with their professional jobs and also apprenticeship. Monitors programs are also highly supported by these institutions. They do not mention the amount. It was said that they build bridges among companies, helping the students to get into the work force. Again, there is no document named “Code of Ethics”. According to the interviewees there are documents provided to employees on the hiring process. Two Universities (C & D) mentioned that they required for all new employees to read and agree with those rules. They complied about the Philanthropic Certificate issued by a council (CNAS) that is connected to the SDM. The Social Security Ministry always, according to the interviewees, disagrees in some extent, with the standards utilized by CNAS. This certificate is always on litigation. All four mentioned the lack of understanding among the government ministries (See section 5 – Brazilian Higher Education Overview)

In the *managerial discretion* item, there is also no code of ethics for managers, meaning that there is no manager trained on the code of ethics. No managers are convicted of illegal activities.

The second level is related to the **process of social responsibility** and also has three levels of analysis. The first one is related to the environmental scanning. All four mentioned they have a mechanism to review social issues that are relevant to the university. In the stakeholders management level all four mentioned they have an analytical body for social issues as integral part of policy making, but they do not have social audit neither ethical accounting statement. Three Universities (except B) mentioned that they have the Corporate Social Responsibility Report, which is, in a sense, a report for the society related to the social actions developed. All four declared that the government (Ministry of Education) has an appraisal instrument that measures in some extent social actions (Brazil, 2004). In the level of issues of management all has policies made on basis of analysis of social issues.

The last level is related to the **outcomes of social responsibility**. The first element refers to the internal stakeholder effect. According to the interviewees the universities have a legal structure that does not allow shares. All surpluses are reinvested in the university itself. All four relied on their cash flows numbers as an important tool. It was not mentioned the financial numbers. There is no corporate irresponsibility or illegal activity. All four provide donations; they do not mention the amount. All four gives at least 20% as a legal requirement, although they all mentioned that they always surpass this amount.

Managers are not trained in code of ethics, because there is no code. Also, there is no rank available for the same reason. On the employees side they mentioned good relation with unions, with no litigation or fines. All 4

mentioned benefits such as health insurance, scholarships, food assistance, and transportation support. They also stated that they are very committed to the employee well-being. About the policies for minorities all stated that they do not carry any policies on these issues.

The next item is related to the external stakeholder effect, once there is no code of ethics for customers the items were not covered. The same conclusion is related on the suppliers' side.

On the natural environment all four mentioned they have recycle programs. There is no litigation and/or fine on that subject. One (B) has an agreement with Germany to exchange technology. Others two (C & D) declared that they helped to create cooperatives. All four follow the rules related to toxic waste, mainly related to hospital waste. They utilize recycling and recycled products, but do not mention the amount. There is a percentage of corporate giving to the community. They affirmed that the amount always surpasses the legal requirement. All four are highly involved with communities, mainly those with low income profile.

The last element is about the external institutional effect. There is no generic litigation related to the business as a social institution and also, no class action suits. All mentioned that the public policy and legislation somehow was improved due to pressure from corporation.

7. ANALYSIS, CONCLUSION, AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

All four universities mentioned they have published what is named Social Report. It is a new practice for all institutions, mainly related to "social" projects. This report shows basically every single social activity, describing the amount of people involved, the services provided, amount of money spent and details about each project. It is important to point out that these universities are philanthropic nature, then by Brazilian regulation on this issue, they are obliged to give away at least 20% of their income. According to their social reports they basically concentrate their giving on scholarships and social projects.

Hopkins' framework was developed for "product-type" companies. The interviewees found it difficult to answer some questions, because they are strictly related to product type companies. Then, in order to be more accuracy and once the research has been developed in service-type organizations, the framework should in some way be adapted.

From the view point of the universities heads, the research question "*How Brazilian confessional universities are measuring social actions?*" is answered by both a) the social report; and b) the requirements from the educational Brazilian legislation.

They suggested the following to be changed and/or incorporated to the framework. University B suggested that it could be incorporated the following measures to assess: a) the projects the university provides to communities; b) the resources fomented mainly by the government agencies; and c) the partnerships (agreements) with other organizations. University C understood that a research should be done with communities and representative sectors from society to identify: a) the university meaning for them, and b) its legitimacy. It is also desired a better understanding of code of ethics (universities have a regiment where there are chapters related to the disciplinary conduct. Is that enough? Could it be just added some items to that regiment turning it to a code of ethics?). University D said that it should add qualitative aspects to the model. Also, it was asked the real meaning of the code of ethics. It also should be changed the "business" language to accommodate the university environment and the concept of social responsibility should be connected to sustainable development. University A has no suggestions to be incorporated in the framework.

It is suggested that other researches could be developed, aiming at a deeper analysis in other dimensions of the corporate social performance, for example the impact of the stakeholders' relationship in the firm performance; the marketing or institution visibility impact; and the impact on the decision making process side; just to mention a few. In Brazil, particularly, new researches in other service institutions could be developed to provide a comparison with these findings, by the way using the suggestions made by the universities' heads.

One point that should be worth mentioning is the reliability, which according to Thiétart *et al.* (2001) consists in establishing and verifying the answers obtained and checking whether those will be able to be repeated with the same results or answers. Yin (1994) states that in the qualitative interviews, reliability is ensured through documentation of the research process. In other words it would be very good to double-check how they responded on the interviews by asking other sources or by consulting documents, such as the social report mentioned by all interviewees. In short, what those reports include and how things are measured and described. For example, the rectors say they have no fines or violations, but would they tell if they did? They have to give

20% away, but they don't tell how much? They tally their service activities but don't tell about them? Is there an independent way to check?

Another research avenue on CSP would be how firms manage their activities on the social responsibility field, this should be a vast and wide potential field for future researches. What really counts? According to this study case the universities seem to align the social activities and projects to their strategies, once their strategic planning have consistent elements related to social responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Bititci, U. S.; Carrie, A. S.; McDevitt, L. (1997). Integrated performance measurement systems: a development guide. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 17 (5), 692-704.
- Bonoma, T.V. (1985). Case Research in Marketing: opportunities, problems and a process. *Journal of Marketing Research*, v. 22, may, 199-208.
- Brazil. (1988). *Brazilian Constitution*. Brasília: National Congress.
- Brazil. (1993). *Social Assistance Organic Law no. 8,742*. Brasília: National Congress.
- Brazil. (1996). *Federal Law no. 9,394*. Brasília: National Congress.
- Brazil. (2004). *Law Project no. 10,861*. Brasília: National Congress.
- Brazil. (2006). *Law Project no. 7,200*. Brasília: National Congress.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 312-322.
- Gregory, Alan; Tharyan, Rajesh; Whittaker, Julie.(2014). Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Value: Disaggregating the Effects on Cash Flow, Risk and Growth. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2014, 124 (4), 633-657.
- Hopkins, M.(1997). Defining indicators to assess socially responsible enterprises. *Futures*, Kidlington, 29 (7), 581-604, 1997.
- Hopkins, M. (1999). *The Planetary Bargain: Corporate Social Responsibility comes of age*. London: Macmillan.
- Kang, Hsin-Hong; Liu, Shu-Bing. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and corporate performance: a quantile regression approach. *Quality & Quantity*, 48 (6), 3311-3325.
- Koh, P. S.; Qian, C. L.; Wang, H. L. (2014). Firm litigation risk and the insurance value of corporate social performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35 (10), 1464-1482.
- Machado, Eliseu V., Jr. (2009). *Stakeholders' Synergy: a management framework for bridging who and what really counts – A case study for Brazilian universities*. Doctoral Dissertation, Methodist University of Piracicaba, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1985). *Contextualist research: A natural way to link theory and practice*. In E. E. Lawler (Ed.). *Doing Research That is Useful in Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Preston, L. E., & Post, J. E. (1975). *Private management and public policy: The principle of public responsibility*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Queiroz, Adele. 2005. *Hopkins Indicators*. In Patrícia A. Ashley (Ed.). *Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility*. Saraiva. São Paulo, Brazil. pp. 95-109.
- Thiétart, Raymond-Alain. Et al. 1999. *Doing Management Research: A comprehensive guide*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 758-769.
- Wood, Donna J. 1991. Corporate Social Performance Revisited. *Academy of Management Review*; 16; 691-718.
- Yin, R. K. 1994. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

TABLES

University	Projected Budget ⁽¹⁾ US\$	Amount of Students ⁽²⁾	Amount of Employees
A	75 millions	17,000	1,660
B	62.4 millions	14,000	1,350
C	81.3 millions	19,500	1,939
D	106.4 millions	25,500	2,780

(1) Exchange Rate: 1 US\$ = 2.40 R\$

(2) Under-graduate and Graduate Students

Table 1 – Universities main features

	UNIVERSITY A	UNIVERSITY B	UNIVERSITY C	UNIVERSITY D
Strategic Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been working since 2002. • It caused a huge change on its mission: this instrument has decentralized decision-making process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been working since 2003. • It has been revised recently to accommodate new mission (social responsibility) and financial situation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its mission is related to sustainability. Not only with economic development, but also natural environment, society values, equity, etc. • It has two central strategies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Pastorality</i> 2) <i>Extensionality</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is working very well. • Everyone is allowed to participate in the process and everything is documented.
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a fund that controls the budget for this area. • The designated financial budget always surpasses its initial amount. • The area is immune to management process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a challenge, because of the difficulty to implement such a culture. • It is initiating worldwide research and developing international agreements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It responds the needs, not only the society demands (which are more related to marketing). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an approval of a State Government Agency (new). • It is internationalizing this area.
Community Extension Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most programs are not systematized yet (not recorded). • Faculty does not pay attention to it. • They improve the institutional visibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are the differentiator element, which means their commitment to the society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an articulated instrument, creating a friendly atmosphere, promoting relationships among the actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are now getting more attention because of the visibility, meaning that internal and external communities are now acknowledging these programs.
Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It uses financial measures and government requirements measures. • They started a process to establish new indicators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It uses government requirements measures. • It has an internal Autonomous Committee (CPA), which is also a legal obligation. • It is also evaluated by nearby communities. • They use all measures to revise and improve services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not have a performance management system. • They are currently working on the process of deciding a system that will fit university features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no global system. • Most are related to financial indicators. • They are working on the process of deciding a system that will fit university features.

Table 2 – Universities profile

Elements of SRE Model	Indicator	Measure	Numerical Classification recommended or other quantitative measure	University Responses			
				UNIVERSITY A	UNIVERSITY B	UNIVERSITY C	UNIVERSITY D
LEVEL I – PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY							
Legitimacy	1. Code of Ethics ⁱ	Published?	Yes/No	No	No	No	No
	2. Code of Ethics	Distributed to employees?	Yes/No	No	No	No	No
	3. Code of Ethics	Independent Group does monitoring?	Yes/No	No	No	No	No
Public Responsibility	1. Litigation involving corporate lawbreakings ⁱⁱ	Amount, size	Amount, size	No litigation	No litigation	No litigation	No litigation
	2. Fines resulting from illegal activities	Amount?	Amount	No Fines	No Fines	No Fines	No Fines
	3. Contribution to innovation ⁱⁱⁱ	R&D Expenditure	\$	Existent	Existent	Existent	Existent
	4. Job creation ^{iv}	Number of net jobs created	Number of net jobs created	Very low turnover and highly job stability	Very low turnover and highly job stability	Very low turnover and highly job stability	Very low turnover and highly job stability
Managerial discretion	1. Code of Ethics ^v	Managers and employees trained?	Amount of trained employees (% of the Total)	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics
	2. Managers convicted of illegal activities	Amount?	Amount	Nobody	Nobody	Nobody	Nobody
LEVEL II – PROCESS OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY							
Environmental scanning	1. Mechanism to review social	Exists?	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	issues relevant to firm						
Stakeholders management	1. Analytical body for social issues as integral part of policy making	Exists?	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	2. Social audit exists? ^{vi}	Exists?	Yes/No	No	No	No	No
	3. Ethical accounting statement exists?	Exists?	Yes/No	No	No	No	No
Issues management	1. Policies made on basis of analysis of social issues	Firm's regulations and policies	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

LEVEL III – OUTCOMES OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

	Stakeholder groups (assumed)	Indicator	Measure				
Internal stakeholder effects	Owners	1. Profitability/valu ^e ^{vii}	Share value, return on investment, and so on	See endnote #7	See endnote #7	See endnote #7	See endnote #7
		2. Corporate irresponsibility or illegal activity	Fines, numbers of product recalls, pollution performance measured against some industry standard	None	None	None	None
		3. Community welfare ^{viii}	Amount of giving, programs as percentage of earnings	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		4. Corporate Philanthropy ^{ix}	Amount of pre-tax giving as percentage	20%	20%	20%	20%

	Managers		of earnings				
		5. Code of Ethics ^x	Published, distributed, trained	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics
		1. Code of Ethics ^{xi}	Trained in code of ethics and apply in demonstrable and measurable ways	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics
		2. Code of Ethics	Rank of manager responsible for applying code	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics	No code of ethics
	Employees	1. Union/Staff relations	Evidence of controversy, good relations	Good relations	Good relations	Good relations	Good relations
		2. Safety issues	Litigation, fines	No litigation or fines	No litigation or fines	No litigation or fines	No litigation or fines
		3. Pay, pension and benefits ^{xii}	Relative ranking to similar firms (measuring percentage spent on employees benefits, programs, and so on)	See endnote #12	See endnote #12	See endnote #12	See endnote #12
		4. Layoffs ^{xiii}	Percentage, frequency, individual chosen	See endnote #13	See endnote #13	See endnote #13	See endnote #13
		5. Employee ownership ^{xiv}	Percentage (%)	See endnote #7	See endnote #7	See endnote #7	See endnote #7
6. Women and minorities policies		Existence, rank with similar firms, litigation and fines	There is a women and minority policy	There is a women and minority policy	There is a women and minority policy	There is a women and minority policy	

Table 3 – Hopkins Framework

ENDNOTES

ⁱ All four believe that the regiment has the majority of contexts for a code of ethics, but no university has a document named code of ethics. The regiment has discipline procedures, that include duties and rights for everyone in the organization. There is also a research committee that supervises all human and animal research. All documents are available on the internet.

ⁱⁱ All four mentioned the lack of understanding among the government ministries (See section 5 – Brazilian Higher Education Overview). They complied about the philanthropic certificate issued by a council (CNAS) that is connected to the SDM. The Social Security Ministry always, according to the interviewees, disagrees in some extent, with the standards utilized by CNAS. This certificate is always on litigation.

ⁱⁱⁱ All four have an amount designated to research and development. They do not mention the percentage.

^{iv} All four showed an extremely low turnover, then it was learned that this phenomenon, since they have low growing rate, creates only few jobs. On the other hand, they all have several programs to assist students with their professional jobs and also apprenticeship. Monitors programs are also highly supported by these institutions. They do not mention the amount. It was said that they build bridges among companies, helping the students to get into the work force.

^v Again, there is no document named “Code of Ethics”. According to the interviewees there are documents provided to employees on the hiring process. Two universities (C & D) mentioned that they required for all new employees they read and agreed with those rules.

^{vi} Three universities (except B) mentioned that they have social report, which is, in a sense, a report for the society related to the social actions developed. All four also declared that the government (Ministry of Education) has an appraisal instrument that measures in some extent social actions.

^{vii} According to the interviewees the universities have a legal structure that does not allow shares. All surpluses are reinvested in the university itself. All four relied on their cash flows numbers as an important tool. It was not mentioned the financial numbers.

^{viii} All four provide donations. They do not mention the amount.

^{ix} All four give at least 20%, although they all mentioned they have always surpassed this amount.

^x Refers to endnote #1.

^{xi} Refers to endnote #1.

^{xii} All four mentioned benefits such as health insurance, scholarships, food assistance, transport support. They also mentioned the employee policies, which are very committed to the employee well-being.

^{xiii} Refers to endnote #4.

^{xiv} Refers to endnote #7.