Journal of Advances in Developmental Research (IJAIDR)

E-ISSN: 0976-4844 ● Website: www.ijaidr.com ● Email: editor@ijaidr.com

A Study of Age-Wise Differences in Community Perceptions of Community Welfare CSR Initiatives of Public Sector Industries in Southern Rajasthan

Dr. Seema Dhabhai[1], Rajendra Singh Chouhan[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, [2]Research Scholar
[1,2]Department of Economics, Janardan Rai Nagar, Rajasthan Vidyapeeth
(Deemed to be University), Udaipur (Rajasthan)

Abstract:
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities are increasingly examined through the perceptions of communities associated with industrial operations. This study sought to compare community perceptions of community welfare CSR initiatives undertaken by selected public sector industries in Southern Rajasthan across different age groups. A cross-sectional quantitative survey framework was applied to 200 respondents selected through purposive sampling in Udaipur, Rajsamand and Chittorgarh Districts of Southern Rajasthan. An eight-statement instrument measured overall community welfare CSR perceptions on a five-point agreement scale. Responses marked unable to assess were excluded from scale calculations, and descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance were used. The overall perception mean was 3.08 (SD = 0.53), and the eight-item complete-case Cronbach's alpha was 0.622. One-way ANOVA did not identify a statistically significant age group-wise difference, $F(4, 195) = 1.61$, $p = 0.172$. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The findings do not establish a systematic difference between the specified demographic groups in the available sample.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility; community welfare; age-wise perceptions; public sector industries; Southern Rajasthan

INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a means for companies to participate in community development projects outside their normal business activities. Types of community development projects include job training, livelihood support, women's programs, programs to assist other disadvantaged community members, and programs to increase community participation. Assessing the benefits of community development programs should include community input on the appropriateness of these programs to address community needs.

Public-sector CSR research topics include corporate-community relations and community development. This study examined CSR initiatives at RIICO and RSMML in Southern Rajasthan. This study did not

collect income data for individuals and organizations. Surveys were administered to gauge community members' attitudes about community development activities associated with CSR at both organizations.
Community welfare programs provide benefits to various age groups. Youth benefits may include access to job training and other services. Other age-group benefits may include access to and continued use of community services. The benefits cited are not limited to the current study participants. Research comparing the experiences of different age groups with community welfare programs could help determine whether different age groups evaluate the programs differently.
The eight survey questions involve social issues, training and employment, issues related to women, assistance to other poor members of the community, political participation, other social issues, and general well-being. The eight survey questions could be combined into a single measure of broad welfare-oriented perceptions for descriptive and comparative purposes.
A cross-age comparison is more informative than a single overall rating. It allows researchers to assess whether variations in program ratings by age are large enough to be statistically significant to infer differences by age group and program or too close or variable to support a statistically significant distinction. Assessing cross-age differences is important in research on inclusive programs to avoid assumptions about differences by demographic group in program benefits.
This study surveys members of five different age groups in the Udaipur, Rajsamand, and Chittorgarh districts of southern Rajasthan state to learn their views on corporate social responsibility efforts to benefit the community. This study examines significant differences in views on welfare programs among members of five age groups surveyed in this study about the same industries. Findings from this study may be useful in other ways, such as distinguishing general views on welfare programs from views on particular features of those programs.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kumar, Gupta, and Das (2022) investigated CSR initiatives and community development by collecting input from India's coal-mining sector beneficiaries. Other research links community development initiatives to other forms of development and resilience.
Narula, Magray, and Desore (2017) developed a CSR framework for mining communities, focusing on livelihood issues. Many of the issues raised in their framework, such as vocational training and other community issues, are also addressed in the welfare statements provided by this tool.
Reji (2024) examined the developmental programs of a government corporation in rural areas. Suggested factors for development program success include institutional commitment and stakeholder partnerships. Applications of the paper include other welfare programs, as total expenditures may not be good indicators of success for those programs. The paper discusses perspectives of both beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries.
Mohapatra (2022) reviewed public-sector rural development projects in public industrial contexts and identified challenges with meeting rural needs in those projects. Challenges similar to those reported by Mohapatra exist in other programs serving other populations.
Srivastava and Srivastava (2023) examine CSR investment in health care and education at public and private firms. Comparison of findings in their study shows diversity in other social issues addressed by CSR investments. We construct a composite social welfare indicator using factors related to skill development, livelihoods, social support, and inclusion in this study.

Kulkarni and Aggarwal (2024) found little business interest in some social areas related to mandatory CSR activities for businesses.

Research Gap

Research on community welfare CSR examines livelihoods, participation and development, but it provides insufficient basis for assuming that age groups in the selected Southern Rajasthan districts evaluate welfare-oriented initiatives differently.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Objective

To compare community perceptions of community welfare CSR initiatives undertaken by selected public sector industries in Southern Rajasthan across different age groups.

Research Design and Approach

The study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional, descriptive and comparative survey design. Descriptive statistics summarised the ratings given to the questionnaire statements, while the comparative component tested whether mean overall perception scores differed between the predefined respondent groups. As the observations were cross-sectional, the analysis measured group differences rather than the causal effect of demographic characteristics.

Population and Sample

The target population comprised community respondents, including beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of CSR initiatives associated with RIICO and RSMML in Udaipur, Rajsamand and Chittorgarh Districts of Southern Rajasthan. The respondent was the unit of analysis. A final sample of 200 respondents was obtained using purposive sampling. As purposive sampling was employed without a probability sampling frame, the findings are not considered statistically representative of the target population.

Sources of Data and Measurement

Primary data obtained through the structured questionnaire provided the empirical evidence. The instrument contained respondent-profile and CSR-benefit questions and eight statements measuring community welfare CSR perceptions. Responses were coded 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. “Unable to assess / Don’t know” was a non-scale response and was treated as missing. The composite score was calculated as the arithmetic mean of valid item responses, subject to a minimum requirement of six valid statements. No reverse scoring was required because all items were positively worded.

Variables and Analytical Groups

The grouping variable was age group, comprising 18–30, 31–40, 41–50, 51–60, and 61 and above. The dependent measure was the composite mean of CWP1–CWP8.

Reliability Testing

Table 1.1: Reliability Testing

Construct	Items	Complete-case N	Cronbach’s alpha
Community Welfare CSR Perceptions	8	167	0.622

The eight-item perception measure produced Cronbach's alpha = 0.622, calculated among 167 respondents with complete item responses. This estimate indicates modest internal consistency and is interpreted cautiously rather than taken as evidence of perfect measurement. No statement was deleted or recoded merely to increase the coefficient.

Statistical Tools and Techniques

Item frequencies, valid response percentages, means and standard deviations were computed for the eight statements. Overall perception scores were compared using one-way ANOVA at α = .05. A median-centred Levene test examined equality of variances. Residual normality was also assessed. No post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted following the non-significant overall ANOVA result. No causal inference was made.

RESPONDENT PROFILE AND PERCEPTION ANALYSIS

Table 1.2: Respondents by Age group

Age group	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18–30	53	26.50
31–40	45	22.50
41–50	55	27.50
51–60	24	12.00
61 and above	23	11.50

The distribution of respondents across age group categories is shown above. The age groups consisted of unequal numbers of respondents, reflecting the observed sample distribution. The use of purposive sampling limits population-level inferences from these distributions.

Table 1.3: Likert-Scale Statement Analysis of Community Welfare CSR Perceptions

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Valid N	Mean	SD
CWP1 Community welfare CSR initiatives address important social needs of local residents.	10	38	79	49	14	190	3.10	0.98

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Valid N	Mean	SD
CWP2 Skill development programmes supported through CSR contribute to community welfare.	11	40	84	45	17	197	3.09	1.00
CWP3 CSR-supported livelihood initiatives help improve economic opportunities in local communities.	13	39	64	61	16	193	3.15	1.05
CWP4 Women's empowerment programmes supported through CSR contribute positively to community development.	11	43	78	46	16	194	3.07	1.01
CWP5 CSR initiatives provide useful support to disadvantaged and vulnerable community members.	13	40	74	56	13	196	3.08	1.01

Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA	Valid N	Mean	SD
CWP6 Community development activities supported through CSR encourage social participation among local residents.	11	45	70	57	14	197	3.09	1.01
CWP7 Community welfare CSR initiatives give appropriate attention to the needs of different sections of society.	13	46	77	46	17	199	3.04	1.03
CWP8 Overall, community welfare CSR initiatives contribute positively to the wellbeing of local communities.	16	43	78	50	12	199	2.99	1.02

Across the eight statements, mean responses ranged from 2.99 (CWP8) to 3.15 (CWP3), with the overall perception score averaging 3.08. The comparatively strongest item was "CSR-supported livelihood initiatives help improve economic opportunities in local communities", while the weakest was "Overall, community welfare CSR initiatives contribute positively to the wellbeing of local communities".

Findings from Likert-Scale Analysis

The findings indicate a moderate perception of community welfare CSR initiatives, with an overall mean score of 3.08, close to the neutral point of the five-point scale. CSR-supported livelihood initiatives

received the highest mean rating (CWP3 = 3.15), suggesting a comparatively more positive assessment of their contribution to local economic opportunities. The overall contribution of community welfare CSR initiatives to community wellbeing received the lowest mean rating (CWP8 = 2.99), indicating a neutral assessment of their broader benefits.

The narrow range of statement means, from 2.99 to 3.15, shows that no aspect received a strongly favourable assessment. Although livelihood support was rated comparatively higher, respondents' views on skill development, women's empowerment, support for vulnerable groups and social participation also remained close to neutral. These findings suggest scope for strengthening the perceived usefulness of welfare initiatives and examining whether they adequately address local needs.

GROUP-WISE DESCRIPTIVE COMPARISON

Table 1.4: Community Welfare CSR Perceptions by Age group

Age group	Valid N	Mean	Standard deviation
18–30	53	3.025	0.570
31–40	45	3.112	0.554
41–50	55	3.106	0.510
51–60	24	3.240	0.574
61 and above	23	2.874	0.368

The highest observed group mean was 3.240 among 51–60 respondents, compared with the lowest mean of 2.874 among 61 and above respondents.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Null Hypothesis

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in perceptions of community welfare CSR initiatives across different age groups.

Variables Used

The comparison used age group as the grouping variable and the eight-item community welfare CSR perceptions composite score as the outcome. Cases without a valid composite score were omitted from the inferential test.

Statistical Test Applied

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance compared the predefined demographic categories. Levene's test assessed variance homogeneity and a residual check was used to examine the normality assumption.

Table 1.5: Levene's Test and Residual Normality Check

Diagnostic	Statistic	df	p-value
Levene (median-centred)	1.051	4, 195	0.382
Shapiro–Wilk (pooled residuals)	0.990	200	0.156

Levene's test was not statistically significant, $F(4, 195) = 1.051$, $p = 0.382$, which provided no evidence of unequal group variances. The pooled residual Shapiro–Wilk test yielded $p = 0.156$. These diagnostics support the specified parametric analysis, while respondent independence remains a study-design consideration.

Table 1.6: One-Way ANOVA of Community Welfare CSR Perceptions

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p-value
Between groups	1.824	4	0.456	1.615	0.172
Within groups	55.057	195	0.282	—	—
Total	56.881	199	—	—	—

Results and Interpretation

One-way ANOVA did not identify a statistically significant difference across the age group categories, $F(4, 195) = 1.615$, $p = 0.172$. The group means ranged from 2.874 to 3.240.

Decision

Since $p = 0.172$ exceeds $\alpha = .05$, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Finding

The observed differences in community welfare CSR perceptions across the specified age groups did not reach statistical significance. The result does not demonstrate equality between groups or rule out more specific differences in individual activities.

Hypothesis Conclusion

The study did not establish a statistically significant difference in community welfare CSR perceptions across age groups in the sampled context of Udaipur, Rajsamand and Chittorgarh Districts of Southern Rajasthan.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The study included 200 respondents, all of whom had valid composite scores and were included in the inferential comparison. The overall community welfare CSR perception score averaged 3.075 (SD = 0.535). Among the eight questionnaire statements, CWP3 recorded the highest mean (3.145), while CWP8 recorded the lowest (2.995). The inferential comparison did not find a statistically significant overall difference across the age groups.

DISCUSSION

The age-group analysis found no significant differences in overall perceptions of community welfare CSR initiatives, $F(4, 195) = 1.615$, $p = 0.172$. Respondents aged 51-60 reported somewhat higher overall perceptions than respondents aged 61 or older. The lack of significant differences among age groups means that age differences found among the groups should not be interpreted as age-related trends. The lack of significant differences does not mean that respondents of different ages had similar experiences with the company's CSR initiatives.

Item survey findings provide additional information about the welfare topic being surveyed. The CSR-specific livelihood aid item had the highest average rating, and the general community welfare item had the lowest average rating. Variations in item average ratings may reflect perceptions of specific and general welfare aid programs. Variations in item average ratings do not demonstrate statistically significant differences or changes in livelihoods and welfare.

Narula, Magray, and Desore (2017) reviewed livelihood-related CSR activities that benefit local communities. Kumar, Gupta, and Das (2022) reviewed other community resilience and development topics. Other research and this survey suggest that survey respondents had favorable opinions of livelihood-related CSR activities. Other research by Reji (2024) and Mohapatra (2023) has identified the importance of effective implementation and stakeholder engagement to meet community needs. Unlike other research, this survey includes survey respondents' opinions about CSR activities rather than direct evaluations of CSR activities.

The study findings provide insights into age-related attitudes toward corporate social responsibility in welfare activities in the selected Southern Rajasthan districts. The findings point to areas for future study of other community members' attitudes toward corporate social responsibility initiatives to benefit other disadvantaged and community groups and create livelihood opportunities, without assuming age differences. Limitations of the study include the study sample and eight-item attitude scale.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

The study examined community welfare CSR perceptions among community respondents associated with RIICO and RSMML in Udaipur, Rajsamand and Chittorgarh Districts of Southern Rajasthan. The questionnaire captured evaluations of eight aspects of community welfare CSR initiatives and produced an overall mean score of 3.075. The primary statistical analysis did not establish a statistically significant difference across the specified demographic categories. Accordingly, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The findings indicate that the observed group mean differences should not be interpreted as firm demographic divisions in CSR perceptions. Continued attention to community feedback is relevant, but the current survey does not establish equal access, identical experiences or verified development outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Community welfare CSR planners may continue to consult residents across age groups when identifying social needs, rather than infer a dominant age category from the non-significant omnibus comparison.

2. Programme evaluations may distinguish skill training, livelihood opportunities, women's empowerment, vulnerable-person support and participatory activities to identify where the greatest practical gaps occur.
3. CSR communication and feedback arrangements may be adapted for accessibility to different community sections while monitoring whether perceived usefulness changes over time.
4. Future evaluations may incorporate independently observed programme participation and outcomes alongside perceptual ratings to clarify whether welfare interventions respond to diverse needs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study used purposive sampling in Udaipur, Rajsamand and Chittorgarh Districts of Southern Rajasthan, so its estimates should not be regarded as statistically representative of all community residents or industries. The data are cross-sectional, self-reported perceptions rather than independent verification of CSR expenditure, programme delivery or realised development outcomes. The eight-item scale showed modest internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.622); the composite result is consequently interpreted with appropriate caution.

SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future work could expand the geographical and respondent coverage using a specified sampling frame, where feasible. Analyses of particular community welfare CSR activities alongside objective programme-delivery indicators may clarify whether aggregate perceptions correspond to lived access or independently verified outcomes. A longitudinal design could track changes in attitudes, while focused qualitative interviews could explore why participants in different age group categories evaluate CSR activities as they do.

REFERENCES:

1. Kulkarni, V., & Aggarwal, A. (2024). Business response to mandatory corporate social responsibility with evidence from India. Business Strategy & Development, 7(1), Article e323. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsd2.323
2. Kumar, A., Gupta, J., & Das, N. (2022). Community resilience, corporate social responsibility and local economic development: The case of coal mining in India. The Extractive Industries and Society, 11, Article 101120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2022.101120
3. Mohapatra, B. (2022). The political-economy of rural development through corporate social responsibility: An assessment of the INs and OUTs. Journal of Rural Development, 41(2). https://doi.org/10.25175/jrd/2022/v41/i2/160020
4. Narula, S. A., Magray, M. A., & Desore, A. (2017). A sustainable livelihood framework to implement CSR project in coal mining sector. Journal of Sustainable Mining, 16(3), 83–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsm.2017.10.001
5. Reji, E. M. (2024). Corporate social responsibility in rural development: Insights from CSR initiatives of a public sector company. Journal of Rural Development, 42(4), 302–313. https://doi.org/10.25175/jrd/2023/v42/i4/172947

6. Srivastava, V., & Srivastava, R. L. (2023). Corporate social responsibility practices of public and private firms: An exploration of education and healthcare initiatives. International Journal of Business and Globalisation, 34(1), 93–111. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBG.2023.131273