Review of: "The Nexus between corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance in the Service-Based Enterprises Sector: Insights from Zimbabwe"

Lorena Caridad[1]

1 Universidad de Córdoba

Enriching Competitiveness through Corporate Social Responsibility: A Study of Service-Based Enterprises in Zimbabwe

The Nexus between corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance in the Service-Based Enterprises Sector: Insights from Zimbabwe

EDITOR

An empirical study based on 650 participants is carried out to link CSR iniciatives to competitiveness in companies, using a SEM model elaborated from a survey to managers. The manuscript is clear, well structured, and sound in its conclusions, that are data-based. Some minor corrections are suggested, that will be answered, without doubt, by the authors. Availability of data would be useful for the review. My final opinion is that it should be accepted by minor (and not fundamental) changes.

AUTHORS

I have readed with pleasure your manuscript where you use a PLS-SEM model to investigate your research questions. I appreciated your figure 1, as it summarizes clearly all the process, including the measured variables used and the research hypothesis.

The links of CSR with governance and investment on Tunisia, using Structural Equations Models, has been used in a paper with http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/imfi.15(4).2018.20 in Investment, Management and Financial Innovations (2018), 15(4), 239.257, that could be included in your literature review.

When you formulate the 10 hypothesis, you could add a sentence about that these are referred to Zimbabwe's service-bases enterprises (in H1 it seems a duplication in 'enterprises'), so you could shorten the writing of the meaning of the hypothesis (later .on there is a comment about the p-values on the results)-

In tables 2, 3, 4 , why you write 'Frequency (N = 109)'? Surely 'N = 109' is not to be included.

2 / 2

In tables 5, 6, 7, 8, …., 15 you describe several measured variables (FPRO, ECT, …), but there is no information about them, even if there are cites; an appendix with the 70 variables would be welcome. It seems that these variables are 7-Likert, which is not stated; as these are ordinal, some statistics calculated as they where numerical could be polemical. Maybe graphs in the appendix would be more rigorous.

In table 21, when you present the path's coefficients and their p-values, you have to take into account that alternative hypothesis are two sided. But when you formulate H1 and H2, you postulate positive relations from the exogenous variable to CSP, that is one-side hypothesis; as the estimated coefficients are negative, the real p-values (for the one-side hypothesis) are respectively 0.558 and 0.557, confirming more clearly your decision of 'non-support' for both hypothesis. In the other cases, even with two-sided formulation, you accept the hypothesis, but the p-values could be recalculated (and been smaller for one-side hypothesis).

It would be desirable to have a look at your data to use Amos software, instead of SmartPLS, and try to analyze identificability issues.