

COMPONENTS AND INDICATORS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY COMMUNICATIONS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF MICE INDUSTRY IN THAILAND

Pornchanok Pongtongmuang*, Sasiwimon Sukabut
and Idsaratt Rinthaisong

*Faculty of Management Sciences,
Prince of Songkla University, Hadyai, Songkhla 90112, Thailand*
**Corresponding author: nickky4921@gmail.com*

Abstract

This research study aims to determine the components and indicators for the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) communications in the environmental aspects of MICE industry in Thailand. The research sample was purposively selected from the organizations listed in the Thailand Convention & Exhibition Bureau. The specific respondents were recruited, using the judgment sampling method from the marketing or marketing communications staff of the organizations, based on their experience gained in each of the MICE activities (Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau, 2016). A total of 200 questionnaires were returned. The data analysis included: test of the statistical hypothesis, component extraction, axis rotation, and interpreting and naming the new components. The results show that the CSR communications in the environmental aspects of MICE industry in Thailand can be divided into 3 components comprising: 1) resources, 2) foods and beverages, and 3) garbage; and each component has four CSR communication indicators as 1) accuracy, 2) completeness, 3) advancement, and 4) simplification of the transmitted information.

Keywords: component; indicator; CSR communications; MICE industry

Introduction

MICE is an acronym for (International) Meetings (M), Incentives (Travel) (I) Conferences (C) and Exhibitions/Events (E). The growth of MICE activities has been an important revenue for tourism industry of the country of destinations (Astroff & Abbey, 2006; Chen & Chang, 2003; Kim & Choung, 2003).

The tourism industry is presently paying a close attention to the environmental crisis as challenges against tourism (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The tourism industry CSR considers both the social and environmental concerns as the key concepts (Argandona & Hoivik, 2009; Moura-Leite & Padgett, 2011; Porter & Kramer, 2006) and as a strong hold in carrying their business to the top of the tourism industry, above its competitors (Aras & Crowther, 2008; Luetkenhorst, 2004). Environmental conservation has also been integrated into the corporates' mission and vision in their environmental concerns.

At present, CSR has been seriously and widely used in tourism business strategies (Holcomb, Uphurch, & Okumus, 2007). The environmental crisis has been brought into play to enhance buying decision of goods and services among the quality touring customers (Ipsos, 2009). As MICE industry has been generating a growing group of quality tourists, it is therefore, an appropriate group to be promoted in caring the environment for effective and sustainable use of resources (Chen & Chang, 2012; Griffin & Prakash, 2010).

In addition to becoming an important policy in tourism management, CSR is also used as a strategy to communicate with the target tourists who will use the service. In fact, social responsibility can be expressed in many ways; and it has been increasingly expressed in tourism strategies in terms of environmental concerns. CSR activity is one of the fast and greatest channels to assist communication between the organizations and their customers; and it can, simultaneously, be used to promote their products and services (Smith & Ong, 2014). CSR communication is presently considered the most cutting-edge media for communication with the prospect customers of the business; it can reach the recipients promptly and effectively (Murphy & Kielgast, 2008). In addition, the governments of many countries have also set certain measures for the organizations to show their social responsibility in the environmental

aspects (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2011). Therefore, it is important that all types of business organizations put great attentions on communicating their corporate social responsibility to their prospect customers and the general public (Nagypal, 2008).

Moreover, CSR communication is very important to many organizations because it helps increase the overall and long-term profit, in terms of making more money and attracting qualified workers into the organizations (Kim & Park, 2011). Recently, all stakeholders of the businesses have pushed for the laws to support and promote corporate social responsibility (Grosbois, 2012). CSR communication of each organization must be designed for the most appropriate communication features to extensively and effectively communicate with its prospect customers (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). From the reviews of related literature; however, the researchers found that knowledge in the areas of CSR communication in the dimensions of environmental crisis and its conservation have not been scrutinized for its dimensions and metrics to guide the applications. In the present study, the components and indicators of CSR communication in the environmental aspects have been investigated based on the MICE industry in Thailand, aiming a generating new knowledge and filling the gap in this area.

Research Objectives

To examine the components and indicators of the CSR communication in the environmental aspects of MICE industry in Thailand

Literature Review

Corporate Social Responsibility Concept and MICE Industry

The concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is gaining attention from organizations worldwide as a guide to business management (Matten & Moon, 2008) and this is not an exception for the MICE industry. It is reported that 80 percent of global conferences have adopted environmental conservation concepts as a part of the events. So whichever organization does not value this concept will be avoided and not selected as the operators due to its bad reputation of CSR. It is evident that the corporate' good reputation in CSR in the environmental issues has influenced the buying decision of the MICE

group. It is evident that trust must be built in the CSR for it has a positive impact on the organization's image (Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau, 2016).

The concept of environmental social responsibility discusses its impacts in the term of *Triple Bottom Line*. The return to the organization must in the three aspects of economic, social and environmental. In terms of corporate environmental responsibility, the business operated by the organization should be done along with the maintenance, conservation and restoration of the environment and aims to minimize and mitigate the environmental impacts (Carroll, 1979). The organization's business and activities can be integrated into the care for and conservation of the environment because environmental conservation is an important part of the corporate social responsibility concept (Porter & Kramer, 2002; Aguilera & Jackson, 2010).

The Concept of Environmental CSR Communication

CSR has emerged in management sciences as a new organizational management strategy (Carroll, 1979); and environmental issues have been integrated into the corporate social responsibility (Porter & Kramer, 2002). The concept of environmental responsibility might vary in each country; however, the traditional and standard approaches of social responsible practices in environmental care and conservation are recognized around the world (Matten & Moon, 2008). It can be said that green politics are important to the corporate social responsibility theory (Aguilera & Jackson, 2010). It is a legal and social norm that the environmental performances or impacts the corporate has been involved in, such as uses of resources, environmental conservation, waste and pollution problems and resolutions have to be accurately informed through accurate communication channels. Communication on CSR is a matter that needs to be addressed in developing a good image and reputation for the organization. If the organizations can provide accurate and complete information that is easy to understand for all the stakeholders, this will increase credibility of the organization (Adams & Zutshi, 2004; Bernhart, 2002; King, 2002).

CSR communication is the application for marketing or product communication in by showing the social responsibility of the corporate (Carroll, 1991; Morsing & Schultz, 2006), emphasizing on several aspects of social

responsibility, including the importance of environmental impact (Carroll, 1979), for example, on local resources (Carrall, 1991). Environmental conservation is taken as a norm of the corporate social responsibility that the corporate should hold as its corporate governance, right at the beginning of the manufacturing process of products throughout the way to reach its consumers. The corporate management with CSR is important for today's economy and society. Therefore, efficiency in providing the CSR information plays an important role in creating a good corporate image (Lvov & Maxwell, 2011) that will lead to credibility for the organization.

Research Methodology

Research Sample

The research sample comprised 200 marketing and marketing communications staff in the organizations in MICE industry, such as convention halls operators, tour operators, event organizers and green hotels. The number of 200 respondents was sufficient for the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), which requires a variable number of 10: 1 (Hair, 2010). This study has 15 variables, so the number of 150 is sufficient for the EFA rule of thumb.

Research Instruments

The questionnaire used in the present study was obtained from phase 1 of the qualitative research method conducted by interviewing a target group of 11 scholars, organization executives and operators involved in MICE industry in Thailand. Then, the questionnaire constructed based on the information obtained in the first phase was used for collecting data for the phase 2 survey research.

Data Analysis

The first step is an analysis to determine the preliminary assumption if the 15 indicators can be factor analyzed. The measure requires a relationship among the indicators of at least 0.30 and a correlation coefficient should not be equal in all matrixes. Tests of the suitability, adequacy and matrix correlation between the indicators are based on the two statistical tests: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) to obtain the sampling adequacy greater than 0.5 and close to 1 and Bartlett's test of Sphericity Approx based on the Chi-

square at statistically significant level of less than or equal to 0.5 ($\text{Sig} \leq .05$). The second step is the factor extraction, in which the main components were analyzed. Results show that the accuracy of CSR communication of the MICE industry in Thailand can be described only on the components with the Eigenvalue > 1 . The third step is rotation of the main components. The components with the Eigenvalue > 1 according to KMO results were then rotated in the Oblique Rotation using the Promex Method. In this step three interrelated components were found. The fourth step is the process of interpretation and nomination of the established components.

Research Results

This section illustrates results of the KMO analysis, Bartlett's Test, Eigenvalue, percentage of variance, percentage of cumulative variance and loading factor of each component and indicator as follows.

1. Indicators for Accuracy of Information

In testing the preliminary assumption, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) Test result is equal 0.896 indicating that the 15 accuracy indicators in the environmental aspects are sufficient and appropriate for the statistical factor analysis. The result of Bartlett's Test at the Chi Square of 1609.838 ($\text{sig} = .000$) is also sufficient and appropriate for the analysis. These results indicate that the correlation matrix of all 15 accuracy indicators in the environmental aspects are interrelated and can, therefore, be used for the survey factor analysis.

Table 1: Component, Eigenvalue, Percentage of Variance and Percentage of Cumulative Variance of the Accuracy Indicators

<i>Component</i>	<i>Eigenvalue</i>	<i>Percentage of Variance</i>	<i>Percentage of Cumulative Variance</i>
1	7.948	52.983	52.983
2	1.674	11.157	64.140
3	1.210	8.066	72.207

Table 1 shows that the Eigenvalue of all 3 components are over 1. The percentages of the extracted variance range from 8.066 to 52.938; and the percentage of cumulative variance can be explained by 72.207percent. The accuracy indicators of the environmental dimension are; therefore, appropriate for all the 3 components.

Table 2: The Component Weight of the Accuracy Indicators

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading		
		1	2	3
Component 1: Garbage				
1 WEAC3	Provide accurate information on packaging selection to reduce the waste.	.937	-.005	-.031
2 WEAC4	Provide accurate information about effects of the increasing amount of waste.	.926	.007	-.089
3 WEAC1	Provide accurate information on needs to control the amount of waste.	.822	.031	-.056
4 WEAC5	Provide accurate information on benefits of the reduction or sorting of garbage	.735	.025	.065
5 WEAC2	Provide accurate information on the reuse of certain types of waste.	.673	.028	.081
Component 2: Resources				
1 ENAC2	Provide accurate information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource.	-.006	.942	-.099
2 ENAC1	Provide accurate information on extinction of certain types of resource	-.012	.870	-.150
3 ENAC3	Provide accurate information on resource statistics.	.001	.656	.170
4 ENAC5	Provide accurate information on how to save resource.	-.005	.637	.201
5 ENAC4	Provide accurate information on potential resource depletion.	.172	.552	.192
Component 3: Foods and Drinks				
1 FOAC4	Provide accurate information on the certification badge.	-.082	-.017	.916
2 FOAC2	Provide accurate information on sources of inputs and raw materials.	-.113	.047	.897
3 FOAC3	Provide accurate information on food safety.	.179	-.083	.746
4 FOAC1	Provide accurate information on production and expiry dates	.127	.131	.497
5 FOAC5	Provide accurate information on proper nutrition for health.	.460	-.121	.461

In Table 2, after rotating the component axis, the results reveal 3 components and 15 indicators; however, only the 3 highest indicators of each

component are explained in this section in a descending order of its weight value. For component 1: Garbage, the 3 indicators include 1) accurate information on packaging selection to reduce waste (WEAC3), is at the weight of .937, while 2) accurate information on effect of the increasing amount of waste. (WEAC4) is at .926; and 3) accurate information on needs to control the amount of waste (WEAC1) is at .822. For component 2: Resources, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) accurate information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resources (ENAC2) is at the weight value of .942, while 2) the accurate information on the extinction of certain types of resource (ENAC1) is at .870; and 3) the accurate information on resource statistics (ENAC3) is at .656. For component 3: Foods and Drinks, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) accurate information on the certification badge (FOAC4) is at the weight of .916, while 2) the accurate information on the sources of inputs and raw materials (FOAC2) is at .897; and 3) the accurate information on food safety (FOAC3) is at .746.

2. Indicators for Completeness of Information

In testing the preliminary assumption with the KMO and the Bartlett's Test, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) Test result is equal 0.893 indicating that all the 15 completeness indicators in environmental perspectives are sufficient and appropriate for the statistical factor analysis. The result of Bartlett's Test at the Chi Square of 1671.073 (sig = .000) is also sufficient and appropriate for the analysis. These results indicate that the correlation matrix of the 15 completeness indicators in the environmental aspects are interrelated and can, therefore, be used for the survey factor analysis.

Table 3: Component, Eigen Value, Percentage of Variance and Percentage of Cumulative Variance of the Completeness Indicators

<i>Component</i>	<i>Eigenvalue</i>	<i>Percentage of Variance</i>	<i>Percentage of Cumulative Variance</i>
1	8.228	54.851	58.851
2	1.571	10.474	65.325
3	1.086	7.243	72.565

From Table 3, it can be seen that the Eigenvalue of all the 3 components are greater than 1; while the percentage of variance extracted ranges from 7.240 – 54.851; and the percentage of cumulative variance can be explained by 72.565 percent. The completeness indicators of the environmental dimension are; therefore, appropriate for all the 3 components.

Table 4: The Component Weight of the Completeness indicators

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading			
		1	2	3	
Component 1: Garbage					
1	WECO4	Provide complete/full information on impacts of the increasing amount of garbage.	.901	-.014	-.050
2	WECO3	Provide complete information on the selection of packaging that reduces waste.	.900	-.024	.064
3	WECO1	Provide complete information on needs to control the amount of waste.	.730	.025	.056
4	WECO5	Provide complete information on benefits of the reduction and sorting of garbage	.721	.082	-.016
5	WECO2	Provide complete information about reusing certain types of rubbish.	.705	.059	.030
6	FOCO5	Provide complete information on proper nutrition for health.	.474	.368	-.028
Component 2: Foods and Drinks					
1	FOCO3	Provide complete information on food safety.	.082	.930	-.179
2	FOCO2	Provides complete information on sources of input materials and raw materials.	.051	.816	-.016
3	FOCO4	Provide complete information on the certification badge.	.025	.794	-.022
4	FOCO1	Provide complete information on production and expiration dates.	.085	.568	.120
5	ENCO5	Provide complete information on how to save resources	-.117	.508	.470
Component 3: Resources					
1	ENCO2	Provide complete information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource.	.116	-.230	.934
2	ENCO1	Provide complete information on the extinction of certain types of resource	-.029	-.060	.867
3	ENCO3	Provide complete information on environmental statistics.	-.055	.262	.645
4	ENCO4	Provide complete information on potential resource depletion.	.113	.373	.410

In Table 4, after rotating the component axis, the results reveal 3 components and 15 indicators. However, only the highest 3 indicators of each component are explained in this section in a descending order of its weight value. For component 1: Garbage, the 3 indicators include 1) complete/full information on the impact of the increasing amount of garbage (WECO4) is at the weight of .901, while 2) complete information on the selection of packaging that reduces waste (WECO3) is at .900; and 3) complete information on needs to control the amount of waste (WEAC1) is at .730. For component 2: Foods and Drinks, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) complete information on food safety (FOCO3) is at the weight value of .930, while 2) the full information on sources of input materials and raw materials (FOCO2) is at .816; and 3) the complete information on the certification badge (FOCO4) is at .794. For component 3: Foods and Drinks, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) complete information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource (ENCO2) is at .934, while 2) the complete information on the extinction of certain types of resource (ENCO1) is at .867; and 3) the complete information on environmental statistics (FOAC3) is at .645

3. Indicators for Advancement of Information

In testing the preliminary assumption with the KMO and Bartlett's Test, results show that the KMO Test result is .902 indicating that the 15 advancement indicators in environmental perspectives are sufficient and appropriate for the statistical factor analysis. The result of Bartlett's Test at the Chi Square of 1762.067 (sig = .000) is also sufficient and appropriate for the analysis. These results indicate that the correlation matrix of the 15 advancement indicators in the environmental aspects are interrelated and can, therefore, be used for the survey factor analysis.

Table 5: Component, Eigenvalue, Percentage of Variance and Percentage of Cumulative Variance of the Advancement Indicators

<i>Component</i>	<i>Eigenvalue</i>	<i>Percentage of Variance</i>	<i>Percentage of Cumulative Variance</i>
1	8.444	56.295	56.295
2	1.697	11.311	67.606
3	1.098	7.317	74.924

From Table 5, it can be seen that the Eigenvalue of all 3 components are greater than 1; while the percentage of variance extracted ranges from 7.317 – 56.295; and the percentage of cumulative variance can be explained by 74.924 percent. The advancement indicators of the environmental dimension are; therefore, appropriate for all the 3 components.

Table 6: Component Weight of the Advancement Indicators

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading			
		1	2	3	
Component 1: Garbage					
1	WETI3	Provide up-to-date information on packaging options to reduce garbage.	.897	.067	-.048
2	WETI4	Provide up-to-date information on effects of the increasing amount of garbage.	.894	-.009	-.033
3	WETI2	Provide up-to-date information on how to recycle certain types of waste.	.837	-.046	.069
4	WETI5	Provides up-to-date information on the benefits of reducing use and sorting of garbage	.723	-.011	.133
5	WETI1	Provides up-to-date information on the need to control the amount of waste.	.665	.064	.117
6	FOTI5	Provide up-to-date information on healthy nutrition.	.506	.086	.252
Component 2: Resources					
1	ENTI2	Provide up-to-date information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource.	.189	.881	-.287
2	ENTI1	Provide up-to-date information on the extinction of certain types of resource.	.016	.868	-.079
3	ENTI3	Provide up-to-date information on environmental statistics.	-.108	.780	.199
4	ENTI4	Provide up-to-date information on potential resource depletion.	.004	.720	.177

Table 6: (Continued)

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading			
		1	2	3	
Component 3: Foods and Drinks					
1	ENT15	Provide up-to-date information on how to save resources.	-.119	.539	.442
2	FOT12	Provides up-to-date information on sources of input materials and raw materials.	.116	-.064	.849
3	FOT14	Provide up-to-date information on the certification badge.	.066	-.081	.825
4	FOT13	Provide up-to-date information on food safety.	.130	-.024	.777
5	FOT11	Provide up-to-date information on production and expiration dates	.018	.133	.607

In Table 6, after rotating the component axis, the results reveal 3 components and 15 indicators. However, only the 3 highest indicators of each component are explained in this section in a descending order of its weight value. For component 1: Garbage, the 3 indicators include 1) providing up-to-date information on packaging options to reduce garbage (WETI3) is at the weight of .897, while 2) up-to-date information on the effects of the increasing amount of garbage (WETI4) is at .894 ; and 3) up-to-date information on how to recycle certain types of waste (WETI2) is at .837. For component 2: Resources, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) up-to-date information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource (ENT12) is at the weight value of .881, while 2) the up-to-date information on the extinction of certain types of resource (ENT11) is at .868; and 3) the up-to-date information on environmental statistics (ENT13) is at .780. For component 3: Foods and Drinks, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) Provide up-to-date information on how to save resources (FOT14) is at .849, while 2) the up-to-date information on the certification badge (FOT14) is at .825; and 3) the up-to-date information on food safety (FOT13) is at .777.

4. Indicators for Simplicity of Information

In testing the preliminary assumption with the KMO and Bartlett's Test, results show that the KMO Test result is equal .899 indicating that the 15 simplicity indicators in environmental perspectives are sufficient and

appropriate for the statistical factor analysis. The result of Bartlett's Test at the Chi Square of 1648.471 (sig = .000) is also sufficient and appropriate for the analysis. These results indicate that the correlation matrix of the 15 simplicity indicators in the environmental aspects are interrelated and can, therefore, be used for the survey factor analysis.

Table 7: Component, Eigenvalue, Percentage of Variance and Percentage of Cumulative Variance of the Simplification Indicators

<i>Component</i>	<i>Eigenvalue</i>	<i>Percentage of Variance</i>	<i>Percentage of Cumulative Variance</i>
1	8.127	54.182	54.182
2	1.738	11.584	65.767
3	1.038	6.918	72.684

From Table 7, it can be seen that the Eigenvalue of all 3 components are greater than 1; while the percentage of variance extracted ranges from 6.918 – 54.182; and the percentage of cumulative variance can be explained by 72.684 percent. The simplification indicators of the environmental dimension are; therefore, appropriate for all the 3 components.

Table 8: Component Weight of the Simplification Indicators

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading		
		1	2	3
Component 1: Garbage				
1 WEUN4	Provide easy-to-understand information about effects of the increasing amount of garbage.	.884	-.058	.000
2 WEUN3	Provide easy-to-understand information on packaging selection to reduce waste.	.875	.025	-.024
3 WEUN2	Provide easy-to-understand information on how to recycle certain types of waste.	.865	.067	.006
4 WEUN5	Provide easy-to-understand information on benefits of reducing and sorting garbage.	.687	.025	.072
5 WEUN1	Provide easy-to-understand information on needs to control the amount of waste.	.635	-.059	.153
6 FOUN5	Provide easy-to-understand information on healthy nutrition	.524	.093	.176

Table 8: (Continued)

Indicators	List of Indicators	Factor Loading		
		1	2	3
Component 2: Resources				
1 ENUN1	Provide easy-to-understand information on the extinction of certain types of resource.	-.082	.871	-.025
2 ENUN2	Provide easy-to-understand information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource.	.197	.840	-.264
3 ENUN3	Provide easy-to-understand information on resource statistics.	-.016	.788	.107
4 ENUN4	Provide easy-to-understand information on potential resource depletion.	-.034	.719	.173
Component 3: Foods and Drinks				
1 ENUN5	Provide easy-to-understand information on resource savings.	-.067	.509	.420
2 FOUN2	Provide easy-to-understand information on sources of input materials and raw materials.	.047	-.065	.938
3 FOUN3	Provide easy-to-understand information on food safety.	.078	-.017	.798
4 FOUN4	Provide easy-to-understand information on the certification badge	.189	-.042	.651
5 FOUN1	Provide easy-to-understand information on production and expiration dates.	.049	.108	.628

In Table 8, after rotating the component axis, the results reveal 3 components and 15 indicators. However, only the 3 highest indicators of each component are explained in this section in a descending order of its weight value. For component 1: Garbage, the 3 indicators include 1) provide the easy-to-understand information about effects of the increasing amount of garbage (WEUN4) is at the weight of .884, while 2) the easy-to-understand information on packaging selection to reduce waste (WEUN3) is at .875; and 3) the easy-to-understand information on how to recycle certain types of waste (WEUN2) is at .865. For component 2: Resources, the 3 highest indicators in weight values include 1) the easy-to-understand information on the extinction of certain types of resource (ENUN1) is at the weight value of .874, while 2) the easy-to-understand information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resource (ENUN2) is at .840; and 3) the easy-to-understand information on resource statistics (ENUN3) is at .788. For component 3: Foods and Drinks, the 3 highest indicators in weight values

include 1) the easy-to-understand information on sources of input materials and raw materials (FOUN2) is at .938, while 2) the easy-to-understand information on food safety (FOUN3) is at .798; and 3) the easy-to-understand information on the certification badge (FOUN4) is at .651.

Discussions

Results of the research show that the three components of the CSR communication in the environmental perspective of MICE industry in Thailand comprise resources, foods and drinks, and garbage. These components must be communicated to their prospect customers and the public efficiently. The indicators demonstrating efficient communication of the information include accuracy, completeness, advancement and simplification of the transmitted information.

For accuracy indicators of the transmitted information, the weight values range from the components of resources, garbage, and foods and drinks, respectively, with the weight value over .900. The indicator with the highest weight value for accurate information is the accurate information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resources (.942), followed by accurate information on packaging selection to reduce waste (.937), and accurate information on the impact of the increasing amount of waste (.926)

For completeness indicators of the transmitted information, the weight values range from components of resources, foods and drinks, and garbage, respectively, with the weight value over .900. The indicator with the highest weight value for complete information is the full information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resources (.934), followed by the full information on food safety (.930), and full information on packaging selection to reduce waste (.900)

For advancement indicators of the transmitted information, the weight values range from components of garbage, resources, and foods and drinks, respectively, with the three highest weight value from .881-.897. The indicator with the highest weight value for advancement information is the up-to-date information on packaging selection to reduce waste (.897), followed by the up-to-date information on effects of the increasing amount of garbage

(.894), and the up-to-date information on collaboration in conservation and safe use of resources (.881)

For simplification indicators of the transmitted information, the weight values range from components of foods and drinks, garbage, and resources, respectively, with the three highest weight value from .938-.875. The indicator with the highest weight value for simplification information is the easy-to-understand information on production and expiry dates (.938), followed by the easy-to-understand information on effects of the increasing amount of garbage (.884), and the easy-to-understand information on packaging selection to reduce waste (.875).

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Office of the Higher Education Commission, Thailand with a grant under the Program for Strategic Scholarships Fellowship Frontier Research Networks (Specific to the southern region).

References

- Adams, C., & Zutshi, A. (2004) Corporate social responsibility: why business should act responsibly and be accountable. *Australian Accounting Review*, 14(34): 31-39.
- Aguilera, R. V., & Jackson, G. (2010) Comparative and international corporate governance. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1): 485-556.
- Aras, G., & Crowther, D. (2008) Governance and sustainability: An investigation into the relationship between corporate governance and corporate sustainability. *Management Decision*, 46(3): 433-448.
- Argandoña, A., & Hoivik, H. V. W. (2009) Corporate social responsibility: One size does not fit all. Collecting evidence from Europe. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(3): 221-234.
- Astroff, M. T. & Abbey, J. R. (2006) *Convention management and service (7ed)*. Lansing, MI: Educational Institute Hotel & Lodging Association.
- Bernhut, S. (2002) Corporate social responsibility, with Pratima Bansal. *IVEY Business Journal* 66(4): 18-20
- Carroll, A. B. (1979) A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4): 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991) The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4): 39-48.
- Carroll, A., & Buchholtz, A. (2011) *Business & society ethics and stakeholder management*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2012) Enhance green purchase intentions: The roles of green perceived value, green perceived risk, and green trust. *Management Decision*, 50(3): 502-520.
- Crane, A., Matten, D., Moon, J., & Moon, J. (2008). *Corporations and Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, J. J., & Prakash, A. (2010). Corporate responsibility initiatives and mechanisms. *Business & Society*, 49(1): 179-184.
- Grosbois, D. (2012) Corporate social responsibility reporting by the global hotel industry: Commitment, initiatives and performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(3): 896-905.

- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Babin, B. J., & Black, W. C. (2010) *Multivariate data analysis: A Global Perspective* (Vol. 7). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Holcomb, J. L., Upchurch, R. S., & Okumus, F. (2007) Corporate social responsibility: what are top hotel companies reporting? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19(6): 461-475.
- Ipsos, M. O. R. I. (2009) *British survey of children, the national lottery and gambling 2008-09* (Report of a quantitative survey). London: National Lottery Commission.
- Kim, S. S., Chon, K., & Chung, K. (2003) Convention industry in South Korea: An economic impact analysis. *Tourism Management*, 24(5): 533-541
- Luetkenhorst, W. (2004) Corporate social responsibility and the development agenda: The case for actively involving small and medium enterprises. Retrieved January 25, 2016 from <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/41767/1/388951109.pdf>
- Morsing, M., & Schultz, M. (2006) Corporate social responsibility communication: stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(4): 323-338.
- Moura-Leite, R. C., & Padgett, R. C. (2011). Historical background of corporate social responsibility. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7(4), 528-539.
- Murphy, C. H., & Kielgast, C. D. (2008) Do small and medium-sized hotels exploit search engine marketing? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(1): 90-97.
- Nagypál, É. (2008) Worker reallocation over the business cycle: The importance of employer-to-employer transitions. Retrieved January 6, 2016 from http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/~een461/JJempirical_2008_0207.pdf
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002) The competitive advantages of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12): 56-68.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006) Estrategia y sociedad. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12): 42-56.

- Smith, T., Pelpola, K., Ball, M., Ong, A., & Myint, P. K. (2014) Pre-operative indicators for mortality following hip fracture surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age and Ageing*, 43(4): 464-471.
- Thailand Convention and Exhibition Bureau. (2016) Plan your events. Retrieved January 5, 2016 from <https://www.businesseventsthailand.com/nc/>
- Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006) *Tourism: change, impacts, and opportunities*. London: Pearson Education.