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Abstract

This study examines the role of a private standard (GlobalGAP) on corporate social responsibility (CSR) compliance in the Pakistani mango industry and how this compliance affects rural workers' motivation. Pakistan is the fifth largest mango producer in the world and the fourth largest exporter in global mango trade, also mango is the biggest fruit crop within the country. Mango trade is subject to trade terms, where buyers decide the conditions of trade agreements by means of codes of conduct. The key dimensions of the codes involved in agro-food trade are food safety, traceability, workers welfare and environmental consideration, issues which are all connected with CSR. Private standards ensure compliance with these codes of conduct.

This study draws on interviews and a questionnaire survey with the certified mango producers and farm workers in the Punjab province of Pakistan. The mango industry also involves other stakeholders such as government institutes and NGOs; interviews were also conducted with their representatives. Given that this study is an impact assessment research, the researcher designed a theoretical framework using a mixed method approach to investigate the rationale behind acquiring the GlobalGAP standard by the mango growers in Pakistan and what impact (if any) this shift has generated with regards to the farm workers' job satisfaction and motivation.

This study is the first to empirically examine good agricultural practices in Pakistan and evaluate their impact. This study shows that private standards play a significant role in ensuring compliance, and CSR practices implemented through them were found to be positively related to the rural workers' job satisfaction and motivation. Furthermore, this study has made separate contributions to theory, methodology, and practice. The production of the synergistic model for improving compliance is among the key highlights of the study. The findings of this study can extend to other agriculture and primary production industry workers in Pakistan and even beyond to other developing countries' rural agriculture workers.

Key Words: CSR, Private Standards, Developing Countries, Food Safety, Working Conditions, Pakistan, Mangoes, Ethical Sourcing, GlobalGAP, Motivation, and Rural Workers.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

1.1 – INTRODUCTION
This chapter provides a summary of the entire thesis along with the background and context of the study. There are discussions on the research aims and objectives, core research questions, existing gaps in the literature, a problem statement, and the contribution.

1.2 – BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT
Since the 1990s, labour conditions have been addressed and looked after with the help of corporate voluntary codes of conduct. There has been a shift from transnational corporations (TNCs) regulations set by governments, towards corporate self-regulation. Businesses in developed countries and their associates (producers, growers or manufacturers) in developing countries are now expected to address social and environmental issues rather relying on governments alone (Jenkins, Pearson and Seyfang, 2002). Businesses in developing countries are becoming global producers. Liberalisation of the international market enables small businesses to participate in global trade. However, all the interested businesses are required to comply with standards set by buyers in developed countries. Civil society and consumers in developed countries are becoming increasingly concerned about the production process of the goods they buy, as there have been several news stories published about exploitation of workers, child labour, environment degradation and other social issues in developing countries (UNIDO, 2015b).

In 1997 EUREP, a working group based on 13 European mega-retailers set up a technical standards committee and a steering committee in order to negotiate a joint resolution by integrating the various systems for supplying safe food. They formed a standard for good agricultural practices (GAP) and named it EurepGAP (now GlobalGAP) which is required to be adopted by all global suppliers and was subject to audits (Amekawa, 2009). Good agricultural practices (GAP) are voluntary private standards and codes. They have been developed during the last two decades by the food industry businesses (supermarkets and retail groups), producers, governments and
NGOs. The purpose was to systemise agriculture practices at farm level to ensure food safety, quality, environment protection, better use of resources, workers' health and safety and welfare. Among the benefits of complying with GAP standards are better product quality and the facilitation of market access (FAO, 2007).

As the organisations who have designed GAP and other similar codes were based in developed countries, they faced huge criticism. Some of the major criticism states that these codes are only beneficial for buyers in developed countries, and they want to implement them to satisfy their consumer base (Jones and Comfort, 2003), improvements in working and environmental conditions of workers are limited, these codes mainly encourage the large-scale producers as small-scale producers cannot afford the associated cost, and producers and other stakeholders in developing countries never been consulted while formulating these codes (Lund-Thomsen, 2008; 2009; Nelson et al., 2007).

Codes of conduct in global trade are quasi-mandatory and almost all trade contracts contain codes of business conduct which are formulated by the importing firms. These codes have a huge impact on exporting businesses in developing economies (Lee, Gereffi and Beauvais, 2012). As these codes and standards are becoming pre-requisites (UNEP, 2011), every farm or producer who wishes to enter high-value global chains are bound to face those challenges associated with such practices. Despite the rise in demands to do more (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b), fewer efforts or interest has been shown by governments to provide exporters with the required knowledge and skills on how to achieve the required standards (Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013). The codes of conduct in agriculture trade implemented through private standards are based on a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) agenda for sustainable agriculture. Producers in developing countries need support in order to handle the pressure associated with codes of conduct and compliance with standards (ITC, 2011).

To meet the standards, there is an upgrade required in the infrastructure, management structure and skills. It is generally considered that if developing countries could cope with the pressure by taking the right steps and equipping local producers and suppliers with the necessary training, it could lead to greater trading opportunities in the global value chain (Sun and Zhang, 2009). It is argued that governments in developing
countries and international bodies must enter into joint ventures with producers and suppliers with the training and support as CSR is becoming a key component. The producers require support for capacity building to match the requirements from international standards (Kuworth and Mustapha, 2013).

The supermarkets and retailers introduce the ethical trade and aim to implement CSR policies in the supply chains. However, they have face the issue of monitoring fatigue which is the key implication involve with the compliance (Sodano et al., 2008). Many new approaches have been introduced by different stakeholders in the global agriculture trade to overcome this obstacle. Private standards such as GlobalGAP are a major step towards improving monitoring throughout the supply chain and to ensure compliance. Almost all the suppliers’ and buyers‘ contracts have CSR codes and compliance clauses, which in turn allows buyers to terminate the contract anytime they find a failure to fulfil the agreed terms and conditions. GlobalGAP equips producers with the required training and infrastructure that helps them to comply with those codes (GlobalGAP, 2014).

Broadly speaking with regards to the core CSR issues in developing countries, according to UNEP (2011), there are a minimum of four issues highlighted in the majority of the codes from different private and government organisations. These include:

I. Human Rights
II. Labour Practices
III. Environment
IV. Corruption (Bribery) (UNEP, 2011).

Although all the aforementioned are the core issues of CSR, somehow, they apply fully or partially dependant on the nature of the business. Also, it depends on buyers‘ demands too. For example, the emergence of UK anti-bribery act recently. Subsequently, all producers and suppliers seeking business terms with UK based buyers are asked to sign a contract with the added clauses of anti-bribery practices (Ministry of Justice, 2010).
1.3 – PROBLEM STATEMENT AND THE EXISTING GAP

The research problem focuses on the impacts of private standard certification on Pakistani mango industry and the rural farm workers, who worked at the certified farms. This study has successfully established quantifiable benefits of private standards by correlating their codes of conduct with the agricultural workers' motivation in the context of developing countries, as there were unanswered questions about the usefulness of private standards and what difference they make for poor farmers and workers (ITC, 2011).

There was no literature available about private standards and CSR in Pakistani agriculture apart from some articles about the Sialkot sports manufacturing industry and leather industry (Lund-Thomsen, 2008; 2009; 2013; Lund-Thomsen and Coe, 2015; Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010a; 2010b) as well as a few UN and FAO publications. The Pakistani mango industry is going through a major shift, and GlobalGAP (a voluntary private standard) is the key player in this change. Currently, GlobalGAP is the only major private standard that is working in Pakistan. Thus far, no research has been done to investigate the rationale behind acquiring a GlobalGAP certification among Pakistani mango growers and furthermore, how this affects the income and working conditions of workers, and consequently the role this plays in workers' job satisfaction and motivation.

Robinson (2010) reported poor working conditions for workers in developing countries, even when CSR policies were implemented. There remained issues of forced labour and working in hazardous conditions. There has been a continuous pressure from buyers to reduce costs and this pressure forces producers to create a "downward spiral" of overall poor working conditions. Despite a huge shift in the sourcing practices and involvement of private standards in recent decades, little is known about the actual impact of such standards on the environment, income and working conditions at the producers' end (ITC, 2011). This particular gap forms the basis for one of the research questions of this research; what difference does the GlobalGAP certification make for the income, work, and environmental conditions of mango farmers and on-farm workers in Pakistan? Lemeilleur (2013), reports the adoption of GlobalGAP programme among smallholder mango producers in Peru, her study suggested a need for further investigation to assess the impact of GlobalGAP adoption on income and rural poverty.
The International Trade Centre has conducted a series of literature review analyses on the issue of private standards and their impact, the detailed and systematic review of existing literature identified the gaps, where literature is either missing or hazy. The report suggested that the impact assessment in the form of quantitative statistical data is missing, as it argued that most of the literature is based on conceptual and theoretical papers and fewer empirical studies have been carried out on this particular issue. The report further claimed that the majority of empirical studies had been done either in South America or Africa (ITC, 2011).

There are several misconceptions about the role of private standards. The majority of studies focus on their impact on the financial gain and profitability of the participating growers or firms (Kersting and Wollni, 2012; Schuster and Maertens, 2013). However, when these private standards were initiated, especially the GlobalGAP, the main purpose was to ensure the food safety, traceability and sustainability (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013; Hachez and Wouters, 2011). Although all private standards which work in food production and food processing have different codes of conduct, almost every standard has some commonalities. They all promised to protect the environment, to eliminate child labour and to protect the core human rights of workers, such as their health, safety and welfare (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013).

There is an on-going debate about the impact of private standards on developing countries’ producers and workers; existing literature on the issue is underdeveloped and divided (ITC, 2011). There was a growing body of evidence that a gap exists in the literature between buyers’ CSR codes of practice and what is being experienced by stakeholders involved in mango production in Pakistan. This research aims to target this gap by examining CSR practices at the GlobalGAP certified mango farms to analyse its impact and to what extent it has improved the income and working conditions of the farm workers. The study further investigates the relationship between CSR practices and rural workers’ job satisfaction and motivation.

1.4 – THE ROLE OF PRIVATE STANDARDS

Private standards have arisen as a new mode of governance that also acts as private governance. To respond to the continuous pressure from civil society and the media, the businesses in Western countries have left with no choice but to adopt CSR strategy that
also requires them to look at what they are buying from other (developing) countries. Ethical sourcing has become a top priority for almost every food retail business. But at the same time, it was not possible for them to monitor compliance with the ethical codes down to the bottom of the supply chain. Private standards provide these services and they ensure compliance through independent audits. These standards have criteria based on codes of conduct set by buyers and other key players in Western countries. They have their auditors and also use third party auditors to carry out visits to the certified farms to ensure the standards have been met (Mergenthaler et al., 2009; Pilbeam et al., 2012; Ruben and Zuniga, 2011).

1.5 – GLOBALGAP
The programme was started in the late 1990s by Euro-Retailers Produce Working Group (EUREP); the group designed codes of conduct for their producers with the name of Good Agriculture Practices (GAP) formerly known as EurepGAP, in the form of a certificate. Retail groups and supermarkets in the EU want their suppliers to acquire the certification if they are willing to continue business ties. By the time global trade increased and became more complex, the standard expands its territory and started offering the services outside the EU too and soon became popular. They changed the name in 2007 to GlobalGAP, and since then it has become the largest private standard with a presence in almost every country around the globe. The key focus of GlobalGAP is to ensure food safety, environmental protection, and workers’ welfare. All the certified producers have to comply, since GlobalGAP auditors make unannounced visits at the sites. Producers are also required to renew their subscription annually (GlobalGAP, 2014).

1.6 – CSR CODES IMPLEMENTATION AND CHALLENGES (GLOBALGAP)
The majority of the leading global firms not only design the codes but also provide the supplier with implementation programmes. Also, other private standards organisations offer different certifications and programme to assist the producers in developing countries, for example, GlobalGAP. According to GlobalGAP (2014) the exemplary steps or stages involved in the implementation of GAP programs are:

A. Adoption of CSR (agreement or contract that reflects willingness)
B. Self-Evaluation (assessment tools and forms available online)
C. Initial Audit (usually seek recommendations)
D. Improvement (work on the action plan and recommendation from the initial audit)
E. Actual Audit (mostly unannounced)
F. Support (leads to capacity building) (GlobalGAP, 2014)

If the external auditor is satisfied at stage E, he/she would recommend the issuance of a certificate with a unique identification number which would work as a visa for entry into the global value chain and supermarkets. The buyers use that unique identification number to track back that where and how the product was produced (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014). It looks vastly simple and straightforward, but there are significant financial costs associated with this process. The standard demands significant changes in infrastructure that involves both management practices and machinery, and even in some cases building a new block or facility.

1.7 – RESEARCH QUESTIONS
After considering the background of the study and knowledge gap, this study attempts to answer the following four questions. These questions have been answered by means of qualitative data and analysis. Also, the first question was further supported by quantitative data and analysis.

Q1 – What is the relationship between CSR practices and workers’ job satisfaction and motivation?
Q2 – What role does the GlobalGAP certification play to ensure CSR compliance at certified mango farms in Pakistan?
Q3 – What difference does the GlobalGAP certification make for the income, work, and environmental conditions of mango farmers and on-farm workers in Pakistan?
Q4 – Does the adoption of standards such as the GlobalGAP present a challenge for the mango growers in Pakistan?

1.8 – RESEARCH AIM
The aim of this research was to examine the CSR compliance and its effects on rural workers' motivation and job satisfaction at GlobalGAP certified mango farms in Pakistan.
1.9 – RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The following were the research objectives of this study.

1) – To synthesise the relevant literature on CSR practices in GVCs, private standards certification, workers' conditions, social and environmental issues, job satisfaction and motivation.

2) – To develop a conceptual framework that characterises the relationship between CSR compliance, farm worker socio-environmental conditions, and farm workers' job satisfaction and motivation.

3) – To investigate the impact of GlobalGAP adoption on the Pakistani mango industry.

4) – To examine CSR practices at the GlobalGAP certified mango farms in Punjab, Pakistan.

5) – To quantify the CSR compliance, and farm worker socio-environmental conditions, and identify CSR practices that have the most influence on the job satisfaction and motivation of agricultural workers.

6) – To produce a new model and propose recommendations for changes in existing standards which will help to improve compliance.

1.10 – METHODOLOGY

After considering the core research questions and the aims of the study, the researcher decided to employ a mixed methodology. Qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews with farm owners, exporters, and other officials who play the role for helping producers to meet the financial cost and technical requirements. A total of 21 individual interviews and seven focus group interviews were conducted; other data was based on documentary evidence and the researcher's observations. For the quantitative data, a questionnaire survey was conducted at the certified farms, and all the farm workers were invited to participate. A total 400 questionnaires were distributed. After an initial screening, the questionnaire without the answers to the initial two questions which were placed to test the literacy, were removed. There were 316 responses included in this study.

The data was analysed separately using appropriate techniques. Interpretation of the qualitative data was made through a coding technique to establish patterns and
similarities. The quantitative data was analysed with the help of statistical package, the SPSS.

1.11 – CONTRIBUTION

This impact assessment research on corporate social responsibility (CSR) compliance and what role GlobalGAP as a private standard certificate is playing in between has contributed to the much-discussed debate about the importance of CSR codes for sustainable development and business progress in developing countries (ITC, 2011).

The existing literature on private standards in developing countries is much focused on two key issues, the adoption of these standards and what the financial returns are for the growers (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014). There is not sufficient evidence theoretically and empirically that implementing CSR is positively related with verifiable success (Lindgreen and Swaen, 2010). It was further argued that there is extremely limited empirical evidence on how private standards affect the exports from developing countries, what contribution they make in creating jobs in agriculture-related industries and how they affect (rural) workers (Colen et al., 2012).

The literature review was extended and deepened to achieve a more focused conceptual model. All relevant variables, including the independent variables were also identified. The work has represented a new contribution to knowledge, not only in the Pakistani mango industry but also in related primary production industries in other developing countries. The unique appointed approach helps to achieve this through an understanding of the reasons for the gap between buyer's CSR codes of practice and the actual experiences of the growers in Pakistan. The proposed model had further tested the relationship between various CSR-oriented practices and workers' job satisfaction and motivation to establish what particular CSR activity influence the most. This study also suggests a new model for implementation of the codes or good agriculture practices in developing countries.

Summary

This introductory chapter highlights the key themes of this thesis. The remainder of thesis has been structured in a systematic order. Chapter Two is based on the research context and detailed analysis of Pakistani mango industry. Chapter Three explores the
vast literature on CSR, global value chains, private standards, GlobalGAP and motivation. The chapter also contains the conceptual framework of this thesis as it emerges from the literature review. Chapter Four describes the research approach and philosophy, and methods adopted to conduct this research. Further chapters heavily draw on the empirical data collected and analysed by the researcher. Chapter Five is based on the qualitative data and analysis; the data was gathered through interviews during the field trip. Chapter Six provides various statistical analyses for testing the hypotheses; the data was collected through questionnaire survey and was analysed with the help of SPSS. Chapter Seven brings all the findings and literature together and discusses the similarities and differences. Chapter Eight, which is the last chapter of the thesis, provides the implications and limitations of the study as well as its contribution. The thesis concludes with points for moving forward.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH CONTEXT

2.1 – INTRODUCTION
The main aims of this research context chapter are to highlight the importance of the Pakistani mango industry and the CSR challenges for businesses in the country. This chapter also presents the available literature on CSR for export-oriented businesses in Pakistan. This chapter also provides an insight into the key facts and figures of the Pakistani mango industry and how critical this industry is for the country's GDP and rural employment. There are discussions on the country's agriculture sector and the dilemma with regards to CSR. There is also a map of the particular area that was chosen for this research.

2.2 – RESEARCH SETTINGS AND PAKISTANI CONTEXT
There are different dimensions of the story of the mangoes and its emergence as one of Pakistan's staple products. Various stakeholders have played the significant part in this development and continue to play a major role in the global trade of Pakistani mangoes today. After Mexico, India, and Brazil, Pakistan is the fourth largest producer of mangoes for the export market (FAOSTAT, 2011). Mangoes exports are critical, both to generate foreign currencies and employment. Thus, the government has a major role to play in upgrading the productivity of its mango industry.

2.3 – BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT PAKISTAN
Pakistan is situated in South Asia and shares its borders with China, India, Iran and Afghanistan. Although its population consists of people from different ethnic backgrounds and religions, the majority of the population is Muslim and the country is recognised as an Islamic country. The official name is also the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, and it came into existence on 14th August 1947, before it was part of the Indian Subcontinent. Since its independence, the country has faced many challenges in terms of its relations with its neighbours, poor infrastructure and corruption – all of which has badly affected its economic growth (World Bank, 2013).
Figure 2.1 - Map of Pakistan

Below are statistics about Pakistan:

Area: 770,880 Sq. Km
Population: 193.20 million
Language: Urdu
GDP: $278.91 billion
GDP growth: 5.5%
Inflation: 0.5%

2.4 - PAKISTAN (An Agricultural Country)

According to the World Bank (2006), Pakistan is ranked in the category of poorer countries where the majority of people live at below $1.25 a day income. However, the inequality of income and expenditure in Pakistan is the lowest of all other countries in South Asia, including India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal (World Bank, 2006). The population is hugely divided between urban and rural areas. Poor resources and lack of
education are the basis for critical issues such as unemployment and children’s health. The other main issues like corruption and bribery also play a critical role and have affected both the rural and urban population. People who live in rural areas also face extra challenges of poor infrastructure and lack of resources such as water, health, and education (World Bank, 2006). Banerjee and Duflo (2004) found Pakistan to have the highest rate of return to education in South Asia which was recorded at 15.4%. The figures in the World Bank (2014) report reflect that the education attainment is uneven in the country where the male population are favoured and have better chances of becoming educated. However, former World Bank reports suggested that there are the female-headed households in Pakistan, where women were more educated, particularly in urban areas.

The World Bank Group (2014) suggested that Pakistan is an agricultural country where agriculture contributes the 21.6% of the total GDP. It is also the source of 60% of country’s export earnings. The majority of the population lives in rural areas (about 64%) and 45% of the labour force are also employed in the agriculture industry. The country’s total agro-food commodities produce just over 13 billion US$ annually. These figures reflect how important the industry is for the country, but in the last two decades the agriculture industry had seen a downfall in overall production and growth, with the industry becoming extremely volatile as numbers suggest a 6.5% growth in 2004 which fell to only 0.6% in 2010. Punjab and Sindh provinces are the major agro-food producers. Since July 2011, an amendment known as 18th amendment has been brought into the constitution of Pakistan. This amendment empowers the provinces to control many sectors such as energy, security, and agriculture with their local resources. It is having an adverse effect on agriculture as the Punjab and Sindh produce over 81% of total agriculture of the country and since there is no more support from the federal government, it is becoming a challenge in terms of receiving aid and funds to invest in capacity building and for marketing purposes (World Bank, 2014).

In the previously mentioned report, World Bank Group (2014) reported that 68% of the rural population associated with the agriculture industry. The report argued that there has been a continuous decline in the agriculture share to the GDP from 46% in 1960 to 26% in 2000 and 21% in 2010. The report criticised the role of public agriculture research activities given that only 15% of research staff hold a PhD. On the positive
side, the report also highlighted the improved credit quality as there was a decline in non-performing loans across the agricultural sector. However, there is still growth in rural poverty and the report blamed unequal distribution of resources and development funds between large-scale farmers and small-scale farmers (World Bank Group, 2014). The agriculture productivity data shows that smaller farms have greater productivity as compared to the larger and largest farms in Punjab province of Pakistan (which was the base for this particular research). However, profitability falls faster for small-scale farmers as they were found less able to self-insure (World Bank, 2006). The latest report of the World Bank (2015), suggested that the agricultural labour's productivity could be improved by adopting the latest technologies.

According to the World Bank Document (1999), Pakistan’s Agriculture tax system has many loopholes. The document identified some key factors leading to this situation. Firstly, the tax regime is archaic and still contains the elements of the pre-colonial land system and revenue collection. The land record system is decentralised and land revenue is paid in cash. The revenue is calculated on the information collected by a local official known as Patwari. The information usually consists of crop area matured, yield and what price was set for that particular return (World Bank, 1999).

Agriculture extension was the one and only public-funded service in Pakistan until 1988 since the country’s independence in 1947 (Riaz, 2010). According to the Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (2015), the sector provides as much as 24% of the total GDP of the country. Almost 50% of the total employed population work for this industry (PBS, 2015). Despite several experiments from public institutions to expand and developed it further, there has been little success. In 1988, the government invited the private sector to participate and to bring in their experiences of running their own product delivery systems. The sole motivation behind this move was to enhance the food security which then helps the commercialisation of the sector. The model was a great success, and today there are several private entities providing training and services to the local farmers (Riaz, 2010). The agriculture sector not only feeds the entire nation but also represents a key source for foreign trade. In 2005 43% of employment was within the agriculture sector in Pakistan, with this figure growing to 44.7% in 2010 (UNDATA, 2015).
Chapter 2: Research Context

2.5 – CSR IN PAKISTAN

Globally, CSR is always looked at in the context of local laws and public regulations, and that varies from country to country. As Carroll’s (1979) pyramid gave the centre place to law-abidingness for every business generating profit at a certain level. Moon et al., (2009) also suggested CSR as a practice going beyond the contribution and compliance. It is the efforts made by the businesses to address the social, ethical and environmental concerns (Moon et al., 2009).

A business can only go beyond the law to initiate any CSR practice when they are completely abiding by the existing law (Klonoski, 1991). The difference between developed countries and developing countries lies on this thin line because the rule of law is fully practised and enforced in developed countries and every business has to follow it. Thus, in advanced countries, it is easier to adopt CSR policies for businesses. However, in developing countries, it is considered challenging for businesses (Busch, 2011).

Poor labour conditions, inequality, human rights violation and child labour incidents in Pakistan have been widely reported (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011). Despite fears and concerns over the worst labour conditions, the country does have labour laws. According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in Pakistan’s 1973 constitution, there are at least five articles addressing matters of labour. Article 11 clearly prohibits all forms of child labour, slavery and forced work. Article 17 states the right to form unions and the freedom of association. Article 18 allows all citizens to conduct any legal and lawful business or trade. Even equality for women has been added to Article 25 which prohibits any discrimination based on gender alone. Last but not least Article 37(e) describes the humane conditions of work where women and children should not be employed for jobs unsuited to their age and gender (ILO, 2004).

The labour law does exist, but there is a serious question mark on its practical implementation. The famous ‘Brundtland Report‘ underlined culture as another aspect that plays a critical role in responding and communicating with the external world (United Nations, 1987). Pakistan has a rich culture and its own values and traditions. It is hugely diverse and rigid at the same time. There is even less flexibility among the rural population (Bashir et al., 2013). However, Perry (2012) found that harnessing the
local culture and embedding it into CSR policies could help in enhancing the implementation and compliance in developing countries, especially in Asia.

The famous case study of the sports brand Nike in Pakistan highlighted areas of concern (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011). The local newspapers in Pakistan also highlighted the threats from bad environmental practices and social injustice (Lund-Thomsen, 2009). To address these issues and to make sure that suppliers in Pakistan are following the code of conduct and compliance fully with CSR criteria, global multinational firms such as Nike and Adidas had set up their offices in Sialkot to monitor the activities throughout the supply chain (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011). Although the constitution of Pakistan prohibited the child labour (ILO, 2004), it was the key issue that brought the Nike story to light, and now these mega-firms are not taking any risks which may affect the brand’s reputation (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011).

Local NGOs have even filed cases against businesses that were damaging the environment and following harmful practices. They claimed that such businesses had the support of government representatives. This situation has made Pakistan a remarkably challenging place to study the impacts and effectiveness of the policies and address these problems (Lund-Thomsen, 2009). The National Environment Quality Standards (NEQS), designed by Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency (PEPA) works under the Ministry of Climate Change (MOCC). PEPA is responsible for enforcing and revising the NEQS (MOCC, 2016).

The highly politicised and corrupt nature of practices, where laboratory reports to test polluted water can easily be modified according to one’s will by paying some extra money. Safety procedures are not in practice, but only show compliance to visitors and auditors in particular. Poor health and safety procedures have been reported in the past along with even poorer waste management. PEPA is not known for putting heavy sanctions to those who are not complying with the criteria set by NEQS (Lund-Thomsen, 2009).

The multinational firms that are working closely with their partners in developing countries had less control of the small hold clusters and had only focused on the main source (Lund-Thomsen, 2013). However, the NGOs are playing a vital role in creating
awareness among local bodies and the general public about environmental protection and social issues. Thus, the role of civil society and communities is critical in putting pressure on businesses to act responsibly (Lund-Thomsen, 2009). Gender discrimination is another alarming issue in Pakistan. The global firms need to review their policy regarding local gender norms and to build a balance between the genders. The consequences of not doing so may lead to socially irresponsible outcomes, and one example of this is the gender discrimination in developing countries (Lund-Thomsen, 2013).

Later it was argued by Lund-Thomsen and Coe (2015) that CSR alone is not enough and a new policy paradigm was needed regarding the role of CSR in global production networks (GPNs) where new models of CSR are transmitted through vertical (top to bottom) dimensions of GPNs. As the GPN model is an enhanced version of the previously used global commodity chain (GCC) model (Gereffi, 1994) and global value chain (GVC) model (Gereffi et al., 2005). It covers a wider area where the role of local legislation such as public laws, codes of conduct for businesses, NGOs and media also monitor the production sites to find out how CSR and labour in GPNs fit into the local socio-economic context (Lund-Thomsen and Coe, 2015). They questioned the benefits and threats to local businesses, contractors and workforce in particular from the restructuring of the GPN. They further suggested that CSR strategies could help in creating a loyal and productive workforce.

Conversely, De Neve (2014) found workers in the Indian apparel industry who prefer to work with a flexible non-complying firm as they offer a more pleasant and relaxed atmosphere in which to work. They have more freedom in terms of time keeping and hours of work. Non-complying firms usually pay by a piece-rate payment which provides them with a potential to earn as much as they want as compared to a fixed hourly rate (De Neve, 2014). Since this particular study was based on the same region, the workers’ preferences were considered in this study.

2.5.1 - CSR THROUGH PRIVATE STANDARDS IN PAKISTAN
The latest dimensions of CSR are environmental concerns, human and labour rights, ethical behaviour, accountability and transparency (Rehman, 2011). Almost all these dimensions are significant and critical in the global agriculture trade. Kambalame and
De Cleene (2006) suggested CSR as a key factor for the agriculture sector to improve economic growth and livelihood for stakeholders in poorer countries. The greatest challenge for growers and agro-food exporters in Pakistan is their inability to ensure the compliance with CSR standards and this situation leads to exporters losing exports into high-value markets (FAO, 2013).

Jongwanich (2009) presented the dataset from the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the years 2002 to 2004. This data suggests that the export value of food items to the numbers of shipment detained by the agency is the lowest for Pakistan in the Asia region at $0.25 million per case, whereas the average for South American countries is at $9.04 million per case. This particular index helps to identify the compliance issues as the lower numbers reflect the least possibility for the producers to meet the requirements of food safety standards (Jongwanich, 2009).

There is also need to change the terms and conditions of compliance according to local cultures and values. The Western oriented codes of conducts are written in so much detail that sometimes it is not possible to comply with them. A small example of this is the requirement of a proper toilet seat whereas in the sub-continent (Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh), there are different kind of toilets with ceramic slabs. The availability of soap in toilets is also a compulsory requirement, but the factory management complain about the theft of soap by workers at the end of their shifts (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011).

Increased awareness among stakeholders, especially consumers, forces the policymakers for environmental and ethical issues, to also include labour conditions into private standard codes (World Bank Working Paper, 2005). Local collective actions are the key to ensuring local governance’s capability to comply with the codes set by external stakeholders. However, there is little information available on how these collective actions have been understood. This is a major constraint in achieving the required governance to counter the external pressure that demands CSR compliance (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b).

Masakure et al., (2009) conducted a study in Pakistan to establish the relationship between standards adoption and export performance. To establish these findings, they
chose the four most prominent industries in the country, and they were textile/apparel, leather, fisheries and agro-food sectors. The researchers used the exports performance data between 2000 and 2004 for that particular study and found a positive correlation between standards adoption and improved export performance. However, these findings were purely based on the ISO 9000 certified businesses, and the researchers have ignored the GlobalGAP standard certified producers as they believed that the standard has a less significant appearance in the country (Masakure et al., 2009).

International Standard Organisation (2008) defines ISO 9000 standard as based on customer requirements and does cover the basic concepts and language. The standard (promise to) ensures efficiency, consistency, transparency, and improvement initiatives to maintain the client's confidence (ISO, 2008). The clients are the buyers and not the individual consumers; now there are several new developments that have come about in recent years, as the buyers are not only looking at the factors which ISO 9000 covers. The focus has shifted to social, ethical and environmental considerations and now these are the key factors to determine the trade ties between buyers and producers/suppliers (Pretious and Love, 2006; Cruz and Boehe, 2008; Adebanjo et al., 2013; Poetz et al., 2013).

Global development affects Pakistani agriculture too, and since the study by Masakure et al., (2009), this situation has improved dramatically. The GlobalGAP standard has emerged as a key player in Pakistan agro-food industry especially for mango and citrus; those are the two major fruit exports for Pakistan.

FAO (2013) reported the adoption of GlobalGAP by the citrus producers in Pakistan through public-private partnership (PPP). The participation from agriculture support funds (ASF) and 16 private exporters invested about US$ 520,000 for the project which was designed for the duration of three years between 2007 and 2010. The investment cost covers the certification (GlobalGAP) cost, project management, capacity building and research and development. The results were remarkable as the citrus production and export increased from 150,000 tonnes in 2006 to 360,000 tonnes in 2010 (FAO, 2013). This growth has been enjoyed by all the stakeholders including farms’ workers however the primary beneficiaries were the producers and those private exporters who invested in the project. The net income for the participating farmers has risen from US$91 to
US$233. FAO reported that 1000 full-time jobs were created through this project. The growers have gained access to high-end markets and they also received their payments on time. The overall risk of rejection at international market been reduced, the risk of social and environmental issues has also reduced. The growers have become more aware through regular communication, and the performance of the entire citrus value chain has been improved in terms of profitability and market share (FAO, 2013).

The technical manager of the Pakistan Horticulture Development and Export Board (PHDEB) presented a paper at an International Symposium on Emerging Trends in Food Science and Technology in 2007. In this paper, he described GlobalGAP, among other standards, as a major challenge and called for combined efforts from the public and private sector to meet the high-value markets’ requirements. He quoted that Pakistan has less than a 1% share in the premium supermarkets of USA and EU as these importing companies rely on standards such as GlobalGAP to verify the product/production quality (Bajwa, 2007).

Oze (2014) prepared a report on the public-private partnership (PPP) for FAO, in that report he mentioned the successful implementation of planning and mapping project by the Farmer Enterprise Groups (FEGs) of Pakistan in 2006. FEGs have the support of Agriculture Support Fund (ASF) which works under the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock. The other players were included, the NGOs, Rural Support Programmes (RSPs) and individual FEGs. The project included 2000 groups consisting of 20,000 farmers (Oze, 2014).

Another report also highlighted the success story of GlobalGAP among the Pakistani citrus industry as it was also based on a PPP model where 50% of public funds were arranged by ASF and other 50% from private entities such as produce marketing organisations (PMOs). The project helps 300 farmers who have doubled their citrus exports and earned an additional 233000 US$. However, compliance with environmental and labour standards was required (FAO, 2013).

Chemical contaminants in agro-food and the associated diseases are also concerns for the Pakistani agro-food exports industry. The reported cases of contamination are higher in developing countries as compared to developed countries, and buyers are incredibly
concerned about such issues. Post-harvest losses, poor techniques, and food safety are the few known challenges faced by Pakistani agriculturists, however by adopting a comprehensive programme such as good agriculture practice (GAP) it is possible to solve these issues.

It was suggested that GlobalGAP could play a pivotal role in transforming the industry up to international standards (Din et al., 2011). This situation formed the second core research question for this study. That is, what role does the GlobalGAP certification plays to ensure CSR compliance within certified mango farms in Pakistan?

Recently an additional phenomenon has arisen in Pakistan, and that is the supermarkets. There are two major supermarkets, METRO and MAKRO. Both the supermarkets have decided to purchase their fresh fruits and vegetables directly from the farmers. However, they require farmers to adopt the procedures to ensure food safety. The supermarkets are helping the farmers by providing technical training, and supporting them by forming clusters in near vicinity (Riaz, 2010).

2.6 – GLOBAL MANGO TRADE
Mango (Mangifera Indica), also known as ‘the king of fruits’, is among the top five fruit crops by production globally, and harvested in 87 countries (Tharanathan et al., 2006). It is the second largest subtropically grown fruit after the banana. The fruit is popular because of its high economic value (Sellamuthu et al., 2013). It represents over 37% of the total worldwide production of tropical fruits. Due to favourable climate conditions, right manipulation of trees and water division through advanced irrigation techniques, Brazil is the country with the longest supply season that lasts from August to November (Souza and Neto, 2012). The major mango exporting countries to EU are Brazil, Pakistan, USA, Ivory Coast, Israel, Burkina Faso, Senegal and Mali (Colen et al., 2012).
The above figure depicts the dominance of Asian countries in global mango production. The latest graph shows that Asian countries produce over 75% of total global production in last fifteen years. The most popular mango variety is Tommy Atkins. This variety attracts foreign trade because of its productivity and durability, which allows it to travel for many days and offers a longer shelf life, which the majority of the buyers seek. On average, a mango tree starts producing fruit from the fourth year, but it takes a minimum of six years to reach its full production when a tree can produce its maximum yield. Since the mango is a perishable item, the value chain has to be tremendously efficient and fast as the fruit lasts for three weeks only before it loses quality and taste (Souza and Neto, 2012).

Accurate temperature control and delicate handling are required throughout the chain following by suitable packaging to deliver the fruit to the far away destination countries (Souza and Neto, 2012). The agency theory has emerged as a solution to it; the process established new control points where every single source took responsibility for its supplier and was held responsible for any failure. This system identifies a problem area in the chain and an efficient measure could solve the issue permanently, however, stringent checks are required (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013).
The Department of Health in the UK encouraged the whole food industry to take the social responsibility for promoting healthy eating. However, food retailers and supermarkets are the strongest units in the food industry and thus carry a major responsibility for creating pressure on producers and manufacturers to promote healthy eating (Jones et al., 2006). The majority of supermarkets in developed countries have appointed the nominated category manager to deal with the mango producers in the producing countries to look at the production mechanism and to make sure the required standards regarding food and environment safety are met as well as ensuring the private standards certificates have been obtained by the producers. The UK fresh fruit market is sophisticated and demanding but pays the highest price (Souza and Neto, 2012).

Mango is the largest fruit crop in Pakistan, and the country is the fourth largest producer in the world (FAOStat, 2011). Pakistan is also among the top mango exporting countries (Badar et al., 2015). The fruit holds a significant position in the Pakistani economy, due to its expanding local demand and growing export potential (Ghafoor et al., 2009). It has been widely reported that Pakistan is among the top mango producers and exporters around the world (Sun et al., 2011). Private entities are the major players in the Pakistani mango industry, and these private businesses are responsible for the production and marketing of mangoes, both for the international and domestic market (Aujla et al., 2007).

There are several types of mangoes harvested in different regions and the harvesting time, sweetness, and taste also vary from one region to another (Sun et al., 2011). A United Nations report suggested that the range of produced varieties limits the performance of the Pakistani mango industry. Other factors identified were the lack of knowledge and poor marketing that affected the industry (UNIDO, 2006). These factors further lead to poor returns from international markets; the growers did not get what they believed to be a good price. This was happening due to lack of real buyers, such as supermarkets (Collins and Iqbal 2011). However, within the country, the high domestic demand implies some gains and incentives for the growers (Gunden and Thomas, 2012).

Mangoes can be consumed in different ways, fresh, dried, pulps, juices, sauces and pickles. However, the extreme demand from consumers is for fresh mangoes that are ripe and ready to eat (Badar et al., 2015). Among the many other varieties, the top two
varieties of Pakistani mangoes are the Chaunsa and Sindhri. The Chaunsa is mostly harvested in the Punjab province, and Sindhri as with its name belongs to the Sindh Province (Collins and Iqbal 2011).

To expand the Pakistani mango industry, the mango growers need to improve the quality of the fruit by adopting the practices that can ensure food safety and can also satisfied the consumer demands (Gunden and Thomas, 2012). To increase the profitability for growers and to improve the quality of Pakistani mangoes, it is critical to upgrade its entire supply chain. Currently, it is widely unorganised and fragmented. There is also a need for building collaboration among the key actors that are involved in Pakistani mango industry (Badar et al., 2015).

The red line in the above figure shows a strong and consistent growth in global mango production. Also, there is a similar growth in the size of the area used for mango harvesting.

2.7 – PAKISTANI MANGO INDUSTRY
The reason behind choosing the Pakistani mango industry as a case for this research is based on the importance of this industry. Pakistan is among the top five producers and exporters of mango around the world (FAOSTAT, 2014). The last decade witnessed a significant rise in the country's mango industry, all the key indicators including area
harvested, production volume, export quantity, and export value, all gone double in size and value. Although there are other main exports where Pakistan has a better ranking such as cotton, wheat, rice, sugarcane, milk, and leather, mango is at the top when it comes to the fresh fruits. The production of mangos relies on certain weather conditions and suitable land. Like the other main crops mangoes are also largely produced in the Punjab and Sindh provinces of Pakistan. As the Punjab province is the major contributor with nearly 70% of total production (Khan et al., 2008), it has been chosen as a base for carrying out this research.

Table 2.1  
Area harvested for mangoes in Pakistan between 2001 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>96995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>98987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>102793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>103110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>105135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>106570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>104958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>106223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>107066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>107131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>107200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>107268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>107289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>107024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>108090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Area harvested</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>107743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: FAOSTAT, 2018)

Table 2.1 shows the total area harvested for mangoes in Pakistan. In the year 2001, 96995 hectares of land was used for mango harvesting, since then there is a gradual rise in the harvested area size up to the year 2012. After 2012, there is a gradual fall and the latest figure suggests that in 2016 the total of 167743 hectares of land was used for
mango harvesting. One of the possible reason for the latest fall is could be due to the modern ultra-high density plantation for mangoes (Singh et al., 2017), where growers plant more trees in less area.

Table 2.2 Pakistani Mango production quantities between 2001 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>985790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1037340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1034580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1053987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1073950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1753910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1719380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1733888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1727692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1845528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1888449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1709010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1658862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1716982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1656473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangostones, guavas</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1608591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: FAOSTAT, 2018)

Table 2.2 shows that in 2001, the total production was below one million tonnes, and that increased to 1.7 million tonnes in 2014. The production, however, has fallen during 2016 and 2016 seasons. According to Pakistan Fruit & Vegetable Exporters, Importers & Merchants Association (PFVA), this decline is caused by the climate change. The mango crops for past two years suffer unexpected heavy rains, hails storms and flooding which caused severe damage to mango growers (Business Recorder, 2017).
Figure 2.4  Pakistani Mango production quantity graph for years 2001-2016
(Sources: FAOSTAT, 2018)

Figure 2.4 shows the production quantity in a graph. There was a dramatic rise between 2004 and 2005, and it kept on increasing gradually. The rise emerges from better farm management (Khan et al., 2008).

Table 2.3  Pakistani Mango export quantities between 2001 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Flag Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>64845.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>47861.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>60441.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>82050.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>48885.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>106608.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>62067.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>69324.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>79575.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>85623.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creps and livestock</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>tonnes</td>
<td>106130.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: FAOSTAT, 2014)
Table 2.3 represents the export quantity; the country has exported 0.052 million tonnes of fruit in 2001 and that increased to 0.10 million tonnes in 2011, which is more than double in ten years.

Figure 2.5 Pakistani Mango export volume graph for years 2001-2011
(Source: FAOSTAT, 2014)

Figure 2.5 shows the export volume in a graph. Unlike production volume, the export falls between 2004 and 2005; it picked up again between 2005 and 2006 and has looked steady since then.
Table 2.4  Pakistani Mango export value between 2001 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>16649.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>14424.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>18007.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>23779.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>15902.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>32299.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>20038.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>25241.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>28385.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>30939.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and livestock products</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Export Value</td>
<td>Mangoes, mangoosteens, guavas</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1000 US$</td>
<td>44731.00</td>
<td>Official data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: FAOSTAT, 2014)

Table 2.4 shows the export value; the industry generated 16.64 million US$ that has increased to 44.73 million US$, much more than double in ten years. The figures are remarkable and show the potential for further growth.
Figure 2.6  Chart of top mango exporters and buyers
(Sources: FAOSTAT, 2014)

Figure 2.4 shows the top mango producers and buyers around the world. The most recent available chart shows Pakistan as the fifth largest exporter. However, the country stood at 4\textsuperscript{th} rank since the Netherlands do not produce mangoes. The country has the biggest port in Europe, so all the supplies arrive in Netherlands and then distribute throughout the EU, and that is why its name appears on the index since this data is calculated on the basis of transactions. On the right side, the top buyers are the US and the EU. This also reflects the importance of the fruit being highly demanded by valued western markets.

2.8 – LOCATION ANALYSIS
GlobalGAP adoption is not uniform across Pakistan. Geographic mapping of certified mango farms indicated that accreditation is clustered in specific areas, primarily in the two provinces of Punjab and Sindh. Multan and Rahim Yar Khan are the two largest clusters for certified mango growers in Punjab, and the city of Hyderabad in Sindh province. The mango growers from the Punjab province were selected for this research, as the province is the major contributor to national mango production. Below is the map of Punjab.
Figure 2.7 shows a map of the Punjab province of Pakistan. The province is the largest by population and per capita income and second largest by area after Balochistan. Punjab is responsible for over 68% of the total agro-food produced in the country. Below are statistics regarding the Punjab province:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>205,344 Sq. km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>72.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Lahore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest City</td>
<td>Lahore – (6,658,393 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Punjabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Rate</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Pamir Tours, 2016)
Mango harvest occurs throughout the country but the major harvesting area is in the south of Punjab. The land, water, and climate in this region are suitable for mango production and that specific region consists of merely four cities which are responsible for over 60% of the total mango production. The researcher highlights that specific region in the south of Punjab on the map with a black boundary circle. The cities included Multan, Khanewal, Lodhran and Rahim Yar Khan. The researcher is a native of Bahawalpur which exists right in the middle of the mango production cluster and was a suitable base for this research.

The purpose of this part has been to portray the dimensions of Pakistan and its agriculture industry, particularly the mangoes. The agriculture sector has received less attention in the past as compared to its importance. The mango industry has been revived recently and still is in the process of upgrading. The government has shown some interest in the industry as it is an export-oriented and foreign exchange generating industry.

The emergence of GlobalGAP in Pakistan helps the growers to uplift the bogus infrastructure to the international standards. The mango industry grew to double its size in past ten years, and FAOSTATS shows some significant growth in the area harvested and the production volume. CSR was seen as a burden initially, but now many growers are adopting CSR practices to improve the competitiveness of the industry in the international market. The next chapter outlines further analysis of the literature on the emergence of private standards in the global agriculture production and supply system, and how it affects the marginalised rural workers.

2.9 – SUMMARY

Pakistan is an agricultural country where half of the total labour is associated with agriculture (ILO, 2004). According to the Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (2014), agriculture contributes about 24% of the total GDP and is also the largest source of foreign trade. Mango is the largest fruit crop in Pakistan, worth about 1,200 million US$ with a production volume over 1.95 million metric tonnes (FAOSTAT, 2014). The industry has progressed dramatically over the last decade.
Private standards are playing a vital role in ensuring compliance in developing countries. The Pakistani mango industry was going through a shift from traditional production to modern cultivation and was an ideal platform to conduct this research. The findings add to the on-going debate about the impact of private standards on workers’ welfare and would also help the practitioners to understand the situation.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 – INTRODUCTION
This chapter is based on the relevant literature review. A detailed systematic survey has been conducted on the literature that was related to this research. Since this study relies on the role of private standards, CSR compliance, and motivation, a thorough literature review has been done on these key dimensions, which then further deepened to the relevance and effects to understand the real essence of the topic. There are detail discussions on corporate social responsibility, global value chains, private standards, GlobalGAP and fundamental motivation theories. The chapter concluded with forming the conceptual framework, and a summary to explain the rationale behind this particular research and how it has contributed to the literature.

3.2 – CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR)
Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a popular subject among academics and practitioners, albeit the core dimensions are economic, social and environmental, commonly known as profit, people and planet, also known as the ‘triple bottom line’ (Elkington, 1998), but there are different definitions for CSR:

According to the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO), CSR is a management concept that suggests the integration of social and environmental issues with firm’s operations and its interaction with the stakeholders (UNIDO, 2014). Broadly the term CSR reflects the concept of a ‘triple bottom line approach’ whereby the businesses tend to achieve the balance in three core dimensions known as economic, environment and social aspects while addressing the concerns of shareholders and stakeholders (Elkington, 1998).

CSR is neither a charity nor philanthropy but purely a strategic management concept, and it is critical to understand this distinction. There are various benefits associated with it for the businesses that are actively implementing CSR in their operations, such as improved business reputation, improved quality and productivity, customer loyalty, access to the (new) market and employees motivation (UNIDO, 2014). The European
Commission (EC) for Enterprise and Industry also has the similar definition of CSR, however, the commission emphasises taking ownership of the impact caused by individual business practices (EU Commission, 2011).

Recently there was a joint discussion launched by the UK Department for Business Innovation and Skills (DBIS), to consult the role of government to ensure responsible and sustainable business practices. The discussion concludes with the emphasis on making firms accountable for its actions. According to the discussion, CSR is a voluntary practice that firms adopt by going beyond the legal requirements (DBIS, 2014). More or less all these major bodies have the similar definition for CSR, but there is not a single establish definition for it. Armstrong (2006) asserts that the research on CSR is still in ‘embryonic stage’. Rehman (2011) argued that it is not the element of CSR but the different segments of time that influenced the highlighted different dimension of the phenomenon during specific times.

In academia, the term CSR is also quite broad, however, the researchers in recent years have focused on its impact on business and society, either positive or negative (Cruz and Boehe, 2008; Cruz and Boehe, 2010; Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013; Poetz et al., 2013). Academics as well as professional bodies describe CSR with similar definitions.

In the modern history, Howard R. Bowen (1953) was among the initial scholars who defined CSR in a definition. According to Bowen CSR is:

―The obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action that are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society.” (Bowen, 1953, p.6).

It was the first authentic definition of CSR in modern days which was published in the book _Social Responsibilities of the Businessman_ by Howard Bowen in 1953 (Carroll, 1979). Bowen (1953) and which has raised the fundamental question in the book which is the basis of modern days CSR, the question was –What responsibilities to society may businessmen reasonably be expected to assume?” Few years later, Heald (1957) further expand the definition, according to Heald:
CSR is recognition on the part of management of an obligation to the society it serves not only for maximum economic performance but for humane and constructive social policies as well.” (Heald, 1957, p.375).

Bowen (1953) and Heald (1957) have defined CSR through clear definitions. The literature on CSR further broadened in the 1960s and 70s, the emphasis remained on the relationship between business and society, and the responsibility of managers (decision makers) to maintain the balance. Walton (1967) defined CSR as:

In short, the new concept of social responsibility recognizes the intimacy of the relationships between the corporation and society and realizes that such relationships must be kept in mind by top managers as the corporation and the related groups pursue their respective goals” (Walton, 1967, p. 18).

Johnson (1971) presented a similar definition where he also highlighted the role of management in a socially responsible business, according to Johnson:

—Asocially responsible firm is one whose managerial staff balances a multiplicity of interests. Instead of striving only for larger profits for its stockholders, a responsible enterprise also takes into account employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities, and the nation.” (Johnson, 1971, p. 50).

All these and several other definitions and explanations have formed the literature on CSR, however, in recent years the majority of the studies quoted and influenced by the definition of CSR by Carroll (1979), according to Carroll:

"The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary expectations that a society has of organisations at a given point in time.” (Carroll, 1979, p.500).

Carroll (1979) first uses a long vertical rectangle shaped model (see Figure 3.0) to elaborate on CSR. He categorised businesses' social responsibilities into four groups, including: economic responsibilities, legal responsibilities, ethical responsibilities, and discretionary responsibilities. The model assigned (gradually decreasing in size from
bottom to top) boxes for each group of responsibilities, Carroll asserts that different sizes represent *relative magnitude* for each group. The economic responsibilities were ranked with the highest magnitude and discretionary responsibilities with the least magnitude. He further described the discretionary responsibilities as an additional expectation from society with no clear message and left to individual choice and judgement of management or decision makers (Carroll, 1979).

![Figure 3.1 Carroll’s Total Social Responsibilities Model](Source: Carroll, 1979)

This particular stance was a partial continuity of Davis’ (1960) explanation, who argued that social responsibility is the discretion of businessmen to address issues beyond the business’s economic interests. According to Davis CSR in his own words is:

>—*Businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest*” (Davis, 1960, p.70).

Twelve years after his initial CSR model, Carroll (1991) produced an updated pyramid shaped model to reinforce his earlier model. However, in the new pyramid shaped model he classified earlier suggested discretionary responsibilities as philanthropic responsibilities. The other major difference between the new and old model was the
expression of relative magnitude. Unlike the previous model with varying sizes of magnitude, the new model presented the core CSR components as their hierarchy of importance. Carroll reaffirms his previous stance that the key social responsibility of any business entity is to be economically profitable (Carroll, 1991). Although he agrees that ethical and philanthropic responsibilities have gained significant importance in recent years.

**The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility**

![CSR Pyramid Diagram](source: Carroll, 1991)

This pyramid-shaped model is still considered to be the most powerful expression for CSR (Visser, 2006). In other recent CSR definitions, Hopkins (1998) and Kotler and Lee (2005) definitions also capture the similar segments. Hopkins (1998) provides a very simple definition and also highlights the importance of stakeholders:

"CSR is concerned with treating the stakeholders of the firm ethically or in a socially responsible manner." (Hopkins, 1998, p.1)
According to Kotler and Lee (2005) CSR is:

—*A commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources*” (Kotler and Lee, 2005, p.16).

More or less all of the above definitions provide a similar explanation of the phenomenon. There is a consensus on the obligations businesses have towards society. Most scholars are convinced that businesses have a responsibility to pay back to the society or community they operate in. CSR has emerged as a key strategic management issue in recent years (Moura-Leite and Padgett, 2011) and has become an integral part of every business organisations particularly in advanced countries. Also, there are no set boundaries for businesses, and instead, they can be innovative and that is why the phenomenon has continued to expand and moving beyond businesses and into the supply chains.

### 3.2.1 – HISTORY OF CSR MOVEMENT

Moura-Leite and Padgett (2011) analysed the historical trends about CSR and how they have been changed over different decades. The researchers adopted a chronological structure technique to trace the conceptual evolution of the concept and how the preferences emerged over the period of time.

- **1950-1960** the primary focus was given to the local societies, and it was expected from the business to do well for the betterment of society.
- **1960-1970** people and ideas deployed to characterise the social changes.
- **1970-1980** this decade was significant in terms of tackling CSR-related issues, but managers and leadership of that era found to be relying on traditional management functions.
- **1980-1990** social and business interests became more closely related, and companies start to respond to the stakeholders.
- **1990-2000** during this decade, their study found the emergence of CSR as an accepted idea globally that reflect in the academia too as other studies during this given period shows CSR as an emerging business strategy.
- **The 2000s** and onward CSR emerge as a key strategic issue (Moura-Leite and Padgett, 2011, 528-539).
Rehman (2011) also traces similar trends and dimensions of CSR by evaluating its definitions that emerges in different times in past 60 years. According to him, the latest dimensions which appear in the 21st Century (years 2001 and onwards) are much deeper and precise as compare to the initial concepts of philanthropy, society and community wellbeing. McBarnet et al., (2009) argued that CSR has become an industry itself, they supported their argument by mentioning the rise in CSR departments in businesses, also educational institutes are publishing regularly on the subject and there are conferences to identify the future challenges and how to overcome those though robust CSR strategies.

3.2.2 – CSR IN PRACTICE
CSR is a voluntary action undertaken by the businesses, beyond the legal minimum requirements. It is caught in response to the shareholders, and stakeholders requirements too; there is a strong positive relation between CSR and competitive advantage (Manning, 2013). There is a rapid growth in the interest which businesses, academia, and society show towards the importance of CSR in today's time (Sharma and Kiran, 2013). While shareholders being highly concerned with profit and share price, stakeholders particularly the consumers also influence on the business strategies, and it is critical to keep them satisfied (Manning, 2013).

Due to the expansion of globalisation, CSR required being dynamic with regard to its implementation, and there are many professionals around the globe working on it, including academic professionals and business entrepreneurs (Sharma and Kiran, 2013). Innovative CSR ideas are one choice (Jones et al., 2005). The latest CSR studies suggest that the focus is shifting from defining it as social responsibility towards more according to the needs of the global economy, where health, environment, and education are the priorities. However, further studies are required to check if these elements require being mediated through other variables (Sharma and Kiran, 2013).

Boardroom agendas have shifted to CSR in recent years, especially within leading food retailer firms, as they are one of the major employers and they are trying to communicate their efforts effectively with all the stakeholders, including customer and their employees (Jones et al., 2005). There are many areas which need to be explored and it is critical to analyse the effect of this shift on the individual companies and also
on the stakeholders (Crane et al., 2009). All the leading food retailing firms in UK have dedicated teams, consist of directors and executive to address CSR and the core responsibility of these teams is to continue to investigate the issues tend to highlight by the stakeholders and how to deal with them? To communicate their efforts and commitment, these supermarket giants use annual CSR reports (Jones et al., 2005). However, there is a gap between the actual reality and the policy on CSR practices (O’Riordan and Fairbrass, 2008). In recent decades, retail food companies had taken serious practical measures towards CSR because of growing awareness among their customers and other stakeholders regarding the business practices and their impact on environment and society (Jones et al., 2007).

3.3 – CSR, GLOBALISATION AND ADDED STAKEHOLDERS

International Standard Organisation (ISO) has introduces an updated definition for CSR which covers the broader stakeholders. According to ISO 26000, social responsibility is:

—. the responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behaviour that contributes to sustainable development, including health and welfare of society, takes into account expectations of stakeholders, is in compliance with applicable law and consistent with international norms of behaviour and is integrated throughout and practiced in an organization’s relationships.” (ISO, 2010, p.3).

The proliferation of international trade and globalisation has impacted business strategies. There is greater awareness about the CSR practices related to labour conditions in supply chains along with the issue of human rights and environment protection (Kercher, 2007). Globalisation brings many new opportunities for business to access resources across the globe. Businesses not only capitalise through establishing supply chains and sourcing materials but also through outsourcing services to the countries with labour (Guttal, 2007). However, this phenomenon also brings challenges for the businesses. Habisch et al., (2005) asserts that the debate about globalisation and sustainability has made CSR the most debated subject among the politicians, consumer groups, trade union, NGOs and businessmen.
The current CSR debate is beyond multinational corporations and large firms to every business entity including small and medium enterprises (SMEs) (European Commission, 2007). The impact of globalisation has generated a new debate around the idea that businesses owe a responsibility to broader stakeholders (Kercher, 2007). This is a move away from the initial shareholder primacy which was defined by the famous economist Milton Friedman (1962) where he argued that businesses sole responsibility is to maximise the profit for its shareholders. The newer stakeholder idea is based on the combination of organisational management and business ethics (Freeman, 1984). A shareholder perspective, according to Friedman:

―there is only one and only one social responsibility of business – to use resources and engage in activities designed to increase profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competitions without deception or fraud‖ (Friedman, 1962, p. 133).

But on the contrary to this, Freeman (1984) argued that there are other parties who are directly or indirectly involved in every business such as employees, customers, communities, suppliers and trade unions. He further argued that the managers must articulate a combined sense that makes value for key stakeholders and also bring them together. This stance has pushed the managers to consider their duties towards all stakeholders. A stakeholder perspective, according to Freeman:

―Corporation shall be managed in the interests of its stakeholders defined as employees, financiers, customers, employees and communities‖ (Freeman, 1984, p.75).

Freeman (1984) provides the evaluation of stakeholders; Harrison and St. John (1998) took it further and depicted it in a figure (see Figure 3.2) to elaborate an organisation’s operating environment and the associated stakeholders. The figure also presents the external forces/factors in the broader business environment as, technological change, sociocultural forces, global economic forces, and global political scenario. Jamali (2008) asserts that the stakeholder’s perspective added new dimensions to the traditional organisational responsibilities.
Various scholars have indeed supported the stakeholder approach when analysing CSR (Jamali, 2008). A research on Italian SMEs accessed the SMEs’ corporate social performance against CSR initiatives. The research identified the demands from the core stakeholders what they expect to be met by the businesses to be socially responsible (Longo et al., 2005). They presented the expectations through a grid of values (see Table 3.1) to separate particular demands from the particular stakeholders.

**Table 3.1: The Grid of Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Expectations divided into value classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Employees   | • Health and safety at work
            | • Development of workers’ skills
            | • Wellbeing and satisfaction of the worker and quality of work
            | • Social equity |
| Suppliers   | • Partnership between ordering company and supplier
            | • Selection and analysis systems of suppliers |
| Customers   | • Product quality
            | • Safety of customer during use of product
            | • Consumer protection
            | • Transparency of consumer information on product |
According to a recent report from the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC), almost all the identified demands and expectations from the stakeholders’ perspective in the above table are directly or indirectly part of the key dimensions of the current global sustainability strategies. The UNGC has defined ten principles of corporate sustainability which would lead to achieve and secure triple bottom line, and those ten principles are largely based on stakeholders’ perspective (UNGC, 2015).

Previously, Spiller (2000) has presented an Ethical Performance Scorecard (EPS) that was also based on the stakeholders’ perspective (see Table 3.2). Later, the same EPS was adopted by Jamali (2008) for his research in developing countries context. He collected the data from Lebanese and Syrian based companies. The data was based on selected companies’ practices against the primary six stakeholders. As this study was in developing countries context the findings were more interesting for this particular research. The employees related practices such as wages, health and safety, training, job security, the community related practices such as direct involvement in community project, and the environment related practices such as recycling and waste management were made part of the questionnaire used to collect quantitative data for this particular research (see Appendix 6).

**Table 3.2: The Ethical Performance Scorecard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Key Business Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>• Fair remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning and development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fulfilling work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A healthy and safe work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equal employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Competent leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social mission integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>• Generous financial donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3: Literature Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for education and job training programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct involvement in community projects and affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community volunteer programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for the local community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campaigning for environmental and social change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An employee-led approach to philanthropy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficient and effective community activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of environmental and social performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Environment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental policies, organization and management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials policy of reduction, reuse and recycling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring, minimizing and taking responsibility for releases to the environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy conservation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective emergency response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public dialogue and disclosure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product stewardship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental requirements for suppliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental audits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Customer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry-leading quality program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value for money</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truthful promotion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full product disclosure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership in research and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal packaging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rapid and respectful responses to customer comments/concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer dialogue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe products</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmentally and socially responsible product composition</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suppliers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop and maintain long-term purchasing relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay fair prices and bills according to terms agreed upon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair and competent handling of conflicts and disputes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliable anticipated purchasing requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouragement to provide innovative suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assist suppliers to improve their environmental/social performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilize local suppliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sourcing from minority-owned suppliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion of environmental/social criteria in the suppliers’ selection</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shareholders</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good rate of long term return to shareholders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disseminate comprehensive and clear information</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| • Encourage staff ownership of shares |
| • Develop and build relationships with shareholders |
| • Clear dividend policy and payment of appropriate dividends |
| • Corporate governance issues are well managed |
| • Access to company’s directors and senior managers |
| • Annual reports provide a picture of company’s performance |
| • Clear long-term business strategy |
| • Open communication with financial community |

(Source: Spiller, 2000).

The practices for customers and suppliers in the above table also provide the basis for the research questions for this study. The element of product safety, expectations from the suppliers, fair prices, innovative suggestions, improving their environmental and social performance and the inclusion of social and environmental criteria in the suppliers' selection are covered in this research. Spiller (2000) asserts that growing interest from customers about social and environmentally responsible production, and Jamali (2008) reported limited resources to monitor suppliers' practices. Also, the inclusion of the social and environmental element for suppliers' selection (Spiller, 2000) all indicated the implication for CSR strategy and its implementation in the relevant supply chains.

3.4 – SUPPLY CHAINS AND CSR

The World Bank (2005) has identified three types of supply chains that were used for global trade, they are known as:

- Vertical Integrated Chain (transnational company <-> retailer)
- Collaborative Chain (producer/groups <-> exporter <-> importer <-> retailer)

The vertical chains are highly consolidated and closely connected as the retailers have direct contact with the producers. However, these kinds of chains are not common to buyers in developed countries and producers in developing countries (World Bank Working Paper, 2005). The majority of the chains in developing countries were based
on a transaction-oriented model where several producers (small-scale and large-scale) sell their commodities to the exporters, exporters then sell those commodities to the importers (Hobbs, 2010; Mondelaers and Huylenbroeck, 2008). This type of supply chains is complex as there is less communication and less awareness for the producers about the quality demands from the buyers (World Bank Working Paper, 2005).

Buyers in developed countries sourced products from complex supply chains that involve exporters, brokers, growers and further sub-contractors. It is challenging to deal with the extent to which these codes apply in supply chains (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013). The majority of buyers solely rely on the first contact point in the supply chain. But this situation leads to many bad examples that damage the reputation of prominent brand names, for instance, a recent case of horse meat contained in Tesco’s beef burgers (The Guardian, 2013). Despite the concerns and fears of non-compliance with procedures in the further tiers of the supply chains (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013), less effort had been put in this direction. Information flow is one element to achieve this and running it throughout the supply chain could improve the product engagement (Manning, 2013).

A good example of this is the sports brand Nike in Pakistan, which is the major supplier for hand stitched footballs for Nike with over 80% of overall production (Financial Times, 2007). After the 1996 crisis, Nike suspended its ties with the Pakistani suppliers and overlooked its policies and codes. The brand refined the criteria and started business again with the Pakistani exporters but this time to meet CSR agenda was the top priority. The company explained the codes categorically, and to ensure the compliance, they established a local, regional office solely for this purpose to monitor the ethical standards (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011). The football manufacturing industry of Pakistan is in the form of clusters based in the city of Sialkot and the suburbs. There are major factories, but due to huge demand, exporters have to rely on sub-contractors who source from small factories and home stitching centres (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010). Nike understands the complexity of this chain and goes beyond relying on the main contact by setting up a local, regional office. In this way, regular audits and checks can be conducted throughout the chain down to the home stitching centre to assure 100% compliance (Financial Times, 2007). This practice not only helps Nike with regaining its reputation but also contributes to transforming the Pakistani football
industry so that all workers have proper contracts, no forced overtime, no child labour and sound procedures for employees' health and safety (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010). Nike is a global corporation and has the resources to afford regional offices at their production sites to ensure compliance but not all the businesses have such resources, and that is why all the major food retail groups and supermarkets now use private standards (Robinson, 2010), to ensure compliance.

The Pakistani mango industry is also based on a transaction-oriented model. There are even additional actors such as brokers/contractors and commission agents who linked the exporters with wholesalers and producers. As every player/actor contributes at different stages, and it affects the farmers/ producers earning margins badly, they end up selling their commodities to the local contractor or commission agent at lower prices (Collins et al., 2006).

It is vital that firms make sure that their entire supply chain is covered under its CSR strategy because treating its employees poorly at any stage would affect the reputation of being socially responsible (Boehe and Cruz, 2010). There is a need for innovation in supply chains. It is critical to ensure a safe supply of perishable tropical fruits such as mangoes, all around the year (World Bank Working Paper, 2005). Many incidents of food containment, poor working conditions or hygiene issues reveal when investigated that in most cases, not the main supplying source is responsible but the problem starts from a third or fourth tier of the chain (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013). There is overly limited information available on the issue of social criteria in selecting the suppliers and the benefits associated with it. Especially, developing countries either could be benefited or affected with this. Stakeholders in the developed countries pressurise the businesses to consider ethical issues when selecting the supplier in developing countries (Ehrgott et al., 2011).

Social and environmental concerns are on the rise in Europe particularly with food consumption and production. Sustainability is posing a challenge for food and agribusiness companies and seeking a response regarding wider interest in CSR practices and that has to be more towards a practical side; the focus is on responsible behaviour. There is little evidence of the efforts made in this regard, despite the importance and stakeholders' interest (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). Competition has
shifted from firm VS firm to supply chain VS supply chain (Hult et al., 2007) as cited by Forsman-Hugg et al. (2013). Large companies define the criteria as a set standard for tendering the supply; there is evidence that CSR-driven supply chains are increasing. However, there is limited information available on the perception, at the supplier end. Health and safety is a top concern followed by environmental issues (Baden et al., 2009).

Since the launch of GlobalGAP in Pakistan in 2008 and the active role of USAID, Pakistan mango industry and its supply chain are going through a shift. Almost all the certified producers have shifted to collaborative chain model with the help of GlobalGAP, USAID, exporters, and Govt. of Pakistan, the operation is getting intensified and all the mentioned players trying to involve the small-scale producers, in the system too through clusters mechanism. More details are discussed in the discussion chapter.

3.5 – GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS
Developing countries exporters are undergoing a transformation phase, the global requirement and codes of business conduct keep on changing. The element of ethics and the requirements of international certifications within the supply chains are mandatory now. Value chain governance is one way to ensure good food standards and trust relationships in the value chain (Vieira and Traill, 2008). A better understanding of the relation among the other actors in the supply chain can be of benefit to coordinators and agro-food business manager. Understanding of the structure and build up the chain can also help in locating self-positioning and this could lead to the development opportunities for individual actors across the value chain (Mikkola, 2008).

The global value chains (GVCs) framework traces the complex links between vast scattered producers and global lead businesses. There is regular coordination of the processes between firms of worldwide distribution and production (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010a). Though the GVCs are highly complex, it is unlikely that the main supplier or exporter have complete control over the entire value chain down to the bottom (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013). However, if local producers want to improve their position within global trade, there is an opportunity available by placing them into a GVC. There is always pressure from the leading firms on cost competitiveness and
improved infrastructure. This pressure leaves the producer with two options: either inject more resources and investment or downgrade by squeezing the labour and working conditions. The latter is perhaps a short term solution and will face difficulties over a period of time (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010a).

GVC is a mixture of opportunities and challenges particularly for businesses in developing countries as it provides an opportunity to access high-value markets in developed countries, as it is not simple to follow the procedures and requirements of the chain and also offers competitive prices at the same time (Sun and Zhang, 2009). GVCs are buyer-driven and buyers are in strong position to control the chain according to their needs, albeit it is not clear how they foster the system of upgrading in developing economies (Sun and Zhang, 2009).

3.6 – CSR CHALLENGES IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS

This is an immensely vast and complex area of research. However, the main focus of previous researchers moved around governance and upgrading. GVC governance communicates the capabilities of other firms that are part of the chain and decide to continue working with them or terminate the ties, while upgrading reflects initiatives such as new technology, enhance processing or improved production (Sun and Zhang, 2009).

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has published a detailed report on CSR and regional trade and the 2011 investment agreement. The report is based on the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) model and studied the case study of USA-Peru and Canada-Peru trade agreements 2009. The report highlighted the importance of CSR and commerce ties between countries and how it will shape in future; it also highlighted the areas which are key dimensions of CSR and what the buyers demand from their suppliers (producers/exporters). There are two broad categories, UNEP (2011) and divided CSR-related issues such as social issues and environmental issues. However, the author further divided social issues into social issues and workforce related issues:
• Social Issues
  ➢ Indigenous People (Human Rights)
  ➢ Child Labour
  ➢ Discrimination
  ➢ Corruption

• Workforce Related Issues
  ➢ Forced Labour (Forced overtime)
  ➢ Wages and Working Hours
  ➢ Health and Safety
  ➢ Freedom of Association

• Environmental Issues
  ➢ Biodiversity
  ➢ Water Protection
  ➢ Air Quality
  ➢ Soil Conservation
  ➢ Renewable Energy
  ➢ Forest Preservation
  ➢ Waste Management and Recycling

The original report presented social and workforce related issues as one unit which is social issues. The report also acknowledged the GlobalGAP standard as an approved and acceptable model which is widely used as pre-requisites for agro-food trade (UNEP, 2011). Previously it was argued by Chen et al., (2008) that standards have an impact on consumers’ behaviour. In their research, they divided standards into further categories such as quality standards that include environmental standards, design standards, testing and certification procedures and labelling requirements. On the basis of the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) survey 2004 data from World Bank, they found quality standards only positively correlated with export volume and export scope notably the environmental standards were found negatively correlated or have no impact on export performance. Similarly, the other categories were found to be less effective too. The researchers focused on establishing the Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRAs) to make this practice more beneficial for the producers in developing countries so the businesses can improve the economy of scale (Chen et al., 2008).
There is much potential for development of local businesses and their CSR responses in global value chains that are less visible with less external pressure (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b). Robinson (2010) found the irregularities in the banana value chain between the UK and Costa Rica. She criticised the parameters to observe compliance as, despite CSR strategies, code of conduct, and local laws, the workers in banana value chain found working in hazardous conditions. The most relevant case studies analysis indicated the importance of local collective initiatives to counter response the external CSR pressure (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b).

Policymakers have to play a vital role in embedding local joint actions in the export industries of developing countries in order to build a sustainable relationship with the buyers as there are threats of boycotts if exporters fail to control issues like child labour and social injustice (Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b). Supermarkets play a part in policy-making; UK-based supermarkets are the largest food commodities buyers, and they are all committed towards ethical sourcing from certified growers and producers. It was reported that workers at the certified farms were working with pesticides without wearing any protective masks. Also, there are reports about pressure from buyers to control costs and that they also force producers to downgrade standards (Robinson, 2010). However, on a positive note, the research found that the average income of farmers and on-farm workers was highest among other South American competitor countries (Robinson, 2010).

A recent study by the Finish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry revealed the seven key dimensions of CSR in food chains. These include: food safety, environment protection, nutritional responsibility, workers welfare, animal well-being and health, economic responsibility and local market presence (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). These dimensions will help producers and buyers to make effective efforts in the right direction to address the core issues involved in food chains related to CSR. Although all these dimensions derive from the major three components of CSR, that is, economic responsibility, social responsibility and environmental responsibility, breaking them down will make it easier to form targeted strategies for sustainable food chains (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). The studies show that less attention has been given to the workers’ welfare but identify that maintaining workers’ health and safety at work, as well as maintaining wages and equality could affect their motivation. Furthermore,
stakeholders in the destination countries, especially the customers, have shown great concern on this issue (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013).

3.7 – ETHICAL SOURCING

Environmental concerns and sourcing of the products from other countries bring more challenges for the buyers. The situation led to the emergence of new terms such as reasonably sourced, fair trade, eco-friendly, and produced locally, used by the food retailers in advanced countries, in an effort to somewhat satisfy their customers and other pressure groups who were raising concerns about the poor working condition, child labour and carbon emissions. The concerns were focused on imports from developing countries (Jones et al., 2005). The buyers started to conduct interviews with suppliers, where questions been asked about the ethical audits and these interviews took place before the final decision (Pretious and Love, 2006). Governments use legislation to define their policies but that legislation does not explain what is good or right, ethics plays the role of defining what is good and right. Without the element of ethical consideration, businesses would lose out in the longer term. At a time of globalisation and intense supply chains it is critical to evaluate moral arguments in order to make judgements, and only by doing this the organisations can come out with well-reasoned decisions. Failure to do so would cost the consumers’ confidence (Manning et al., 2006).

Although the major influence of price competitiveness, quality and delivery time dominate the decision in selecting supplies from an international supplier, ethics audits do have an impact on this decision too (Pretious and Love, 2006). Quasi-hierarchical governance reflects the chain where buyers have control over exporters, and they have to comply with rules and criteria set by the purchaser (Cruz and Boehe, 2008). It was argued that CSR requirements are the decisive parameter for qualified and non-qualified suppliers from developing countries because the local regulatory agencies have weak control on CSR compliance that forces the supplier to take initiatives to compete in an international market (Adebanjo et al., 2013). Among other ethical concerns, child labour is the one issue that has been raised by many, especially in developing countries of South East Asia (Pretious and Love, 2006).
Previous surveys reflect the concerns of the businesses regarding the welfare of the workers and working conditions in developing countries. To ensure that, there are policies and code of conducts they follow while partnering with the businesses in international markets. Global actors are actively involved in shaping the policy and offering solutions, however the underlying motives and objectives are yet to be discovered along with the potential impact of CSR in agricultural business (Poetz et al., 2013). There are variations in the practices adopted by different firms, where some of them shown flexibility toward ethical audits (Pretious and Love, 2006). Ethical audits also consider agriculture workers’ wages. The average income of farmers and on-farm workers was the highest at CSR committed (certified) farms among the other competitors (Robinson, 2010). However, to continue this trend and for building a sustainable, ethical supply chain, society must pay (a premium) for what is right and fair (Manning et al., 2006).

3.8 – PRIVATE STANDARDS

During the last two decades, the phenomenon of private standards in agriculture and food production has intensified around the globe in particular among the producers from developing countries (Fuchs et al., 2011). Currently, there are 105 private standards globally that provide services in the agriculture sector (Sustainability Map, 2018). The major agro-food private standards are GlobalGAP, Fairtrade, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), International Standard Organisation (ISO), Organic, Rainforest Alliance, and UTZ Certified (ITC, 2011). Rainforest Alliance and UTZ have recently merged into one standard to cover the wider segments of social and environmental issues in global agriculture (Rainforest Alliance, 2017).

It is not clear how useful these standards prove for the producers regarding the returns on investment. Previous studies in this area either focus on the average impact or adaptability of these standards (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014). The major initiative was taken by the supermarkets and retail groups by setting up a code of conduct for the producers in developing countries (Fuchs et al., 2011). The most promising aspect of these standards is the rural sector development as they require a shift in infrastructure and technology (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014). Figure 3.1 shows a comparison between GlobalGAP, Fairtrade, and Rainforest Alliance against five indicators which are social, environmental, economic (triple bottom line), quality and ethics. Fairtrade is more
focused on social issues. Rainforest Alliance is focused on the environmental issue, and GlobalGAP is more focused on quality (food safety) but also have a fair score against social and environmental indicators. The standard has been discussed in much detail further in this chapter.

Figure 3.4 - Comparison of GlobalGAP, Fairtrade and Rainforest Alliance
(Source: Sustainability Map, 2018).

For the evaluation of private standards, three indicators are critical, and these are participation, transparency, and accountability among the involved stakeholders (Fuchs et al., 2011). Hansen and Trifkovic (2014) reported a positive impact on farmer household income and wellbeing after the adoption of private standards. The additional costs of complying with the standards, however, marginalised the profit and made it insignificant for small-scale farmers. It was argued that middle to large-scale farmers enjoy the major benefits but again the results are not significant as large-scale farmers were already getting the higher prices as compare to small-scale farmers, so the standards best suits to the middle-class farmers as it enables them to receive good value for their produce (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014).

Poor institutional knowledge among the farmers in small countries led to having an adverse effect, and there are significantly low chances of farmers in those areas to get these advanced certificates. The most remarkable finding was the existence of previous
trade relationship. The standard certificate is greatly influenced by previous trade terms. The financial cost and other requirements in addition to the added benefit of having previous trade terms limit the scope for small-scale producers in developing countries and do not guarantee any significance in export sales growth in return to adopt these standards (Herzfeld et al., 2011).

The globalisation of the agro-food system and the mounting variety of food items have made it impossible for public institutes to monitor food safety and quality issues, the situation paved the way for private standards to take over. It was all started in the early 1990s, and there is a dramatic rise in last ten years, now it is almost impossible for non-certified producers to get into high-value global chains (Sodano et al., 2008). The top agenda have however been given towards food safety, and that is the priority for all private standards firms to ensure it (Henson and Humphrey, 2010). These private standards and third-party quality assurance certificates are sets of regulations; they play the coordinator’s role globally and create similarities (Sodano et al., 2008). Product differentiation factors are going to be a cause of concern as producers prefer common standards to gain a competitive advantage and there is a new trend in developing countries to establish their local standards, for example, kenyaGAP and ChileGAP in association with GlobalGAP. This situation certainly forces the global standard certificates such GlobalGAP and BRC to maintain their identity (Henson and Humphrey, 2010).

The literature is divided when arguing the benefits of these standards as a majority of the researchers believe that these standards ignore small-scale and poor farmers and that needy proportion fails to be benefited through these schemes. Transparency, reliability and power imbalance are the other known concern affiliated with private standards (Sodano et al., 2008). Later it was argued by Sagheer et al., (2009) that the role of governments in developing countries is critical in this whole scenario. Public institutes can initiate and generate collective actions from the stakeholder. It was suggested in the same study that the government must launch the local standards (IndiaGAP in this case) to prepare the local farmers and producers for the global challenges and that will somehow help them to meet the required standards globally (Sagheer et al., 2009). However, it was suggested that government alone can’t handle the changing global
situation and does require support from the private standard to encourage investment and ensure food safety (Liu et al., 2012).

There are three principal actors involved in private governance through private standards, and they can be defined as rule-setters, rule-takers, and rule-users. A study found the rule-setters to be the major beneficiary of this system, as it allows them to be legitimate and controls it through political empowerment and environmental management; however, the impact on other two actors is equivocal (Kalfagianni, 2014). There is a continuous pressure on rule-setters from the civil society and NGOs to promote ethics throughout the supply chain particularly in the production sites in developing countries (Tallontire, 2007). It is an unavoidable phenomenon, and the development of such standards is inevitable. There is a need to make some reforms and to make these private standards more equitable by dissolving the conflict between equity and social justice (Kalfagianni, 2014). Public accountability is one of the solutions if it is also faced by rule-setters and not only by the rule-takers. It was suggested that extending such accountability would protect those actors who fail to benefit by these standards, that is, due to a lack of resources, particularly the small-hold and poor farmers and only by doing so private governance could become more pronounced (Kalfagianni, 2014).

The above findings are consistent with the previous study by Mondelaers and Huylenbroeck (2008) where the researchers found the retail group (rule-setters) to be the major beneficiary in a situation created by private standards. The study also failed to conclude if there is any positive effect on rest of the actors in a food chain. The major attraction for producers is the reduced transaction cost, but overall, they are less interested in these private standards. They also face major price competition in the open market because of other certified producers. Mergenthaler et al., (2009) found a positive relation between private standards implementation and improved access to value chains. The researchers argued that the role of internationally recognised standard bodies such as ISO, HACCP, and GlobalGAP that help certified supplier to access the high-value supply chains into the OECD countries.

The non-OECD countries, however, accept the national quality assurance programs as an entry requirement. The study also found the potential ban for the producers in
developing countries if they fail to comply with one of the globally recognised bodies. Private standards are used as an instrument of governance in the complex supply chains and they are better suited if there is a relationship between buyers and suppliers. They improve the coordination and control between the actors (Pilbeam et al., 2012). The earlier research concluded with the implications for ruler development and thus suggested to policymakers in developed countries to improve the trade ties with developing countries, as it will open new opportunities for farmers and small-scale producers (Mergenthaler et al., 2009). The production also improved at certified farms, as farmer's enthusiasm level was found comparatively higher than the non-certified farmer's (Ruben and Zuniga, 2011).

The majority of private standards that specifically represent organic produce use different logos to attract consumers and inform them about the product being produced organically. However, there is an element of reliability associated with the brand logo too (Gerrard et al., 2013). Unlike organic produce and other private standards, GlobalGAP is distinctive and never use any logo or sign to attract consumers. They believe that it is a volunteer standard to produce food safely, and ethically, as it is considered being the basic requirement to ensure food safety and not for marketing gimmicks (GlobalGAP, 2014). A study in the UK reveals that there are certain organic brands which consumer trust more and ready to pay a premium price for them, Soil Association and Organic Farmers and Growers, rated top by the UK-based consumer in a recent study (Gerrard et al., 2013). The study revealed the sceptical approach that is penetrating among the UK-based consumers about the organic logos as they found to be unsure about the inspection process and standards (Gerrard et al., 2013).

The authenticity of a brand was a major concern as the consumers are unaware of the standards and techniques being acquired to produce a specific organic product. Most of the consumers are not sure what organic products mean. Also, major supermarkets have organic lines under their own names, and that is where producer's organic logos lose attention (Gerrard et al., 2013). Prominent retailers and major brands in developed countries actively promote private standards initiatives (PSIs) to minimise the risk of being involved in any controversy which could affect their brand image and reputation, and also for promoting social issues (Tallontire, 2007). Fairtrade is found to be the most prominent standard that has also been appreciated for its work in strengthening local
farmers. However, disappointingly, the figures for gender empowerment are not commendable, besides all the efforts on seminars and workshops. There is little evidence that it increased women’s bargain power (Ruben and Zuniga, 2011). Despite the concern raised by producers and poor farmers, private standards are mandatory now (Tallontire, 2007). Overall, Fairtrade has done some great reforms at production level. However, there is a threat from other private standards that are based on the B2B strategy and offer confirmed prices (Ruben and Zuniga, 2011).

Later, in another study, it was argued that private sector players have the greatest influence on Private Standards Initiative (PSI). The horizontal and vertical aspects of a supply chain were being analysed to establish the level of influence from the top leadership to the poor farmers at the bottom of the supply chain. The roles of importers and donors are also positively linked with the high level of influence since if they withdraw the support which they are providing, this could affect the situation dramatically (Tallontire et al., 2011). Although these PSIs are designed to create a link between CSR and development due to the presence of many actors, it is not clear who going to regulate them (Tallontire, 2007). It was criticised as the PSIs were initiated to improve the coordination in the value chain that would ultimately improve the governance. The results show the limited impact on democratic governance and primary beneficiaries were private sector players. The scope for civil society organisations is also limited in the formation of these private standards (Tallontire et al., 2011).

Developed economies such as the USA and EU have strong public standards, and they ensure key issues like food safety, animal welfare, and use of water, waste and recycling and use of pesticides all meet the required standards (Hobbs, 2010). Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) systems are mandatory for all federal registered producers in the USA (Hobbs, 2010). Since 2007 there are also obligations to label the food items in order to provide all the required dietary and nutrition information to the consumer (Hobbs, 2010). The changing economic and political situation globally could change the dynamics as currently the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and OECD member countries rule and decide when formulating these standards but if the power shifts it will certainly have a huge impact on private standards (Henson and Humphrey, 2010).
The implications for WTO are it's core values that ensure no discrimination among suppliers and producers from all the member countries. Additionally, there are special arrangements within the members countries to award *favourite nation status* to certain countries which results in obtaining open access to all the markets. WTO, however, has no control to ensure the food safety (Hobbs, 2010). On the other hand, buyers in developed countries are keen on food safety and social compliance, and also, it is unlikely that every producing country managed to gain favourite nation status. Therefore private standards bridge the trust deficit and ensure due diligence among buyers and sellers (Hobbs, 2010).

Private standards are also effective in reducing transaction cost through building business relations between producers and buyers and ensure the information flow throughout the chain (Hobbs, 2010). Previously it was argued by Jongwanich (2009) that there is a great room for improvement in the existing standards to achieve social protection however the role of developed countries is critical to keep tweaking the standards for optimal results.

Konefal et al., (2005) has criticised governance through private standards and the role of supermarkets. They argued that private standards are not be open for public debate to make democratic decisions, not anymore at least. Rather they are moving towards the backstage where only buyers, including supermarkets, retail groups, and other importers control them for their own interests. They want to control how, where and by whom the food produced, what they are selling (Konefal et al., 2005). These standards are not mainly driven by the stated cause, as they came out as a reaction to the pressure from the public thus the primary objective was not the betterment of the society. Even all the right initiatives about food safety, health and safety of workers and environment protection were part of the strategy to maximise profit. They further raised the following question; will there be any positive effect of these standards in the long term? The current evidence suggested that there will be many controversies and this mode of governance will remain contradictory (Konefal et al., 2005). Richards et al., (2013) also supported this school of thought by arguing that the elected governments must do the agricultural restructuring. However, in reality, it has shifted, and now non-elected market actors control this. They believe that the future of small-scale farmers and producers is bleak in this mode of governance. Buyers in developed countries are more
interested in building ties with large-scale farmers and producers as they are in a better position to adopt private standards. It has been argued in the past too that governments should have control over private standards as it has been controlled by private bodies (Busch, 2011).

One thing that has not been discussed is the importance of these private standards without government policies and law, such as land law, corporate law, and property law? They probably would look meaningless, so it is incorrect to say that these standards can work without public governance, that they cannot be implemented without the state will (Busch, 2011).

Bonnel (2010), found that countries with secure labour conditions and standards, perform even better as compared to other countries and their exports to GDP ratio is higher too. Using the panel data technique for the data from 112 countries between 1980-2004 focusing on the two variables, work injuries and the rate of strikes and lockouts he statistically tested what impact these factors have on the export performance. The results revealed a positive correlation between improved labour conditions and export performance. He found countries with less reported injuries and fewer union strikes have a better export-GDP ratio. Although he emphasised the complexities for businesses in developing countries as it is hard for them to maintain such standards since there is no formal agreement on the imposition of labour standards in developing countries but as the global environment is changing, maintaining the labour standards is becoming a challenge (Bonnel, 2010).

Therefore, it is in the interest of the Government to initiate the implementation of the criteria. Recent research has quoted improved living standards for the certified producers as compared to the non-certified. The study reported that the ease of adoption, which negates the previous impression that smallholder producer, cannot cope with international standards because of the financial cost (Chiputwa et al., 2015). However, it was not clear whether the better living standard existed among the certified producers before the standards were adopted or not.
3.8.1 – ADOPTION OF PRIVATE STANDARDS

It was reported that the trade agreements under WTO influence these standards, since the globalisation of food value chain (Smith, 2009). Hobbs (2010) argued oppositely by stating that WTO has no Jurisdiction over private standards and that is why some of the voluntary consensus standards are becoming de facto mandatory. Wouters and Geraets (2012) also support Hobbs‘ argument by arguing the unclear status of private standards under WTO, especially in the presence of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement.

There are also other underlined factors that determine the adoption of such standards, a cross-national empirical study based on historical, infrastructure conditions, geographical location, institutional and sectorial characteristics concluded the importance of macroeconomic factors that have a huge impact on the adoption of private standards (Herzfeld et al., 2011). A study on the Colombian coffee industry and the role of private standards revealed that the majority of the certified farmers are those who have more assets and quick access to the capital (Ruben and Zuniga, 2011). The majority of private standards required huge financial costs in order to implement them thus they were not suitable for small-scale producers and suppliers. However, GlobalGAP and The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) have options available for small-scale producers to facilitate them in the form of a group (Fuchs et al., 2011).

Producers in developing countries were advised to participate in such schemes, but they know their prime target market better. If their target market is not concerned about international certifying firms, then it is better to adopt the national program as it will save money and resources (Mergenthaler et al., 2009). However, those who adopt them would be of competitive advantage and will capture more exports into the high-value global chains. In developed countries, local government agencies have done much work to ensure the minimum level is achieved through public standards and therefore private standards set their baseline while drafting their code to go beyond the basic requirements and standards (Smith, 2009). These standards could play a critical role in accelerating economic growth (Bonnel, 2010).

A recent study conducted in Uganda found the adaptability of volunteer food standards among the poor and smallholder coffee growers, but the research fails to establish a
clear positive relation between standards adoption and poverty reduction (Chiputwa et al., 2015). Schuster and Maertens (2015) found no correlation between standards adoption and improved export performance; these findings are significant and directly linked with Chiputwa et al., (2015) as export performance is the only possible factor that could affect the poverty level. Both of these studies were conducted in different countries with different products, but the findings complement each other. These studies also strengthen the argument of Jongwanich (2009) that the impact of food standards on improved export performance of the businesses in developing countries is inconclusive and leads to the question raised by Loconto (2014), whether some standards are better than others?

Over the last two decades in general and last ten years in particular, there have been many initiatives introduced into the global supply chain. The main purpose of those initiatives was to improve the working conditions in the exporting countries (Robinson, 2010). A formed combination of different actors from government, businesses and civil society joined to counter an issue that affects all of them by finding a solution is commonly known as a multi-stakeholder initiative (MSI). This approach works well in compound situations as it starts by collecting the key information from different stakeholders, analysing it and then finding a joint solution that is acceptable to all affected parties (Roloff, 2008).

Mena and Palazzo (2012) highlighted the role of government and its inability to address all the concerning issues that affects society and environment and thus suggested the usefulness of MSIs in a global context by building soft laws to bridge the gap. Rasche (2012) also found that MSIs are based on relational systems. To build a better MSI, it is critical to understand the underline relationship, and that will help in analysing its impact on society.

3.8.2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE STANDARDS

Private standards such as GlobalGAP along with publicity and goodwill also have implications, especially for developing countries. There is immense pressure on the producers in those countries from the importing firms in developed countries to acquire the standards certificate and to ensure compliance (Henson and Humphrey, 2010). It is not a straight forward step if a producer in developing country decides to enter into the
GVC, there are standards need to be achieved consistently. There are private certification bodies who certified the producers, but this process required a massive financial budget however it is compulsory for the producers to be certified to make sure the food safety and quality along with other requirements have been met (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014). Previously it was argued that trade in global value chains has different meanings now, there are set standards in the form of codes, and every producer must adhere to them as they are not left with any way to avoid these standards (Tallontire, 2007).

Private standards put special importance towards food safety and traceability; all private standards are keen on these and ranked them as mandatory to be qualified. It has been criticised as these factors are only important for the end consumers in the developed country and do not reflect any concerns for the farmers and other stakeholders involves in production (Fuchs et al., 2011). The national markets entry requires compliance with local public standards and they vary country to country. If a producer is fully complying with the global private standards, they still have to comply with public standards to ensure entry into the national market. However, there will be fewer producers that are complying with both standards as private standards require more infrastructural changes and capital and not easy for every producer to adopt them (Smith, 2009).

There are a set standards required to be followed by audits to ensure compliance down the value chain (Fuchs et al., 2011). Smith (2009) suggests the implications for the producers and exporters if they fail to comply with the requirements set by the global buyers in the forms of private standards. He also identifies the importance of public and private standards; it is equally necessary to comply with the public standards in addition to private standards (Smith, 2009). There has been a new institutional arrangement formed with the encouragement of GlobalGAP between exporters, farmers, and donors to ease the cost of compliance. Public-private partnership (PPP) is making it simpler for farmers as the cost has been distributed among public institutes, donors, exporters and farmers, and places no burden to the producer solely. There is a great opportunity for the small-scale farmers to upgrade under PPP and get their produce to the high-valued GVCs (Kersting and Wollni, 2012).
Chapter 3: Literature Review

The demographics suggest that there is no evidence that the age or sex of farmers has any influence on GlobalGAP adoption but socioeconomic factors and their education level does have a strong impact on the adoption and compliance with the standards (Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013). Other factors such as access to the water in terms of irrigation access and previous experience in working with the GVCs are the added benefits and producers with these characteristics had shown greater interest in adoption and compliance with GlobalGAP. With the continued support from the donors and other policymakers, it is critical to encourage the farmers to promote and ensure food safety (Kersting and Wollni, 2012).

3.9 – GLOBALG.A.P (GOOD AGRICULTURE PRACTICES)

When it comes to the reporting, the only success stories which have been highlighted are in the form of CSR reports and any failure, always appear in the shape of a scandal that damages the brand reputation (Wiese and Toporowski, 2013). The last two decades has witnessed numerous food scandals that occurred in Europe, as citizens of the EU became more conscious and sensitive to such issues due to the fear of catching associated diseases. They started to react and demanded extra measures to ensure food safety. This situation obliged the public and private sector to initiate tighter measures for food safety, so the new legislations regarding food safety controls have been introduced (World Bank Working Paper, 2005).

To handle this situation, in the late 1990s, Euro-Retailers Produce Working Group (EUREP), a consortium consisting of major EU-based retail groups, designed a code of conduct for their producers with the name of Good Agriculture Practices (GAP) commonly known as EurepGAP. It was a voluntary private standard that has gained a reputation for being the most prestigious private standard throughout the global value chains. In 2007 they changed the name to GlobalGAP. This standard is the pioneer for addressing the issues of food safety, labour conditions, hygiene, animal welfare and the environmental management at the producer’s end to ensure their consumers in EU that whatever they are selling and wherever it is coming from, it has been produced ethically (GlobalGAP, 2015). World Bank Working Paper (2005) also suggested that in coming days EUREP GAP is expected to dominate the fresh produce production in developing countries, in particular among the producers/exporters who supplied to EU.
GlobalGAP is consortium-specific standard hence fall into the category of consortia standards (UNIDO, 2015). It has emerged as a new dimension and soon become the leading standard certificate, and rest of private standards struggled to get compatible with it. The proliferation leads to set new standards and emergence of a hybrid market that was retail driven and high end, the only requirement to enter into this market is following the supra-legal demands set in the form of a private standard certificate (Mondelaers and Huylenbroeck, 2008). Although it all has started in EU for GlobalGAP, the volunteer standard has initiated to build a partnership between global retailers and producers and that enable them to become the mandatory standard for the top 10 mega retail group around the world including Wal-Mart and Tesco. The standard continues to innovate the ways to enhance the participation, and the idea of group certification for small-hold clusters even enable the poor farmers to benefit from the scheme (Kalfagianni, 2014).

GlobalGAP, first initiated by the major retailers in EU, is a private standard for the implementation of good agriculture practices (GAP) mainly during the production phase (Henson et al., 2011). It started with the focus on fruits and vegetable production under the name of EurepGAP, but now also covers plants and animals globally (Henson et al., 2011). The major known challenge for the producers in developing country is to comply with the standards set by the GlobalGAP as it requires a major shift in the production process. This situation makes them rely heavily on donors and exporters to acquire both technical and financial assistance (Kersting and Wollni, 2012). The purpose behind this certification was to go beyond the value chain to ensure food safety and traceability especially when the products are coming from a developing country (Henson et al., 2011). However, from the producers’ perspective, the core attraction of GlobalGAP is trade with high-valued global chains and the export value of the produce. However, it is not evident that being a certified farm will increase its chances of getting into GVCs. It was reported that mostly buyers do prefer buying from certified farmers (Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013). This leads to the formation of a research question for this study, that is, does the adoption of standards such as the GlobalGAP present a challenge for the mango growers in Pakistan?

If a producer fails to comply with codes or not having enough gain, he remains at the risk of losing the certificate. However, the analysis reflects a considerable gain in the
form of export performance for the certified producers (Henson et al., 2011). Other constraints highlighted by Jongwanich (2009) include the capacity of suppliers to provide compatible supplies, available resources especially financial resources. Workforce and established institutions also play a pivotal role in complying with the standards. She further emphasised the need for governments in developing country to assist producers in facing the challenge and to provide them with credits or to initiate some multilateral project to cope with the financial and technical requirements (Jongwanich, 2009).

It is hard to suggest the impact of GlobalGAP on imports of fresh fruits and vegetable as the specific data for certified, and non-certified items is not available. However, it is the requirements of the supermarket chains in the developed countries like the UK (Henson et al., 2011). Although the major export destinations were the UAE and other Gulf countries for Pakistani mangoes, with the recent initiatives from USAID for helping with the capacity building and farms infrastructure with GlobalGAP certification help mango growers to access the developed countries market like USA and EU (Hafeez et al., 2012). Earlier it was suggested by Riaz et al., (2010) that by adopting good agricultural practices (GAP) standards, the Pakistani mango industry could enhance its market share in high-income Western markets such as USA and EU. However, there is a need for them to build trade terms with leading supermarkets in those regions to accelerate the process. They also argued that the tough standards, poor marketing strategy and lack of high quality and consistent supplies represent other hurdles which could be addressed by adopting the certificate.

There is no clear evidence as to how significant adoption of the GlobalGAP is for the farmers as the exporting companies took a huge portion of the profit and operational costs also affect the actual financial gain of the end producer (Kersting and Wollni, 2012). A study in sub-Saharan African countries reveals a considerable growth in export sales for the GlobalGAP certified growers; the average margin was found to be roughly €2.6 million higher as compared to similar non-certified producers (Henson et al., 2011). The significant results are evidence of how important GlobalGAP is in terms of accessing the high-value global market. The study however also concludes the benefit for those who took the first initiative and set the entrepreneurial reputation for their
business. The impact is lower to those who adopted the certificate in the end (Henson et al., 2011).

There has been not much attention paid toward workers at the certified farms. However, there is evidence of improved working conditions at the certified farms as compared to the non-certified farms. The other benefits including higher wages and sustainable employment are also associated with the GlobalGAP certified farms along with creating more jobs for women (Colen et al., 2012). Previous studies in a similar area revealed the price constraint associated with the certification cost but options are available for small-scale farmers to get financial support from the exporters and the donors. Results are also encouraging in the context of compliance in developing countries with the required standards as GlobalGAP provides complete support on how to achieve them. The study poses the challenge for the countries which are behind in the race and for the businesses within those countries (Henson et al., 2011).

Financial cost and not so significant returns are the major constraints in the adoption of the GlobalGAP, but at the same time these standards are going to stay, and producers who want to trade with lucrative GVCs have to adopt them. There is a need for support, and initiatives from the local government for the small-scale farmers in the form of finance and education to prepared them for the future (Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013). Unlike the proprietary standards set by the larger retail groups such as Tesco and Marks and Spencer, GlobalGAP is based on voluntary consensus among a panel of stakeholders including supermarkets and retail groups. Another distinctive characteristic associated with GlobalGAP is that it is not a tool for product differentiation since there is no logo or label they use to highlight it. The core focus of the standard is to improve the supply chain operations and protect reputation (Hobbs, 2010). The level of awareness among the certified farmers regarding various aspects of GlobalGAP also varied, every farmer is aware of traceability, record keeping, and internal audits but only a few know about aspects such as irrigation and water management (Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013).

3.10 – A CRITIQUE OF PRIVATE STANDARDS

Although different standards target various aspects and specific issues, they all have two particular core limitations, and they are, firstly, their inability to influence producers
that how they put them into practice or how they enact them. Secondly, what role these standards play in rural development (Loconto, 2014). Some studies even found adverse impacts on the farmers in developing countries (Schuster and Maertens, 2013). One more criticism is that these private standards faces play in part in allowing supermarkets to become such a powerful actor in the global value chains. As these standards are based on CSR-related activities, the supermarkets in the developed countries use them for profit maximisation through product differentiation (Sodano et al., 2008).

The core reason behind the initiative of GlobalGAP was similar to the other quality assurance certificates, and that is to ensure their stakeholders that environmental and social responsibility standards met throughout the production. The audit reports suggest that more attention has been given towards the production processes rather on the environmental issues. Also, workers health and safety and welfare including a minimum wage rate are ranked as recommended and not as a major must (Thompson and Lockie, 2013). It was argued that the utility of these private standards in terms of opportunities for distribution for development is limited to a certain group of people (Kalfagianni, 2014). The GlobalGAP refers to the environment and socially responsible measures in the context of the locality. This means that these standards vary from country to country and this is a critical weak point. The GlobalGAP has its own standards, but when it comes to cover the core causes, it refers to the local requirements of that particular country (Thompson and Lockie, 2013).

A recent study on the effects of private standards on small-scale asparagus producers in Peru revealed the negative impact of these standards on small-scale farmers. It is argued that previous studies only concern about the certified farms and the financial gain but nobody considered the losses endured by small-scale asparagus producers in Peru. The country has a reputation in the international market for asparagus, and everyone who is involved in the production benefits from this. Since private standards came in practice, the balance has moved toward the large producers. They are capable of bearing the financial cost of having private standard certificates such as GlobalGAP (Schuster and Maertens, 2013). Earlier it was argued that upfront costs could be a key constraint, but the donors are and would be available with financial and technical support (Henson et al., 2011). There is a need for government and NGOs involvement to facilitate the
small-scale producers with financial aid and other support such as training to make them able to achieve the certificates (Schuster and Maertens, 2013).

Almost all private standard certification bodies have private auditors to monitor compliance through, quarterly, half-yearly, and yearly audits both announced and unannounced. This situation makes them relying on the auditors and their audit reports. It has been argued that different certification bodies have different priorities and the same problem arise among the independent auditors. The origin of these standards was based on how to satisfy the customers and to regain the brand trust if these standards still create doubts then there is a need of revival to establish the authenticity of these standard schemes (Albersmeier et al., 2009). Consumers in the developed countries are well aware of sourcing standards, and there are wide ranges of factors that influence their food buying behaviour. However, the studies show that the exploitation of developing countries is high on their agenda, even above forest destruction and genetically modified food (Jones and Comfort, 2003).

GlobalGAP is the most prominent name among the agriculture food industry’s standards, and is accepted globally. Although the body is recognised for its work for the food safety and traceability in GVCs, the standard also considers social and environmental factors along with the responsibility while issuing its certificates (Hachez and Wouters, 2011). Private standards in agriculture food chains are quasi-mandatory, and almost all the buyers use these standards for their marketing as well to gain competitive advantage (Lee et al., 2012). The fastest growing region for GlobalGAP is developing countries, but unfortunately, there is no representation from developing countries in the board room, western influenced board strategies are somehow biased as the decision makers are less aware of the challenges faced by the poor farmers in developing countries. Due to the less participatory rights, there is a gap between the policy makers and growers in developing countries. The situation leads to an important debate about the democratic legitimacy of the GlobalGAP (Hachez and Wouters, 2011).

Private standards within agricultural production are also criticised as being a hurdle for small-scale producers in terms of their entry into the GVCs and treated as an obstacle to poverty reduction (Lee et al., 2012). Comprehensive literature on private standards refers these standards as a volunteer or optional that businesses choose for themselves
but this is not the case for the producers in developing countries as they left with no choice but to adapt these standards if they are willing to trade with western high-valued markets. The three known options for the small-scale producers are an upgrade, downgrade or exit, where downgrading refers to cutting labour and other operational costs to supply at low prices to remain competitive (Lee et al., 2012). However, Jongwanich (2009) opposed this previously and argued that standards are not only being considered as a barrier but they are opportunities to upgrade the techniques and infrastructure and to meet the market trends and sophistication.

A recent study in Tanzania found that the tea producers are actively involved in good practices. They are treating their workers well, looking out for ways to control environment damage and they want it to be considered as normal procedure rather than letting the standards dictate to them. The number of such producers is growing as they want to see an end to standards dominance in the market. They are not willing to keep on paying for the certification (Loconto, 2014).

The existing literature has covered several aspects of private standards and their impacts, but no empirical research has been carried out to test the impact of private standards on the rural workers' motivation. There is evidence that these standards have improved the working conditions in developing countries significantly (Colen et al., 2012; Kersting and Wollni, 2012; Lemeilleur, 2013; Lund-Thomsen, 2008; 2009; Nelson et al., 2007). Forsman-Hugg et al., (2013) argued that improving working conditions and better wages can affect the workers' motivation.

A United Nations report also suggested that implementing CSR practices linked with employees' motivation (UNIDO, 2014). However, it was not known how the rural workers would react to such improvements, and what would be most important factors for them. It was argued that the urban and rural workers have different characteristics. The rural workers either work on the daily wages on a self-employed basis or they have to work many additional hours in their employments as compare to the urban workers (Fortin, 2008). Pateman (2011) found that house prices are less affordable to the rural workers as compare to their urban counterparts. He further argued that there be fewer jobs for the workers in rural areas comparing with the number of available workers and employment ratio. Earlier, it was suggested that there is an opportunity to inquire about
the motivation factors that influence the rural agriculture workers (Barbuto Jr. et al., 2004).

3.11 – MOTIVATION

Robbins and Coulter (2012) defined motivation as a result of interaction between a situation and the person. It is a process to energise the efforts to achieve goals; they identified three characteristics of motivation which include: energy, direction, and persistence. Energy reflects the intensity of effort made, direction to guide to achieve firm’s goals and persistence is to exert the effort until that goal is achieved. The duo also insisted on bringing compatibility between an individual’s needs and organisation’s goals for the best results.

It was argued by Honore (2009) that every business required motivated employees for that business or firm’s survival, motivating employees could be as cheap as praising their efforts. Later it was also acknowledged as a continuous process that has to keep on going (Goudas et al., 2011); motivation thus depends on the individual and the circumstances around that person (Strombeck, and Wakefield, 2008). It is certainly different than satisfaction (Mahesh and Kasturi, 2006), as it was previously argued by Pardee (1990) that motivation, job satisfaction, and reward systems are the components of one specific area of any organisation, where motivation has the strength to overlap the other two elements.

This theory was supported by Ramlall (2004), as he argued that the challenges of employee retention are faced by every small, medium and large organisation regardless of their size and the role of motivation at work. He highlighted the importance of retaining critical and experienced employees as losing them would cost the organisation from an economic perspective and it would also represent a loss of knowledge. As mango cultivation is greatly based on manual handling and the process of water use, pesticides use and taking the fruit from the tree requires certain expertise. All the workers at certified farms have been trained extensively to follow each step with care as the fruit is an exceedingly sensitive commodity. Also, these workers work on their own without supervision most of the time, as to cover a considerably large area; it is not possible to monitor each worker individually. Therefore, it is critical to retain such workers for sustainable performance of the particular farm.
There are several theories associated with the concept of motivation, below are several pioneering theories and most of the above definitions are somehow derived from these theories.

3.12 – MOTIVATION THEORIES

There are many motivational theories exists today, and almost all of them have been tested empirically at some stage of time at the certain population. The most famous motivation theories are the hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1954). The two-factor theory is also known as the hygiene factor theory (Herzberg, 1959). The X and Y theory (McGregor, 1960), the achievement theory (McClelland, 1961), the expectancy theory Vroom (1964), and the existence, relatedness and growth theory (Alderfer, 1969). Below there is a brief introduction to these theories.

3.12.1 – HIERARCHY OF NEEDS THEORY BY MASLOW

Maslow (1954) relates motivation with human needs. According to him there is a hierarchy of human needs. He introduced a pyramid with five levels, and each level reflects certain needs and the hierarchy move from bottom to top. It is certainly not possible to motivate someone by ignoring the bottom two levels and address the issues of level three as the lower need has to be satisfied first.

Figure 3.5 - Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need
(Source: McLeod, 2007)
Maslow (1954) believes that the given hierarchy of needs represents what could motivate an individual. Security or family comes after the basic needs of food and shelter, and it could reach the level of self-actualisation where a person can best use his talent and potentially provided all hierarchies been satisfied. Lea at al., (1987) stated that Maslow’s theory is based on the doctrine that talks about humans’ efforts and potential to achieve self-actualise. This theory has been criticised by arguing that human needs are inborn and this fact downgrades the issue of culture and social interaction (Trigg, 2004). It was also argued that the social connections in the context of Maslow’s views are limited to self-actualisation (Hanley and Abell, 2002). Maslow’s approach ignored the social interaction factor and solely relied on an isolated individual self (Trigg, 2004).

3.12.2 – HYGIENE (TWO FACTORS) THEORY BY HERZBERG
Herzberg (1959) introduced his two-factor theory of motivation also known as a motivation-hygiene theory. He argued that the factors that can lead to job satisfaction are not necessarily opposite to those which lead to dissatisfaction. According to him motivation of an employee is associated with his attitude and in order to inquire about the attitude he designed two distinct lists of factors. One group, he named as motivators and the other as hygiene factors:
Table 3.3  Herzberg’s Two Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators (job factors)</th>
<th>Hygiene Factors (extra job factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition</td>
<td>• Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement</td>
<td>• Interpersonal Relations with Company Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>• Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advancement</td>
<td>• Company Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsibility</td>
<td>• Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work Itself</td>
<td>• Factors in Personal Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Status</td>
<td>• Job Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Herzberg, 1959)

The hygiene factors are not directly linked with the job itself, but with the atmosphere around him while performing the job. Both factors thus rely on inherent satisfaction or dissatisfaction; however, the results of his survey showed that the factors caused extreme satisfaction or dissatisfaction were not identical.

3.12.3 – X AND Y THEORY BY MCGREGOR

McGregor (1960) identified the two different behaviours in managers, and he refers to them as X and Y. The X type of managers believe that the subordinates who they are working with are lazy and are looking for the opportunities to escape work - this behaviour makes them churlish as they are always after their employees and this situation leads to mistrust at both ends, these managers always blame others for any failure. The Y type of managers believes that all the workers are self-motivated and they can perform better on their own without any additional supervision by providing a healthy environment at work. This thinking leads to a better workplace with open communications and fewer hierarchies. He further argued that by changing the behaviour from X to Y it is possible to motivate the employees.

3.12.4 – EXISTENCE – RELATEDNESS – GROWTH THEORY BY ALDERFER

This theory is directly derived from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Alderfer (1969) simplified Maslow’s theory by merging the five level hierarchies into three levels: the
existence, relatedness and growth (ERG) theory. He gave varying degrees of importance to each level according to their abilities to get verified. Existence reflects the basic needs and is the easiest to verify, whereas growth depends on individuals and is hard to verify.

3.12.5 – EXPECTANCY THEORY BY VROOM
Vroom (1964) introduced the element of expectation and how it affects the behaviour of individuals. He argued that the three variables are known as expectancy, instrumentality and valence;

Expectancy: where expectation drives performance
Instrumentality: performance seek desired results (for example a pay rise or promotion)
Valence: it is critical that the concerned employee values those rewards

The whole idea enhances the importance of engagement between the management and the team and how management can make the right decision by providing a reward to the individual’s performance or if the reward is as that individual expected it.

3.12.6 – ACHIEVEMENT THEORY BY MCCLELLAND
McClelland (1961) proposed three factors that can lead to motivation as a sense of achievement, feelings of affiliation and sense of power.
Achievement: people who belong to this category tend to be hard workers, they like to take extra responsibilities and challenging tasks. They do not rely on luck and like to get feedback about their work.
Affiliation: this group represent those who like to work with influential people, they like to establish relationships with powerful people, and it motivates them to be a part of an elite group where their work is recognised.
Power: individuals from this category like to hold the position where they can control and influence the others. They prefer working at the top management level or in military sector and always stayed disciplined.
3.13 – THEORY ADOPTED

Pardee (1990) conducted a detailed literature review analysis on the four top motivation theories which were Maslow’s theory, Herzberg’s theory, McGregor’s theory and McClelland’s theory, and he found many similarities in all those theories. He argued that a clear relationship exists between the theories from Maslow, Herzberg, and McClelland. He further claimed that Herzberg’s hygiene factors have the same criteria as Maslow’s bottom three levels which are physiological, safety and a sense of belonging as they both consider the factors such as basic pay and working conditions, etc. Also, the Herzberg’s motivation factors derived from Maslow’s top two levels which are esteem and self-actualisation as they consist of factors such as achievement, recognition, and growth, etc.

The contradiction between these two theories is based on the psychological state of mind. Maslow (1954), was convinced that all unsatisfied needs provide a source of motivation regardless of the level of the hierarchy, whereas Herzberg (1959) believed that only top two level of Maslow’s hierarchy which he described as motivators in his theory are the real source of motivation. He believed that satisfying extrinsic factors (salary, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relation, company policy and administration, etc.) could not lead to a motivated workforce and only the intrinsic factors (work itself, achievement, recognition, and advancement, etc.) are the source of motivation (Pardee, 1990).

This particular study has tested the Herzberg’s two-factor theory in a developing country context and unlike the engineers and accountants as examined by Herzberg (1959); the subject of this research was the rural agriculture workers.

3.13.1 – HERZBERG AND EMPLOYEES’ MOTIVATION

There are two main types of motivational theories that have been used to test the motivation at a workplace. These are known as need theories and process theories (Lundberg et al., 2009). Need theories are based on a model that helps to identify the particular needs that motivate an individual. Achieving that individual’s motivation for work goes through fulfilling the identified needs (Wright, 1989). Herzber (1959) argued that there are further two factors involved with individuals needs at a workplace. The presence of one factor can lead to avoiding employee’s dissatisfaction, and the absence
of the same factor can cause dissatisfaction. He called this factor the hygiene factor. The second factor deals with employee's motivation. He emphasised that the presence of the hygiene factor did not lead to achieving employee's motivation; in fact, there are other elements that motivate an employee. He labelled those factors as the motivators.

Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation has been applied and tested widely in the academic studies and professional reports. The theory has been largely used to test job satisfaction and motivation of healthcare (doctors and nursing staff) workers, and in particular, those who work in challenging circumstances (Labarda, 2011; Labiris et al., 2008; Lambrou et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2010; Paleologou et al., 2006; Purohit et al., 2016). Research based on Vietnam public healthcare workers reported that the majority of public health workers perform their jobs in rural areas and tough conditions. The research found appreciation from the management and job security to be the major motivators for such healthcare workers, and that low salaries caused dissatisfaction among them (Dieleman et al., 2003).

A study that was based on temporary workers at a skiing resort found that the Herzberg's theory is still valid. This study reported that there was a weak relation between hygiene factors such as wages and temporary workers' motivation. The study also argued that workers' higher needs play a critical role in achieving their motivation (Lundberg et al., 2009). Pegler (2012) found a similar outcome while testing the Herzberg theory to test the motivation for reusing the open educational resources. He argued that an increased salary would not be an effective motivator as Herzberg suggested it.

Working conditions and wages play a critical role in motivating individuals to remain within a certain post. It was argued that if working conditions remain below an acceptable level or wages fail to cover expenses; this situation leads to dissatisfaction. A dissatisfied worker will look for other ways to cover the deficit rather putting extra efforts at work (Dieleman et al., 2003). This point opposed Herzberg's theory as he considered wages as a hygiene factor that did not necessarily affect workers' motivation. Lambrou et al., (2010) also found that financial incentives were among the non-incentives that motivated employees. They reported appreciation from management and a stable income to be major motivators. The main factors which caused
dissatisfaction were poor working conditions and low wages. Gaziel (2001) conducted research based on the Herzberg theory which involved elementary school principles. The findings were consistent with the Herzberg theory. The research suggested that the interpersonal skills of the principles play the central role in motivating the teachers at elementary schools.

It is not possible to achieve employees' motivation by merely focusing and fulfilling their fundamental needs (the motivators), but there is a need to build a programme that considers the extrinsic needs (hygiene factors) as well (Purohit et al., 2016). A study to assess the motivation of library workers revealed that there are positive rewards such as appreciation and money, and there are negative actions such as punishment. The study argued that the negative action can force an individual to perform a certain task, but it cannot make that individual happy or motivated about it. Based on Herzberg theory, the study suggested that negative factors like close monitoring of workers must be discouraged. The employees needed to be provided with a good working atmosphere to achieve optimum motivation (Olorunsola, 1992).

Location, cultural and social needs also play a pivotal role in establishing the needs of the workers. A recent study in Ghana claimed that financial incentives were found to be a prominent predictor for the motivation of health professionals. The study partially supported the Herzberg theory as leadership skills and opportunities to grow were among the identified motivating factors (Adzei and Atinga, 2012). This represents the central argument of this particular research. The rural workers in developing countries have different needs and challenges, and they have different priorities.

3.14 - CSR AND EMPLOYEES’ MOTIVATION

Skudiene and Auruskeviciene (2012) argued that corporate social responsibility and how it affects workers' motivation and job satisfaction is an understudied phenomenon. They found that internal CSR is more strongly related to workers' motivation as compared to the firm’s external CSR policies. Customer related activities and helping society were among the top external practices which affect their motivation. Employees are the most important and critical stakeholders for any business; every successful business hugely relies on its workforce to keep up the business momentum. As CSR is highly diverse in terms of stakeholders’ expectations and deals with all the involved
stakeholders including employees, often it is classified as internal CSR or employees’ engagement. Existing literature is consolidated and mainly focused on employees’ involvement in the process.

Previous studies focuses on how to encourage employees to participate in CSR related activities and enhancing their understanding and knowledge about CSR initiatives taken by their respective employers (Albdour and Altarawneh, 2012; Haski-Leventhal, 2013; Mirvis, 2012; O’Riordan and Fairbrass, 2014). All these areas of research do have importance but they mainly deal with the input point of view and little is known about the output or what impact such initiatives have on employees’ performance. This situation leads to the formation of the key research question of this study, that is, what is the relationship between CSR practices and workers’ job satisfaction and motivation?

It is not known what impact it has on employees and whether it improves their working, whether it enhances their productivity and most critical, whether it motivates them towards their job. It can be the other way around in the case that their employers don’t take part in CSR-related activities. Tongo (2015) argued that CSR does have a strong impact on employees’ motivation and he found it evident with the more motivated workforce in Nigerian SMEs as compared to not participating SMEs. He argued that employees were found to be committed and gave back to employers where they had been treated well as compared to their peers in other firms.

### 3.15 – BUILDING UP OF THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

The detailed literature survey led to the identification of the knowledge gap and the formation of the conceptual framework to define and test the hypotheses. The literature review suggested that previous studies focused at macro (firm/farms/SMEs) level productivity (Leipziger, 2001; 2003; Rasche and Esser, 2006) in terms of financial gains (Kersting and Wollni, 2012) or access to the new markets (FAO, 2007; Sun and Zhang, 2009).
This particular study has attempted to explore the effects of CSR practices at micro (individuals/workers) level. The hypothesis based model to collect the quantitative data is inspired by a model used by Turyakira et al., (2014) for research on CSR and SMEs in Uganda, also the same model was previously used by the European Commission (2007) for research on CSR and SMEs productivity in Europe. So, it is an established model to test CSR practices against competitiveness of a firm.

Turyakira et al., (2014) hypothesised the CSR factors/practices to test their relationship with increased competitiveness of the SMEs in Uganda. Hypothesis testing is one of the most important statistical interfaces (Li and Yu, 2012). They heavily rely on the assumption that the given model which is under consideration is correct (Hagemann, 2012). Both the previous studies (European Commission, 2007; and Turyakira et al., 2014) seek the relationship between CSR practices and productivity of the participating business/SME.

Figure 3.6 - Initial model adopted for this research
(Source: Turyakira et al., 2014)
Turyakira et al., (2014) has used the above model (see Figure 3.6) for investigating the relationship between CSR practices and SMEs' performance in Uganda. The main attraction in this model for the researcher was its independent variables. Before Turyakira et al., (2014), the European Commission (2007), carried out a similar study to evaluate the usefulness of CSR for the competitiveness of the European SMEs. That study also used the same independent variables. It confirms the legitimacy of the proposed independent variables to observe CSR practices. These variables were ideal to explore CSR practices at the certified farms and to test the relationship with workers' motivation.

The formation of the model was in accordance with the population and sample under subject. As this study was held in Pakistan and the researcher was convinced that the given model was best suited for developing countries context. The above model was used to assess the business performance of the SMEs, but this particular study aimed to evaluate the farm workers' motivation, so the unit of analysis was different and to adjust the model according to the purpose and the research questions, the researcher has amended the model accordingly.

As Forsman-Hugg et al., (2013), UNIDO (2014), and Tongo (2015) suggested, CSR practices can positively affect employees' competitiveness and can improved workers' motivation, the model was modified according to this particular research. The irrelevant variables have been either removed or replaced with the more relevant ones. Below is the proposed model for this research to collect and analysed the quantitative data:
**Figure 3.7 - Proposed model designed by the researcher**

**H1a:** There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.

**H1b:** There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Motivation.

**H2a:** There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.

**H2b:** There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Motivation.

**H3a:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.

**H3b:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Motivation.

### 3.15.1 – CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE VARIABLES

The world business council for sustainable development (WBCSD) discussed CSR at a summit held in 2001. The council defined CSR as _the commitment of business to
contribute to sustainable economic development, working with employees, their families and the local communities’ (WBCSD, 2001). It was also argued by Clarkson, (1995) and Waddock et al. (2002) that CSR stands on this fundamental idea of looking after a wider array of concerned stakeholders. Jamali and Mirshak (2007) discussed the scantiness of available empirical evidence on philosophy and practices of CSR in developing countries. The duo found in their research that not only the local firms but also the international subsidiaries have a rather amateurish and sketchy approach towards CSR, and that the core emphasis has been given to the philanthropic activities. Thus, they suggested the need for systematic planning and strong will from private sector actors in developing countries to take initiatives by enhancing coordination among each other and other key players such as NGOs and the public sector to formulate the strategies to address this serious issue.

In the same year, the European Commission for enterprise and industry directorate general’s funded report, “CSR and Competitiveness European SMEs’ Good Practice” (2007) was published by KMU Forschung Austria, which is an Austrian Institute for SME Research. This research project found a positive relation between CSR practices and job satisfaction and employees’ motivation. The study argued that the SMEs with higher involvement in CSR-related initiatives such as better and secure workplace, better society and safer environment have improved their human and financial resources, the most prominent aspect was workers motivation and job satisfaction had been improved that positively affect the employee retention, downfall in absenteeism and better productivity. The same model has been tested by Turyakira et al., (2014) where they conducted a similar study on the SMEs in Uganda; similarly, they found the positive link between CSR practices and job satisfaction. These studies inspired this particular research; however, it is different in terms of population and location of the research.

Instead all SMEs this study has focused on certified mango farms, and only GlobalGAP certified farms were included in the study as it was the sole standard working with Pakistani mango growers. The standard has set criteria for CSR also known as codes of conduct. To establish a link between CSR practices and employees’ motivation and satisfaction, the researcher designed this hypothesis model. Since this study was an attempt to look at CSR from a different perspective, with the element of private
standards and its impact on workers and farmers, this model is the most appropriate. CSR is treated differently in developing countries, and western countries are trying to ensure compliance through private standards. The necessary attention was given to workers regarding their health and safety and wellbeing, because this was the first study of its kind in South Asia and especially in Pakistan. This model has also helped in identifying the factors that have the most influence on workers' job satisfaction and motivation, and that will allow for improvement of the structure of existing standards. GlobalGAP does not address the social issues through its certification; the researcher decided to add them because issues such as child labour and women at work had a history in Pakistani context and even if there was no social consideration in GlobalGAP, such matters make an impact on the acquisition of a successful certificate.

3.15.2 – INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

The major dimensions of CSR are social, economic and environmental (Elkington, 1998). However, they have been divided into many sub-dimensions. Forsman-Hugg et al., (2013) identified seven key dimensions of CSR that are related with the food chain. These include: occupational welfare, product safety, environment, animal welfare and safety, nutritional responsibility, local market presence and economic responsibility. This particular study was examining CSR in the context of GlobalGAP as a private standard and whether it has any influence on workers' motivation. The researcher chose workforce-oriented CSR, society-oriented CSR and environmental-oriented CSR as the independent variables. Although the current mode of certificate does not include the society consideration, the researcher decided to add this into the conceptual model to see if there was any correlation.

3.15.2.1 – WORKFORCE ORIENTED CSR PRACTICES

The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD, 2000), highlights the importance of employees by redefining CSR as a continuous commitment to behave ethically. Therefore, businesses are not only responsible for the economic contribution but they are also required to take care of their workforce and their families along with community and society as a whole. Wan (2007) insisted on the importance of workers regardless of the industry, by improving workforce productivity any business can take the lead over its competitors. It is vital to equip them with the training and skills to become even more productive in coming years, and their retention is critical for
business success. Robinson (2010) found that workers perform their tasks in hazardous conditions, and they are not pleased with the situation, but due to limited resources and no job security, they have no choice. De Neve (2014) discussed workers’ prospects and highlighted two key factors that determine their choice of work derives first from their need for a livelihood and second from their sense of autonomy and dignity at work. He further argued that the sense of autonomy changes with time, and so do the livelihood needs. However, he found that livelihood needs took precedence after certain stages and dignity at work became less important.

The workforce is considered to be the backbone of any successful business, and when it comes to agro-food industry, the importance of the workforce is increased as they are required to work on their own most of the time without any supervision. Workers associated with mango farming thus require considerable attention because mangoes are a delicate and highly perishable fruit that require extra care and attention because its appearance has a strong influence on consumer buying decision. A motivated and satisfied worker will be more productive and efficient as job satisfaction is linked to improved performance (Ramlall, 2004). Van Knippenberg (2000) found a positive relation between work motivation and task performance.

In a case study of two separate firms who fully adopted and implemented CSR in their operations, Kim and Scullion (2013) find a positive relationship between employees-centred CSR and work motivation. Rodrigo and Arenas (2010) identified three different types of employees’ attitude towards CSR implementation; dedicated employees, dissenting employees and indifferent employees. De Neve (2014) defined complying firms as they are required to regulate workers’ overtime, provide them with standardised contracts and avoid contract and casual labour. The particular research in this study has focused on only those dimensions of CSR which are there to improve workers’ working conditions and welfare rather the overall impact.

3.15.2.2 – SOCIETY ORIENTED CSR PRACTICES

Society responsibility reflects the local communities and society, how they are affected by an organisation’s actions and what businesses are doing to improve them. In developing countries, there are issues of child labour and women empowerment. Uddin et al., (2008) argued the importance of healthy and stable communities and how the
reputation as a producer and employer affects business competitiveness. Olejarova (2004) highlighted the importance of building a good relationship with neighbouring communities by minimising the damage to the environment because as soon as a business starts to work in any location it becomes part of that society. Public welfare services and voluntary work are the best examples of society oriented CSR. Recruiting those who might struggle to get work otherwise is also categorised as a society oriented CSR (European Commission, 2007).

3.15.2.3 – ENVIRONMENTAL ORIENTED CSR PRACTICES

Environmental oriented CSR represents the initiatives that had been taken to protect the environment by the businesses. There was a time when Carroll (1979) produced his famous pyramid to explain CSR. The pyramid does not include environmental consideration, but today, the most prominent dimension of CSR is the environment protection. Today, not only organisations which are concerned with the issue but also governments are actively working on it and offering funds to various projects to control the damage. European Commission (2007) identified the areas where EU-based SMEs are actively working to address environmental concerns. The key points highlighted in the report are:

- Environment-friendly processes to produce goods.
- Systematic use of available resources.
- Reduce waste and pollution through active waste management and recycling.
- Water management.
- Assessing the suppliers and their environmental practices through ecological systems.
- Spreading awareness to all stakeholders on the environmental issues and how collectively protect it.

Turyakira et al., (2014) describe this as the measures taken by a business to minimise its harmful impact on the environment. For example, by using an environmentally friendly material, recycling, waste reduction and pollution control. The FAO Report (2014) explained the natural environment factors that occurred as a result of food production such as soil, water, genetics and air. These factors have enormous impacts on society and environment in the form of climate change and disease, and it is then beyond the
control of the producers. The report suggested that sustainable environmental practices could also become a source of value creation and competitive advantage.

3.15.3 – DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variables for this study were job satisfaction and motivation; previously it has been explained how different motivational theories work. As the literature identified that workers are the major stakeholders in developing countries when implementing any governance structure, the best possible outcome one can expect from this exercise is to have increased motivation among workers. Chaudhary and Sharma (2012) explained the relationship between workers’ motivation and their performance; they argued that improved productivity is highly related to employees’ motivation and motivated employees are the most valued asset for any business.

3.15.3.1 – JOB SATISFACTION

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a positive or pleasurable emotional state of mind perceived through overall job experience. Deshpande (1996) discussed the role of organisational ethics in the way that it affects job satisfaction and positively relates to increase the level. Johnston (2001) argued that the company’s strategy towards CSR and the employees and said that if a firm cannot assume a higher level of social responsibility towards its employees, it is unlikely to consider the other stakeholders including customers. The relationship between employees’ attitude and CSR has never been explored in detail; a relative study had been carried out that found a positive relation between CSR practices and employees’ job satisfaction (Tziner et al., 2011).

3.15.3.2 – MOTIVATION

Lombart (2012) reported a rise in the number of employees that have been motivated through CSR implementation. The implementation process included the formation of employees’ forums, arranging recreational activities and atmosphere, creating real rivalry and competition among the team, and arranging training and development courses for individuals. It was observed over the years that the numbers had been improved and the first outcome was a huge drop in absenteeism.
3.16 – SUMMARY

The intense literature on core components of this research indicates the importance of this topic for academics. Researchers from various backgrounds have conducted various studies to test the relevance among CSR and private standards and what role they play to ensure compliance. Since developing countries are the major focus when it comes to private standards, almost all the studies have been carried out either in Africa or South America (Henson and Humphrey, 2010), as these continents have extensive agro-food trade ties in Europe and US. It was critical to acknowledge the lack of interest shown by the researchers for Asia in general and Pakistan in particular. Also, the studies that had been carried out elsewhere had ignored the rural workers. The major attention had been given to individual producers, financial gain, competitive advantage and product differentiation (Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014; Herzfeld et al., 2011; Mergenthaler et al., 2009).

A handful of studies that indirectly addressed the workforce also restricted their findings to their health and safety and working conditions’ issues (Colen et al., 2012). This particular study is an attempt to establish the relationship between CSR practices and workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. The good agriculture practices are there to achieve competitiveness, and a motivated workforce is at the essence of it. The designed model for this study has worked in two ways; firstly, it has established whether there was compliance at the certified farms. Secondly, it has identified which particular CSR practice has the strongest impact on rural workers’ motivation. The chapter also briefly explains the conceptual framework and rationale behind it. The researcher amended a similar model which has been used previously on a different population for a separate study. The variables both dependent and independent have been identified, and explanations have been provided as to how and why they have been chosen for this research.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 - INTRODUCTION
This chapter explains the methodological consideration and rationale behind the chosen strategy and method for this research. The methodology utilised for this research was a mixed method research that has used both qualitative and quantitative data for analysis. After careful consideration of all the factors associated with this research, the researcher was convinced that the aforementioned research method was the most appropriate for this study. There are also detail discussions about other aspects such as research philosophy, research paradigms, research approaches, research design, research framework, and data collection. The researcher conducted multiple field trips to Pakistan to collect the data. Interviews (individual and focus group), observations and documentary evidence were used to collect the qualitative data. The interviewees were key stakeholders in Pakistan mango industry and GlobalGAP partnership. The quantitative data was collected through a questionnaire survey of the workers at the participating farms. The overall structure is based on the following overarching sections: Research Philosophies, Methodology, Research Journey, Fieldwork, Data Collection and Analysis, and Ethical Considerations.

4.2 - RESEARCH PROCESS
Finalising the research objectives
↓
Designing the research
↓
Primary and secondary data collection and analysis
↓
Analysing and drafting the findings

4.3 - RESEARCH PHILOSOPHIES
The researcher's belief about the understudied social reality is critical in shaping the methodology they adopt. The ontological and epistemological positions sharpen the
focus of the investigation and the chosen methodology. Blaikie (2007) explained this phenomenon as:

“The methodological perspectives are defined in terms of their ontology and epistemology, and include reference to the logic of theory construction, what counts as data, explanations and theory, criteria of validity, and views on the particular nature of social reality and the relationship between the natural and social sciences”, (Blaikie, 2007, p.6).

Bryman and Bell (2007) described the concept of a research paradigm as a set of beliefs that control the ways in which research would be carried out and how the results will be interpreted. Johnson and Christensen (2005) argued that the research paradigm is a perspective that relies on shared values, concepts, assumptions and practices. Crotty (1998) recognised the difficulties in drawing and distinguishing the concepts of Ontology and Epistemology. He argued that both concepts are related and mutually dependent in discussing the research issues and can lead to conflate each other. Scotland (2012) suggested that the assumptions a researcher make are conjecture, so the underpinning of each paradigm is not possible to prove or disprove empirically. This research has discussed the ontology, epistemology, and pragmatism as the considered paradigms.

Table 4.1 Research paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical assumption</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Post-positivism</th>
<th>Critical theory</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Native realism: real reality exists but is apprehendable. It is conventionally summed up in time and context-free generalisations, and is based on cause-effect laws.</td>
<td>Critical realism: real reality but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehendable.</td>
<td>Historical realism: virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural economic, ethnic, and gender values; crystallised over time.</td>
<td>Relativism: local and specific constructed realities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Dualist/subjectivist; finding true.</td>
<td>Modified dualist/subjectivist; critical tradition/community; findings probable true.</td>
<td>Transactional/subjective; value-mediated findings.</td>
<td>Transactional/subjectivist; created findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Experimental/ manipulative; verification of hypotheses; chiefly quantitative methods.</td>
<td>Modified experimental/ manipulative; critical multiplicity; falsification of hypotheses; may include qualitative methods.</td>
<td>Dialogic/ dialectical</td>
<td>Hermeneutical/ dialectical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Guba and Lincoln, 1994)
Guba and Lincoln (1994) designed the above matrix in order to distinguish the philosophical assumptions.

4.3.1 - ONTOLOGY – What is Knowledge?

The etymological meaning for ontology is 'speaking of being' and is classified as a discipline of philosophy that studies the nature of reality (Stahl, 2007). It is the study of being' (Crotty, 1998). The argument about the ontological assumptions of the research was critical to building the foundation for this research. It was also the starting point of this research that what researcher's belief about the nature of reality of the understudied phenomenon. Scotland (2012) argued that researchers need to take a clear position in terms of their perception of reality and how things work. The ontology of this particular research is based on CSR compliance in the Pakistani mango industry and how it affects the rural workers. Burrell and Morgan (1979) suggested that ontology contemplates assumptions about the essence of the phenomenon being investigated. This philosophical term portrays one's views about the nature of reality, and our assumptions or claims also reflect that perception too.

There are many possible ways to answer the question about the social reality; core assumptions about what exists, what factors it comprises and what it looks like (Blaike, 2007). Stahl (2007) stated that the researcher needs to know what exists in order to investigate. It is the central point of any research regardless of the discipline (Klein et al., 1991). Guba and Lincoln (1989) argued that the researchers must consider the authenticity of ontological assumptions, as it would make it convenient to formulate more sophisticated and informed constructions. It would help the researcher and others in understanding the content and gain a sense of engaging with the constructions. The ontological assumption for this particular research was concerned with the rural workers' perception of good agricultural practices and their motivation. Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggested that reality can be subjective and differ from person to person.

Individuals have their own ontological assumptions about the reality, and every individual's belief is based on their personal experiences and learning. It is highly likely that, based on personal assumptions, the participants in any research would have responded differently to the same questions or statements. This research has considered these assumptions prior to data collection. The researcher's own beliefs about the under-
investigation phenomenon may contradict with the respondents’ views. The important questions which arise from such a situation are how to measure reality and what is the basis of the constructed knowledge? This particular research project has answered these questions by adopting mixed methodologies. The qualitative and the quantitative approaches were used to allow the triangulation of data to come up with the integrated interpretation of the findings.

4.3.2 - EPISTEMOLOGY – How Do We Know It?

It was pointed out by Crotty (1998) that the term epistemology has been confused with other terms used in the literature such as methodologies, methods or theoretical perspectives. He further argued that the researchers adopt an initial position about the nature of knowledge which is called the epistemological position. This position or epistemology underline and govern the research process. For example, objectivism and subjectivism are examples for epistemology. It is concerned with knowledge and its nature (Cohen et al., 2007). The epistemological assumptions are concerned with the existence of knowledge and how it can be created and communicated (Scotland, 2012). It seeks to uncover the nature of a relationship between the researcher and what can be known (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). The epistemology provides researchers with grounding in testing the legitimacy and adequacy of the possible knowledge (Maynard, 1994).

Blaike (2007) argued that it is possible to discover or develop new knowledge through the epistemological process. According to Crotty (1998), epistemology is the first critical step in forming the research design as it informs the researcher of the underlining philosophical stance that contributes to the adoption of the adopted methodology. Therefore, it suggests views for appropriate methods of inquiry (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008). Resultantly, the real influence of epistemological assumption becomes visible in data collection.

The epistemological assumption for this particular research was to involve all stakeholders in a dialogue (interviews, focus groups and questionnaires) to produce a meaningful analysis. Tsoukas and Chia (2002) attributed epistemology as a source to describe what we know and how we found it out. In other words, it can be described as a source which enhances existing knowledge. This study is classified as a social
research, and according to Bryman and Bell (2007), the most fundamental purpose of social research is to find out about events that are happening in real life.

There are great possibilities to enhance our knowledge about existing reality, so the epistemology pivots on how the data was collected. As the study was based on the GlobalGAP standard in Pakistan, the results were not to be limited to the interests of academics, but also private standards and other stakeholders can also use them to review their policies and practices. These facts assure that this particular research would enhance readers’ existing knowledge about the studied reality. It was argued by Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) that one can collect the most relevant and verifiable data by adopting the right epistemological position. The author hoped that this study provides some guidance for policymakers involved in the Pakistani agricultural industry and also for those who design and implement private standards in developing countries.

4.4 - RESEARCH PARADIGM

The term ‘research paradigm’ is also denoted as a research philosophy (Saunders et al., 2009). There are four components of a research paradigm and they include: ontology, epistemology, methodology and methods (Scotland, 2012). However, Blaikie (2007) suggested that the initial process of defining the research philosophies (ontology and epistemology) leads to establish the research paradigm. The paradigms are those systematic sets that form our beliefs and methods that \( \text{represent a distillation of what we think about the world (but cannot prove).} \) (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). According to Bryman and Bell (2007), the research paradigms are collections of beliefs that influence the researcher to conduct the research in a certain way and also how they interpret the results.

4.4.1 - INTERPRETIVISM

The interpretive attitudes propose that social reality is subjective. Interpretivism is an anti-positivism stance (Crotty, 1998; Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006) that looks for \( \text{culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world.} \) (Crotty, 1998). In the social life-world, it is quite evident that individuals see things differently. The interpretation of the truth always varies from person to person. Individuals will respond differently to the same question or statement, according to their situation and the circumstances around them. Thus, what motivates rural workers today
may not motivate them in the future. This interpretive stance suggests that natural reality is different from social reality and it requires different methods to investigate. In contrast to the natural science that looks for consistencies in numerical data, social science largely derives from the actions of the individual (Gray, 2013).

Blaikie (2007), described interpretivism as a post-positivism stance as it was insisted that there is a basic difference between the subjects of natural and social sciences. Social reality is established upon individuals’ experiences and expectations. Thus, the knowledge acquired from a social science continues to be reconstructed through varying interpretations. However, the key challenge for a social science research is to justify the human behaviour. Easterby-Smith et al., (2008) highlighted the importance of understanding peoples’ thinking and feelings as well as verbal and non-verbal communication and how people engaged with them.

An understanding of contextual factors is critical along with the different interpretations that construct (social) reality. It has helped in determining and justifying the differing interpretations from various individuals. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) noticed that the respondents’ point of view is the most critical thing for the researchers that are investigating a social reality. Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (2003) discussed the multiple realities and interpretivist stance and about the possibilities of exploring them.

The context of this particular research is an impact assessment of socio-economic and environmental practices through private standard in Pakistan. Interpretations of the individuals’ responses comprised the background of this research. Saunders et al., (2009) argued that individuals’ responses can be extremely contextual and they cannot be generalised. In terms of epistemology, interpretivism is most closely associated with constructivism. Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008) suggested that an interpretivist approach is closely related to the qualitative method techniques. They also acknowledged that this paradigm is hugely subjective in nature and thus its emphasis is on the language and the relationship between the researcher and the respondent.

4.4.2 - REALISM

Realism is a section of epistemology that believes social science and nature can co-exist and can work side by side. The realists believe that reality is independent of perceptions
that a researcher can access and speculate about (Bryman and Bell, 2007). This philosophical approach suggests that reality is objective. Unlike the extremely deterministic positivistic stance, the realists have little room for choice because of the causal nature of universal laws. According to Blaikie (2007), realism is concerned with the nature of things and how they behave. He argued that an objective reality exists, notwithstanding observations and science. He further suggested that the realists perform the task independently in perceptible situations. It is critical to understand that the social reality and structure brings the understudied phenomenon into consideration (Bhaskar, 1989). Therefore, social conditioning is the basis of our knowledge about reality (Saunders et al., 2009).

A common element between the interpretivist stance and the realist stance is the agreement on the fact that natural science and social science are different and that social reality is pre-interpreted. In addition to this, the realists also consider that the science must be based on empirical data and is objective and rational. This position is in line with the positivist stance. Realism suggests that social objects can be explained scientifically, similarly to the quantitative analysis. This particular study also included quantitative analysis in order to explain the social objects and phenomenon. The positivists also claim the existence of a causal relationship and these relationships provide a further basis for predictions. The realists argue that through observations, it is possible to understand the underlying mechanism, which is the case for qualitative analysis. Ultimately, realism considers aspects from both the interpretive and positivist positions.

4.4.3 - PRAGMATISM

Pragmatism is similar to realism as it also provides the opportunity to use qualitative data, quantitative data or both in order to satisfy the research questions. Creswell (2003) suggested that pragmatism is a kind of mixed methodology, as it allows the researchers to use and combine qualitative and the quantitative data. The primary focus of the pragmatists remains on the research questions, and in order to answer the research questions in a satisfactory way, the researchers can use more than one single type of data in one single research project (Denscombe, 2010; Saunder et al., 2009). For this particular research, pragmatism appears to be the most suitable paradigm. Gray (2013) suggests that pragmatism is an old philosophy. However, this stance has seen a recent
revival. Johnson et al., (2007) held that pragmatism is a widely used paradigm in mixed method research as it provides an epistemological justification to adapt mixed methodology.

The fundamental idea behind pragmatism is the practicality of the research. This stance argues that ideology is true as long as it works and produces a practical output for the society. Rorty (1998) makes this simpler; he argued that the pragmatists did not focus on a particular ontology, but instead they look for suitability to the purpose and the ability to produce actions. The management and the organisational research bring pragmatism back into the limelight as the philosophy provides an epistemological justification that allows the researchers to use mixed methods and approaches (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009). There is flexibility to keep the research paradigms separate or mix them to turn into another research design.

Gray (2013) argued that, in most of the cases, it would be necessary to mix qualitative and quantitative data in a single study where a pragmatist approach has been adopted. Suanders et al., (2009) argued that if a researcher believes that choosing one position to conduct a particular research would be practically unrealistic, it would be appropriate to adopt the pragmatist position. It has allowed for adjusting methodology according to the merits of the research questions. In the context of this particular research, it was more appropriate to adapt the pragmatist approach as it was the most suitable paradigm to conduct this research. Also, Howe (1998) suggested that the both qualitative and quantitative methods are compatible. He asserted that mixed methods are useful for building a good research design.

4.5 - RESEARCH APPROACH

Research approaches are critical in defining the research design. Suanders et al., (2009) suggested that it is vital to have a clear understanding of the chosen theory as it will decide the suitability of the research approach. There are two major research approaches, inductive and deductive. The deductive approach starts with a theory and hypotheses and then designs the appropriate strategy to collect data and then tests the proposed hypotheses. Conversely, the inductive approach starts with data and leads to building a theory (Suanders et al., 2009). The hypotheses and their relevance to the study draw a distinction between the adoptions of an inductive or deductive approach.
The deductive approach is largely used to test and validate the assumption or the proposed hypotheses, and the inductive approach usually produces a new theory that can be generalised (Bryman and Bell, 2015). This research started with a theoretical perspective, and that can be classified as a deductive approach.

4.5.1 - INTEGRATION OF AN INDUCTIVE AND DEDUCTIVE APPROACH

This research was carried out with a pragmatist position, and that position allows and involves combing the research approaches. The deductive and inductive approaches were integrated to produce a workable research. Both approaches are different to each other, and there are underlying differences between the two approaches. Blaikie (2007), stated that it is feasible to combine the two approaches. This particular research has successfully combined both strategies. The table below highlighted the differences between an inductive and deductive approach. Saunders et al., (2009) made the distinctions in the approaches explicit in the given table by highlighting the factors which approach emphasises. According to them, the deductive approach involves the collection of quantitative data, and the induction approach adapts qualitative data to understanding the meanings and context better.

**Table 4.2 Deductive and Inductive approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deduction emphasises</th>
<th>Induction emphasises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scientific principles</td>
<td>gaining an understanding of the meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving from theory to data</td>
<td>humans attach to events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the need to explain causal relationships between variables</td>
<td>a close understanding of the research context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the collection of quantitative data</td>
<td>the collection of qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the application of controls to ensure validity of data</td>
<td>a more flexible structure to permit changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the operationalisation of concepts to ensure clarity of definition</td>
<td>of research emphasis as the research progresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a highly structured approach</td>
<td>a realisation that the researcher is part of the research process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researcher independence of what is being researched</td>
<td>less concern with the need to generalise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the necessity to select samples of sufficient size in order to generalise conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Saunders et al., 2009)
The first phase of this particular research was based on an inductive approach that involves qualitative data collected through interviews. It has been argued in this study that there is very little data available on this particular issue of CSR compliance and rural workers’ motivation. Only a few studies partially discussed this problem, but that does not represent the population being explored in this research. Lobe (2008) suggested that it is possible to conduct the qualitative phase first and later the result can be supported with quantitative data. The collected data was analysed systematically, and some assistance was acquired from the software NVIVO to identify the themes and patterns.

This particular strategy was based on interpretivist assumption, where induction is considered the right approach to investigate a social phenomenon. Robson (2002) highlighted the five stages which are involved in an inductive research. They suggested that the induction process starts with the deduction of hypotheses from the theory and leads to express the deduced hypotheses in operational language by proposing a relationship between the two particular concepts. The third stage involves testing the hypotheses, followed by an examination of the results as to whether it confirms the theory or suggests further modification. The last stage is situational, where the findings suggest an amendment of the theory.

A deductive stance was taken during the second phase of this research. The quantitative data was collected and analysed for this purpose. The purpose behind the adoption of this technique was related to operational issues. The study seeks to establish a link between private standards and CSR compliance in developing countries and if that compliance leads to rural workers’ motivation.

The best option was chosen to go with the qualitative study to explore the area deeply and then gather the quantitative data to seek the statistical significance. Also, it was not possible to conduct the interviews with as many workers as it was possible to through the questionnaire and similarly it was not appropriate to collect the quantitative data from the other participants (growers, Government, officers, NGOs, etc.) as they were significantly limited in numbers. Hempel (1966) criticised the deductive approach as this approach ignored the relative importance of the observed facts. However, in this particular research, the deductive approach was used to include the maximum
participation and to support the qualitative findings. The qualitative and quantitative data was triangulated to answer the key research question in the discussion and conclusion chapters.

The integration of deductive and inductive approaches is visible throughout the study. The independent variables had never been tested against rural agriculture workers' motivation. This area of investigation was identified but there was not an established framework available to investigate it, so the theoretical framework is based on constructs. Also, the respondents’ data was triangulated and analysed using an existing theory. The study not only presented if the proposed hypothesis were accepted or rejected, but also it has presented an alternative model.

4.6 - RESEARCH DESIGN
Groenewald (2004) insists on choosing the right design for research that is in accordance with that particular study. That is, to pick the most appropriate design from the available options required in order to conduct a thorough study. Research design falls into two broad categories, experimental design, and survey design; this study certainly falls under survey design. Further, there are subcategories of longitudinal design where data collect from the same sample over the period of time at different points and cross-sectional design where data collected at one single point (Ross, 2005). The data for this research was collected at a single point and thus falls under cross-sectional design.

According to Bryman and Bell (2007; 2011), a cross-sectional research design comprises a collection of data at a single point from more than one case through testing the connection between different variables. Further examination of such data then establishes the patterns and associations. The design is also known as social survey design where researchers are interested in testing variation among people, organisations or nations.

4.7 - MIXED METHODOLOGY
There is a significant increase in the number of researchers who are turning to mixed method techniques of research to make the result more powerful and to widen the scope
of their studies (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). However, with this rise, there is confusion among them too on how to combine the quantitative and qualitative research best in order to achieve conclusive results or findings. This method is considered as dynamic in terms of generating the combinations for sampling and data collection. The researcher positioning and view decides the nature of the combination and what techniques will be used to perform that as well as how and where he wants to mix stories and numbers or keep them separate throughout and conclude separately (Sandelowski, 2000).

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) explain the usefulness of mixed methodology; they argued that mixed method research is one of three research paradigms which are a qualitative, quantitative and mixed method. They define mixed method research as a method where researchers combine or mix qualitative and quantitative data in order to achieve a detailed analysis; it is an attempt to provide researchers with more freedom to choose how they want to conduct a study according to the needs of the study.

Steckler et al., (1994) suggested four models of methodological triangulations. The first model uses multiple measures to investigate the same phenomenon. The second model involves the observation of different fields. The third model involves theoretical triangulation that involves multiple theories. The fourth model involves methodological triangulation which considers the equal use of the qualitative and quantitative method.
This particular study has adopted the first model by using multiple measures to explore the same phenomenon. The purpose was to establish the usefulness of private standards for ensuring compliance with CSR practices and if those practices affect workers' motivation. The study draws on qualitative data and analysis and all four research questions have been answered with qualitative analysis. However, the findings of the core research question which is about the relationship between CSR practices and workers' motivation were further investigated and supported by quantitative data's findings.

The most fundamental thing in a research project is the research question and the methodology should be flexible enough to address the core question(s). It is also critical
for the researcher that they can best use a mixed method research and one essential step is to consider all the relevant major characteristics of both the qualitative and quantitative methods. It will allow the researcher to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of both methodologies in context with their study (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The researchers also designed a flowchart and proposed eight steps to conduct a mixed method research. The eight essential steps involved in a mixed method research are as follows:

(1) Determining the core research question(s)
(2) Establishing whether a mixed method design is appropriate
(3) Choosing either a mixed method or a mixed model research design
(4) Data collection
(5) Data analysis
(6) Data interpretation
(7) Data legitimacy
(8) Draw conclusions

(Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Mixed method research provides a platform to reinforce the trust among communities as there is an awareness of the power of both quantititative and qualitative data (Mertens, 2007). Johnson et al., (2007) argued that the stages of research and discuss what could be the best stage at which to mix the methods. Mixed data requires some integration and researchers have to be careful when choosing the philosophical position that best suits a mixed method research. The pragmatism philosophy is the most popular among the advocates of mixed methodological research as pragmatism provide epistemological justification and logic for choosing this method. They conclude that a mixed method is best to use in a situation where it is leading to a nexus of occurrence in the context of one’s research question(s).

Bryman and Bell (2011) argued that there is a growth in the number of researchers who are adopting a mixed method research approach but agreed that not all the researchers are convinced that this is an appropriate method of conducting research. The conflict arises from the impediments of ontological and epistemological backgrounds. It was also suggested that many options are available for researchers to combine the
quantitative and qualitative data to represent mixed method research; however, the outcomes of the mixed method research can be either planned or unplanned.

4.8 - WHY MIXED METHODOLOGY

Over the last century, there has been a debate about qualitative and quantitative research methods, and advocates for both paradigms who claim that certain methods are better. There is a list of strengths and weaknesses for the both methodologies (Campbell and Stanley, 1963; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). A comparatively new pragmatism of mixed methodology certainly causes a great deal of noise in academia, and researchers from the qualitative and quantitative schools of thoughts discussed whether a study can build a consensus by adopting both methods at the same time when these both methods are opposite to each other. However, many researchers have successfully adopted this new paradigm and draw more definitive results (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The nature of the study was the core reason to choose mixed methodology for this research. Since this was an ex-post impact assessment research about GlobalGAP as a private standard in the Pakistani mango industry, and the researcher had tried to investigate the impact on both, the mango farm owners and farm workers. There were about thirty-one certified mango farms in Pakistan, the numbers of farms were not enough to conduct a quantitative study and also the nature of the research questions cannot be answered to the satisfactory level through the questionnaire survey alone. The subject and population of this research have never been examined before, so thorough understanding and knowledge were required in order to understand why growers were acquiring the GlobalGAP certificate since it was a requirement by the supermarkets in developed country and Pakistani mangoes only sold at the community markets. To examine the potential impacts on the motivation of workers, a quantitative study was required as all the certified farms have a minimum of approximately fifty workers each and the population was large enough to conduct a statistical analysis.

The findings from both methods made a more conclusive result (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004), and had allowed for drawing a solid verdict about the usefulness of GlobalGAP in Pakistani mango industry. The results are broad enough to open new directions for further studies as the available literature is still unclear over the role of private standards in Asia, particularly in Pakistan. The proposed research method was carefully selected and integrated best with the core research questions. It was the first of
its kind of research among the chosen population, so it was vital to have complete in-
depth analysis for better understanding.

4.9 - RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The extensive literature review and the problem statement help in identifying four
research questions. The answers to these questions have assisted in bridging the
identified gap. The interview questions were derived from the literature review to
understand the underlying rationale behind the adoption of the GlobalGAP and what
difference this exercise made towards overall performance and workers' welfare.

This study attempts to answer the following four questions:

Q1 – What is the relationship between CSR practices and workers’ job satisfaction and
motivation?
Q2 – What role does the GlobalGAP certification play to ensure CSR compliance at
certified mango farms in Pakistan?
Q3 – What difference does the GlobalGAP certification make for income, work, and
environmental conditions of mango farmers and on-farm workers in Pakistan?
Q4 – Does the adoption of standards such as the GlobalGAP present a challenge for
mango growers in Pakistan?

4.10 – HYPOTHESIS TESTING
The hypotheses were frequently used to test the relationship between two or more
concepts or variables (Bryman, 2012). Usually, this process involves testing them in the
context of a theory, if that is correct in the real world, or if the results are different
(Babbie, 2007). This study has presented six hypotheses, which were considered vastly
relative to the concept of this research. The defined hypotheses were as follows:

H1a: There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and
rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.
H1b: There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and
rural workers’ Motivation.
H2a: There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural
workers’ Job Satisfaction.
**H2b:** There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers' Motivation.

**H3a:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers' Job Satisfaction.

**H3b:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers' Motivation.

### 4.11 - INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND CASE SELECTION

This research was an impact assessment of private standards adoption practice to comply with CSR requirements and its effects, as the chosen population was Pakistani mango industry and there was only one major private standard working with the growers and exporters in Pakistan, and that was GlobalGAP. Therefore, this study was based the GlobalGAP certification and its impact on Pakistani mango industry.

The researcher tried to test the relationship between CSR practices at certified mango farms and workers' job satisfaction and motivation. It was the first study conducted in Pakistan to analyse the impact of the GlobalGAP, and that required a thorough analysis based on sound data. In order to collect comprehensive data the researcher decided to adopt mixed methodology that was based on both quantitative and qualitative data. A quantitative questionnaire survey could have served the purpose of testing the workers' motivation, but that might look meaningless without the input from the farms' owners. CSR is still in its developing phase in Pakistan, and as this study was conducted in rural Punjab, it was unlikely that the concerned stakeholders understand the importance of this and how it could change in the future. The motives behind the adoption of the GlobalGAP in Pakistan were not known. This, alongside knowledge of the extent of what it had achieved so far and what represented its barriers, all needed to be known for a comprehensive impact assessment and analysis.

The questionnaire for quantitative data was designed in line with the conceptual framework and the research hypothesis. The independent variables were derived from the literature review of agro-food private standards and CSR practices, the three most important elements of CSR regarding private standards are workforce, society and the environment. Even though GlobalGAP is not particularly keen on society issues and focuses more towards traceability. The researcher added the society element to test how
stakeholders would react to it, and the findings could help in shaping the standard in the future.
Pollard (1985) openly confessed that personal contacts and circumstances influenced the decision to choose the particular location as a case study. Also, Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) suggested that a close consideration must be given to the suitability and feasibility of the chosen location. The Punjab Province has two major mangoes producing clusters, situated in Southern Punjab known as Multan and Rahim Yar Khan Regions. Personal background and local knowledge helped the researcher during the field trips for data collection. The trips were conducted between August 2015 and April 2016.

4.12 - DATA COLLECTION
Mangoes start to arrive on the market from May to August, so the timing of the field trips was ideal for observation of the complete harvesting procedures including post harvesting procedures. As the mangoes are a once annually commodity and unlike other crops, mango trees require less maintenance and are usually self-sufficient. Almost all the mango farms have temporary staff of around 25 to 40 workers depending on the size of the farm. During the season there are temporary workers between 250 to 400 per farm.

The field trips were conducted during the high season, the quantitative data was collected from all the workers who were willingly available to participate in the study. In the questionnaire, they were asked to confirm if they were permanent or temporary seasonal workers and that in fact helped in adding another dimension to the findings as to how preferences vary among permanent and seasonal workers. Also, it was in the best interest of the farm if it could attract temporary workers back in the following seasons as they were trained to work according to the high-quality requirements.

The mango farms were located in close vicinity of one and another and were more like in the form of clusters. There were three major clusters: Multan, Rahim Yar Khan and rural Sindh. The Sindh cluster had a slightly different time cycle than the Punjab which is Multan and Rahim Yar Khan Clusters. Also, the Punjab clusters were the major producers and exporters of mangoes. The researcher chooses the Multan and Rahim Yar Khan Clusters for the primary data collection. Every participating farm owner or
management was contacted before the visit to discuss the time and agenda; interview questions were shared with them in the first contact to allow them to prepare the facts and figures and also enable them to raise any concerns on any particular issue prior to the interview process to avoid any delays. A full day visit was conducted on each farm; some farms were visited twice even thrice depending on the size of the farm and the numbers of workers work there. The visit starts from 10 am and lasts until the late evening in order to cover a maximum number of workers working in different shift patterns. A few farms even had the facilities and workers to work through the night, therefore an additional visit was conducted in those hours to collect data and observe the practices. The interviews have been carried out during the first trip, and then the questionnaire surveys were conducted in later trips.

There were a few challenges associated with this research too, and the major one was the climate. The mango harvesting season occurs in sweltering weather when the temperature hits 42 to 50 degrees; it was hard and tough to manage as field trips involved extensive travelling throughout. The researcher had the appropriate (country specific) vaccination as advised by the NHS travel clinic in London.

4.13 - DATA ANALYSIS - TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES
The data from questionnaire survey answers were transferred to an MS Excel sheet prior to uploading the data onto SPSS. That data was then analysed extensively from different angles and methods. The qualitative data presented an even tougher challenge, not only because of its nature and sensitivity but also because multi-methods were adopted, and to organise all the information consumed a great deal of time during the analysis phase. A coding technique was utilised for the interoperation of the interviews, observation, and other documentary evidence to pick the key points and similarities.

4.14 - VALIDITY
During the field trips, a total number of 17 certified mango farms were visited in the Punjab province, and that was the total number of the certified farms in that region. Therefore, it is safe to say that the study has covered the entire population in the area. Altogether twenty-one (21) individual interviews were conducted with the growers, exporters, and other key players, along with the seven focus group interviews. For the
quantitative data, the researcher had 349 valid, usable questionnaires filled in by the employees and workers at mango farms. A total number of 400 forms were distributed among the workers. The data was significant enough to generalise the findings. Although the questionnaire survey and interviews do not represent the entire mango industry, the data was sufficient enough to ascertain the findings, and that reflects a general understanding about the GlobalGAP among the stakeholders in Pakistani mango industry.

4.15 - RESEARCH SETTINGS AND SAMPLE
This research was carried out in the Punjab province of Pakistan; the population for the study consisted of GlobalGAP certified mango growers, farm owners, farmers, on-farm workers, exporters, and NGOs. For the qualitative data, the researcher conducted interviews with the farm owners or the top executives at each certified farm and exporters. USAID was the main donor and helped every farm in arranging finances required to acquire the certificate; the researcher interviewed the CNFA officials who also represented USAID in Pakistan. The provincial government of Punjab initiated a research centre specialised for mangoes in the city of Multan, and few officials were interviewed from that research centre too. Altogether there were 21 individual interviews, and seven focus group interviews were conducted throughout, for the qualitative data.

In addition, an email interview was also conducted with Professor Ray Collins from the University of Queensland, Australia. Professor Collins and his team have been working with Pakistani mango growers under the Agriculture Sector Linkage Program (ASLP) since early 2006. They had also published a report on the Pakistani mango supply chain constraints (2006) and a journal article on how to make marketing a tool for the sustainable supply chain (Collins and Iqbal, 2011). These were the only established published works which was available on Pakistani mangoes in terms of supply chain improvements when this particular research was initiated. It was critical to establish an understanding of the on-going projects which Professor Collin was leading and to seek his views about the developments and progress of the mango industry.

Furthermore, the researcher’s observation and documentary evidence were also integrated into the qualitative data. The observations were noted down to consider
compliance with physical requirements of GlobalGAP such as clean toilets, staff room, secure and separate room to keep all the chemicals and pesticides, protective clothes (apron, gloves, and masks), secure equipment and wastage management. Documentary evidence was based on record keeping and the information displayed. GlobalGAP has compulsory ‘major must’ criteria for complete documentation of all the activities on the farm. The growers are required to maintain the record of pesticides and fertilizers that have been used, their quantities, date, and authorisations. To establish compliance, it was critical to view and observe these pieces of evidence.

For the quantitative data, the population consisted of farm workers and on-site workers at the certified farm. Since the certified farms must have all the facilities in-house, including storage and packaging units, they were expected to have much more labour than the non-certified farms. The researcher expected around 300-400 site workers to participate in this research and was able to collect 374 filled questionnaires out of 400 distributed questionnaires. A questionnaire translated into Urdu (the local, national language) was requested to be filled in by the voluntary participants, the researcher administered this process. The survey was conducted during the field trips to Pakistan during harvesting and post/pre-harvesting season.

This study is focused on GlobalGAP certified mango farms only, so the respondents were identified accordingly. The researcher obtained the list of the certified mango growers in Pakistan from the GlobalGAP website (https://database.globalgap.org). The first contact point for the researcher in Pakistan was the Mango Research Institute (MRI), the institute which helped in accessing the individual growers. The researcher also has several local contacts that paved the way in accessing the information. The interviews were arranged through telephone calls and the agenda was discussed prior to the visit. Most of the growers or farm owners were interviewed directly, and some of the interviews were conducted with the farm manager where the owners were not available for an interview. The workers to complete the questionnaire survey and to participate in the focus groups were chosen randomly as to who was available and interested in partaking in the study. The number of participating workers varied according to the size of the farm. The focus groups held at those farms were only those who willingly allowed the researcher to conduct them and where the workers were allowed to participate. Particularly those workers who were unable to complete the
questionnaire survey due to literacy problems but who had shown an interest in the study were encouraged to participate in the focus groups.

4.16 - CAPTURING THE QUALITATIVE DATA

The qualitative research helps in understanding the under-investigation phenomenon, and partially dependent on the researcher's position (Bryant, 2002). Therefore, it is critical for the researchers to have prior knowledge in order to produce a quality outcome. As the researcher has grown up in the mango producing region and was acutely aware of the practices prior to the adoption of GlobalGAP, he was in a position to differentiate between old practices and the new good agriculture practices. Douglas (2005) argued that the credibility of qualitative data is based on its quality and the analytical ability of the researcher.

4.16.1 - INTERVIEWING PARTICIPANTS

The technique of using a semi-structured interview was used throughout this phase as the nature of questions could be changed according to the situation and respondent. Semi-structured interviews are best for their usefulness when in-depth knowledge is required from a comparatively small sample size, the technique also allows for probing for responses (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) suggested using open-ended questions for a semi-structured interview; they allow for exploration of the key research questions, and the interviewer will get more input from the interviewees. Saunders et al., (2012) suggested semi-structured interviews for a situation where a researcher is trying to investigate the causal relationships between variables, to understand deeply the reasons behind a particular decision of the respondent which researcher is trying to explore.

Interviews took place face to face. The agenda and time were discussed and agreed prior to conducting the actual interview. The researcher successfully finalised each interview within 60 minutes, the majority of the interviews have been carried out in Urdu (the local language). Some of the interviews were recorded where the participant agreed to be recorded. The rest of the interviews were written down during the interviews.

4.16.1.1 - FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS

The terms group interview or focus group involve the interviewer and a group of participants. Boddy (2005) suggested that there are multiple terms used to describe such
settings, the major known terms are: group interview, focus group, and group discussion or some more similar combinations of these words. He argued that they are all assumed to have same meanings. Carson et al., (2001) previously stated that the term focus groups refer to such group interviews where the topic or theme is clearly defined with certain settings. The number of participants taking part in a group interview depends on the nature and topic of the research, the ability of the interviewer to interact with the number of participants also considered (Saunders et al., 2009). The focus group interviews involved a group of participants (farm workers).

4.16.2 - ACCESSIBILITY AND INTERVIEW ADMINISTRATION
All the interviews were pre-arranged prior to the actual visit; the interviews were arranged with the help of local sources and contacts in the mango industry. The majority of the interviews had been conducted face to face while few over the telephones. The face to face interviews were mainly performed on the sites at the farms or offices. However, few farms owners invited the researcher at home for the interview. Herzog (2005) argued that the interview location plays a vital role not only technically but also socially. She emphasises social consideration as an integral part for allowing participants to decide where they want to give the interview. It allows them to be more natural in their responses without any pressure as they feel comfortable.

4.16.3 - OBSERVATION AND CHECKLIST
There are some specific requirements from the GlobalGAP in terms of the facilities on farms; this includes clean toilets, staff common room/cafeteria, secure room to keep all the chemicals and pesticides, protective clothes/uniform, secure equipment, storage procedures and wastage and garbage management. Usually, GlobalGAP conducts the audits every year through their authorised auditors but all those audits were planned, and every farm knew when the auditor will arrive, it was likely to shape things good to satisfy the auditor. But this research was purely for academic purpose, and the researcher had no affiliations with any other body or organisation, the things were kept and monitored in more natural way.

4.16.4 - QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS
Most of the interviews were written down during the interviews, and some of them were recorded (audio and video). In the first stage, all the audio and video files were
transcribed by the researcher to bring them in the written form. The field notes and the researcher's observations were also compiled and marked. Layder (1998) suggests taking every opportunity to pre-code the data by circling or highlighting the key facts or any significant quotes while collecting data. Therefore, some of the codes were identified during the field trips, particularly from the claims made by the growers during the interviews.

The next steps involved coding the pattern and themes and code them into different categories and subcategories. The analysis was carried out manually. After all data been transcribed and brought into the text format, thematic analysis was used to identify patterns, similarities and themes in the scripts (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The coding system was created analytically to ensure that the patterns in the coding structure were linked to the data themselves. The author examined and identified the similarities and disparities. The data was interpreted and represented in a narrative form which also included direct quotes from the respondents. Layder (1998) mentions the concept of 'Provisional Codes' that refers to the key words and concepts which are relevant to the area under consideration. In the final step, some codes were renamed to make them more relevant to the context of this particular research.

4.17 - CAPTURING THE QUANTITATIVE DATA

There are multiple options for researchers as to how they want to administer the questionnaire survey with the research participants, for example, telephone survey, self-administered survey, online survey and postal survey (Robson, 2002). The administered questionnaire survey technique was employed for this research to collect quantitative data, consisting of Likert scale style questions. The researcher himself was present to monitor the process and to explain questions, in case someone needed further explanation to understand the question.

4.17.1 - QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND LAYOUT

The questionnaire was in three major sections, in the first section two basic questions were asked to test the literacy level of the participant in order to ascertain whether s/he was eligible to take part in the survey. The second section is based on the principal content of the questionnaire, there were twenty-five questions based on a Likert scale where respondent had the choice to pick from the five options, and that were (1.
Strongly Disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agrees/disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree). Likert scales are regularly used for attitude measurement by providing a range of responses to a statement or question (Jamieson, 2004). The last section was based on demographics where respondents were asked about their age group, qualification, the number of years of work, mode of employment and their position/title. The logic behind the adoption of Likert-style questions was to keep the possible answer limited (Hussey and Hussey, 1997).

4.17.2 - QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT
Hussey and Hussey (1997) suggested that the content of the questionnaire and the range of possible answers must be limited for a convenient and clear analysis. The questionnaire used to conduct the survey among workers and management employees was designed in the context of the proposed hypotheses. The questions were divided into sections; there were questions to address workforce-oriented CSR, society-oriented CSR and environmental-oriented CSR as these three were the independent variables in this research.

Since this research was based on the case of GlobalGAP, the questions were derived from the literature and were in line with what was expected as per GlobalGAP requirements. The standard does not address the society oriented CSR with great consideration. The researcher added this in his model to test the response. Questions on society oriented CSR were also based on the broader literature on CSR and developing countries. Further, there were questions to test the level of job satisfaction and motivation. Given that the researcher adopted Herzberg's motivational theory for this research, the questions to test job satisfaction and motivation was based on his two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959).

4.17.3 - QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION
The entire questionnaire was filled in by the respondents in the presence of the researcher, the whole process was administered to ensure the authenticity of the responses and also to explain the content to the respondents. The farms were visited multiple times to cover the maximum respondents and sufficient time was spent solely for this purpose. The researcher shared the information sheet with the respondents to brief them on the research context, research aim, and researcher position.
4.17.4 - DATA ANALYSIS
Quantitative data was analysed with the help of statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS), a tool which is ideal for testing the relationship between various variables and allow researchers to test several possibilities with the same data. As the proposed model required multiple hypotheses testing between the variables, SPSS was arguably the best option.

4.18 – ETHICAL CONSIDERATION
Gregory (2003), tried to highlight the importance of ethics while conducting research, he suggested that the researcher has to be completely impartial and unbiased especially during the empirical part and not to be influenced by personal priorities or expected results. He also argued the importance of data security and using it carefully; all the secondary data and literature review must be cited and reference properly.

All the secondary data that has been used in this study is acknowledged with complete reference and its source provided. Research ethics standards are in line with the Cardiff Metropolitan University's requirements. The researcher had ensured that guidance and procedures were followed at every stage. The entire fieldwork had been done in a professional way to ensure that the University's reputation was not affected.

The following potential ethical issues/risks were identified prior to the data collection phase and the researcher has satisfied the university's research degree committee and obtained ethical approval before the field trips occurred:

1. Moderate risks involving the literacy rates of workers in order to complete the questionnaire.

2. Minimal risks involved in the access to some information.

3. Minimal risks in collecting qualitative data, as there is a possibility that some growers and other actors hesitate to be interviewed.
4. Minimal risks to the researcher associated with acclimatising to the severe hot and humid weather conditions in Pakistan during mango harvesting season.

The researcher has addressed each potential risk accordingly:

1 - To overcome the literacy issue, the researcher has taken a number of steps that resolved this issue. Two simple questions to test literacy were included in the questionnaire; the researcher only used those questionnaires with the correct answer to those questions. Also, the questionnaires were designed with the simplest language possible and were translated into the local language. A notary public attested translated script available to verify that the translation is as accurate as the original English version.

2 – To overcome the access to information issue, the researcher has utilized some of his personal contacts and also seeks support from the MRI. The researcher has established some great references with some of the key actors in Pakistani mango industry including growers and exporters and that further helped in addressing this issue. The researcher belongs to that specific region chosen for data collection and his background also helped in this process.

3 - To overcome the hesitance or avoidance issue during qualitative data collection, the researcher discussed the nature and background of the study in detail with each participant prior to conducting the actual interview. This initiative helped to enhance the value and importance of this study for them. In appendix 6, there is the cover letter that was distributed to the participants and their consent was taken prior to the interview. The letter explained the process and researcher's position.

4 - To overcome the extreme weather conditions issue, the researcher acquired vaccination prior to travel. During the field trips, he used sun protection products and carried mineral water all the time. The researcher was aware of such conditions and took every precaution including covering head and neck area with scarf or turban.

Furthermore, approval for the data collection by interview and questionnaire survey of both qualitative and quantitative data including dates and times were sought prior to the actual visits from the mango growers and exporters. All participants took part on a
voluntary basis, and their identities were kept strictly confidential, except from those who willingly agreed to be interviewed.

Several situations arrived where growers showed their desire to review the filled questionnaire before the researcher leave the farm or facility. Although there were no names or IDs on the questionnaire to track any particular employee, the researcher explained the conditions of anonymity to the growers, and that he was unable to share the completed questionnaire. However, they go through the questionnaire prior to its distribution to the workers, to identify any areas of concern. After the growers’ satisfaction, the questionnaires were distributed among the workers.

4.19 – SUMMARY
This chapter has underlined that a mixed methodological approach was adopted in the research study. The chapter also explains the background of the study and the position of the researcher. As discussed earlier, both qualitative and the quantitative data was collected in order to find answers to the research questions and to test the hypotheses. The major adopted instruments were interviews, observation and the questionnaire survey to get an insight of the whole exercise. Having been born and brought up in the mango producing region of Pakistan presented a great advantage for the researcher as it allowed him to access the participants and the information with ease. However other challenges were highlighted. Research ethical consideration was the top priority throughout, and researcher maintained the anonymity of the participants. The data collection was handled in a professional way and analysed with the help of the latest software for an accurate reflection of the facts.
CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS – QUALITATIVE

5.1 – INTRODUCTION
The aim of this chapter is to provide an insight into the agricultural practices carried out at the certified mango farms and the pack houses in Pakistan. Testimonies of the mango growers, farms managers, exporters, government officials, NGOs representatives, and bottom tier workers have been provided to explain the day to day operations at the GlobalGAP certified mango farms. The participants spoke about the role of the GlobalGAP in improving the practices, their motivation to adopt the standards, how they ensure compliance and what significance this whole exercise has on production and productivity. The majority of this chapter is based on empirical data derived from commentary provided by the participants in one to one interviews and focus groups. There are also images added to this chapter to illustrate agricultural practices at the certified farms; the researcher took all these images during the field trips. The content and flow of this chapter follow the order of the research questions, starting with some basic information about the structure and current state of the Pakistani mango production.

5.2 – THE MANGO INDUSTRY IN PAKISTAN
Mango farms in Pakistan especially in the Punjab province are named either after the area name or more commonly after the surname of the family who own the land. Over the last five years or so, mango production has entered a new phase with tough competition and a race to accelerate. The younger generation has taken over businesses, and they are keen on production enhancement. The orchards are still owned by the same families and have not been sold to multinational firms. Many of the workers during focus groups told, how they used to come and play on the same farm when they were a child.

“I grew up here on this farm playing all afternoon, my father used to work here, and during school holidays I preferred to come along and play with the children of other workers. This place is not new to us, we use to climb these trees every day and never get tired but now when we work here, and we realised how hard work it is. We do have
better facilities today, like shelter and child drinking water but still, this is a tough job” (Focus Group 6, September 2015).

Mango production and mango exports were two different segments of the Pakistani mango industry before the GlobalGAP standard entered into the country. The mango growers were typically based in rural areas with less knowledge and limited access to the markets; they rely solely on local contractors and commission agents to buy their fruit and sell it to the wholesale markets or to the exporters to export outside the country. The commission agents used to purchase the fruit at the minimum possible price and sell it further at slightly higher prices; the main beneficiaries were the exporters who purchased the fruit either from commission agents or directly from the growers at low prices and exported the fruit on considerably increased prices. Jekayinfa et al., (2012) considered mango to be an economically efficient yield, so arguably all the involved stakeholders made a profit out of it.

Figure 5.1 Pakistani mango supply chain before the GlobalGAP
(Source: Based on Collins et al., 2006, and from the primary data collected during field trip, September 2015).

The above figure shows the supply chain of Pakistani mangoes and how they travel from the growers to the end consumer. The figure also shows a dotted (weaker) link between the exporters and the category manager who supplies the supermarkets. Due to this weak link all the fruit ended up being sold at the community markets at low prices.
The difference is visible; with the help of all the training and support the growers are able to establish a more consolidated supply chain which is also beneficial for the buyers in terms of food traceability. It is pertinent to mention that only a few growers were able to update the supply chain by their own efforts, whereas most of the certified growers still follow the old chain with minor changes. In the old chain, all sorts of fruits were exported to the EU market and at the importing ports. A number of processes were used, such as sorting, washing and packing. In the new chain, there are added processes carried out before the fruits are exported. The added processes deal with stricter checks on the importing ports. The government departments also play a critical role in the monitoring of processes carried out within Pakistan before the shipment departs; their role is discussed in detail further on in the chapter. The growers who are working under the new chain have achieved a significant competitive advantage, and their operations and working relations with their partners in western markets are getting better and better.

“We have advance orders for the UK for next year, we work with only two category firms in the EU, and they introduce our fruit to the supermarkets. The payments we received are on time, and we have continuous feedback from our buyers about our fruit. We have designed special boxes as per the supermarkets’ requirements, and they display our fruit in the same box, this exercise is helping us establishing our brand in the EU, and we are quite optimistic about the future trade” (Interview 7@PAK, September 2015).
— I wish that we had adopted this system before, we are receiving reasonable prices for our mangoes. This year is the first time that we sent the shipment to the Chicago in the US, and we received positive feedback, the buyers already expressed their interest in buying more quantities for the next year. Pakistani mango is the best in the taste, and as we have a more efficient supply chain, it enhances the shelf life that benefited the retailers. In London, we target the Spitalfields market which is the largest fresh produce market in the UK, and our mango was particularly popular this year” (Interview 11@PAK, September 2015).

Pakistani mangoes are distinctive in taste and aroma. The issues of poor appearance and short shelf life harm the mangoes’ reputation among prospective sellers and the element of poor farm practices further damages the industry. Under the Pak Australia Mango Project, Australian experts from the University of the Queensland provided excellent technical support to mango growers in Pakistan to deal with those issues. The project was prior to the adaptation of the GlobalGAP and assistance was available for all the interested parties. However, after the GlobalGAP, the certified growers taking the major advantage of that learning.

— In our research European consumers quickly come to appreciate the quality attributes of Pakistani mangoes such as sweetness and flavour, once the external appearance problems are sorted out; and wholesalers and retailers appreciate that we can reduce wastage and improve saleability. Until recently most Pakistan mangoes sold in the UK are sold to other Pakistanis to whom ethical issues are not a concern – they just want the mangoes from their home country at a low price. We are closely working with the involvement of women and poor smallholder farmers, and a food safety issue is arising from the use of (dangerous and illegal in most countries) calcium carbide to ripen mangoes. Mango value chain is a dynamic system where our interests lie mostly in the social, technical and economic sub-systems. It, therefore, integrates quantitative (e.g., postharvest science) with qualitative (e.g., consumer focus groups)” (Email Interview 1@UQ Australia, November 2013)

The mango production process at the GlobalGAP certified farms split into two locations mainly, an orchard where mangoes are cultivated and harvested, and a pack house where the mangoes are sorted, graded, washed and packed. Almost all the pack houses
have been constructed as per the requirements of GlobalGAP prior to acquire the standard.

5.3 – MANGO PRODUCTION AT LARGE-SCALE FARMS

The initial findings are consistent with FAO (2006) that mostly the large-scale producers were the first to acquire the GlobalGAP, under the option one which is the individual farm certification. This study found that all the participating producers were large-scale landlords; the orchard size varied from 50 acres to 1000 acres. Even under the certificate option two that is for group membership, initially launched to help the small-scale farmers to share the cost but in Pakistan, there is a consortium which works under option 2, but all the participants in that group have land in access to 100 acres.

“We are registered under option 2 of the GlobalGAP as a group of growers, there are seven individual farms under this group, and the total area is around 700 acres” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).

Many growers, who are involved in mango harvesting, had inherited the land and the occupation but work hard to bring the industry to the level where it is today.

“Our elders started the mango harvesting, but due to lack of education and access to information, the industry never flourishes. There has been a significant development in last ten years, and we had the opportunity to learn from the Australian experts. Now the losses have decreased significantly, and we have better control on the crop” (Interview 7@PAK, September 2015).

The Pakistani mango industry used to be considered more vulnerable regarding sudden losses through natural disasters such as torrential rains and sandstorms, or due to fungicide related issues. The mango growers in the old days tended to adopt the policy of growing other crops on their lands such as cotton, wheat and sugarcane to sustain them if something goes wrong with the mangoes. This strategy was somewhat helpful for them to deal with mitigating circumstances. However, it reduces the area used for mango harvesting, but in the last 10 years this trend has changed, and there is a significant rise in the harvested area dedicated to mango production, and it is now almost double in size (FAOSTAT, 2014). The growers have a better understanding
about pesticides, the latest techniques about protecting the fruit and advanced treatments such as hot water treatment and fruit fly eradication treatment.

“Of the most promising aspects of mango cultivation that we had learnt since we acquired the GlobalGAP is to produce what is high in demand. Previously every farm had the same trees they have for years, but now since we began participating in developed Western markets we have continuous feedback from our buyers about the type of mango which is more popular among customers and supermarkets, and we have brought significant changes to our orchards to meet those demands. We have an in-house nursery where we breed and test new varieties by grafting them onto old trees, it is a highly sophisticated art, and we learnt with the help of foreign experts and the researchers from Mango Research Institute. In last five years, we have shifted our orchards from Desi and Summer Bahisht (name of old mango varieties) to the White Chaunsa and Black Chaunsa (new more popular mango varieties). We achieved this through grafting by utilising the old trees, and we just patched up the new variety, this technique helps us to achieve more in less time as the grafted tree start to produce new variety within two year time” (Interview 13@PAK, October 2015).

Image 5.1   Trees Grafting and Pruning
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)
The researcher witnessed this at most of the certified farms that the growers and management were excited and enthusiastic about learning new arts and implementing them. Image 5.1 shows the trees that were prepared for grafting, as the trees were grown already with strong roots, they will produce new variety the following season. Although these growers are large-scale and influential, they still face challenges in exporting their fruit smoothly. It would have been immensely difficult for the small-scale producers to survive in the market, and that portrays less scope for the small-scale producers to acquire the GlobalGAP in Pakistan.

5.4 – THE ORCHARD

The mango harvesting season in Punjab starts in May and lasts until September. This is also the scorching and humid patch of the summer months. The workers are required to be physically fit and tough to work under severe conditions, and this could be one possible reason to exclude the women and older workers from working on the plantation. The orchards are usually spread across the acres of land, and each tree has a certain distance between them. It is quite challenging to look after every tree and pick the fruit from them; extra care is required from when the bud breaks until the fruit development as most of the fungicides including fruit fly attacks occur during this time frame. All the certified farms have strict procedures for the use of chemicals and pesticides as per the GlobalGAP ‘major must’ requirement and only trained and authorised workers may participate in the process.

‘We are not allowed to enter the storeroom where all the chemicals are being kept, during the spray we do not enter into the field and only authorised workers (they took the names) perform that job, we saw them, wearing masks and gloves. The orchard has been divided into four wings, and we do not work on the wing having the spray, we only go there when told by our supervisors, usually the next day’ (Focus Group3, September 2015).

Trees shadows are often considered to provide huge relief as they protect from the sun rays, but the extremely hot wind is a stiff challenge and workers are advised to cover their face especially the head and neck area with a turban or scarf to avoid heatstroke which is quite common in that region. The workers were also required to wear
protective gear. Some of them complain about this new requirement of wearing masks, gloves, and aprons during the harvesting.

“If we had a choice we might avoid wearing the masks, this is what we used to do all the time. We struggle to breathe as we were not used to it, they explained us during the training the harms of inhaling chemicals and that covering mouth with a cloth is not enough. We urged them to make these masks a bit more comfortable, the conditions are scalding and humid, and we felt suffocated while wearing the masks” (Focus Group 6, September 2015).

The certified growers have adapted the whole new practices for good agriculture and implemented them according to the guidance from GlobalGAP with the help of the experts from USAID, UNIDO and Australian Aid under the Pak Australia Mango Project. All the fieldworkers have demonstrated how they should look after their personal hygiene, and how to prepare themselves for harvesting. Workers also have to take care of their tools and equipment they use during harvesting. The workers have been provided with the modern cutters that can reach the top of the tree and hold the fruit after cutting it from the stem. The fruit then carefully placed on a de sap frame in an upside down position (de-sapping process) to avoid the sap touching the fruit skin, sap is the liquid came out of the stem and can leave marks on the skin.

“We provided training to the workers on how to use the new cutters, it makes their job easy and secure, and they can take the fruit off the tree with much ease. Initially, they found it bit more frustrating as they have to pick the fruit individually but with the time now they can use the cutter with full proficiency and that enhance their speed too. At the end of every session, the fruit then transferred to the pack house” (Interview 1@CNFA, October 2015).

The mango tree produces fruit during extreme summer, it requires proper care throughout the year, and the most critical aspect is the availability of water. All the permanent staff also trained to work with irrigation system as usually there is one main canal that is linked to the individual farms through small canals and every land owner has a fixed quota for water at any given moment. Tube wells are available but this option is not price efficient, and growers try to capitalise on the canal water as much as
possible. Water also plays an important role in terms of the fruit quality and yield. Spreer et al., (2009) found that growers were required to irrigate the orchard for a good yield and better-quality mangoes throughout the dry season. Some of the large-scale growers were found to have water sprinklers installed in their orchard with weather monitoring system, but such systems are not affordable for everyone even though Spreer et al., (2009) argued that water sprinklers could be cost efficient in the longer term, but this practice is not common in Pakistan yet.

“Our farm is the largest farm in the Punjab with 1000 acres of land. We have two water reservoirs where we store the rain water and also the excessive water from the main canal. We also installed the water sprinkler especially with the new plants, they are controlled from our pack house as we monitor the weather through the weather station installed in the field. It saves time, our orchard is quite large, and it would have been difficult to monitor it manually” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).

Image 5.2  Weather station and water sprinkler
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)

The above photographs show the weather monitoring system and the sprinklers at one of the largest mango farms in Pakistan. The weather system informs the management
about the climate condition and humidity level and these can be monitored from anywhere in the world as this station is connected to the internet and management can monitor the status while they are away and can instruct the supervisors by telephone accordingly. Such farms are exceptional, and the workers on these farms have excellent wages and facilities. Most of the farms have a manual system to monitor the water system.

Most of the workers were found to be comfortable with tough working conditions and hot climate; they have their own remedies to protect them from the sun.

—*We use plenty of drinks to keep ourselves cool under boiling conditions; we have special drinks for the summer like Lassi (buttermilk) made with yoghurt and water and we add some salt too as we sweat continuously and need some salt to keep ourselves going. We also use fresh lime and again we use salt in it, and there is one particular drink from this local region called Sattu. It is made with the roasted gram flour and jaggery powder (unrefined raw sugar) and some salt, so salt intake is critical as our body losses too much salt as we sweat and if we don’t use such drinks we become vulnerable to heatstroke*” (Focus Group 2, September 2015).

The orchards are the core part that covered under the GlobalGap standard, as the main activities took place here throughout the year and pack houses only active during the season.

### 5.5 – THE PACK HOUSES

The pack houses hold the major activities during the harvesting season only; they usually and ideally remain empty and tidy offseason. Before the GlobalGAP certificate awarded, there was a requirement for a proper fully equipped pack house at every interested farm to ensure food safety. The GlobalGAP has set criteria about the facilities they required in the pack houses and USAID then help the growers to develop those advanced pack houses. Now every certified farm has its own pack house where they maintain the temperature according to the guidance; each pack house is equipped with hot water treatment machines, mango sorting station, cold storage, blast refrigerators (to instantly cool down the temperature of the mango) and humidifier to maintain the right humidity level. All these might be common in developed countries, but in the Pakistani
context, these facilities are considered as significant innovations. The growers have been trained on how to ensure the right temperature for the mangoes as soon they arrived at the pack house and until they reached to the buyers through control atmosphere shipments.

“The mangoes are required to be cooled down within a certain time frame after they are taken off the trees, any delays can lead to starting the ripening process, and that can affect the shelf life. We equipped the growers with blast refrigerators to store the mangoes as soon as they arrive at the pack house, these refrigerators bring the mango temperature down to 12 degrees within two hours. After these processes the mangoes then move to the cold storage which has a fitted humidifier to ensure that the fruit does not lose the essential moisturisers. Before the shipment, the mangoes require hot water treatment and ethylene shots to protect them from the fruit flies during the travel and to start the ripening process, so the product reaches its buyers in perfect conditions with decent shelf life. Typically, mangoes can keep the best quality after the hot water treatment to up to 14 days, and that is why the buyers only apply the treatment after having a confirmation from the airport.” (Interview 2@CNFA, October 2015).

Image 5.3 Pack house Loading Area
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)
The image 5.3 shows the loading dock at one of the visited farms. The temperature-controlled lorry gets attached to that square box and workers then transfer the mangoes to it. Also, the huge exhaust fans are visible too in order to ensure that the pack house have enough fresh air for the workers. All the visited farms have the same outer docks to load the mangoes on the lorries, which is absolutely in line with the GlobalGAP requirements for ensuring food safety, controlling the temperature requires high skills and great care throughout the value chain.

Unlike the orchards, the women are encouraged to work in the pack houses to perform easy tasks in considerably comfortable conditions. They perform delegated tasks such as peeling the mangoes for making mango pulps, slicing mangoes for making dry mangoes, putting stickers on the mangoes and sorting the boxes. The researcher tried to ask few questions to the female workers, but they refused to participate. However, he was told by the management that the farm provides all women with transport facilities, and they only come to work for a five hours shift which is typically from 7 am to 12 noon.

The workers are required to wear head nets and gloves while working in the pack houses; they were provided with all the facilities including the modern pallet jacks, every pack house has toilets, clean drinking water, and first aid facilities. The workers perform different tasks in the pack houses such as sorting, grading, storing, washing and packing. Previously, all these tasks used to be performed in the orchards and growers usually built temporary shelters under the trees, until recently even after having GlobalGAP the sorting and grading were used to carry out at the orchards and pack houses were being used for storing and packing functions. Over the last two years, this practice has also changed as the mango ripening process starts as soon as they are taken off the tree; the growers are required to process them immediately to slow down the ripening process. Now they only de sap the mangoes at the orchard and move them to the pack house in baskets through tractor trolleys.
The image 5.4 shows the mangoes being unloaded at the pack house, these workers carry one basket at a time and stack them at the first entrance hall in the pack house, from there the pack house staff took the control and moved the baskets to the chilled refrigerator to cool down the mangoes temperature. The pack house supervisor told the researcher during a focus group:

—As soon as the mangoes arrived at the entrance hall we start to move them into a quarantined area, there are green nets around that area throughout to protect the fruit from the flies and other insects. After cooling down the mangoes we then sorted them and removed any mango which didn’t fit the criteria. The next stage is grading where workers manually grade the mangoes according to the size and appearance and store them in cold storage in separate baskets. The mangoes stay there, and as soon as we receive the instruction from the management about the next shipment we start the process. We know the exact requirements of the buyers, and we only prepared certain mangoes for the specific buyer. The mangoes then go through the hot water treatment and dryer just before the packing in the buyer’s specific boxes. It is important to mention that these tasks carried out at a certain temperature to control the ripening process.” (Focus Group5, September 2015).

The workers and growers gain most of this expertise through the USAID training programme, as one of the representatives told during the interviewer:
"We also help in providing control atmosphere shipment through sea freight. There are new requirements for them in terms of the size of the pallets, so we provided them with new pallets and a new storage system. We are also going to achieve the target of turning growers into automated graders as the fruit sell in the high-end market per piece or per kg. We help them provided with guidance about appropriate boxes. We have a success story of a farm which we assist in delivering high-quality Sindhri mango to the UK now we are working on Chaunsa” (Interview 1@CNFA, October 2015).

This kind of fruit handling is highly sophisticated as compared to other fruits. The workers only box the fruit right before the shipment, even though it would have been easier to prepare the boxes in one go and kept them in cold storage. Instead, full instructions have been followed at all the farms, and that reflects the willingness and passion of the Pakistani mango growers for the compliance.

5.6 – WORKERS’ MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION

As the certified growers upgraded their infrastructure and practices to improve the mango production, the main beneficiary of this upgrade are the workers who work at the certified farms. Even though the mango industry in Pakistan is vast and significant but the workers always worked under poor working conditions, and there was a question mark on their welfare and health and safety. The growers implemented all the changes and upgraded the facilities merely to meet the requirements of the GlobalGAP, but these changes bring so much comfort and somewhat luxury for the workers at those farms.

These workers used to pack mangoes in wooden crates and sealed them with nails and hammers under the tree in temperatures in excess of 45 degrees; now they box mangoes in delicate cardboard boxes in air-conditioned pack houses. They used to drink canal water as growers dig wells or install hand pumps by the canal to pull water and there were used to be one or two hand pumps across the farm and workers have to walk all the way to access water, now there are chilled water coolers install throughout the farms.

"We are happy with all the facilities at the farm; we get even better money too. Although money is still not as good as people received in other industries but when we look at the facilities, we feel satisfied. We work hard with more joys and willingness as
we do not want to lose this job, this is the best place to work in this area, our jobs have become easy now, and there is great learning for us. We know now what is right for us and if we need some assistance or support, we ask for it.” (Focus Group6, September 2015).

―We have more desire to come to work here as we do like it here, there is a TV in our staff room where we can watch cricket matches. We often come here on our off day as there is a continuous power failure in our village, but our farm has generators so we can sit under the fans during hot summer” (Focus Group1, September 2015).

The growers also highlighted the interest shown by the workers:

―Not only the permanent workers but also the seasonal temporary workers love the facilities, and they expressed their desire to work permanently. Unfortunately, we cannot accommodate much labour during offseason, but we do offer them work the following season” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015). It also affects the retention and availability.

―There is a significant difference in worker retention. Previously we looked for workers and trained them and hope that they stay with us for as long as possible but most of them left for other opportunities. Since we have these facilities on our farms, things are different, and even some of the previous workers have come back. The absence from work due to sickness has also reduced significantly. The main reason is the improved hygiene practices as workers were reminded to wash their hands all the time. Another reason is the use of right tools and equipment as previously every season we used to have accidents at farms but now workers work under secure conditions” (Interview 13@PAK, October 2015).

The growers acknowledged the improved working atmosphere at the farms. They said the workers feel happy and satisfied with what they do at the farm, and they always turn up for every training session, and that reflects their interest in learning and development. The workers can take their initiatives to the orchard, and they take extra care to deal with the fruit to protect them from any bruises and damages. Two major concerns have been raised by the workers which they think still represents a constraint
between them to achieve their full potential. First, none of the workers (apart from management) has been given a written contract or job agreement, and that includes permanent staff too. Some of the workers have been working on the same farm for over ten years but still have no written contract or job security, and it is all verbal promises. Secondly, the workers want the growers to announce special bonuses during the harvesting season as they work hard to meet the deadlines and ensure every consignment is shipped on time with all quality and safety measures in place. The findings related with workers' job satisfaction and motivation were further supported with quantitative data which is discussed in the next chapter.

5.7 – COMPLIANCE WITH GLOBALGAP

According to GlobalGAP (2016), The Fruit & Vegetables Standard covers the following areas:

• Food Safety
• Traceability
• Quality Assurance
• Workers’ Occupational Health & Safety
• Site Management
• Soil Management
• Fertiliser Application Management
• Integrated Pest Management
• Plant Protection Products Management
• Water Management

These areas were also recently identified as the key dimensions of CSR in food supply chains (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). Almost all of the areas mainly related to the orchard, as part of data collection researcher's observations were also used to cross match the claims made by the growers.

—All the certified farms are located in rural areas but they are well connected through metal roads and transportation is not an issue. One thing which was common among all the certified farms was the cleanliness of the orchard; every farm was surprisingly clean and well managed. No weeds, no wild plants, no animals and no rotten dropped
fruit, each farm has a common room for workers with toilets, some of them even provided a TV and gym equipment. Water management was found to be commendable too as there were no signs of water waste; however, waste management was found to be weak on certain farms. The overall appearance shows great compliance with the standard as no child working was witnessed; each farm has displayed the health and safety posters and guidance” (Researcher’s testimony September to October 2015).

As this study particularly examined the compliance at the certified farms and how it affects the workers’ job satisfaction and motivation, all the areas mentioned above have been discussed and investigated during data collection. Nelson et al., (2007) criticised private standards as they mainly benefit the buyers in the western market to satisfy their consumers. The standard assures that certain products were produced in a safe environment. However, looking at the area covered under the GlobalGAP standard, apart from the food safety, traceability and quality assurance, all other areas are to benefit the participating growers. Even food safety, and quality assurance are added advantage for them regardless if the products are made for the foreign or local market.

5.7.1 – FOOD SAFETY

Food safety is a global challenge; with growing supply chains and the inclusion of the new producers, it is becoming challenging for the buyers to decide the food items they are receiving are safe enough. A recent *E Coli* episode damaged many businesses in the EU, previously there has been the issue of food containments, and horsemeat burgers, fruit flies, and list carry on. Most of these problems arise due to the poor practices during the production process; GlobalGAP has strict criteria to ensure food safety.

"From the first presentation about the GlobalGAP, we have been kept informed about the importance of food safety and how it affects the global trade. We have been given posters to display in our farms to keep reminding the workers that their personal hygiene contributes towards food safety. From clipping their nails to washing their hands and how to wash hands - everything has been briefed, and our workers welcome this change. In some cases when a worker reports sickness that can cause containment we have to send him off work to protect the food and the other workers” (Interview 12@PAK, September 2015).
We use the new baskets and utensils to keep and carry the mangoes. These baskets and utensils are washed regularly. There is also a secure mechanism to deal with pest-related issues, our workplace looks neat and tidy, and we feel good about it” (Focus Group4, September 2015).

As food safety rated as a major must by the GlobalGAP and the auditors have zero tolerance towards it, it has been implemented actively. Workers toilets were found to have soaps available at most of the visited farms.

5.7.2 – TRACEABILITY

After food safety, traceability is the second highest priority for the GlobalGAP and thus for the buyers in western markets. It is critical to have the ability and resources to track down any product which comes from a faraway country, and with a few clicks, they can access all the information including; where the certain food item came from, which specific farm, which area, what and when pesticides and chemicals have been used, etc. This facility provides the buyers with great control, and they can simply identify the problem and address them in a more systematic way. On the other side the growers are aware of the consequences as they can lose trade ties if they been identified as persistently problematic, so the traceability work as due diligence.

“Every producer has been provided with a 14-digit code, and all the shipments from the same farm carries that specific code” (Interview 1@CNFA, October 2015).

This feature also benefits the producers as if any specific farm is not following the procedures, only that specific farm will be investigated, and it will not affect the other producers.

“If we fail to ensure food safety, we can be identified through traceability, and we do not want to risks our business reputation. We have seen some cases where buyers refused to buy from certain farms; it is hard to establish the business terms with the buyers in the EU and the US but quite easy to lose them” (Interview 13@PAK, October 2015).
Some participants apart from the growers raised questions about the traceability and hinting the malpractices as they doubt that might be the certified buyers sometimes buy the fruit from third parties and export under their certificate, but the growers clearly denied such things.

―How can we risk our reputation, we can only assure how we ensure food safety, but we do not know what is going on at the farm next-door. The stakes are high and such things are mere rumours‖ (Interview 7@PAK. September 2015).

―We are not aware of any such complaints yet, there are options for contract farming and producers have a choice if they want to expand their exports, they can adopt the option 3 of the GlobalGAP‖ (Interview 1@CNFA, October 2015).

Since there are strict checks carried out at the importing destinations especially in the EU and the US, it is unlikely that a grower can risk his reputation by sending the fruit which has not been produced at his own farm under his own supervision.

5.7.3 – QUALITY ASSURANCE

The quality assurance came through a combination of food safety and traceability. GlobalGAP assures that food is produced under a safe environment and of high quality. To ensure this there is a huge amount of paperwork which every farm has to maintain, each and every activity must be logged. The researcher was told that even his visit would be documented.

―We maintain a full log of all the activities on the farm, including chemicals used, dates when they have been used, cleaning activities and visitors who visit them farm‖ (Interview 13@PAK, October 2015).

During the audits, the auditors check all the paperwork to see evidence that all the procedures have been followed as instructed.

5.7.4 – WORKERS’ OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH & SAFETY

This area has been ignored completely previously by the mango growers in Pakistan; there were poor working conditions at the mango farms. Workers tended to work in a
high-risk environment and used to perform dangerous tasks such as climbing trees; they used to work with poor and old equipment that sometimes caused injuries to them. Workers used to deal with pesticides and chemicals without any protective gear; there were no gloves or masks for them to wear. No facilities were available to provide first aid at the farm. There were no fire exit signs or a fire assembly points. Every worker was exposed to danger. There were no pack houses; workers used to box the mangoes in the orchard under extreme heat. Old methods involved wooden boxes which were sealed with nails and hammers. In short, it was the worst conditions to work in. The GlobalGAP required the growers to address this critical issue. Several workshops and training seminars were arranged by USAID, UNIDO, ASLP and MRI to assist the growers to implement safety measures. USAID also provided the latest equipment and tools for the workers to make their daily work life much convenient.

—*Mango trees require constant trimming (pruning) especially after every season. We used to use axes that were fitted with a wooden handle. We always have bruises on our hands as it was very difficult to cut the tree’s boughs. Over the past few years they have provided us with cutters, and prior to their usage, they provide us with the training how to securely use them”* (Focus Group7, September 2015).

—*We have been informed of what to do in the case of a fire. We have some equipment to deal with a little fire, but our management clearly told us, if the fire is spreading fast then just run out of the site and report at the assembly point. We never have had any fire incident here, but it is better to be prepared”* (Focus Group2, September 2015).

The overall state of workers’ health and safety at certified farms was found to be satisfactory, the tools and equipment were in good condition, and workers were required to submit them back to the store before they finished their shift.

5.7.5 – SITE MANAGEMENT

Site management is more concerned with the suitability of the location for production, GlobalGAP considers facts like the previous crop, landfills and if the site has been used for other purposes. As the mango production is a yearly process and there are no other crops during the year, there is not much for the growers to do to ensure site
management. There were two things that some of the growers highlighted, that they stated required changing. First the animals at the site and second the landfills.

“We used to have in-house landfills where we used to dispose of all the garbage. There were so many flies at the site, but we never care about it, also we use to have our cattle on the farms too, and we use to feed them with mango leaves. Now we have no animal on our farms, and also the landfill had been sealed, and now we dispose of our waste in a remote landfill provided by the local union council. We pay them some incentives, and on a weekly basis, they came on their tractor trollies and collected all the garbage from our bins to dispose of the site” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015).

The researcher did not witness any animals at any of the certified farms. There was one farm with a small well that was being used to dispose of the garbage, on enquiry he was told that it is a temporary arrangement and that they are working on moving it out of the orchard.

5.7.6 – SOIL MANAGEMENT
For soil management, GlobalGAP has three areas to address; erosion, derange patterns, and wind exposure as all these could affect the soil and crop. Again as mangoes are a tree based crop, it even strengthened the soil and reduces the threat during flooding season. Wind exposure is a constant threat for the growers, as the region is often hit by sandstorms but this is something they cannot control.

“To protect the soil from erosion, we have our own irrigation network which is all cemented, the water either from the canal or the tube wells travels through them and we control this movement. There is a systematic method of watering our mango trees, and we ensure that the trees get the required level of water. Mango trees do not require much water as compared to other crops and the rain provides a source of water too” (Interview 7@PAK, September 2015).

“Our farm has the sprinklers installed, and we have adopted the latest technology to ensure that there is no damage to the soil from irrigated water. We are also improving how we deal with the rainwater after the rains, as that water can become a hub for mosquitos and other insects” (Interview 3@PAK, September 2015).
The growers usually water the trees in a set pattern, as mostly they have to rely on the tube well which is a costly option and they only use the quantity that is required the trees.

5.7.7 – FERTILIZER APPLICATION MANAGEMENT
Mango growers usually use nitrogen as a key fertiliser; GlobalGAP requires a maintained record which shows whether the applied fertilisers were organic or inorganic. However, it is a choice which the growers can make as to which one they want to use. Most of the farm managers are trained personnel who supervise the fertilisation process. This process is usually completed by October, to allow the trees to complete their cycle. The growers also receive support from the experts of MRI.

“—We use nitrogen at our farm, previously we were not aware of the harms of using nitrogen in the wrong quantities, but since we started working with GlobalGAP, we have been briefed about the use and right quantities. Excessive use of nitrogen affects the fruit, and the fruit has premature ripening from the inner side and makes the fruit uneven. It also affects the taste of the mango, and they started to taste sour. Now we are fully aware of the right use of fertilisers, and our mangoes are improving in their taste and appearance” (Interview 16@PAK, October 2015).

The growers also give credit to the DPP as they have established the modern labs and they can test their fruit against the effect of fertilisers, and that minimised the risk of product recall at later stages.

5.7.8 – INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT
The use of chemicals and pesticides are essential to keep the trees and fruit safe from all the diseases and fungicides. GlobalGAP requires the growers to keep all the chemicals and pesticides in a secure separate storage; they also have to maintain a detailed log of every spray they use anytime during the year. The log carries the record for chemical or pesticide name, content, quantity, and date. To ensure the operative staff’s safety, GlobalGAP also requires them to wear the productive wear including aprons, gloves, and masks to prevent them from inhaling the poisonous chemicals.
We have been trained on how to use the pesticides, they are set parameters, and we follow them. We start the process as early as in February to protect the bud and fruit flowers from the flies and other insects by installing the traps. The fruit flies are lethal and highly dangerous for the crop, they are challenging as they do not eat or harm the leaf so one cannot be sure when they actually attack, so our precautionary measures help us dealing with the threat and the result are quite encouraging” (Focus Group7, September 2015).

Image 5.5  Trap to Control Fruit Flies
(Source: field trip, March 2016)

—Traps are the most sophisticated method to control the fruit flies, as we use methyl eugenol in the traps which attract the male flies and killed them. This process stops the reproduction cycle and eliminates the flies completely. Our orchard is 137 acres in size, and we have 132 traps installed, every trap has its unique number, and we maintain the record that what quantity has been poured at which trap. Most of our permanent workers are trained to work with this method, but only supervisors are allowed to deal
with chemicals, and they monitor the whole process” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015).

Image 5.5 shows a hanging trap at one of the certified farms. They put the medicine inside and left it hung on the tree in this position. The smell attracts the flies and eliminates them. As the GlobalGAP requires adoption of a treatment that not only kills the insects but also discourages the development of the population too and the adopted technique is absolutely in line with that specific requirement and all the certified farms have installed such traps to control the fruit flies. Other conditions are concerned with the usage and quantities of chemicals and what adverse effect it can cause, as the mangoes are subject to a hot water treatment prior to export and that process eliminates all the chemicals from the food surface.

5.7.9 – PLANT PROTECTION PRODUCTS MANAGEMENT
As the GlobalGAP’s aim is to assist the growers, the standard ensures that the growers can produce quality food with real economic value. In case the use of pesticides and chemicals is at risk of affecting the economic value of production or increasing its cost, they have Plant Protection Product Management system. This system guides the growers on how to best store and use the chemicals or medicine on the fields. The standard requires that only authorised and validated products have been used and to makes it simple for the local growers as the standard requires them to follow the local government policy in this regard. Thus, the growers in Pakistan have to use only those pesticides and chemicals which are approved by the DPP.

“The amount of chemicals and pesticides used has been reduced as compared to the old practices. We used to be frightened by attacks of fruit flies as we had limited knowledge about them and we used to spray after spray with different pesticides to kill them. The cost associated with the use of pesticides and fertilisers always fluctuated and affected our abilities to plan and budget our crop. Now we take precautionary measures and use only advised medicine at certain times, and they work more efficiently, and we also save an enormous amount of money too” (Interview 14@PAK, October 2015).

The DPP officers also carried out audits, and they collect a sample from the farms and test them in their laboratories against the chemicals and fertilisers been used if any farm
finds with using unauthorised pesticides the DPP refused them to issue an NOC which is compulsory for all the exports.

5.7.10 – WATER MANAGEMENT
The mango growers have four possible water sources, and they are canals, tube wells, reservoirs and rains. Rain cannot be predicted or controlled so when they have it they have it, water reservoirs require ample space and land, so only large-scale growers have such reservoirs at their facilities. Most of the growers rely on canals and tube wells. Canals are the most desired option as they can use the free water which travels through the nearby canals but again the water flow from canals is seasonal and sometimes they just went dry. Also, canal water is usually assigned by the local government to the growers in a certain order, and there are specific days and timings when a grower can access water. Most growers are left to rely on the tube wells. The few growers who install solar panels to run the tube wells incur significant losses because of the huge financial investment required upfront. Tube wells run mostly on the diesel or electricity, but only if these energy supplies are available. GlobalGAP requires growers to maintain a plan on how effectively they use the water and how they preserve the plan according to the future needs.

“We have a diesel tube well as we suffered badly with the electric shortfall and often subject to unannounced load shedding, diesel is a costly option, but we have no choice. We do maintain the invoices for diesel purchases, and we only use the tube well when it is necessary, so on the positive side, we control the water waste. In our pack house, we use water to wash the mangoes before shipping them, and we retain all that water and use it in our fields later” (Interview 14@PAK, October 2015).
All the farms were found to have their own artificial irrigation systems, and they were built with bricks and cement (see image 5.6) to protect water waste. Canal water or tube wells water travels through these cemented small canals within the farm to water the trees. These practices also safeguard the soil against erosion.

5.8 – STAKEHOLDERS

This study has identified four major stakeholders who are directly involved in mango production at the GlobalGAP certified farms in Pakistan. The key players are the mango growers; most of them have been involved in mango production for generations. The provincial government of Punjab is also actively involved in mango production and have dedicated institutes to help the growers. The rural workers are the most critical stakeholders as mango farms are the only possible source of income for them. Also for the mango farms, the availability of the workers is essential. Lastly, the NGO, USAID has worked with the mango growers intensively, and they are still providing assistance with improving the supply chain capabilities of the producers.
5.8.1 – GLOBALGAP AND WORKERS’ CONDITIONS

Agriculture sector not only contributes significantly to the country’s GDP but also the largest sector to provide the employment. In 2005, 43% and in 2010, 44.7% employment were from the agricultural sector in Pakistan (UNDATA, 2015). As mango is the largest fruit crop in Pakistan, it also employs the largest number of workers, especially during the harvesting season. During the field trip, the researcher was told that on average every farm has 20 to 50 permanent employees and each farm recruits an additional 200 to 300 temporary workers during the season which lasts for five months from May to September. The certified farms were required by GlobalGAP to ensure workers’ health and safety and welfare that includes providing them with safe working conditions and improving their hygiene standards (Lemeilleur, 2013).

—The majority of us have been working on this farm for over five years, and we have witnessed the change process throughout, and we are proud of what our farm has achieved in the past few years. When they build a dedicated area for us to rest in the afternoon with clean toilet we were shocked as it was something that we never expected, we told this to our families and friends, and they wanted to work on our farm too‖ (Interview Focus Group1, September 2015).

—We have been provided with the opportunities to attend several training sessions and workshops where we learn how to use the new equipment and how to handle the fruit. We are also required to wash our hands before and after work and in between when we use the toilet or work with chemicals. Previously we were not bothered and even ate our food with dirty hands, this habit improves our health and we tell these things to our kids too” (Interview Focus Group4, September 2015).
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Image 5.7 Instructions Poster for Workers
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)

The image 5.7 shows a displayed poster. Similar posters found to be placed on all the certified farms. This particular poster has been placed in one of the MRI offices as they hold regular training workshops for the mango workers and farmers. These posters were printed under the Trade-Related Technical Assistance (TRTA II) Programme which was funded by the EU. For the ease of workers, all such posters were created with visual images to illustrate to the workers so they can understand and follow as instructed.

Previously there has been arguments about the working hours in developing countries. The workers work longer hours in developing countries like Pakistan, in most of the cases that came through forced work, where workers could lose their job if they didn’t work lengthy hours (Lund-Thomsen and Coe, 2015; Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010; Lund-Thomsen, 2009). The socially responsible standards clearly mentioned in their code of conduct about the working hours and some even include maximum overtime clauses too (Tongo, 2015; Robinson, 2010). As the GlobalGAP ensures workers’
welfare, they also have a clear guideline about working hours and standard emphasis on making it more transparent for the workers.

―We work nine hour day shifts, and we get a one hour break in the afternoon, there are no such restrictions that we have to take a break at a certain time, some of us split our break into two mini breaks. Apart from the hour break we are free to have a toilet break, or if we need to have water or to say our prayer, the management is flexible, and we also cooperate with them during the busy season. Most of us are already aware of key dates, and we update the management with our availability. The harvesting season provides excellent opportunity to make some extra cash. We get some extra money in the form of bonus or little reward, but there is nothing like they force us to work certain our, we are entirely independent in this regard” (Interview Focus Group6, October 2015).

―There is no issue regarding working hours, we have an excellent relationship with our supervisors and someday if we cannot make it we just inform them and on some occasions when they required us to work few extra hours they ask us. All the time we spend at training workshops is also paid and we work in a friendly atmosphere” (Interview Focus Group3, September 2015).

The right to association is considered as a critical factor in developed countries but in developing countries, the unions’ role is not so strong, and that is because of financial insecurity, lack of education and poor communication across industries.

―We do have a union of mango growers and every time we face challenges we work together towards resolutions. However, I must admit that there is no union among workers and to be honest nobody has ever tried for it. We will welcome it if they want to form one. Previously there has been issues when trained workers suddenly walk off and join another farm and we lose out on all that we have spent on their training. If there will be a union with a representative whom they trust can help us identify the issues or any grudges workers have, and we will be able to address them in better way” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).
5.8.1.1 – TRAINING FOR WORKERS
There have been intensive training programmes being arranged for the workers by USAID and EU-funded program to prepare them to work under the GlobalGAP standard. The main challenge was to change their habits in terms of personal hygiene and how they care about the mangoes. MRI also played a critical role in providing the training to the workers, all the manuals not only published in the local languages but also have the graphical illustrations of step by step guidance.

5.8.1.2 – WAGES BETTER AND ON TIME
The workers at the certified farm receive better wages as compare to the nearby non-certified farms. The researcher does not visit any of the non-certified farms to confirm this, but a considerable number of workers expressed this during the focus groups as they came from the other farms.

"Wages are comparatively good here, and we always get them on time without asking them, in my previous job there was no set pattern sometimes they used to pay us monthly, and sometimes they do not pay for months and merely provided us with some wheat and rice. This farm pays us every week, and this allows us to budget our expenses" (Focus Group7, September 2015).

5.8.1.3 – WORKERS HYGIENE’S
This particular factor has been given the most consideration, poor hygiene leads to poor food, and GlobalGAP has a strict policy for workers’ hygiene as they interact with the fruit constantly. Each farm has toilet facilities for the workers with soap to wash their hands (see image 5.8). They have to wear a clean dress and also their personal hygiene monitored by the supervisors if any worker fails to comply with this the supervisors simply send him home.
Image 5.8  **Toilets and Hand Washing Facilities for Workers**  
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)

Washing hands after using the toilet or even after blowing the nose are essential, and especially during the harvesting season, no worker is allowed to touch the fruit with dirty hands.

Image 5.9  **Moveable Trolley Toilets**
The above picture shows the trolley toilet, during the harvesting season these trollies carried through the orchards as workers need to use the toilet. Previously workers used to sit in the bushes, and that practice is completely banned at the certified farms:

“We invest in building the toilets and also arrange the trolley toilets for the workers which also carries washing sink with soap just to ensure that workers kept their selves clean all the time. We told every worker to use the facilities and if someone found creating mess will lose the job” (Interview 5@PAK, September 2015).

5.8.1.4 – WORKING CONDITIONS
The working conditions at the certified farms have been improved massively. The workers have proper sheds and rooms to rest or have their meals, and most of the growers even provided the workers with TV and radio facilities so they can enjoy their free time. They have been provided with the latest tools and equipment; they have masks to use while spraying so overall the working conditions have been greatly improved.

Image 5.10 Sheds and Common Rooms
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)
The workers typically have an hour and thirty-minute break during a nine-hour shift; at these facilities, they can have their meals and rest during their break times. There are also prayer areas as well at every farm; some of them even have their own dedicated mosques.

5.8.1.5 – HEALTH AND SAFETY
Workers’ health and safety has been ignored completely in the past, there have been many examples of terrible incidents in developing countries. Workers always remained vulnerable as they work in hazardous conditions. There have been clear guidelines provided by the GlobalGAP on how the growers should assure workers’ health and safety. Each certified farm now has a dedicated fire assembly area and the pack houses are equipped with the fire extinguishers. Workers have been briefed about the spillage, they have been trained on how to use the tools, and how to deal with chemicals. They are no longer subjected to climbing trees as they have been given special cutters.

Image 5.11  Fire Assembly Directions
(Source: photographs were taken during the field trip, September 2015)
5.8.2 – GROWERS AND EXPORTERS

Pakistani mango production regions are divided into two provinces Sindh and Punjab, this study was carried out in the Punjab province only as the region is the largest in area and production volume and is responsible for over 60% of the total output.

“Punjab province have three major mango clusters. The largest is in Multan where 31000 hectares land use for mango production, number two is in Rahim Yar Khan where 25000 hectares land use for mangoes and then the Muzzafar Garh area where 19000 hectares of land has been dedicated for mangoes” (Interview Officer1@GOV, September 2015).

Although it was started with the help of dedicated mango exporters in Pakistan, as of the previous case study of GlobalGAP and Pakistani citrus industry (FAO, 2013), unlike citrus growers, the mango growers, are mostly large-scale and have the resources to export their produce themselves. Over the last few years, the producers’ consortiums and individual growers themselves perform the exports operations too.

This practice helps them to better understand the requirements from the advanced markets, and also, they get better prices. Also most of the exporters are based in Karachi, the largest city in the Pakistan. The city has the biggest seaport but since most of the mangoes shipments deliver through air freight, it marginalised the scope. The distance to Karachi is about 950 kilometres from the Multan region, and it takes a container to reach the city from the farms in about 18 to 24 hours. It takes even longer for taking security clearance as it travels from one province to the other and also there is a significant cost associated.

On the other side, the growers in Punjab have the better option of the city Lahore which is merely 347 kilometres from the mango producing region and it only took about 8 to 10 hours for a container to deliver due to a short distance, better roads, and the same province advantage. As for future prospects, this year the local airport of the Multan city (the major mango producing region) started international flights to Dubai and Qatar connecting to the EU and the US through Emirates, Qatar, and Gulf Airways. The new airport also has a mega cargo complex with the storage capacity of 10,000 tonnes of perishable fruit to accommodate the agriculture trade (DAWN News, 2015).
One of the reasons for crises in the initial years was the issues with exports operations. We sent the container on time but most of the time they arrived there late, the route was not secure and drivers prefer to travel in daylight when traffic volume is high. Since we started exports ourselves from Lahore, it reduces much pain. Now we send a member of staff with the containers to Lahore, and it has become much easier now that Multan airport has started its international flights, and it will save further time that will add to the shelf life and provide us with some competitive advantage” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015).

The main advantage exporters used to have is the availability of the equipped pack houses where they can stock and maintain the fruit in cold storage, since acquiring the GlobalGAP we have our own pack houses at our farm, we do not need to rely on the exporters. The old practice was that exporters came to the orchard and looked at the fruit on the trees and gave us an estimated price for the whole or half the orchard. They then got the local contract workers to pack the fruit in the wooden crates and transfer them to Karachi or where they had their pack houses. Sometimes we ourselves approached the exporters and sent them a certain quantity at a price which we had mutually agreed. However, in both cases, we used to get low prices, and many of the growers then preferred to sell their fruit to the local market. Over the last couple of years, we have achieved so much regarding price and market exposure, we also established some good contacts in the EU and now they contact us soon we enter into the harvesting season” (Interview 6@PAK, September 2015).

These growers have successfully established the consignment basis supply chain, Souza and Nato (2012) described consignment basis chains where producers hire a firm or agent who commercialises the produce in the targeted market.

There was a misconception among the producers in Pakistan that GlobalGAP will help us find the buyers too, but this was not the case. We experienced significance loss in the first two years as we paid for the certification cost and all other developments, but we never had orders from the desired buyers. USAID and GlobalGAP, however, introduced us to the global food fairs such as Fruit Logistica, where buyers and producers participate from all over the world. The platform actually helped us in establishing contacts and introducing our product to the buyers, now we have buyers in EU, and we
deal with them directly, the same buyers are the key suppliers to the leading supermarkets” (Interview 3@PAK, September 2015).

5.8.3 – GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

Two prominent public institutes are actively involved with mango industry, Mango Research Institute (MRI) and Department of Plant Protection (DPP). DPP works under the Federal Ministry of National Food Security and Research and MRI work under the provincial government of the Punjab province. DPP is mostly involved with inspections and audits; the department has final authority to give clearance to any shipment leaving Pakistan, their officers inspect every single shipment at the airport to ensure that the consignment is free from flies and fungicides and that other legal procedure have been followed. On the other side, MRI is purely developed to help the farmers and growers to educate them about the pest control and developing new varieties, they have two offices one is in Multan city, and the other one is a station in a small town of Shujabad. MRI research officers also helped the growers to understand the technical requirements for GlobalGAP but their services are not limited to certified growers, and they help everyone involved in mango harvesting regardless of their orchard size and production volume.

“Apart from providing technical and scientific assistance MRI also helps growers to obtain the GlobalGAP certificate by guiding them with regards to the requirements. The Institute is accessible for everyone regardless of the size of their orchards.” (Interview Officer3@GOV, September 2015).

The institute was initiated to uplift the mango industry and to facilitate the growers.

“The institute was first approved in 1972 and started its operations in 1974 with the purpose of addressing basic mango diseases as there was no support available for the growers. However, the first fifteen years were less effective due to the lack of knowledge and guidance. The best initiative from the Institute was taken when they decided to collect all the varieties which have been harvested throughout the Punjab province and closely monitored their qualities, advantages, and disadvantages. After careful consideration, the institute decided to eliminate less rich varieties and convinced growers to work on those varieties which were more in demand commercially and also
better in taste. The institute also helped the growers with the latest techniques of drafting where they can use an already grown tree to produce different variety.” (Interview Officer2@GOV, September 2015).

MRI research officers frequently visit the mango orchards across the region and not only provide technical knowledge and support but also observe the practices at the farms.

“-There are two types of farmers; growers and exporters (who grow and export themselves. Exporters understand the importance if they want to sell their produce to high-end markets they have no choice. In 2008, the Agriculture Support Fund (ASF) and USAID provided funds to encourage the growers to participate in GlobalGAP. The interest has now decreased, and one major reason is the registered audit firms which act on behalf of GlobalGAP in Pakistan. Their staff are less bother about observing the practices than they are required to be. I do not see any significance difference between certified and non-certified farms; however, there is a difference between growers’ farms and exporters’ farms” (Interview Officer3@GOV, September 2015).

- The labour codes of conduct also need serious attention. We noticed no child labour issues at the certified farms, and also workers feel happy about the fact there is a clean area dedicated for them to rest or have their meals with clean water available to drink and for other uses. Women’s working is still a cultural issue however they have a scope to work in the packing houses. The local governing bodies are non-professional and need to be more practical and strict regarding the unannounced visits with the right to cancel the certificate. Critical control points need to be identified, and they must be monitored more closely, the EU must have equal merit for everyone, if it is compulsory for one it has to be the same with everyone regardless of the country of origin” (Interview Officer1@MRI, September 2015).

MRI is the only institute of its type in Pakistan that provides support to one specific fruit item, and that reflects the importance of mangoes for Pakistan. Since there is foreign involvement from the experts from Australia, USAID, and GlobalGAP, MRI is still an invaluable asset to the growers and the government.
DPP on the other side is a federal government initiative, and it works across the country, the department manages the advanced testing laboratories and quarantine facilities, a sample from all agro-food items tests in those facilities before they exported outside the country. DPP have their own code of conduct which has to be followed by all the certified, and non-certified growers who aim to export theirs produces outside Pakistan. The main objective of the department is to ensure only high-quality products are exported with no fungicide-related issues (DPP, 2016).

"DPP provides guidance and support to all the growers regardless of their size, and if they are certified by GlobalGAP or not, our department was created to help the agriculture exports. We provide assistance with all type of treatments required to protect the fruit from flies and getting a fungicide. Our department also has independent auditors who check every consignment before it leaves for a foreign market to ensure it met the required standard. For that, we not only visit the farms and warehouses but also inspect the shipments at the airports ready for depart. At the airport, we also check the appropriate documents for shipment to ensure only authorised fruit from certified farms are being shipped to avoid disappointments later.” (Interview Officer1@DPP, September 2015).

DPP officers’ conduct random checks at the exporting warehouses to pick the sample and test it in their laboratories; there are even stricter checks for the consignments aiming for the western markets.

"We are aware that false practices are going on within the mango production industry; we also acknowledge the difference between certified and non-certified farms and our department just help those who are following the right procedures and maintaining the quality as required. Our officers are trained in terms of international standards and requirements. Our quality checks are in line with the requirements set by the designated buyers, for instance, if the shipment is going to the UK we have to go at length to ensure it is safe to send this shipment but if the destination is the Middle East or China, there are different criteria which are quite simple as compared to the UK. We faced criticism from the growers especially the GlobalGAP certified growers as they think we try to put a barrier between them but in fact our department helps them, so they do not pay the price for someone else’s mistake. Last year Indian mangoes were banned in the UK
because of the fruit flies and other fungicides related issues, and we cannot ignore it. Even there is better practices and hygiene at certified farms, but fungicides still can affect the fruit, this year we only have one shipment that has been reported with fruit flies intercepted by DEFRA in the UK.” (Interview Officer2@DPP, October 2015).

There was a mixed response from the growers on the role of DPP, and some even referred it as a red tape. As the GlobalGAP requires to follow the local law in line with compliance, growers are bound to work with them, and they require No Objection Certificate (NOC) from DPP for every single consignment as customs officers and airliners required that legally.

5.8.4 – ROLE OF USAID
Apart from the participating growers and exporters, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has played the major role in introducing the GlobalGAP in Pakistan. The agency also provided financial support to the participating mango growers. GlobalGAP required major infrastructure changes at the mango orchards like availability of blast refrigerators, cold storage, hot water treatment, separate storage room for chemicals and pesticides, resting room for staff and clean toilet for farm workers. USAID provided financial assistance to achieve this. There are hot water treatment machines and other equipment with the USAID stamp on them.

“The facility you are visiting right now came through the project of USAID, there were initially 15 growers who benefited from the scheme, and we were one of them. The project helps us with the facility of advanced pack houses including latest hot water treatment and cold storage. USAID contributed 45% of the machinery cost that enables us to have this cooling infrastructure on the farm” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).
Not only did the agency help with buying the required equipment but they also arranged information seminars and training workshop to spread the awareness.

―Before we acquired GlobalGAP we carried out intensive research exercises, time and again we attended many seminars and workshops some of them were arranged by Australian professionals and some of them were arranged by USAID. I am grateful to USAID for providing us with the resources and information we required to uplift the Pakistani mango industry.‖ (Interview 5@PAK, September 2015).

―I must acknowledge the role of USAID in this whole process as the NGO not only arranged informative seminars but also provide with financial support too. They invited all the major stakeholders of the industry and proposed how the finances could be divided into three parties which were USAID, exporters, and growers. The idea struck well, and that is how we implemented the project of GlobalGAP‖ (Interview 13@PAK, October 2015).
There were some reservations about the role of USAID, and it was not clear what interest the agency had in the development of the Pakistani mango industry. On their website under the caption *what we do* the agency clearly defines their intentions and motives —*USAID is the lead U.S. Government agency that works to end extreme global poverty and enable resilient, democratic societies to realise their potential*” (USAID, 2016). For a better understanding of their role, it was necessary to get their input.

There is an organisation CNFA who assisted the growers under USAID program, the researcher asked them about the assistance they have provided and how that is improving the mango industry.

—*We have helped 33 growers to upgrade their farm structure and to achieve the certificate that helps open the new market for Pakistani mangoes, in last four years those growers have great results. GlobalGAP is a great innovation for mango growers in Pakistan. Our focus is in the Punjab province that produces above 60% of total mango production in Pakistan.*” (Interview 1@CNFA, October 2015).

For food safety, they provided everything from picking baskets to sorting trays. There have been intensive training workshops to address the importance of Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) to ensure food safety. Although DPP has to check and clear every shipment before it leaves the port, it is critical that PRA procedures have been followed throughout. They also test the fruit independently from different GlobalGap certified farms from time to time to monitor the quality and compliance.

—*We had three interventions in the UK last year and it was about 100 in previous years. After the new policy, only five interceptions per year are allowed. Otherwise, the UK will ban imports for the whole year. We are working with growers and exporters to help them achieve a more smooth supply chain. There is an eleven digit code which tells you all the required information about traceability. This includes a date, farms, processing unit and pesticides used. There are legal documents that are required for certified farms to attach with the shipment*” (Interview 2@CNFA, October 2015).

There is a significant improvement in terms of enhancing the supply chain operations and growers’ knowledge about the new requirements.
5.9 – GLOBALGAP ADOPTION BY MANGO GROWERS

There is a significant divide in the available literature about the effects of private standards, particularly about the benefits associated with them (Ehrgott et al., 2011; Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014; Herzfeld et al., 2011; Mikkola, 2008; Sodano et al., 2008). During the interviews, when the growers were asked about the challenges and opportunities associated with the adoption of GlobalGAP, some of the important developments were revealed by the growers. The GlobalGAP standard has improved the infrastructure of the Pakistani mango industry, and there were a number of benefits, which the growers were found to have enjoyed since its adoption.

5.9.1 – ACCESS TO THE WESTERN SUPERMARKETS

There has been a common understanding about the demands and requirements from western supermarkets. Almost all the growers highlighted the attraction they have for the western markets, and probably it was the main force to drive the adoption of GlobalGAP.

“The supermarkets have strict criteria for the producers, and there is a must requirement for ethical standards. We acquired GlobalGAP but this is the minimum requirement, and some of the leading supermarkets require further certification to ensure social audits such as Sedex. The situation is challenging for us, if we have confirmed orders in advance then all this exercise worth it. Otherwise, we just end up paying for these standards.” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).

The western supermarkets in particular pay the best price for the mangoes, and in most cases, it is more than double the price paid by an ordinary buyer. Before the GlobalGAP entered into Pakistan, the country was still among the top mango exporter. However, all the fruit used to be sold by community-based shops and markets in Asian populated neighbourhoods. Since DEFRA imposed stricter checks on the imports especially to counter fruit flies it has become almost impossible for non-certified growers to export their fruit to the UK. Some certified growers complained about the double standards in the EU as due to the complaints from the fruit produced at a non-certified farm, the certified farms’ produces face extra scrutiny.
There are still few exporters who buy the fruit from the growers without checking whether they are certified or not and export it to the EU as they target the community markets who are not concerned about the standards. This practice affects our business as we adopted GlobalGAP purely to target the UK market as we have a huge Pakistani and Indian community and they love the mangoes from Pakistan. We seek support from the supermarkets, to establish more sustainable business relations with us so we can have some sort of assurance in terms of future orders.” (Interview 9@PAK, September 2015).

The GlobalGAP is a minimum requirement imposed by the EU-based retail and supermarket groups, the top supermarkets, however, require further assurance through more compliance. Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) is the system widely encouraged by the supermarkets. According to the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) – HACCP is a management system in which food safety is addressed through the analysis and control of biological, chemical, and physical hazards from raw material production, procurement, and handling, to manufacturing, distribution and consumption of the finished product” (FDA, 2015). As per the requirements all the GlobalGAP certified growers who trade their mangoes to the US and the EU also adhere to this system to ensure food safety. – Along with the GlobalGAP, we also have adopted the HACCP system to ensure that extra measures have been taken throughout the production and all the critical points been monitored by our well-trained staff” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015).

The cost associated with the certification is only worth it when they (the growers) intend to export their fruit into the EU markets. Some growers who initially adopted the standard, have now opted out and have not renewed their certificates.

We were among the first growers who adopted the GlobalGAP in order to capture the high-value EU market and also to improve our day to day practices. There is no doubt that we have learnt new knowledge through GlobalGAP program but after having it for five years, we opted out this year and didn’t renew our certificate. GlobalGAP did not ensure the trade ties, and we are supposed to find the buyers, and we do not have great experiences. We send our best fruit, and later they told us that there were issues with your fruit and deduct our payments as a result. Now we explore new markets around
Pakistan in Iran, Gulf, China, Singapore and Russia and they are not interested in the GlobalGAP so long as the fruit looks good. We keep on following the practices we learnt from GlobalGAP, but as we are not sending any produce to the EU, we are not required the certificate anymore” (Interview 11@PAK, September 2015).

This trend tend to accelerate in the future if the buyers in the western market fail to provide the required support, the growers are educated now, and they know how to explore new markets.

5.9.2 – IMPROVED MANGO PRODUCTION
Mango production has been enhanced overall since the growers adopted the GlobalGAP. The majority of the growers are convinced that the standard certainly helps them in enhancing the production, there have been many new permanent jobs created for the local workers, and all these workers are highly trained and equipped with technical training. The GlobalGAP is extremely keen on food safety and that comes from following the right procedures at every stage throughout the production cycle. From providing the right amount of fertilisers to carrying the mangoes in the pack house, every activity has to be documented. This practice enables them to track back any issues which arise at later stages that what went wrong, when and where. The growers keep on learning from their experiences and results are quite encouraging.

“\textit{It looks simple now; we only need to ensure that we protect the fruit from everything which could harm it. Hygiene plays the most critical role in this process, and we are committed to continuing to improve our practices, it is not only great for mango production but have a great impact on our daily life. These basic steps have improved our yields, and we have seen a significant decline in our losses.”} (Interview 16@PAK, October 2015).

The old system of taking the mangoes off the trees was not only dangerous for the workers, but it also used to cost the growers a huge amount. The mangoes with injuries and bruises affect the other mangoes too, and as there were large sized wooden cases, by the time, it reaches to the market most of the pieces in those cases get rotten.
Complaints about rotten mangoes from buyers have been reduced, and new measures are improving our control of the waste. We have targets for maximum exports and to achieve this we have to produce high-quality mangoes which only satisfy the criteria. Every mango is subject to audit during the sorting and grading stages and we are pushing to increase the volume for class 1 mangoes, this results in superior quality left behind for the local market. Our mangoes are therefore popular among the local consumers too as they receive good quality mangoes as compared to what they used to have before GlobalGAP” (Interview 9@PAK, September 2015).

5.9.3 – IMPROVED VALUE

The market response to the mangoes from the certified farm has improved the value both in the international market and also in the local markets.

“Rather than selling our fruit to the brokers or commission agents we have direct links now with the buyers both international and domestic. For the local market, we also prefer the national supermarket and avoid selling our mangoes at the wholesale fruit market. We are getting much better prices now even from the local markets, and that enables us to pay better wages and to provide better working conditions to our workers” (Interview 11@PAK, September 2015).

Metro Cash & Carry and Hyper Star are the two leading supermarkets in Pakistan, and their success is paving the way for other supermarkets to enter too, these supermarkets not only provide a great atmosphere and varieties of products but also offer the great prices and value for their customers. Metro Cash & Carry, promote best quality mangoes which they buy directly from their dedicated growers to ensure top quality fruit for their customers. The supermarket only buys from the growers who follow the standards (Metro, 2016). The supermarket already has nine stores across the country, and they are growing fast, so even if the certified growers have mangoes which they cannot export they can still sell at decent prices at these supermarkets.

5.9.4 – SUSTAINABILITY

The growers have some information about sustainability, and that is what they have learnt through communication with their buyers. Most of the growers were clear about the importance of sustainability, but they could not relate or articulate the business term:
—I heard about sustainability during an expo in Berlin a few years ago; the buyers kept using this term that they require sustainable supplies and sustainable business terms. Now we have good control on the production, and we deal with the threats well, we are in a better position to promise the require supplies as if we fail to provide the orders timely we might lose the business” (Interview 9@PAK, September 2015).

Another grower discussed the lack of knowledge about sustainability and how it can affect business:

—Many other growers acquired the GlobalGAP during the same time as us, but they failed to get their products into the desired markets, and the main reason was the lack of the support and that growers had less knowledge on how they could access the buyers. Also, the supermarkets are keen on the sustainability issue, so we as a group of seven producers can supply them as per their requirements, and that is the main reason that other supermarkets are also contacting us now and we are happy to deal with them. Sustainability is the core issue as supermarkets give 83% weight to it when making the decision as to whether they will choose a supplier, so they prefer to deal with a representative of a group to ensure sustainability. They prefer group over individual farms to make it secure as if there arise any issue with a grower they wish to have alternatives available. So in my opinion wherever growers join in a group there will be more chances for them to be successful.” (Interview 2@PAK, September 2015).

In the Pakistani agricultural industry, the term sustainability is relatively new, and the growers are doing their best to learn about it, but the main force which is driving them is the demand from the western buyers rather than self-motivation.

5.9.5 – NEW KNOWLEDGE
The participant also highlighted the new knowledge they learn since the GlobalGAP enter into the Pakistani mango industry. Apart from sustainability they growers also have sufficient information about the importance of shelf life, temperature control, value chain, international tariffs, transaction costs, compliance, CSR, workers’ welfare, fruit residue level, HACCP and climate change.
If we look at the things we have learnt through GlobalGAP, we realise that some of them were quite basic and we should have the prior knowledge on them. It shows that the government and agriculture ministry had no interest on these issues.” (Interview 4@PAK, September 2015).

The new knowledge is not limited to the certified growers only, as the growers implemented new practices at their farms, the non-certified small-scale growers also learnt through MRI, and even the certified growers do not hesitate to share information with others. Social media is playing a key role, and surprisingly many stakeholders use and learn through the social media platforms, almost every farm has their Facebook page where they share their produce and practices.

5.9.6 – SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The social and environmental issues have been on the rise over the last two decades, but nothing has been done significantly to deal with them in Pakistan. The mango growers never considered that social and environmental responsibilities could hurdle their scope to capture the western markets. The mango growers’ prime target was the EU market and these issues are considered to be crucial there. Buyers make their decisions based on the compliance with social and environmental practices carried out by the producers at the production sites. One grower discussed his experience:

—During the Fruit Logistica 2010 in Berlin, we have been approached by the buyers who supplies to the Tesco, and they want some sort of assurance that we comply with the social and environmental practices at our farm and only after the satisfied evidence they will do business with us. We were doing most of the things right since we acquired the GlobalGAP but we do not have any knowledge how to capitalise on it, now we learnt and still improving our understanding of CSR and related practices. We are in a better position to discuss the initiatives we are taking at our farms, including the solar panels for renewable energy and use of safe chemicals to protect the environment and also to protect the workers” (Interview 15@PAK, October 2015).

Another grower highlighted how they promote their initiatives to protect soil and water waste:
We regularly attend the expos and food fairs around the world in search of new markets. Not only do we introduce our products but we also show the prospective buyers the images about how we protect the soil from erosion and how we control the water waste and these initiatives have been appreciated by the buyers, and we have made new partnerships. These issues are critical in building sustainable business terms, and at the same time they are essential in protecting the climate for generations to come.” (Interview 13@PAK, September 2015).

Social and environmental issues are the core issues when it comes to CSR and compliance, and Pakistani growers have gained immensely valuable knowledge and information through the GlobalGAP standard that not only helps them to win over the buyers' trust but also represents a positive step towards a safer environment and a healthy society.

5.9.7 – EU MARKET

Most growers argued that the GlobalGAP standard is EU specific and that is quite obvious as it was initiated by the EU-based retail groups. The European market is the top target for the Pakistani mango growers. There are also other new markets open for the Pakistani mangoes, for example, Russia and China (The Express Tribune, 2016).

―GlobalGAP has top supermarkets as their members in the EU, and this is the minimum requirement from those members' supermarkets. We are happy that people can buy our mangoes from the supermarkets like Tesco, Morrison, and Asda. These supermarkets are popular among the customers from various backgrounds and that helps us to introduce our product to the other nationalities too, we are kind of promoting the soft image of our country and people love the taste and fragrance of our mangoes” (Interview 8@PAK, September 2015).

The GlobalGAP was originally launched as EurepGAP just to focus the EU market, but now the standard has a global presence. The standard has already started a partnership with the principal stakeholders in Africa, the Gulf, and China, in the near future, even the Gulf and Chinese markets will demand the certificate from the growers and the certified growers will again have the competitive advantage over non-certified producers.
5.9.8 – Challenges for Growers

From the growers’ perspectives, there were two primary complaints: first almost every grower complained about the government policies and the existence of the red tape that placed hurdles in the way of progressive growers.

“Rather than government helping and encouraging the producers, there are problems as putting hurdles for those who thrive, and government officials try to put unnecessary pressure on the producers. We have to deal with red tape all the time, and there is no such platform where we can raise such issues, there is also the issue of corruption” (Interview 10@PAK, September 2015).

The second complaint they have is with the GlobalGAP although most of the growers agreed that GlobalGAP must have assisted them in entering into the new markets. According to them, the GlobalGAP has a strong global presence, and they can help the certified growers to explore new markets, but there is no support in this regard and growers have to put in their own effort to find buyers who are not easy for the new entrants to find and thus marginalise their scope to capture high-end markets. Also, there is no consultation from GlobalGAP with the participant in terms of reviewing policy, they just informed the changes but never ask for any input of feedback.

“They just dictate us about the requirements, but never consider the challenges we face here” (Interview 16@PAK, October 2015).

Most of the problem faced by the growers in terms of marketing their products and securing orders arises due to the lack of knowledge about the demands and the current issues in global trade for example ethical sourcing. The things, however, improving gradually and growers were optimistic about the future of Pakistani mango industry.

5.10 – VULNERABLE ISSUES

Along with all the positives, there have been few areas identified during the field trip that require further consideration from the concerned authorities and stakeholders. Even though the nature of work is difficult for women, they have been ignored and discriminated against by the mango growers, they have their own reasons to avoid
recruiting women, but the fact is, nobody wants to take the responsibility to ensure a safer working environment for women. Even the constitution of Pakistan’s paragraph 25 states that every individual is equal and has the same rights. They cannot be discriminated against because of their genders (ILO, 2004). That means it was a violation of the constitution, and thus a violation of the GlobalGAP as the standard require respect of the local law. It would have been better if there were some checks carried out to ensure this issue as well. Pakistani mango industry is huge, and it can accommodate a good number of women workers who can participate in the day to day activities.

The second deficiency is the lack of union, or in harsh words, right to have a union. There is no workers’ union among mango workers in Pakistan. This particular finding is consistent with the findings of Barrientos and Smith, (2007). The growers have expressed their views in favour of having a workers’ union, but no practical action has been taken in this regard, the workers are never encouraged to form a union even this is considered as a basic for human rights and workers’ welfare. Lastly, the issue of written job contracts to ensure job safety to the workers. Currently, there are no written contracts between the farms and the workers - even the permanent workers have no job security.

5.11 – SUMMARY

There is a visible divide among large-scale growers and small-scale growers in the Pakistani mango industry as only large-scale growers were able to acquire the GlobalGAP standard. Previously it was argued that only the buyers in western countries, especially the supermarkets, were the major beneficiaries, but this study has found that growers and workers also benefitted hugely with these good agricultural practices. The GlobalGAP standard ensures food safety through good agricultural practices at the participating farms. These good practices cover the whole production system from traceability to workers’ welfare and from safe chemical use to environment protection. It covers all, however some of the elements are ranked as a major must including the documentation of every activity at the farm and some elements have minor must and that includes wages and facilities for the workers. However, even the minor must requirements only allow a relaxation margin of 5% negligence and the growers have to satisfy the auditors demands that there is at least 95% compliance with those elements.
too. This major must and minor must systems has also been criticised previously as when it comes to workers’ welfare the standard only requires a minor must, but this study found that even the minor must is a compulsory too and also subject to the compliance with the standard.

The participating farms have some common characteristics such as clean and tidy first impression. There were facilities for workers including clean toilets with soap, room for rest during lunch breaks and chilled drinking water. The farms also have separate secure storage for all the harmful chemicals and pesticides and well-organised pack house with visible instruction and written codes of conduct. The certified farms vary in size, but the majority of them are large to very large-scale with a number of permanent workers ranging from 20 to 300 according to the scale of the orchard. USAID was the main donor agency who helped the growers financially and technically to acquire the GlobalGAP. The agency also provided the facilities to build the modern pack houses.

All the farms are actively adapting the practices to improve their production, but in terms of capturing western supermarkets which were the prime attraction for the growers, there is still a serious amount of work which is needed to be done. All the certified growers export their mangoes but only a few of them are able to capture the high-value supermarkets, whereas the rest of them sell their mangoes to wholesalers who later sold them at community market at low prices.

The growers are doing their best to comply with the standards fully and were enthusiastic about the new knowledge they are learning but there is a huge margin of improvement. In the Pakistani context, all that they have achieved so far is remarkably significant, but in terms of global competition, they are required to achieve more. The benefits that growers gained through GlobalGAP include improved production, improved value, new markets, better working conditions and learning about new knowledge. They were unaware of the fact that these practices also affected the workers’ motivation and job satisfaction which ultimately affected their operation and working atmosphere. Also, the GlobalGAP never highlighted this added benefit for the growers who anticipated joining the standard. This particular finding was supported by the quantitative data from the workers, something which is elaborated on in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6
DATA ANALYSIS – QUANTITATIVE

6.1 – INTRODUCTION
This chapter is based on the examination and analysis of quantitative data to answer the first research question which is about the relationship between CSR practices at the certified mango farms and workers’ motivation. The data that was collected through the questionnaire survey was loaded onto MS Excel for the initial screening to detect missing values, and to eliminate the responses with zero standard deviation. The refined data was then imported into SPSS for further analysis. Table 6.4 illustrates all the variables that were used in the survey. The first part of this chapter represents the demographic analysis of the participants, followed by a descriptive analysis in terms of how the questions were answered. In order to test the relationship between the variables, Spearman’s correlation analysis was used to verify the relationship between the variables. The next stage of screening the causal relationship between the variables and the hypotheses involved a regression analysis which included a step-wise procedure to rank the independent variables in order of their prominence to predict the dependent variable.

6.2 – SAMPLE
As the study is based on GlobalGAP certified mango farms in Pakistan, the sample consists of workers at the certified farms only. Around 400 questionnaires were distributed among the farm workers (managerial and tactical employees), to collect the required information. Out of 400 questionnaires, a total of 374 were completed. That represents a useable response rate of 93.5%. However, only 349 of them were found to be useful as the rest of them did not pass the criteria to be literate enough to understand the questions. Two initial questions were designed to test the literacy level of the participants. The numbers were further cropped to 316 as the responses with 0.00 standard deviation (SD) were eliminated. 0.00 SD means no variance in the answer, for example, if the respondent ticked all 1s or 2s. There is an exclusion for only one 0.00 SD, and that is for the gender data, all the participants were male and that hugely reflects the gender inequality, however, the causes and excuses have been discussed in the previous chapter. To test for adequacy of the sample the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
(KMO) test was conducted with SPSS. According to Rennie (2002), the value closest to 1 represented a good fit. Table 6.1 shows the KMO as calculated at 0.80. It was found to be significant at P<0.001 and it confirmed that data was factor analysable. Table 6.2 shows communalities to confirm the KMO was calculated for all 26 items.

Table 6.1  **Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Adequacy Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>6815.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2  **Communalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFOP1</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP2</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP3</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP4</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP5</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP6</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP7</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP8</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP1</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP2</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP3</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP4</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP1</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP2</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP3</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP4</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questionnaire was based on Likert scale style questions (see Table 6.3) where respondents were given choices to choose from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and each response has been assigned a number from 5 to 1 to feed the answer into the SPSS.

Table 6.3  Likert scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was also a demographic section in the questionnaire where respondents were asked about their age, experience, and qualification, etc. The questionnaire can be found in the appendices.

Table 6.4  List of variables and Items in the Survey Questionnaire

**WORKFORCE ORIENTED PRACTICES**
- WFOP1 – Facilities at Work
- WFOP2 – Working Hours
- WFOP3 – Wages
- WFOP4 – Management Attitude
- WFOP5 – Forced Overtime
- WFOP6 – Health & Safety
- WFOP7 – Training
- WFOP8 – Performance based Rewards

**SOCIETY ORIENTED PRACTICES**
- SOP1 – Educational Facilities
- SOP2 – Health Facilities
- SOP3 – Societal Recreational Activities
- SOP4 – Child Labour

**ENVIRONMENTAL ORIENTED PRACTICES**
- EOP1 – Pesticides and Fertilisers
- EOP2 – Garbage and Waste Management
- EOP3 – Recycling Mechanism
- EOP4 – Water Waste Management
**JOB SATISFACTION**
JS1 – Job Security
JS2 – Work-Life Balance
JS3 – Fair Treatment
JS4 – Working Conditions

**MOTIVATION**
M1 – Recognition and Appreciation
M2 – Targets to Achieve
M3 – Equal Opportunities
M4 – Extra Responsibilities
M5 – Love your Job
M6 – Willingness to Contribute

### 6.3 – DEMOGRAPHICS

The table below represents the demographic information of the participants. The standard deviation values for Age Group, Experience and Education show a good variety of the participants from different age groups, educational backgrounds and the years of experience they have.

**Table 6.5 Analysis of demographical data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age_Group</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Employment_Type</th>
<th>Job_Position</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As described previously in the methodology chapter, this study was carried out at only the GlobalGAP certified mango farms in Pakistan. Thirty-one mango farms were certified, and they were split into two regions, the Sindh province, and the Punjab province. All the data was gathered from the 17 mango farms in the Punjab province. The respondents were asked to participate in the study on a voluntary basis, and the workers filled in all the survey questionnaires on the main farms, and their pack houses. Only lower level supervisors and tactical workers were the targeted respondents, as owners and top managers have been interviewed separately during the visit on those farms. The mango industry in Pakistan is overwhelmingly male dominated and only a few female works in the pack houses, few attempts had been made to hear their views, but they refuse to comment or participate, so male employees completed all 316 questionnaires.

The Age Group was divided from 18 to 50 and over, the mean value ($\bar{X}$) 2.06 shows that the majority of the respondents were aged between 25 and 36, the SD value ($\sigma_X$) 0.719 indicates that there were the representations from the workers of various age groups.

![Figure 6.1 Age-groups of the participants](Source: Own Data)
According to the statistics, 60% of the country’s population are youths (IPRI, 2014) where the median age is 22.7 (Worldometers, 2016). The scarce opportunities for education in rural area pushes the young people to start working at as early an age as 15, and agriculture is the top occupation amongst those who live in rural society (World Bank Group, 2014; Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2015; UNDATA, 2015). The sample was an unbiased representation of the population and the findings can be generalised. The questionnaires were distributed to the certified farms randomly, and no priorities were made to pick specific responses, so all the demographic data occurred naturally according to the population.

There was a good mix of the experience among the respondents, and that is why the SD is highest at (σₓ) 0.841. However, the mean value (⎨) 2.39, shows that the majority of the respondents were working in the industry for three years or more, it was important to know as these workers have seen and gone through the change process. Employment Type and Job Position have only two options to choose from, a majority of the respondent were permanent workers and were ordinary bottom tier workers. The Education figures were surprising as there were even graduates who worked as workers and that made up for the higher SD value (σₓ) 0.787. The mean value (⎨) 1.95 shows that the majority of respondents had a minimum of matriculation.

6.4 – DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The study uses five variables, three independent variables named as Workforce Oriented Practices, Society Oriented Practice, and Environment Oriented Practices, and the two dependent variables named as Job Satisfaction and Motivation. As the data was collected through a Likert scale style questionnaire, all the variables were divided into items in order to collect the relevant information. Eight items represented Workforce Oriented Practices named as WFOP1 to WFOP8, four items represented Society Oriented Practices named as SOP1 to SOP4, four items represented Environment Oriented Practices named as EOP1 to EOP4, four items represented Job Satisfaction named as JS1 to JS4 and six items representing Motivation named as M1 to M6. This study’s findings were incredibly consistent with the literature; however, there were some significant contradictions that have also been identified, which will be discussed in the following chapter. There was a significantly high mean score (⎨) for the majority of the responses which reflect a strong agreement with the given statements.
Appendix 1 contains the tables and data that have been used below for the descriptive analysis.

6.4.1 – WORKFORCE ORIENTED PRACTICES
As the Workforce Oriented Practices variable consisted of 8 items, the highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.78, was recorded for WFOP1 which was the ‘facilities at work’ with the SD value of 0.588 which shows the responses do not vary significantly. This particular finding was significant as the facilities at the workplace were at the core of the GlobalGAP requirements and these numbers suggested strong compliance with the criteria. The second highest mean score ($\bar{X}$) of 4.72 was recorded for WFOP4 which was the ‘management attitude’. This item also had a little SD value ($\sigma_X$) of 0.497, this particular finding was significant in the cultural context as there was no culture of fair treatment before the adoption of GlobalGAP as quoted by workers during the focus group interviews.

WFOP7 which was the ‘training’ and WFOP6 the ‘health and safety’ also attracted higher mean values ($\bar{X}$) of 4.67 and 4.54 respectively. Both these items are considered to be of great importance for the implementation of the GAP and the growers were found to be keen on giving them a high priority. There were visible instructions and guidance displayed at all the participating farms and this had been witnessed during the field trip.

The lowest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 3.90 was recorded for WFOP3 which was the ‘wages’; the item also had the highest SD value ($\sigma_X$) of 1.114. GlobalGAP requires to meet the national minimum wage requirement, it attracted a mixed response and the higher SD value shows that there was significant variation in the responses. One possible reason as witnessed during the field trip is that among the participating farms, some farms offer higher wages as compared to the others as they were larger in size or have better yields. Also, the national wage rate in Pakistan is still low but the workers on agricultural farms have not even received the minimum rate and most of them were even paid with rice and wheat rather money. GlobalGAP ensures at least they receive the wage rate set by the government. Similarly the item WFOP8 which was the ‘performance based reward’ attracted the second lowest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.03 with the SD value ($\sigma_X$) of 1.215. These findings were consistent with the findings for the
wages for same reason, as larger farms with financial resources have rewards schemes implemented for the workers. Although this particular item is not a requirement of the GlobalGAP but relevant to the scope of this study.

Other items WFOP2 ‘working hours’ and WFOP5 ‘forced overtime’ attracted similar mean values ($\bar{X}$) of 4.30 and 4.28 respectively, both the items associated with each other and the similar mean values validate this relation. The SD value ($\sigma_X$) for WFOP5 is slightly higher at 1.016 that shows the responses varied. However, the mode value ($Mo$) of 5 reveals that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed that there was no forced overtime.

6.4.2 – SOCIETY ORIENTED PRACTICES

There were four items with which to examine the Society Oriented Practices (SOP). Currently, there is only one requirement from the GlobalGAP which represents the SOPs, and that is SOP4 ‘no child labour’, the other three items were proposed to observe how the respondents would react to those initiatives if adopted in the future. The highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.81 was found for SOP1 and that was ‘educational facilities’. Almost all the respondents strongly agreed that their respective farms must initiate provision of funding for education.

The SOP2 which was ‘health facilities’ has attracted the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.79, that shows the respondents willingness for their employers to initiate the health facility by funding to build a dispensary or to improve the facilities at local medical centres.

The third highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.72, was found for the SOP3 which was ‘sports or recreation’. This particular item was added as almost all the farms have so much spare land, and many of their workers either live on the farm or nearby but ironically there was only one farm found that offered a playground and a small gym for its workers. The respondents, had shown their interest if such facilities or events can be organised for the workers. The SD ($\sigma_X$) values for all three items remained low at 0.403, 0.413 and 0.456 respectively. Lastly, the SOP4 which was ‘no child labour’ calculated at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.59. Interestingly, the SD value ($\sigma_X$) of 0.785 for SOP4 was found highest among all four items as some farms reported to allow young workers between the age of 13 and 15 to work in the pack houses during their summer
holidays only under the supervision of their parents or close relatives. Those growers argued during the interviews that the young workers only perform the easiest tasks such as placing the stickers and work in air-conditioned pack houses and are allowed to work on the permission of their parents. This practice allows them to earn some extra money and they also learn new skills.

6.4.3 – ENVIRONMENTAL ORIENTED PRACTICES
The Environmental Oriented Practices (EOP) were examined and there were four items added to the questionnaire seeking responses on the key environmental practices which were in line with the requirements of the GlobalGAP. The highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.88 was found for EOP1 which was ‘use of pesticides and fertilizers’. GlobalGAP have a major must clause for the use of chemicals and the mean value for EOP1 confirms a strong compliance as the majority of the respondents strongly agreed that their respective farm only uses the chemicals as advised by experts and that these were also secured in locked storage.

The item EOP4 which was ‘water management’ fetched the second highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.79. EOP3 which was ‘recycling’ attracted the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.78 and the EOP2 which was ‘waste management’ also had the higher mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.67. The SD values ($\sigma_X$) for all 4 items also remained low as the highest value was found for EOP2 at 0.579. Unsurprisingly, there was no disagreement on the environmental issues and all the participating farms were found to be in full compliance with the GlobalGAP requirements. The obvious reason was the pressure from the certifying body as environmental issues have a major must clause and moreover, enormous efforts have been input by the growers with the help of USAID to ensure that they met the critical criteria for environmental standards.

6.4.4 – JOB SATISFACTION
Job Satisfaction was the first dependent variable. There were four items added to the questionnaire to examine job satisfaction among the workers. The highest score was achieved by JS4 which was ‘working conditions’ at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.77. This result validates the higher mean values for the items analysed above, as a majority of the respondents agreed to CSR practices, and that results in better working conditions.
The JS3 which was _fair treatment_ was found to have the second highest mean at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.64, respectively JS2 which was _work-life balance_ accounted for the third highest mean at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.26. All these major indicators of job satisfaction reflect on the higher mean values for the items among the independent variables. The most critical element of JS1 was _job security_ which was found to have the lowest mean at a value ($\bar{X}$) of 3.49. Also, the SD value for this particular item was found to be the highest as well at ($\sigma_{\bar{X}}$) 1.148.

So despite all the good practices that helped growers to achieve good recognition among the workers as they admire better working conditions and work-life balance, somehow this failed to ensure the job security of the workers. The mode value ($M_o$) of 3, shows that the majority of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed when asked if they think their job is secure, but quite a few even strongly disagreed with the statement. One obvious reason was the absence of a written job contract as only a few farms offer written agreements but only to the managers and the supervisors and ignored the workers at large. Despite the appalling concerns over their job security, the overall score for Job Satisfaction was found to be encouraging and that was also in line with the improved practices at the certified farms.

**6.4.5 – MOTIVATION**

This study included six items which were inspired by Herzberg’s hygiene theory to test the motivation of farm workers. The most decisive element to test the motivation was item M6 which was _willingness to contribute_ and that has attracted the highest mean among all the six items at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.67. The mode value ($M_o$) of 5, that shows the majority of the workers strongly agreed to the point that they were willing to contribute to the growth of their respective farms. The lowest SD value of ($\sigma_{\bar{X}}$) 0.564 confirmed that the majority of the responses were around this mean score. This particular finding is phenomenal for this particular study as a willingness to contribute, is the best indicator to observe the motivation.

The second most important element was M5 which was _love your job_ which gained the second highest mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.34 and which shows that the majority of respondents enjoy their work. It is vital to keep workers motivated, and that shows when they start to like their job or workplace. The third most critical element to
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calculate the motivation was item M4 which was ‘extra responsibilities’, and that factor gained a high mean ($\bar{X}$) of 4.33, it shows that the majority of respondents agreed to the willingness of taking on extra responsibilities. This item becomes relevant during the harvesting season as mango is a once a year yield and farm owners required extra support from their workers during the harvesting season.

Other factors such as M1 ‘recognition and appreciation’ and M2 ‘set targets’ also brought higher mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.28 and ($\bar{X}$) of 4.25 respectively. The lowest mean score was found for M3 which was ‘equal opportunities’ at the mean value ($\bar{X}$) of 4.11, this might be particular to the ordinary workers as some of them have worked for decades and still work as an ordinary worker. The overall picture is clear as the mode value ($Mo$) of five was found for all six items, and it shows that the majority of respondents were in agreement with the question and expressed their motivation strongly.

The descriptive stats provided a relatively clear picture of compliance with the standard and how all those practices affected their job satisfaction and motivation. There was a complete synthesis of the mean values for all the proposed indicators to examine CSR practices at the participating farms and to test their relationship with the job satisfaction and the motivation. The results looked much correlated. However, the correlation test has been conducted separately and has been discussed further in this chapter.

6.5 - DATA RELIABILITY

Prior to conducting the correlation and regression analysis, it was critical to establish if the data was reliable enough to produce correct results. The data reliability was analysed using Cronbach's Alpha test with the help of SPSS. The Alpha closer to 1 shows a perfect fit. Cronbach's Alpha calculates the internal consistency of the data. Most of the studies suggested that an acceptable level of alpha is a minimum of 0.7 (Lance et al., 2006), but later it was argued by Suhr and Shay (2009) that for academic research purposes the alpha is significant at 0.6 and must be acceptable.

The overall Alpha in Table 6.6 shows 0.924 which is significant given that the higher the value of Alpha, the stronger the internal consistency between the variables. Table
6.7 provides the details about the scale if the item(s) deleted. So if SOP2 removed from the analysis, the Alpha would have increased to .927.

Table 6.6 – Cronbach’s Alpha for all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.924</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 – Item-Total Statistics for all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-Total Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP1</td>
<td>111.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP2</td>
<td>112.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP3</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP4</td>
<td>111.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP5</td>
<td>112.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP6</td>
<td>111.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP7</td>
<td>111.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP8</td>
<td>112.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP1</td>
<td>111.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP2</td>
<td>111.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP3</td>
<td>111.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP4</td>
<td>111.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP1</td>
<td>111.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP2</td>
<td>111.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP3</td>
<td>111.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP4</td>
<td>111.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>112.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>112.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>111.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>111.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>112.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>112.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>112.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>112.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>112.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>111.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Alpha for independent and dependent variables has also been tested separately. Below are the tables showing the state of internal consistency between the items for the independent variables.

**Table 6.8 – Cronbach’s Alpha for Independent Variables (CSR Practices)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.822</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 shows Cronbach’s Alpha for the independent variables. All the independent variables have been tested in combination as they all reflect on the same phenomenon and that is CSR Practices.

**Table 6.9 – Item-Total Statistics for Independent Variable (CSR Practices)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFOP1</td>
<td>68.48</td>
<td>29.844</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP2</td>
<td>68.95</td>
<td>25.889</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP3</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>27.557</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP4</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>31.373</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP5</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>25.368</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP6</td>
<td>68.71</td>
<td>29.915</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP7</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>31.813</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOP8</td>
<td>69.22</td>
<td>24.537</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP1</td>
<td>68.45</td>
<td>32.826</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP2</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>33.544</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP3</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>32.066</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP4</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>29.101</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP1</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>32.470</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP2</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>30.892</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP3</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>32.225</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP4</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>31.926</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alpha was found at 0.822 which is significant. The high-value for Alpha confirms that there was significant consistency between all the observed independent variables. Below are the Alpha calculations for the dependent variables.
Table 6.10 – Cronbach’s Alpha for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.677</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11 – Item-Total Statistics for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>4.689</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10 shows the Alpha as 0.677 for the first dependent variable that is Job Satisfaction. Table 6.11 shows Alpha if certain item deleted. If JS4 was excluded from the analysis, the Alpha would have increased to 0.714. However, the analysis was carried out with all four items, as the overall Alpha was > 0.6.

Table 6.12 – Cronbach’s Alpha for Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.911</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13 – Item-Total Statistics for Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>15.227</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>15.389</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>13.378</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>14.633</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>15.996</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>18.369</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.12 shows Alpha as 0.911 for the second dependent variable that is Motivation. Table 6.13 shows Alpha if a certain item is deleted. The Alpha shows significant internal consistency between the items chosen to access Motivation.

### 6.6 – COMBINED VALUE MODEL

As the statistical model required to be tested with different tests and combinations, the relevant items were computed to have the data under the actual variables. The ‘compute variable’ function in SPSS was used. The entire workforce related (WFOP1 to WFOP8) items added to create the variables Workforce Oriented CSR, Society Oriented CSR and the Environment Oriented CSR. For the dependent variables, the items have been grouped into two variables and that were Job Satisfaction and Motivation.

Table 6.14 – Combined descriptive data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workforce Oriented CSR</th>
<th>Society Oriented CSR</th>
<th>Environment Oriented CSR</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35.2184</td>
<td>18.9146</td>
<td>19.1203</td>
<td>17.1614</td>
<td>25.9842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.25416</td>
<td>.06233</td>
<td>.06853</td>
<td>.13033</td>
<td>.26342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>36.0000</td>
<td>19.0000</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>18.0000</td>
<td>28.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4.51802</td>
<td>1.10797</td>
<td>1.21816</td>
<td>2.31679</td>
<td>4.68260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>20.412</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>5.368</td>
<td>21.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>11129.00</td>
<td>5977.00</td>
<td>6042.00</td>
<td>5423.00</td>
<td>8211.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7 – CORRELATION

As the data was collected through a Likert scale style questionnaire and the findings were presented in categories in the ordinal form, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient ($r_s$) was deployed to assess the correlation between the variables. According to the data in Appendix 2, the two dependent variables, Job Satisfaction and Motivation themselves shared a strong correlation at ($\rho = 0.740$). This particular finding was
significant at P-Value .000 which is P≤0.01. See Appendix 2 for the data discussed below.

There was a strong correlation between the Workforce Oriented Practices and the Job Satisfaction at (\( \rho = 0.671 \)), and an even stronger correlation between the Workforce Oriented Practices and the Motivation at (\( \rho = 0.710 \)). The result proving the first two hypotheses which were:

**H1a:** There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.

**H1b:** There is a positive relationship between Workforce Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Motivation.

The correlation was also significant at the P-Value .000 which is P≤0.01 for both the above hypotheses. Among the main variables, particular items were strongly correlated with each other. Namely, WFOP5 (Forced Overtime) has a strong correlation with JS2 (Work-Life Balance) and M3 (Equal Opportunities) at (\( \rho = 0.671 \)) and (\( \rho = 0.662 \)) respectively. The majority of respondents have shown strong agreement with no forced labour with the mean value at 4.28, resulting in more respondents expressing that there is a balance between their work and home life.

Another interesting relation has emerged between WFOP8 (Performance based Rewards) and M3 where the correlation was strong at (\( \rho = 0.606 \)), so the study established a strong positive relation between performance based rewards and equal opportunities at work. There was one negative, weak correlation found between WFOP7 (Training) and JS1 (Job Security) at (\( \rho = -0.18 \)), however, it was not significant at P-Value .750 which is P≥0.05.

There was moderate positive correlation recorded between the Society Oriented Practices and the Job Satisfaction at (\( \rho = 0.476 \)), and between SOP and the Motivation at (\( \rho = 0.489 \)). These results validate the third and the fourth hypotheses which were:
**H2a:** There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers' Job Satisfaction.

**H2b:** There is a positive relationship between Society Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers' Motivation.

For the above hypotheses, the correlation was significant at the P-Value .000 which is P≤0.01.

The most prominent correlation was found between the items SOP4 (Child Labour) and M3 (Equal Opportunities) at (ρ = 0.617). The values suggest that the respondents who showed strong agreement with the fact that their farm has a clear policy about child labour attracted a mean value of 4.59, also showing a strong agreement with the fact that there were equal opportunities at their workplace. Another significant correlation has been found between SOP4 and JS3 (Fair Treatment) at (ρ = 0.571), that shows the relation between the elimination of child labour and the fair treatment at work.

For the third independent variable which was the Environmental Oriented Practices (EOP), there was a moderate positive correlation found between EOP and JS at (ρ = 0.530), and between EOP and Motivation at (ρ = 0.463), both values were considered significant at the P-Value .000 which is P≤0.01. These results validated the fifth and the sixth hypotheses, which were:

**H3a:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Job Satisfaction.

**H3b:** There is a positive relationship between Environmental Oriented CSR Practices and rural workers’ Motivation.

The most prominent correlation was found among the items was between EOP1 (Pesticides and Fertilizers) and JS4 (Working Conditions) at (ρ = 0.614). This finding is particularly significant for this study as the respondents correlate the improvements in the use and handling of the pesticides and fertilizers with the better working conditions.
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It was also consistent with what the study found during the focus group interviews with the workers.

The Spearman Rho’s Correlation suggests that there is a positive relation between CSR practices and the workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. These findings were also tested significantly against the P-Values at $P \leq 0.01$. Apart from the combined relationship between the independent and the dependent variables, there were also some interesting relationships which have been discovered among the individual items within those variables. However, in this section, only the magnitude of the correlation coefficient has been examined and to identify the causation, a more rigorous technique of multivariate regression analysis was adopted to explore the causal relationship between the variables.

6.8 – REGRESSION (LINEAR)

The Spearman Rho’s Correlation has identified the significant positive correlation among the variables. However, to make a prediction about the dependent variables (Job Satisfaction and Motivation) on the basis of the independent variables (Workforce Oriented Practice, Society Oriented Practice and Environment Oriented Practices) a linear regression equation was tested to make the prediction. It was a step towards testing the independent variables simultaneously against the dependent variables through multivariate regression, which is discussed further in this chapter. See Appendix 3 for the detailed tables and data which have been quoted below:

6.8.1 – WORKFORCE ORIENTED PRACTICE AND JOB SATISFACTION

The linear regression analysis shows that there was a significant positive relationship between WFOP and Job Satisfaction at $(\text{adj } r^2=0.582)$ with P-Value .000 which is $P \leq 0.01$. It transpired that Job Satisfaction was dependent of WFOP ($t$-value=20.97) and this value also significant at $P \leq 0.01$, with 99% confidence level.

Regression Equation

$H_1: \text{Job Satisfaction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{Workforce Oriented Practices}$
6.8.2 – WORKFORCE ORIENTED PRACTICE AND MOTIVATION
The second hypothesis also validated that there was a significant positive relationship between WFOP and Motivation (adj \( r^2 = 0.543 \)) with a significant index of \( P \leq 0.01 \). The numbers suggested that Motivation was dependent of WFOP (t-value=19.37) this value also found significant at \( P \leq 0.01 \) with 99% confidence level.

Regression Equation
H1a: Motivate = \( \beta_0 + \beta_1 \) _Workforce Oriented Practices_

6.8.3 – SOCIETY ORIENTED PRACTICES AND JOB SATISFACTION
The results from the regression model to test the relationship between SOP and JS shows that there was a significant positive relationship between SOP and JS (adj \( r^2 = 0.249 \)), so the JS is dependent on SOP with (t-value=10.26), both the regression coefficient and the t-value were significant at \( P \leq 0.01 \). These numbers validated the third hypothesis.

Regression Equation
H2: Job Satisfaction = \( \beta_0 + \beta_1 \) _Society Oriented Practices_

6.8.4 – SOCIETY ORIENTED PRACTICES AND MOTIVATION
There was a significant positive relationship was found between SOP and Motivation at (adj \( r^2 = 0.237 \)), that shows Motivation is dependent on SOP with (t-value=9.941). The coefficient and regression both were considered significant at P-value of .000 which was \( P \leq 0.01 \).

Regression Equation
H2a: Motivation = \( \beta_0 + \beta_1 \) _Society Oriented Practices_

6.8.5 – ENVIRONMENT ORIENTED PRACTICES AND JOB SATISFACTION
A significant positive relationship was found between EOP and JS at (adj \( r^2 = 0.253 \)), it shows that Job satisfaction was dependent on EOP (t-value=10.365), both the values were significant at P-value .000 which was \( P \leq 0.01 \).
Regression Equation
H3: \( \text{Job Satisfaction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Environment Oriented Practices} \)

### 6.8.6 – ENVIRONMENT ORIENTED PRACTICES AND MOTIVATION
The linear regression result shows that there was a significant positive relationship between EOP and Motivation at \((\text{adj } r^2=0.180)\), the relationship was significant with \((t\text{-value}=8.386)\) at \(P\leq0.01\).

Regression Equation:
H3a: \( \text{Motivation} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Environment Oriented Practices} \)

### 6.9 – MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
The Multiple Regression Correlation (MRC) is a technique often used when testing the relationship between multiple independent variables and a single dependent variable. There were two dependent variables in this study, so they have been tested separately in two MRC models, first the relationship between WFOP, SOP, EOP and Job Satisfaction and then between WFOP, SOP, EOP and Motivation. At the first stage, a simple linear regression model was run to test the correlation among the variables separately, during this phase one-to-one regression coefficient \((r^2)\) were calculate to test the relationship.

As one of the objectives of this study was to identify CSR practices that have the most influence on the job satisfaction and motivation of farm workers. A stepwise procedure was adopted to analyse this MRC model with the help of SPSS20, this procedure not only eliminates the non-significant variable(s) but also ranked the independent variables in order to understand the most prominent predictor (Hu and Ansell, 2007). The values and data that was used for multivariate regression analysis below can find in Appendix 4 at the end of this thesis.

### 6.9.1 – CSR PRACTICES AND JOB SATISFACTION
The stepwise procedure excluded the SOP from the calculation and predicted Job Satisfaction only on the basis of WFOP and EOP. There was a significant positive relation between CSR practices (WFOP and EOP) and Job Satisfaction at \((\text{adj } r^2=0.634)\), this was also significant at P-value .000 which was \(P\leq0.01\). It transpired that Job Satisfaction is dependent on WFOP \((t\text{-value}=18.107)\) and EOP \((t\text{-value}=6.720)\),
both the t-values were also found significant at P≤0.01. The SOP counted for the (t-value=1.242), but this was not significant as P-value was found of 0.215, which has crossed the borderline of P≤0.05.

Regression Equation:
Job Satisfaction = β0 + β1 ‗Workforce Oriented Practices‘ + β2 ‗Environment Oriented Practices‘

The Standardised Coefficients Beta values ranked the variables as the best predictors; the Beta for WFOP was found 0.669 which was higher than the Beta for EOP which was 0.248. On the basis of Beta value, it can be concluded that the Workforce Oriented Practices found as the best variable to predict the Job Satisfaction.

6.9.2 – CSR PRACTICES AND MOTIVATION
There was a significant positive relationship between CSR Practices (WFOP, SOP and EOP) and the Motivation at (adj r²=0.571) the relationship was significant at P≤0.01. It explained that Motivation is dependent on the WFOP (t-value=14.712) with P-value .000, the EOP (t-value=3.003) with P-value .003 and the SOP (t-value=2.076) with P-value .039, all the relevant P-values were found significant at P≤0.05.

Regression Equation

The WFOP Beta was found at 0.638, the Beta for SOP was found at 0.097, and the Beta for the EOP was found at 0.132. The Beta ranked index showed that the WFOP was the top predictor to predict the Motivation, the second-best predictor was found as the EOP, again the SOP was least significant in terms of predicting Motivation. These findings were significant in many ways. The GlobalGAP major must considerations were found towards the environmental oriented practices, and the workforce-oriented practices ranked as a minor must, but according to this study, the workforce-oriented practices have the greatest influence on the workers‘ job satisfaction and motivation. Interestingly, society-oriented practices were not currently considered as a requirement
from the GlobalGAP but that even have some significant influence on workers Motivation.

**6.10 – SUMMARY**

The chapter provides a comprehensive list of the constructed variables that the study has used for its quantitative analysis. The demographics have provided insight into the backgrounds of the participants. These details help to establish some key facts such as the average age of farm workers. The descriptive analysis assists in providing an overview of the responses with the frequencies and standard deviation. Cronbach's Alpha values provided the reliability of the variables. The core purpose of the analysis was to test the relationship between the independent variables (Workforce Oriented Practices, Society Oriented Practices and Environment Oriented Practices) and the dependent variables (Job Satisfaction and Motivation). The correlation and regression analysis showed that there was a significant positive relation between CSR practices, job satisfaction and motivation. The step-wise multivariate regression analysis also ranked the Workforce Oriented Practices as the most prominent predictor of workers' Motivation.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

7.1 – INTRODUCTION
This chapter discusses the findings of this research. This study can be considered as being in two parts; first the study examined compliance with private standard (the GlobalGAP), and secondly, it investigated the effects of compliance on job satisfaction and motivation among rural farm workers in Pakistani mango industry. In order to meet the objectives of this study and to answer the research questions, a mixed method technique was employed. The in-depth literature review and the empirical results from both the qualitative and the quantitative data suggest that private standards do indeed play a critical role in ensuring compliance at complicated production sites. It was evident in the study that CSR practices implemented and monitored through the private standard resulted in a significant impact on workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. Furthermore, the overall productivity and atmosphere at the certified farms has improved in recent years and that situation has led to an increased market share as a consequence of access to new, high-end supermarkets. Following the findings of this research, a model based on modern literature on social and environmental issues and Herzberg’s hygiene two-factor theory has been presented to enhance the compliance by targeting the key components of CSR to help growers, especially in developing countries.

7.2 – Research Theme and Framework
The research framework for this study was designed according to the nature of the population and location of this study. Given that research of this kind has never been conducted in Pakistan before now, it was essential to cover the maximum segments of the Pakistani mango industry to underpin the causes and to highlight the notions in order to fully satisfy the research questions. The qualitative approach was applied, and data was collected through in-depth interviews, observations and focus groups which sought to understand the real influence of the GlobalGAP on the industry and how it has affected the people involved in it. A significant amount of quantitative data was also collected during the field trips to match the claims and findings. This technique enabled the involvement of maximum participation from all the stakeholders, most importantly
from bottom tier workers. This methodology also enables the larger population to participate in the study. It also brings lots of clarity in the findings. The participants also realised the importance of the topic and this study provided them with an opportunity to think and reflect on their experiences before and after the emergence of GlobalGAP.

### 7.3 - CSR PRACTICE AND WORKERS’ MOTIVATION

A recent report from UNIDO (2014) confirmed that implementing CSR practices in the workplace leads to improve employees’ motivation, but the report did not highlight which CSR practice(s) in particular leads to this result, nor did it cover the implementation of CSR policies in rural society. In 2013, research was conducted by the Finish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, in which the researchers broke down CSR to ensure food safety into seven dimensions. The dimensions were food safety, environment protection, nutritional responsibility, workers welfare, animal welfare and health, economic responsibility and local market presence (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). That particular study argued that maintaining workers' health and safety at work, wages and equality could affect their motivation. The findings from this study support said argument but added that environment protection and societal initiatives also affect the workers’ motivation.

Ramlall (2004) discussed the implications of the lack of employee retention. He suggested that losing an employee was not limited to the economic loss but the loss of knowledge was also found to be associated with it. Apart from the other aspects, the growers do highlight that workers' retention has been improved significantly. Prior to the adoption of GlobalGAP practices, the growers struggled with labour, and finding the right people for the job during the high season. It always remained a challenge for them but now, over the last few years, *the permanent workers have shown significant commitments and surprisingly the temporary workers are also coming back as they prefer to work on our farm*, explained by one grower during the field interviews.

Motivation has been expressed with many different expressions in various theories, yet Mahesh and Kasturi (2006) concluded that motivation is decidedly different from (job) satisfaction. Although this study has established a strong relationship between job satisfaction and motivation, various factors have been identified that affect the workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. The most prominent finding was that society oriented
practices have no significant relationship with job satisfaction but were found to have a significant relation with motivation; this finding supports the argument presented by Mahesh and Kasturi (2006).

The items to test workers' job satisfaction and motivation, and what particular workers' related initiated had been taken by the certified growers were combined picked from the Herzberg (1959) Two Factor Theory and the requirements of the GlobalGAP to design the questionnaire. The findings are partially consistent with what had been proposed by Herzberg. The hygiene factors were presented in workforce-oriented practices, and job satisfaction along with the requirements of the GlobalGAP, and the results showed a strong relationship between the hygiene factors and the workers' motivation.

Herzberg argued that the absence of the hygiene factor could lead to demotivated workers but that its presence would not necessarily motivate them. This study, however, found that the presence of hygiene factors does affect workers' motivation and its stronger presence was found to correlate with greater motivation. Also, the Herzberg theory (1959) was limited to two factors, the motivators and the extra job factor (hygiene factor) but this study added two new factors – the societal factor and the environment factor. It can be summarised as follows: societal and environmental factors leads to increased motivation but their absence does not necessarily demotivate workers.

The argument resulting from the qualitative data does support the findings of the numerical data. The growers and the workers who were interviewed for this study expressed how the adaptation of GlobalGAP has changed daily working life at the certified farms. The researcher also observed the compliance during the field trips. The workers during the focus group interviews praised the new practices as these practices brought safety for them; the growers also acknowledge the decline in the cases related to occupational health. According to the senior workers and the farm management staff, work has become fun, and they work in close cooperation in a friendlier environment. The workers also said that they had been kept informed of the progress in terms of yield and the foreign trade. The growers expressed their views about workers' progress and productivity. They claimed that their workers are fully trained, and they only need to tell them the quantity and the shipment destination, and they exactly know how to grade, sort and pack the fruit as per the requirements of the specific buyer. The workers also
told that the wages are better as compared to the local rate and they receive their payment on time. The interviewees also provided the detail of their working hours. The growers claimed that they have enough workers to complete the activities without putting an extra load on few workers. The statistical data is consistent and confirmed these claims, the strong mean values for wages, working hours, training and health and safety reconfirm the compliance with the standard.

7.4 – CSR COMPLIANCE AND ROLE OF PRIVATE STANDARDS

Khan and Lund-Thomsen (2011) identified that Nike (sports brand) has set up an independent office in Pakistan with the sole focus of ensuring compliance with its code of ethics. It was however not possible for the supermarkets and for the GlobalGAP itself to directly monitor the compliance. Therefore they appointed and then relied on private audit firms in the production countries. In Pakistan, there are also some audit firms who worked as auditors for the GlobalGAP. Their role, however, was hugely criticised by the growers and other stakeholders such as the representatives of MRI. The major criticism was the attitude and personal interest of the audit firms, as those people are from the local vicinity, so they know the growers well, which in turn raises the question of its merit.

Also, the audit process itself was criticised for being more like a formality. Some participants did blame the audit process of GlobalGAP as a reason for not achieving the industry's full potential. It was also said that such practices demotivated the growers who were exceeding the compliance criteria. Lund-Thomsen (2009) also previously argued that most of the procedures have been carried out only during the audit merely to demonstrate compliance to the auditors. This study, however, found a fair compliance at the certified farms. Although all the visits were pre-planned, the facilities were there for the workers, and every farm had documented evidence that showed compliance with the GlobalGAP, particularly with regard to environmental practices.

The production volume and exports figures also supported the argument that there are huge improvements for the participating growers. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations published a report that specifically highlighted the inability of Pakistani farmers (growers) to comply with the standards that led to their failure in high-end markets (FAO, 2013). However, this problem has been overcome.
significantly, and mango growers have shown great passion and capacity to meet the requirements from the western supermarkets.

7.5 - SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL AND WORKING CONDITIONS OF WORKERS
Poor working conditions is a term which is used widely in the literature and also in the media to describe the challenges faced by the workers in developing countries (Jones et al., 2005; Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010a; Pretious and Love, 2006; Robinson, 2010; Wiese and Toporowski, 2013; with socio-economic issues of the workers, the standard does insure protection of their basic human rights and welfare, and also protection of the environment (GlobalGAP, 2016). Before the GlobalGAP, the mango industry in Pakistan was in turmoil, as the growers had little knowledge about the complexities of foreign trade. They followed old procedures and practices and only hoped for better yields, but even when they had better returns, they were unable to capitalise on them.

The major reason was the lack of knowledge and resources to access the advanced markets (Interview Data, 2015). The first difference the GlobalGAP made was to train the growers with the current demands and trends in the global trade. The standard made them realised that they have to upgrade their infrastructure, and they have to provide the required facilities for the workers. All the participating farms were encouraged to build a secure storage room for chemicals and pesticides, so they do not harm the workers. They were told to build the toilet facilities and to provide them with soap and hand washing facilities. They were also told to make proper sheds and common rooms for the workers where they can rest and have their meals. All these demands sound like basic necessities in the modern day, but the workers in Pakistan were working in the absence of all these basic facilities.

7.6 – OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE GROWERS
The qualitative and the quantitative data reconfirmed the findings that there were numerous opportunities for the participating producers. It has been previously criticised by Lee et al., (2012) and Schuster and Maertens (2013), that the private standard put up barriers for the farmers and growers, in particular, preventing small-scale producers from participating. However, in this study it was evident that there were options available for small growers to form a group or consortium to obtain a group certificate at a lower price through sharing the cost. Those growers who are even smaller in size
have only limited scope for exports, as they do not have the capacity to keep with the sustainable supplies which are the major requirements from the buyers. Therefore, solely blaming the standards will not be appropriate. The findings of this study are partially consistent with Jaffee, (2008), von Hagen and Alvarez (2011), that the standards certificates assure significant financial returns to the participating producers. The certificate itself has no direct link with financial gain, but it enables the growers to access the high-end supermarket. However, locating, approaching, and convincing the buyers are the tasks for the growers, and GlobalGAP provides no support in building business ties between the growers and the buyers. The majority of the growers in Pakistan give credit to GlobalGAP for encouraging the growers to participate in the global expos, and for providing training and updated knowledge which they later utilise to building business relation with the buyers.

The upfront financial cost associated with the adaptation of the standard has been criticised previously (Fuchs et al., 2011; Herzfeld et al., 2011). This study found that the majority of the upfront cost is spent on the upgrading of the infrastructure and building the facilities for the workers including pack houses, staff room, toilets, sheds and storage room for the chemicals. Therefore the cost is partially associated with the GlobalGAP. The standard does require these facilities for the workers as well as food safety before issuance of the certificate, but these facilities stay there permanently. Also, there were options of the donor for the interested growers, as it was also reported by Henson et al. (2011).

Chiputwa et al., (2015) criticised the financial costs required for adoption of the standards, they assert that such costs limit the scope of small-scale producers that are able to participate. This study found that the interested growers had the option to access the financial resources made available by USAID and ASF. However, it is not clear as to the criterion for choosing the growers, as the agency claimed that they had offered an open invitation to the growers if they were willing to participate. There is a need to make this practice more transparent to ensure that financial assistance is available for all the growers regardless of the size of their farm. Also, USAID and ASF must not limit their funding solely for the purpose of obtaining the standard but also to encourage the growers to adopt good agricultural practices. This multi-stakeholder initiative is a great model for implementing private standards for small-scale growers.
USAID has provided significant financial support both in terms of providing the machinery and the construction of modern pack houses. The agency also provided the technical assistance to the growers on how to monitor the value chain throughout and identification of critical control points, which are usually referred to as HACCP training. USAID is currently assisting the growers on how they can use sea freight as an alternative to the normally used air freight (Interview2@CNFA, October 2015). There were two successful sea shipments which arrived into the EU from Pakistan in 2014-2015 through a controlled atmosphere shipment, which maintains the quality of the fruit for as long as 22 days, before its transfer to the supermarket where the fruit can sustain the quality up to further five more days (shelf life). The agency's officials provided a detail presentation during the field trip for this study. Their technical team is upgrading the growers with an automated grading technique, which will help them in saving time during the preparation of shipments to various countries as per buyer's requirements.

The issue of fruit flies has been catastrophic for the Pakistani mango growers and exporters in recent years, especially before the adoption of GlobalGAP. There were so many interceptions that many countries, including the US, banned Pakistani mangoes. With the help of latest techniques, growers have successfully overcome this problem. The largest market for the Pakistani mangoes in the EU is the UK, and DEFRA who monitor all the imports coming into the UK allows only five interceptions a year. In 2014, Indian mangoes were banned in the UK as there were more than five interceptions carried out by DEFRA as they found the fruit flies. The same year, Pakistani mango growers suffered three interceptions, so they were able to sell their mangoes in the UK. The number is improving as there were only two interceptions were found in 2015 (Interview Data, 2015).

Pakistani mangoes are thriving, unlike the old days where the country's mangoes being sold in the community market, leading supermarkets such as Sainsbury's, Asda, Tesco and Morrisons are among the top sellers in the UK for Pakistani mangoes. However, the supermarkets only sell the mangoes from GlobalGAP certified farms, at a balanced price, which assures the growers receive a fair price for their produce.
7.7 – LIFE EXPECTANCY

Socio-economic factors such as the percentage of the population associated with agriculture, literacy and public health factors such as access to safe water were found strongly correlated with life expectancy rate in developing countries (Rogers and Wofford, 1989). Several workers during the focus group interviews said that they used to get bad stomach as the result of chemical contamination. But the new strict procedures about washing hands with soap after working with the pesticides have solved the problem.

A working paper on the pesticide and environment discussed the threat of the exposure of the pesticides to the human. The paper reported high ratio of pesticides poisoning in developing countries (Jabbar and Mallick, 1994). The pesticide poisoning cases were found to be the highest in Sri Lanka at 69.1%, in Malaysia 53.6%, in Thailand 52%, in Indonesia 41.2%. In Afghanistan, the overall mortality rate was 6.2% due to accidental poisoning among children. Organophosphorus Insecticide Poisoning (OPI) is responsible for 50% of total deaths (Chaudhry et al., 1987). OPI has been used as a pesticide for decades and is still used in developing countries (Palaniappen, 2013).

Jabbar and Mallick (1994) asserted that there is less information available about food contamination cases in Pakistan. The information is still lacking as influential landlords cover up the incidents to protect their reputation. The access to the pesticides to an unauthorised individual was recently linked with the killing of 23 people in Pakistan as the poisonous chemical contaminated with a traditional sweet (BBC News, 2016). The lack of education and awareness are the causes for such incidents.

The certified farms were not left to rely on the workers but forced to build the secure storage. These storages remain locked all the time and only authorised trained workers (usually a supervisor) can only access the storage. The GlobalGAP also requires strict compliance with the paperwork to maintain every little activity with the pesticides. This particular action certainly makes it secure for the people who work and also for their families. The workers must also wear protective clothes and masks while working with the chemicals and it further assures that they remained safe at all times.
7.8 – COMPLIANCE

Compliance with the GlobalGAP was initially monitored through the foreign auditors who normally travelled from India or other nearby countries like Malaysia or Singapore to conduct the audit. Even though their trips were pre-announced, as those auditors have no personal relation with the growers, they conducted the audit on full merit as per the GlobalGAP requirements. Over the past few years, the standard has appointed some local firms in Pakistan, and now they perform the audits on behalf of the GlobalGAP.

There were some serious reservations about the role of those local audit companies and their associations with the local area and with the producers. Many interviewees expressed their frustration as the audit standards are reducing in quality; some suggested that the audits are becoming a formality now. One grower even suggested making these audits more transparent and result oriented, and if the grower(s) is found to not be complying with the standard, they must have their certificate cancelled. This, they stated, will encourage those who are complying and will increase their enthusiasm and motivation. Amekawa (2009) uses the term ‘super audits’ introduced by the GlobalGAP to monitor the compliance at the certified facilities.

The audit process for ensuring the compliance has been criticised previously. Several studies found that compliance is only in place before and during the audit to convince the auditors (Albersmeier et al., 2009; Lund-Thomsen, 2009; Pretious and Love, 2006). However, since the GlobalGAP appointed the local auditors, it hugely affects the audit process, and the majority of the growers who are fully complying with the standard were not pleased with the situation. Those growers also criticised the role of developed countries for having different criteria for compliance.

Despite all these facts, the data from this study suggests that there was strong compliance at the certified farms. The numerical data supports the findings of the interviews, focus group and the observations that certified farms were adhering to the requirements. The study trip, however, was pre-planned, and the visited farms were aware of the visit and the purpose of the visit before the actual visit.
7.9 – AWARENESS

The technical awareness that the growers have developed under the GlobalGAP programme has an enormous impact on day to day practices at the farms. From daily cleaning to the use of the right chemical in right quantity has improved the yield over the years. It is important to mention that prior to the entry of GlobalGAP in Pakistan; a few initiatives had been carried out by UN and the Australian horticulture groups. Several delegates arrived in Pakistan from Australia to test the soil and water. The majority of the participants expressed their gratitude towards the support they received during Agriculture Sector Linkages Program (ASLP) between Australia and Pakistan.

Furthermore, with the entry of GlobalGAP, the growers learnt about the requirements of the supermarkets, the standard has clear guidance about the use of pesticides and fertilisers, helping the grower to use them in the right quantity and at the right time for maximum impact. The growers gave more credit to the GlobalGAP as it was the minimum requirements for them if they want to access the high-value supermarkets. The standard also helps the growers in presenting their fruit at the Fruit Logistica which is the most prominent fruit fare in the world. That platform helps the growers to meet the potential buyers and provide them with an opportunity to display their fruit to the global buyers.

7.10 – STAKEHOLDERS

The data from both the qualitative and quantitative studies has shown that there were many stakeholders involved in the whole exercise of reviving the Pakistani mango industry. There were growers, exporters, workers, audit firms, NGOs, and public institutes, who have played their roles in shaping the industry. The growers gave full credit to the role of USAID and the Mango Research Institute (MRI) for their dedication and support, and there were significant improvements reported by the workers that have made their working conditions more secure and pleasant.

The overall impression derived from this study that there are great opportunities for Pakistani agriculture if GAP is made accessible to everyone. Although the MRI and DPP do play a critical role in providing technical training and performing audit and checks on exports, the public institutes must do more in terms of providing financial assistance as the growers cannot rely on USAID or other donors solely. There is a need
to make funds available for agriculturist through Agricultural Support Fund (ASF). That is, especially for export-oriented products as it has been reported previously by FAO (2013), when ASF along with exporters provided funds for citrus growers in the Bhalwal District in Pakistan, which resulted in double production and export volume.

7.11 – WORKERS’ JOB SECURITY

This study found some serious reservations among the workers in terms of their job security. Only two farms were found that have written job contracts with the workers and that was even limited to the permanent full-time workers, mostly the supervisors. As the Pakistani mango industry is going through a change, there is a need for some reforms in order to address this particular issue. During the focus group interviews, many participants raised this problem; some of them reported to have been working for over ten years without any written contract. As there is no legal binding involved in such employment, the workers tend to be in a vulnerable situation, and their employment can be terminated at anytime without any notices.

The growers on the other side claimed that this setup is mostly with mutual consent as the rural workers tend to change their employment more frequently and they were found to be more reluctant to be in any legal agreement. A few growers suggested that mostly rural workers prefer to work as freelance; they turn up for work when they need money and leave as soon as they have other options. Another factor which was found to play a major role in such attitude in workers was the social aspect. Mostly workers especially the younger ones prefer to work with their friends or family members, and if one person moves, he fetches others with him too. There is a chance that the growers’ point of view was valid to some extent, but there was another factor found that allowed the growers to refuse to offer written contract to workers.

Article 18 of the constitution of Pakistan enacted an ordinance in 1968 for industrial and commercial employment that every employee working in the relevant sector must be provided with job security by means of a written contract (ILO, 2004). The ordinance however, excluded the domestic workers and agriculture-related workers as it was unlikely to monitor these areas. If it had been a legal requirement for the agriculturist to offer the written contract, the mango growers would have been complying with it.
Previously the rural agricultural workers never raised such demands for different reasons; the feudal system and lack of education among the rural population were the two main reasons. The time, however, is changing fast and the electronic media, social media, and training at the certified farms has provided the opportunity for mango workers to become aware of their human rights. They can raise their concerns, but they are still far from forming unions and only hoping that things will change. The GlobalGAP has the opportunity to initiate and encourage the certified growers to offer a written contract to their workers as it will bring some sense of security for both the workers and the growers to deal with the issue of employees’ retention.

7.12 – THE PROPOSED ARGUMENT

Previous studies hugely criticised this mode of governance as they considered the private standard as an additional requirement which will only help the wealthy growers who can afford to adopt it (Chiputwa et al., 2015; Fuchs et al., 2011; Hansen and Trifkovic, 2014; Herzfeld et al., 2011; Kuwornu and Mustapha, 2013; Schuster and Maertens, 2013). Some studies suggest that private standards are only beneficial for the buyers in advanced countries, particularly the supermarkets, as they used these standards to protect their brands and to gain a competitive advantage (Konefal et al. 2005; Sodano et al., 2008; Tallontire, 2007).

This particular study argued that the sole purpose of private standards and of GlobalGAP, in particular, was not to ensure financial gain to the wealthy growers and the supermarkets solely, but it was initiated to protect the whole production system through good agriculture practices and to improve the workers’ welfare. These practices were not only limited to the food safety but also to ensure better working conditions for the workers and to protect the environment too.

This research has reported numerous benefits of social and environmental engagement for the GlobalGAP certified mango growers in Pakistan. It has been proven that compliance with the standard optimises the operational performance of the farms. The major benefits identified by this study are:

- improved financial performance;
- reduced losses that were emerging from operational inefficiencies;
• initiated poverty reduction by creating new jobs for the locals;
• ensured safer working conditions;
• enhanced workers’ productivity, their job satisfaction and motivation;
• increases the farms’ reputation and image among workers, and,
• led to better yields and production volume.

7.13 – VALUE-ADDED BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPATING GROWERS
The following value-added benefits were reported by the certified mango growers in Pakistan.

7.13.1 – FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE
This study argued that much of the attention have been given to the financial gains and the majority of the studies have been conducted to explore the financial benefits for the participating growers (Kersting and Wollni, 2012; Schuster and Maertens, 2013), so this indicator was out of the scope of this particular study. However, during the interviews, most of the growers mentioned that their financial performance had been improved since the adoption of the GlobalGAP. Even the growers who failed to secure any supermarket deals were getting higher rates from the local markets as the fruit quality, and shelf life has been improved.

Collins and Iqbal (2011) found that Pakistani growers failed to receive decent prices for their mangoes because they don’t have access to the western supermarkets. This particular study found that those growers who had secured the deals with the western supermarkets were found to be in the receipt of premium prices. However, they have to be consistent with the quality and the supply in order to maintain the relationship. These findings are consistent and support the argument of Collins and Iqbal (2011). According to Dawn Newspaper (2016), Pakistani mangoes prices jumped from 400$ per tonne in 2015 to 700$ per tonne in 2016, in international markets, where the major rise came from the supermarkets in western countries.

7.13.2 – REDUCED LOSSES
The Pakistani agriculturists are vulnerable to unforeseen losses because of poor practices (Din et al., 2011). However, at the certified farms, the growers showed a strong consensus about the abilities of good agricultural practices in minimising the
operational losses that were occurring due to operational deficiencies. Since the adoption of the GlobalGAP, the farms have to keep record of all the activities performed at the farms and the pack houses. These documents were aimed to track the use of pesticides mainly but also helped the growers to monitor their expenses. This practice helps them in planning their financial budget, and they fairly remain in good control over the operational costs. The use of chemicals and the techniques to counter fruit flies as advised by the GlobalGAP experts also helped the growers on taking great control over the lethal issue.

The growers have strong statistics to support their argument, as there is a significant drop in the shipment cancellation at the western importing ports. These cancellations were occurring quite frequently in the previous years due to a sole reason of the presence of fruit flies. Lastly, the new methods for handling the mangoes from the orchard to the pack house and from pack house to the exporting destination also played a huge role in minimising the losses. Previous practices were involved, workers climbing the trees and jolting the fruit bearer branches and rest of the workers catching the falling mangoes with the help of a fabric sheet. During this process, many mangoes fell outside the sheet and hit the ground that resulted in bruises that eventually affected other mangoes too. The new practice involved the use of sophisticated cutters, that can reach any heights and also capable of holding the fruit for bringing it down safely.

7.13.3 – POVERTY REDUCTION

Previous studies discussed the role of private standards and codes for fighting poverty (Lemeilleur, 2013). Some studies failed to recognise a positive relationship between standards adoption and poverty reduction, and some even blamed the standards as an obstacle in tackling poverty (Lee et al, 2012; Chiputwa et al., 2015). This study found that the good agriculture practices required additional workers to tackle the workload. The new innovative way of picking and transferring the mangoes also required significant numbers of workers to work in the vast fields. This situation forced the certified growers to recruit additional workers, especially during the harvesting season. All the workers receive the minimum training, and that equipped them with some skills that help them in either retaining the employment or finding a work somewhere else in local vicinities. During the interview, the growers said that they have to hire additional workers for the farm, and as we provide them with the training we usually keep them
permanently. The temporary workers also have been informed that they can come back the following season. The majority of the workers belong to the local area, the certified farms somehow contributing to fight poverty this way.

7.13.4 – SAFER WORKING CONDITIONS
Poor and hazardous working conditions are the most discussed issue regarding labour in the global supply chains particularly in developing countries (Jones et al., 2005; Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi, 2010b; Robinson, 2010; Wise and Toporowski, 2013). Workers’ health and safety procedures and equipment training are the highlights of the GlobalGAP initial intervention at the participating farms. All the visited farms were found to have displayed the notices, posters and banners, addressing the health and safety issues. The posters were found to be printed in the local language, and each description had the graphical explanations too.

Every farm had a strict policy to wash hands after working with pesticides and chemicals. Protective clothes and masks were available for the workers to use while spraying, and it was a mandatory requirement. Even many workers complain that they feel suffocated while wearing the mask as they work in hot and humid climate but this requirement is classed as ‘major must’ by the GlobalGAP, and growers were found in full compliance. However, there is a need to introduce the advanced masks which are more suitable to use in humid conditions. The standard has introduced the modern equipment to pick the fruit; the workers were no longer required to climb the trees.

7.13.5 - WORKERS’ PRODUCTIVITY – JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION
A productive workforce can provide a competitive advantage to businesses (Wan, 2007). This study has explored the benefits for the workers as a result of adopting the good agricultural practices, and how they responded to this change. As the main theme of the study, this particular factor was also supported by the quantitative data. This study has found a significant positive relationship between CSR practices and workers’ motivation and their job satisfaction. Better working conditions, training, and facilities at work, regular payment of wages and the caring attitude of the management were some of the named factors the workers praised the most. Most of the workers have worked at non-certified farms previously, and they experienced different working conditions at the certified farms. Some of the workers had even gone through the
change as they were working before the GlobalGAP and recognised significant changes since the farm acquired the standard. The statistical data suggests that facilities at work were the most admired factor by the workers, and facilities at work referred to the availability of staff rooms/sheds, toilets and clean water for drinking.

7.13.6 - FARMS’ REPUTATION AMONG WORKERS
The growers have expressed their satisfaction about worker retention and recruitment of new workers. Even the workers during the focus groups expressed how they happily introduce their farm to their friends and family.

7.13.7 – PRODUCTION VOLUME
The production at the certified farms has been improved. Despite the frequent losses due to sand storms and unexpected heavy rain, the production volume for export has increased. According to a leading newspaper, Pakistani exporters have exported approximately 100,000 tonnes of mangoes, and the country receives about $50 Million through the mango trade (Dawn Newspaper, 2016). This report supports the claims made by the growers and other stakeholders during the interviews.

7.14 – THE PROPOSED MODEL FOR OPTIMUM RESULTS
This study found that the rural workers’ motivation and job satisfaction are dependent on CSR practices and its compliance. The qualitative analysis revealed that private standards (GlobalGAP in this case) are capable of implementing CSR practices in poorer and complicated regions in developing countries. The compliance was found to rely on two factors, the first and most important one being the growers’ ambitions and desire to upgrade the mango industry by protecting the environment and the socio-welfare conditions of the workers. Second, the more critical factor was the compliance audits. The participants raised some questions about the audit criteria and the way they have been conducted by the local auditors/firms. However, overall, they had shown satisfaction with the progress they had made over last five years.

“The audit process will gradually improve, as these requirements are new to the audit firm too. Soon when we have more certified auditors and firms, the standard of compliance audit will also improve.” (Interview 7@PAK, September 2015).
The growers were found to be highly ambitious and enthusiastic about the GlobalGAP, the interviews data shows their interest and passion about the improvements in the Pakistani mango industry. Most of the visited farms during the field trip were found to be complying with the requirements of the GlobalGAP. The researcher witnessed the secure storage units for the pesticides and chemicals, files system for documentation, and facilities for the workers. Almost all the growers have improved their knowledge about good agriculture practices, and they were aware of its importance.

The results from quantitative analysis supported and reinforced these findings of the qualitative data. The descriptive analysis shows strong compliance at the certified farms, as the majority of the workers was found strongly agreed to most of the statements. The detailed analysis revealed that the rural worker's motivation is largely dependent on workforce-oriented CSR practices. However, the environment oriented practice and society oriented practices were also found to be significantly related to the rural workers' job satisfaction and motivation. Multiple statistical analyses have painted a similar picture with minor differences. The results suggested that the proposed CSR practices in the context of developing countries, workforce-oriented, environment oriented, and society oriented practices were correlated to the rural workers' job satisfaction and motivation.

The above conclusions led to the development of a synergistic model which suggests that identifying CSR practices or code of conduct and complying with them (compliance) are two separate factors. They produced a combined greater effect when implemented simultaneously.
This harmonious synergistic effect model integrates the two concepts. Moving from left to right, the model has split CSR into two components which are CSR codes and compliance. Frederick (1978) introduces the terms CSR1 and CSR2, he refers corporate social responsibility (CSR1) as a philosophical concept that addresses ethical issues. In contrast, corporate social responsiveness (CSR2) was described as an action-oriented strategy or managerial concept. He argued that the current debate on CSR2 that started to emerge in 1970 brought in the most fundamental question about the businesses' responsibilities toward society. Carroll (1979) further explained that CSR1 is concerned with the identification of moral and ethical issues and that runs through the whole concept of corporate social responsibility. He further asserts that CSR2 has no ethical or moral connotations and is a purely managerial strategy to address or respond to the identified ethical issues. In the above model, the box for Compliance represents the element of responsiveness from the growers to address the ethical issues covered under the codes of conduct.

GlobalGAP made it easier for growers and farmers by identifying the ethical issues in global trade and formed them into the codes of good agriculture practices. However, it was evident during the field trips that the second part, which is related to the growers' response and how they comply with them, varies farm to farm. Considering the work of Frederick (1978) and Carroll (1979), it reflects how morally or ethically a particular
grower is connected or concerned with the identified ethical issues. Among the other recommendation this research has produced in the next chapter, there is one suggestion which recommends involving growers in the process of policymaking. Understanding and identifying the areas of concern will lead to effective actions. The existing standards are very complicated and sometimes irrelevant to the particular population (Khan and Lund-Thomsen, 2011). There is a need to make the standards simpler and more relevant, particularly for the new participants. As Carroll (1979) suggests, every business must assess which particular areas need to be addressed, and prioritise them. The same strategy applies to the agriculture growers and workers, and there must be some flexibility to adopt any standard according to their needs.

CSR codes for good agriculture practices were further divided into three CSR oriented practices and they were named workforce-oriented practices, environment-oriented practices, and society-oriented practices. These three factors are much discussed in the literature on private standards (Forsman-Hugg et al., 2013). GlobalGAP initially started with food safety and environmental protection as its top priorities. This strategy faced some criticism as the standard’s audit criteria to comply with workers related issues ranked as minor must but the criteria to comply with environmental practices ranked as major must (Thompson and Lockie, 2013). However, this particular research has revealed that even minor must criteria are compulsory and there is only a 5% margin of error allowed by the GlobalGAP auditors. In other words, the growers still have to ensure 95% compliance with the minor must criteria.

Recently, GlobalGAP has introduced a new add-on which is available to add to the existing requirements. They named it GlobalG.A.P. Risk Assessment on Social Practice (GRASP). The standard focusses on people (workers) through GRASP, and encourages producers to provide additional details on social practices (GlobalGAP, 2017). The add-on is voluntary and optional at the moment but the frequently asked questions (FAQs) section on GlobalGAP’s website suggests that it may become a mandatory requirement (GlobalGAP, 2017). This development has increased the importance of the above synergistic model and makes it even more relevant. The GRASP option was not introduced to the Pakistani mango growers when this particular research was conducted. However, the participants had shown great interest in social issues.
The model further ranked these practices according to the findings of this research. The data analysis suggests that workforce-oriented CSR practices including facilities at work, regular income, safer working conditions, and training have the strongest influence on rural workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. It is followed by environment oriented practices that include safe use of chemicals and water protection, and society oriented practices that highlighted the issues such as child labour, public health, and education. The existing model is highly focused on product quality and environmental issues (see Figure 3.4) while worker related social and ethical issues are ranked as secondary. Robinson (2010) raises the question as to whether it is businesses or workers’ interests being reflected in voluntary initiatives. If it is to improve workers’ conditions then workforce related issues must be prioritised, particularly their immediate needs including regular income and basic facilities at work.

Herzberg’s theory (1959) suggested that the absence of hygiene factors at work can demotivate the employees, but their presence does not necessarily motivate them. He further argued that it was the motivator factor that motivates the employees to work hard. However, this was not the case when it was applied to the rural workers; this study has found that the hygiene factors (wages, working conditions, facilities and management attitude) do have a strong positive relation with the rural workers’ motivation. In fact, the hygiene factors (workforce-oriented practices) were found to be the most prominent predictor to predict the rural workers’ motivation.

The literature on the aspects of adopting and then complying with private standards reveal the inadequacy of private standards in addressing the issue of rural development (Loconto, 2014). According to the UN’s Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform, rural development comprises wider issues as compared to agricultural development. It includes providing basic needs to improve livelihood, providing training and learning opportunities to rural population, providing sustainable sources of income, and preparing the rural communities and population to understand and cope with environmental risks (UNGA, 2015). The priorities for CSR oriented practices in the proposed model are also in line with the guidance from the United Nations and it will certainly have more of an impact on rural development.
The curved arrow on the right side suggests the positive correlation between job satisfaction and motivation. Initial correlation analysis revealed that the two dependent variables share a strong positive correlation between them. This particular finding supports the previous studies that investigated and found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and motivation (Mafini and Dlodlo, 2014; Roos and Van Eden, 2008). Apart from job satisfaction and motivation, several other benefits have been identified throughout this research. Most of those benefits were also found and reported in several previous studies, particularly the access to new markets, production volume, safer working conditions, and reduced losses (FAO, 2007; 2013; Mergenthaler et al., 2009; UNIDO, 2014). However, the model only consists of the benefits that were derived from the empirical data and analysis. The model is flexible and can be adapted to other similar situations with minor amendments.

To summarise the synergistic model, it is possible to implement CSR with the help of private standards’ codes (in this case good agriculture practices), and compliance is an integral part of the process. For optimum results, it is critical to ensure compliance with CSR codes. This study evidences how the Herzberg’s two-factor theory provides chances to sync CSR and good agriculture practices with the rural workers’ motivation. CSR consists of two factors when implemented through private standards, and they are the codes and the compliance.

The codes were further divided into three core components: the workforce, the environment, and the society. The existing models, which were adopted by different private standards, have different priorities. The GlobalGAP model has primarily focused on the environment-oriented practices, and they have set the _major must_ criteria for it. The workforce-oriented practices are not given equal importance, and they are ranked as a _minor must_ to meet the audit criteria (Thompson and Lockie, 2013). This study has found that to achieve the optimum productivity from the rural workers; it is essential to put workforce-oriented CSR practices as a top priority. The rural workers have different needs, and they are surrounded by different circumstances as compared to the urban workers. For them, it is more important that their immediate needs are met as a top priority. The environment and society come after.
To improve the compliance process at the certified farms, this study has proposed several recommendations. A few interviewees highlighted the weaknesses in the current audit practices, including lack of experienced and certified auditors. However, there is another fundamental element which is missing, and that is workers’ unions. Riisgaard (2005) suggests opportunities for unions to be aware of the agreements and monitor compliance. Jenkins et al., (2002) assert that workers’ interests have been ignored because they don’t have representatives to monitor relative compliance of the codes. The policymakers must encourage and facilitate workers to form unions. It will provide more assurance to workers.

7.15 – SUMMARY
CSR compliance through good agricultural practices has created shared value for the mango growers and rural workers in Pakistan. The certified farms have implemented the GlobalGAP codes and the initial upgradation and follow up training help the growers to meet the international demands for food safety. The rural workers enjoyed the benefits of this infrastructural upgrade. The qualitative and quantitative data suggested that significant improvements had happened at the certified farms that result in the form of financial gains for the growers and better working conditions and wages for the rural workers. The growers gained the added value of having a more productive workforce, as the study successfully linked CSR practices with the rural workers’ motivation.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

8.1 – INTRODUCTION
This thesis has shown that the adoption of private standard results in compliance with CSR practices and how this positively affects worker motivation. This study diminished the literature criticising private standards and private form of governance through the standard certificates. This final chapter highlights the implications of the study, what contribution it makes for academia and practitioners. There is also a discussion about the limitation of this study as well future area to be considered for further research.

8.2 – OVERVIEW - SUBJECT MATTER OF THE THESIS
The main interest of this study is the impact of CSR practices on the rural workers’ motivation, in developing countries. The fundamental theme of the study is the position of private standards in the global governance of sustainable and ethical food production. The study discusses the ability of the private standard (GlobalGAP) to influence compliance in the complicated agriculture industry of Pakistan, and how this affects rural workers’ motivation and job satisfaction. The extensive literature review on private standards in chapter two highlights the emergence of this phenomenon and how it is controlling the global trade. The mango trade from Pakistan was a different case, as mango is once a year crop. The growers face different challenges to ensure compliance, as extreme weather (untimed/excessive rains, floods, sand storm) or a fungicide virus (fruit fly) could destroy the entire orchard.

The GlobalGAP or any other standard certainly cannot assure favourable weather conditions, but the adoption of GlobalGAP has helped the growers in protecting against most common fungicide attacks such as of fruit fly. Apart from the growers, there are other stakeholders also involved in the Pakistani mango industry, such as government and NGOs. However, these stakeholders were found to be in a more supportive role, and they even helped the growers with the adoption of GlobalGAP. The complexity of the mango industry structure in the Punjab province of Pakistan and the exhaustive requirements from the GlobalGAP make for a rather an interesting case to examine.
8.3 – REFLECTING ON THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

One of the core questions this study attempts to answer is:

Q1 – What is the relationship between CSR practices and workers’ job satisfaction and motivation?

This question was given the central place in this study as the available literature is underdeveloped and insufficient on this particular issue. It was proposed prior to conducting this study that there is a positive relationship between CSR practices and the workers’ job satisfaction and motivation. The findings are in line with the proposed hypotheses. The results from both the qualitative and quantitative analysis confirm that the workers at the certified mango farms were found to be extremely satisfied with the facilities and training they received, and they also expressed their desire to contribute more to the success of their respective farms. The main influence on the growers is the healthy competition within the country, and every grower’s desire is to sell their mangoes at the premium supermarkets. The growers also acknowledge that their workers are more trained and aware, and that they are capable of making their own decision.

Mango is a yearly crop, and every grower relies on the workforce to be available at the right time. They look after the workers in a way which means they continue to stay with them and also the temporary workers, so they come back next season to work with them. The reaction from the workers was encouraging; the conditions have been improved but they are not perfect yet. However, even the small initiatives by the growers are popular among the workers. The traditional terms of working and non-regular income have always been challenging disadvantages for the labour market in the Pakistani agriculture industry especially for those who work in the rural areas.

Good agricultural practices ensure a regular income at the national minimum wage rate. This was praised as being the most beneficial feature for the poor workers. It brings some sustainability into their daily life. They can budget for their needs, and they have more control over their finances now. The other facilities such as sheds, common rooms, toilet, and protective gears were also highly regarded by the workers. After the regular income, the workers were found to be enthusiastic about the training they
received at the certified farms, the training empowers them, and they can work on the terms which are suitable for them with the mutual consent of the management.

Q2 – What role does the GlobalGAP certification play to ensure CSR compliance at certified mango farms in Pakistan?

The second research question was proposed to verify whether CSR compliance was achievable through private governance structure. Although the GlobalGAP is not particularly a social standard, it does cover some of the most critical issues that come under the CSR umbrella. The issue of environmental protection, child labour, workers welfare, health and safety and record keeping are all covered in GlobalGAP certificates, and none of them were being practised by the mango growers in Pakistan prior to the adoption of the standard.

The growers have raised several concerns about the audit process that ensures compliance. However, at the same time, they also acknowledge the gradual improvements in the system. The key role GlobalGAP played in ensuring the compliance was the initial upgrade process that involves structural changes at the farms, the building of modern pack houses and most importantly the training and education of growers and workers. Despite the weaknesses in the existing audit system, the growers were found to be enthusiastic about the good agriculture practices.

The focus group interviews with workers and the questionnaire survey data revealed that the farms‘ management were complying with the requirements of GlobalGAP. However, there is a need to improve the audit system in Pakistan. There are few audit firms currently operating in the region, and it was unclear if they have the capacity to meet the requirements. GlobalGAP must address this issue by motivating and inviting more professionals to join, and this can be done through induction seminars and training workshops.
Q3 – What difference does the GlobalGAP certification make for the income, work, and environmental conditions of mango farmers and on-farm workers in Pakistan?

The third question aimed to identify what difference the GlobalGAP made for socio-environmental conditions of the workers. Pakistan is a developing country and although it is an agricultural country the agriculture sector requires huge reforms to protect the growers and the workers in particular. With little support from the government and limited resources, the facilities the certified growers are offering to their workers are commendable. The GlobalGAP certainly has huge impact to uplift the workers socio-environmental and working conditions. The workers do acknowledge these initiatives and were found to be more committed towards their personal growth and the growth of their associated farms.

Health and safety of the rural workers always remained a question for the policymakers. The certified farms’ workers were provided with the latest cutters, and they have been also been equipped with the modern training on how to safely use and secure those cutters. A worker was jubilant during a focus group, saying that he was no longer required to climb the trees. This practice works for the growers as it certainly reduced the losses and for the workers too as it prevents them from sustaining life threatening injuries.

The issue of wages is still not streamed line for the workers who work in the agriculture. Most workers are paid after the crop and some are even paid with rice and wheat instead of money. The GlobalGAP does not promise higher wages but ensures the payment of a minimum wage on time. It was observed during the field trip that workers were happy as they received regular income, some complained that it should be higher, some suggested annual bonuses, but there was a large consensus that they get their salary on time mostly on a monthly basis. Some workers even said during the data collection that they get better wages as compared to their previous farm which was not certified.
Q4 – Does the adoption of standards such as the GlobalGAP present a challenge for the mango growers in Pakistan?

The fourth and final research question seeks to analyse the challenges faced by the mango growers in Pakistan who have adopted the GlobalGAP. The data analysis and discussion chapters highlighted several benefits and opportunities for the participating mango growers in Pakistan. Also, the interested growers are supported by USAID and the provisional government to meet the financial requirements. Despite all of this, the findings of this study are consistent with Hansen and Trifkovic, (2014), that the standard is most suitable for middle to large-scale growers. The small-scale producers cannot cope with the required volume and the sustainable supplies, as these are the major requirements from the supermarkets in the advanced countries. However, the GlobalGAP does provide the options for the small-scale growers to form a group or consortium to apply for a group registration under the option 2 of the producers’ groups. There are two active groups of mango growers working in Pakistan, one is in Sindh cluster, and the other operates in the Punjab.

There was a small fraction of producers who initially acquired the GlobalGAP but failed in establishing links with foreign supermarkets. Those growers think that the renewal cost is a burden as they are dealing in different markets which are not strict about the standards. Some of them even cancelled their on-going subscription, but they are still benefitting from the learning they have learnt through the GlobalGAP program.

8.4 – IMPLICATION AND LIMITATION

The generalisability of this study can extend to the other agriculture and primary production industry’s workers in Pakistan and even beyond in other developing countries’ rural agriculture workers. There are three major limitations of this study. First, the numbers of certified mango farms are limited in Pakistan. Second, this study was solely conducted in the Punjab province. Although the region is a major contributor to the national mango production, there was a significant mango cluster in the Sindh province which has been excluded from this study. The Sindh and Punjab provinces are different, their history, culture and language are distinctive from each other. Third, the study does not include the non-certified farms to establish a comparison. There were several mango farms in the region, which were not certified. It was possible to collect
the data from those farms to make a comparative analysis between certified and non-certified farms. However, this study has ignored those farms and solely collects the data from the certified farms. It is not known if the GlobalGAP inspired the other smaller non-participating farmers or not.

In the Punjab province, the GlobalGAP standard has a successful case of uplifting the province’s citrus industry (FAO, 2013), and the standard is also working with other growers such as sugarcane and cotton growers but this study has limited its scope only to the mango industry. The findings of this research, however, can be generalised beyond the Punjab mango cluster to wider global rural agriculture workers in developing countries as they encounter similar challenges discussed and explored in this study.

The in-depth literature review revealed that there are many different definitions for CSR, and also the use of this term varied according to the themes of previous studies. This particular study purely focused on the role of private standards in ensuring compliance in developing countries. Private standards have specific codes and framework but in this study, the focus was on CSR compliance. This study is based on the GlobalGAP (as a private) standard and its role in ensuring CSR compliance in Pakistani mango industry. It is also evident from the existing literature that private standards are largely based on CSR-related issues and their prime role is to ensure the compliance with CSR practices in the complex supply chains (Pilbeam et al., 2012; Sodano et al., 2008; Tallontire, 2007). Thus, regardless of GlobalGAP’s emphasis on traceability and food safety, the standard does promise to ensure that minimum CSR requirements (social and environmental issues) have been met by the certified growers and producers.

8.5 – CONCLUSION

Herzberg’s two-factor theory had never been tested with rural agricultural workers. It is also critical to remember that there is a huge difference between the rural population of advanced countries and the rural population of developing countries. The participants of this study have acknowledged that GAP resulted in establishing a better understanding of social and environmental issues and responsibility. The workers also acknowledged that the working conditions had been improved at the certified farms.
The contributions of this thesis are fivefold. Firstly, this thesis has given an insight into the good agriculture practices initiatives of Pakistani mango industry as it is the first ever study that has been conducted on this particular population. The approach was also different to other studies that have been carried out in other regions. Secondly, this thesis has contributed to knowledge as it shows a significant positive relationship between CSR practices for good agriculture and rural workers’ motivation and job satisfaction. Thirdly, the thesis also identifies the particular practices that affect the workers’ motivation the most. The workforce-oriented practices were found to be the most important factor followed by the environmental practices. Surprisingly, the society oriented practices were found least significant to predict the rural workers’ motivation. Fourthly, the findings of this thesis are equally important for practitioners and policymakers, as they are important for the academia. These findings have bridged a significant knowledge gap, and also answer many questions that are part of a debate these days regarding the usefulness and benefits of private standards. Lastly, it puts forward recommendations for future research agenda that will help to spread the good agriculture practices across the entire agriculture industry in Pakistan and beyond.

The intention of this thesis was to examine the Pakistani mango industry and the role of GlobalGAP in ensuring CSR compliance at the certified farms. The rural workers have been ignored previously and the phenomenon of ‘rural workers’ motivation’ is a new term that has been introduced in this thesis. There is a need to review the policy to address the issues of those workers. These workers are the strongest asset as 64% of Pakistani population lives in rural areas, and 68% of them work in the agriculture sector, the sector also contributes 21.6% of the total country GDP (World Bank, 2014). The country, however, has much more potential, and it is critical for all the stakeholders to play their part in transforming the agriculture industry.

8.6 – FUTURE RESEARCH

There is a huge divide in what private standards such as the GlobalGAP are eyeing for the future, including the scientific ways and innovations to improve the food security and sustainability. The agenda was revealed during the GlobalGAP Summit in Amsterdam on 27th September 2016. The stakeholders on the other side are still confused and unclear how to relate the need for private governance with their existing
working atmosphere. While the academic and professional bodies are shifting their focus on the future trends such as materiality index, collaborations, circular economy and big data, the critical questions remained unanswered as to how CSR codes can change or rather transform the working conditions in developing countries. This study found that thousands of new jobs had been created at the certified mango farms and the pack houses, new jobs thus associated with the poverty reduction. Pakistan is a hugely populated country, and that is why the difference GlobalGAP made is not clearly visible. However, there has been a significant reduction in poverty in the immediate surroundings of the certified farms.

Considering the findings from this study, along with the suggestions from the Brundtland Report, the Rio summit, and the sustainable development goals (SDGs), it was clear that the basic questions about poverty, human rights, inequality and gender discrimination remained the top priorities for the world’s leaders. The findings of this study look relevant and can be used as a base point to start exploring such complicated areas. With all these facts, the future studies may try to investigate the following research questions:

1. Is it possible to tackle social injustice and inequality through private governance?
2. Can private standards play a role in building collaborations among the stakeholders in developing countries?

The element of life expectancy appeared as an unexpected finding of this research. It will be of great value if further research considers this area in order to examine the impacts of good agriculture practices on rural life expectancy in developing countries.

8.7 – RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations have been made for the policies and the existing practices.

8.7.1 – STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT

Notwithstanding the success of the certified Pakistani mango growers in the western supermarkets, the numbers of certified mango farms are declining in the country. During the field trips, some of the growers expressed grievances and their intentions to cancel the subscription. The main cause of such grievances was the lack of
Chapter 8: Conclusion and Recommendation

communication and the absence of stakeholder engagement. After the implementation and issuance of the certificate, GlobalGAP failed to engage with the growers, and the growers were left relying on the local audit firms which were appointed by the GlobalGAP. There are many ways in which the GlobalGAP can actively interact with the participants, for example through monthly or quarterly newsletters, through social media or by launching a dedicated portal for the growers where they can post questions and queries.

8.7.2 – HIGHLIGHTING THE CAUSE

The success of private standards has been vastly associated with the financial gains for the participating producers and growers, especially regarding gaining the lucrative deals with the foreign supermarkets. Although the GlobalGAP was initiated by the supermarkets and retail groups in the EU, it was designed to address the global issues of ethical trading. The growers who were found to be less motivated during the field trips were those who failed to secure any sound deal with the EU supermarkets. There is a need for the GlobalGAP and other similar initiatives to promote the cause among the growers in developing countries.

There have been many significant improvements reported in this study, and there is a need to capture on that rather promoting the standards as a visa to enter in the high-end markets. As the three pillars of sustainable development are profit, people and the planet, the core attention has been given to the profitability and there is a need to highlight the other two factors with the same determination. As productivity has been improved at the certified farms and the quality of mangoes enhanced, the growers were receiving better prices from the local buyers. Also with the training and education which the growers gained through the GlobalGAP program, they were empowered enough to explore new markets in the Gulf and far eastern countries.

8.7.3 – HUMAN CAPITAL

The findings revealed that workforce-oriented practices were the most important factor for the workers. Thus, there is a need to focus on the workers. Currently, the GlobalGAP requires a minor must for the clauses related to workers. There is a need to make them major must as with the environment and traceability factors. According to UNDATA (2014), 44% of the population in Pakistan was associated with the
agriculture and in the whole South Asia that was 45.4%, therefore, there is a need for serious reforms. The role of governments is critical as they can build on the existing work done by the GlobalGAP and other global players in the region. This study discussed the expertise of the mango workers and how they benefited from training and coaching at the certified farms. The study further found how that expertise helps the growers (the employers) in minimising the losses and enhancing the production volume. If such expertise can be transferred onto rural workers across the country, the agriculture sector shall do wonders.

8.8 – CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The literature on CSR and private standards in Pakistan is still inchoate. This research has filled this knowledge gap through empirical data. This study has made a methodological contribution, empirical contribution, theoretical contribution, and contribution to practice.

8.8.1 – METHODOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTION

This study has produced a framework to observe the usefulness of private standards’ codes or CSR initiatives in the context of developing countries. The framework has allowed the researcher to involve maximum participation from all involved stakeholders. From government representatives to NGO officials, and from growers and exporters to bottom tier workers, every stakeholder has participated in this study. A combination of mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) and multi methods (individual interview, focus groups, observation) provided flexibility to explore almost all the segments of the GlobalGAP episode and the Pakistani mango industry transformation. The study further produced an instrument to test the rural workers’ motivation against CSR practices by the help of combining CSR practices and motivation theory.

8.8.2 – EMPIRICAL CONTRIBUTION

It was the first study of its kind that has ever been conducted in Pakistan. There were several types of research that have been carried out to explore the private agro standards in the Africa and South America. Previous studies considered private standards as an extra burden and barrier to the growers in the poorer developing countries, but this study has revealed that there were options available for the growers to access funds that
were supplied by the donors and exporters. The majority of the studies have been conducted to examine the financial benefits of private standards in terms of opening up of the new markets, access to supermarkets and through low transaction costs. This study, however, argued that private standards were not made solely to ensure financial gains for the participating producers and growers but were also designed to ensure food safety, environment protection, worker wellbeing and sustainability, and therefore they should be tested against these values too.

The empirical qualitative studies are rare in this particular category, and this study has attempted to enrich the knowledge about the relationship between CSR and performance in primary production industries. The rural workers in all developing countries face similar challenges including, poverty, inequality, discrimination, poor health and education facilities, child labour, human rights violation, and hazarded working conditions. The United Nations’ sustainable development goals (SDGs) were also designed with a view to tackle these critical and alarming issues. This study has provided an insight into the implications of addressing these issues and has argued that initiatives such as GAP can pave the way to achieve those goals.

The researcher has adopted a unique approach in involving the participation of all the stakeholders in Pakistani mango industry, and this approach has provided an insight into the complications and elusiveness in decision making. The study has contributed to the on-going debate about the verifiable or quantifiable benefits of private standards. This study was the first to test the relationship between private governed good agricultural practices codes and workers’ motivation. This study has made a unique contribution to existing know, given that it:

- Underlines the importance of private standards compliance in the implementation of the global CSR agenda among the agriculture growers in developing countries.
- Establishes a significant positive relationship between CSR practices and the rural workers’ motivation.
• Identifies the workforce-oriented practices as the most prominent predictor to predict the rural workers' motivation and job satisfaction, followed by the environment oriented practices.

• Acknowledges the GlobalGAP initiative as a means to reducing poverty by creating new jobs.

• Opens up a new debate on the linking of good agricultural practices with life expectancy.

8.8.3 – THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

The contribution to the theory of motivation has emerged through this research. The framework was based on Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation to test the rural workers' motivation. Herzberg had suggested that the presence of hygiene factors can only avoid the element of dissatisfaction but cannot motivate the employees. The population he tested were urban, white collared employees such as accountants and bankers. However, when the same hygiene factors were tested on the poor rural workers, they were found to be strongly correlated with their motivation. This new theoretical finding of rural workers' motivation can be generalised to all rural workers elsewhere in the world, as they face similar challenges.

8.8.4 – CONTRIBUTION TO PRACTICE

This study also contributes to the policy for approaching and pursuing the social and environmental governance in developing countries. The synergistic model can be adopted and used for implementation policies in developing countries. The suggestions highlighted in this study should provide insight into policy making that could help the growers in developing countries to better understand the importance of social and environmental issues and how the compliance can affect their workforce, something which is a key asset for the growers. The current practice is largely focused on the financial returns for the growers, and when they fail to establish any engagement with the western supermarkets, they become demotivated easily. The financial gain is important and will occur in the more sustainable way if the growers commit to compliance with full motivation.
8.9 – MOVING FORWARD

The concept of compliance is an organisational practice that travels from top tier to bottom tier, in the ideal circumstances. The leadership and managers are expected to set the standards and also to coach the team. Compliance with international CSR codes of practice has opened up opportunities for growers in developing countries. There are several success stories and case studies to convince the stakeholders, especially in Africa and South America. It is a relatively new and uncommon phenomenon in South-East Asia, particularly in Pakistan.

There are several benefits for the participating growers and for the wider community as these codes are designed to protect the society and the environment. There are also the economic benefits to the growers as compliance with CSR codes, and private standards are associated with the gaining of a competitive advantage (Henson and Humphrey, 2010; Lee et al., 2012; Manning, 2013; Smith, 2009). The advantages for the certified mango growers in Pakistan are not limited to gaining access to the western supermarket, but the growers also acknowledge the productivity of their workers, cost control, operational efficiencies and production volume, all these indicators have been improved since they have adapted the GlobalGAP standards.

This thesis suggests that the farm’s performance should not be judged against the financial gains indexes solely but instead, tested alongside other critical indicators such as workers' productivity and socio-environmental performance. The statistical analysis in this study shows that the social issues including health and education have the least significance in predicting the workers’ motivation for the workers of the mango industry in the Punjab province of Pakistan. The issues related to the workers directly like their wages, working hours, facilities at work and training were found to be the most prominent predictor to predict their motivation and job satisfaction, followed by the environmental issues, especially the safe use of chemicals and water waste.

These findings appear to partially support Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1954) for motivation. The rural agriculture workers represent a significant population in Pakistan, and almost all of them live below the poverty line. Their desire to fulfil their physiological and safety needs first is a natural phenomenon. However, the workers’ preferences for environment protection appear to be a pleasant surprise. Climate change
and global warming affect the poor the worst, in the form of floods, storms and soil erosion. The findings reflect their concerns. This study has also adds environmental safety to the hierarchy of the rural population's needs, alongside employment, infrastructure, housing, health and education facilities (Gonzalez and Esquivel, 1992).

The research model for this study was inspired by Herzberg's two-factor theory. The hygiene factors were labelled under workforce-related issues, and those factors found to be positively correlated with the workers' motivation. However, this study has contributed to add the environmental practices as an "added hygiene factor". The addition of the environment protection factors to Herzberg's theory and by considering the hygiene factors as motivators, the new proposed model can be reinforced as the best possible model to test the motivation of workers in poorer, developing countries.

Previous studies failed to establish the link between private standards adoption and poverty reduction (Chiputwa et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2012). However, this study found that thousands of new jobs were created at the certified farms during the initial upgrade, and the series of training lectures and workshops also help the workers from local areas to advance their skills and knowledge that help them to find work. There are limited numbers of certified farms in Pakistan, but they are playing their role to tackle poverty in the local surroundings. Also, the farm workers at the certified farms received regular wages weekly/monthly that helps them to plan and budget. Therefore, there is evidence that private standards help in poverty reduction in the Punjab mango cluster. The agricultural sector requires serious reforms for the welfare of these mass workers, and the core agenda must be set to meet their immediate needs.

The comprehensive approach allowed the researcher to have a different level of understanding about the phenomenon of private standards and its integration into primary production industries, such as agriculture. Developing an increased comprehension and grasp of the underlying problems in implementing CSR in complex situations, the researcher was able to produce a workable model and suggest amendments to improve compliance. In conclusion, the objectives for growers and producers to achieve compliance are:
improve their understanding and knowledge of global supply chain agenda;
implement the code of conduct to best of their ability and resources;
ensuring the workers’ basic and immediate needs met as a top priority;
increased awareness and importance of the social and environmental issues;
encourage the maximum participation from the society;
report the progress on key performing areas;
acknowledge the efforts through appraisals;
provide job security to workers through written contracts; and,
improvements in the audit process that are merit and transparency.

The study also suggested the following objectives for the private standards to improve participation from the producers and growers in developing countries:

• involve the growers and producers in policy making;
• making this easier and convenient for a grower to start with basic requirements;
• motivate them instead of pressurising them;
• less emphasis on financial gain and more on productivity and sustainability;
• keeps a regular interaction with the certified growers through newsletters, memos, or bulletins;
• sharing innovation, success stories, and latest researches with them;
• providing them access to the online resources; and,
• establish an efficient contact point to deal with complaints, queries, suggestions, or requests.
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### APPENDIX: 1 – DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

#### Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>WFOP1</th>
<th>WFOP2</th>
<th>WFOP3</th>
<th>WFOP4</th>
<th>WFOP5</th>
<th>WFOP6</th>
<th>WFOP7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOP3</th>
<th>EOP4</th>
<th>JS1</th>
<th>JS2</th>
<th>JS3</th>
<th>JS4</th>
<th>M1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFOP1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WFOP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WFOP3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WFOP4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WFOP5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WFOP6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WFOP7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WFOP8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOP3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOP4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EOP1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EOP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EOP3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EOP4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JS1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JS3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JS4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix: 2 – CORRELATION

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</th>
<th>Society_Oriented_CSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environment_Oriented_CSR</th>
<th>Job_Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonparametric Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>WFO Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>JS1</th>
<th>JS2</th>
<th>JS3</th>
<th>JS4</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFO Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFO Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFO Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFO</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.480   .671   .533   .317   .566   .509   .662   .532   .565   .580</td>
<td>.000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.309   .467   .573   .320   .547   .371   .580   .527   .241   .349</td>
<td>.000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.018  .231   .187   .468   .089   .220   .239   .232   .175   .323</td>
<td>.750   .000   .001   .000   .116   .000   .000   .002   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.275   .596   .525   .298   .599   .434   .606   .578   .379   .492</td>
<td>.000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.027   .085   .172   .094   .272   .112   .221   .147   .110   .168</td>
<td>.637   .131   .002   .096   .000   .047   .000   .009   .051   .003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.054  .161   .015   .127   .134   -.062  -.097  -.017  -.129  .030</td>
<td>.340   .004   .785   .025   .017   .268   .086   .769   .022   .600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.078   .264   .350   .132   .265   .254   .351   .281   .209   .441</td>
<td>.165   .000   .000   .019   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.413   .528   .571   .217   .509   .355   .617   .462   .402   .235</td>
<td>.000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.134   .258   .166   .614   .123   .016   .315   .065   .169   .101</td>
<td>.017   .000   .003   .000   .029   .772   .000   .246   .003   .074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.349   .482   .442   .209   .462   .337   .506   .332   .439   .324</td>
<td>.000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000   .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316    316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.278 (^<em>) .389 (^</em>) .376 (^<em>) .095 (^</em>) .402 (^<em>) .235 (^</em>) .448 (^<em>) .366 (^</em>) .258 (^<em>) .480 (^</em>)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .092 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.101 (^<em>) .219 (^</em>) .266 (^<em>) .381 (^</em>) .170 (^<em>) .248 (^</em>) .182 (^<em>) .236 (^</em>) .057 .102</td>
<td>.072 .000 .000 .002 .000 .001 .000 .317 .069</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>1.000 (^<em>) .482 (^</em>) .392 (^<em>) .127 (^</em>) .484 (^<em>) .306 (^</em>) .548 (^<em>) .428 (^</em>) .311 (^<em>) .319 (^</em>)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .024 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>.482 (^<em>) 1.000 .766 (^</em>) .356 (^<em>) .729 (^</em>) .476 (^<em>) .859 (^</em>) .689 (^<em>) .506 (^</em>) .515 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>.392 (^<em>) .766 (^</em>) 1.000 .259 (^<em>) .718 (^</em>) .504 (^<em>) .737 (^</em>) .686 (^<em>) .444 (^</em>) .505 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>.127 (^<em>) .356 (^</em>) .259 (^<em>) 1.000 .145 (^</em>) .366 (^<em>) .425 (^</em>) .380 (^<em>) .366 (^</em>) .402 (^*)</td>
<td>.024 .000 .000 .010 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>.484 (^<em>) .729 (^</em>) .718 (^<em>) .145 (^</em>) 1.000 .427 (^<em>) .750 (^</em>) .617 (^<em>) .366 (^</em>) .440 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .010 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>.306 (^<em>) .476 (^</em>) .504 (^<em>) .366 (^</em>) .427 (^<em>) 1.000 .504 (^</em>) .673 (^<em>) .614 (^</em>) .605 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>.548 (^<em>) .859 (^</em>) .737 (^<em>) .425 (^</em>) .750 (^<em>) .504 (^</em>) 1.000 .730 (^<em>) .568 (^</em>) .601 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>.428 (^<em>) .689 (^</em>) .686 (^<em>) .380 (^</em>) .617 (^<em>) .673 (^</em>) .730 (^<em>) 1.000 .551 (^</em>) .581 (^*)</td>
<td>.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000</td>
<td>316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M5 Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.614**</td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.518**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M6 Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>.319**</th>
<th>.515**</th>
<th>.505**</th>
<th>.402**</th>
<th>.440**</th>
<th>.605**</th>
<th>.601**</th>
<th>.581**</th>
<th>.518**</th>
<th>1.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix: 3 – REGRESSION (Linear)

Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered/Removed&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.738*</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>3.16489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR

ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3761.723</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3761.723</td>
<td>375.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3145.198</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Dependent Variable: Motivation

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.764*</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>1.49737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>986.740</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>986.740</td>
<td>440.091</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>704.029</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1690.769</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>20.978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
Regression

Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.501*</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.00782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Society_Oriented_CSR

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>424.923</td>
<td>105.404</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Society_Oriented_CSR

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.2666</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>-1.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
Regression

Variables Entered/Removeda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSRb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.489*</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>4.09039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Society_Oriented_CSR

ANOVAa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1653.292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1653.292</td>
<td>98.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5253.629</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>16.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Society_Oriented_CSR

Coefficientsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-13.126</td>
<td>3.941</td>
<td>-3.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
Regression

Variables Entered/Removed\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.428*</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>4.23930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Environment_Oriented_CSR

ANOVA\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1263.820</td>
<td>70.323</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>17.972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>4.23930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Environment_Oriented_CSR

Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-5.455</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>-1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
Regression

Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction  
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>2.00297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Environment_Oriented_CSR

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>431.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>431.041</td>
<td>107.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1259.728</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>4.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1690.769</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Environment_Oriented_CSR

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.200</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>-.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
Regression

Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.804*</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>2.78830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job_Satisfaction

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4465.686</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4465.686</td>
<td>574.392</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2441.235</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>7.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Job_Satisfaction

d. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.906</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>-1.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job_Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>23.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
### APPENDIX: 4 – MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION

Multiple Regression – Stepwise Technique

#### Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.764&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>1.49737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.798&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>1.40203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR
c. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>986.740</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>986.740</td>
<td>440.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>704.029</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1690.769</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1075.511</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>537.755</td>
<td>273.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>615.258</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1690.769</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR
c. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>5.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-3.938</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>-3.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction

### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>6.720</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.054**</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR
### Residuals Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>12.3142</td>
<td>19.2161</td>
<td>17.1614</td>
<td>1.84779</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-4.34402</td>
<td>3.52689</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>1.39757</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-2.623</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-3.098</td>
<td>2.516</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job_Satisfaction

### CSR AND MOTIVATION

#### Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter &lt;= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove &gt;= .100).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
## Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.738&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>3.16489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.754&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>3.08367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.758&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>3.06750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR
c. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR, Society_Oriented_CSR
d. Dependent Variable: Motivation

## ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3761.723</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3761.723</td>
<td>375.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3145.198</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3930.602</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1965.301</td>
<td>206.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2976.319</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3971.141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1323.714</td>
<td>140.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2935.780</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9.410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6906.921</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR
c. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR
d. Predictors: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR, Society_Oriented_CSR
### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-953</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>-.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-11.027</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>-4.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-14.786</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>-4.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Motivation*

### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Society_Oriented_CSR</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR  
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Workforce_Oriented_CSR, Environment_Oriented_CSR*

### Residuals Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>16.7025</td>
<td>30.0392</td>
<td>25.9842</td>
<td>3.55061</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-9.16077</td>
<td>6.23503</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>3.05286</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-2.614</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.986</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Motivation*
APPENDIX: 6 – THE COVER LETTER AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

PROJECT TITLE

The Impact of Private Standard Certification on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Compliance in Developing Countries and its Effects: The Case of GlobalGAP Certified Mango Farms in Pakistan.

INVITATION

You are being asked to take part in a research study on the impact of GlobalGAP standards to ensure CSR compliance and its effects on your business and your employees.

The aim of this study is to test the relationship between CSR practices and workers' job satisfaction and motivation, and how your business gets benefitted. The research is also keen on identifying the factors and rationale behind acquiring of GlobalGAP and what significance the investment has so far.

I am an independent researcher and a PhD candidate at Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK. I have no association with any other organisation or body, and this research is purely for academic purpose only. Professor David Crowther is my Director of Studies, and Dr Leburn Rose is my supervisor, this project has been approved by the Cardiff Metropolitan University Research Degree Committee.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN

In this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview. The interview will be recorded on both audio and video recording devices; however, you have the right to say NO to either mode or even both of them.

The questions you will be asked are already shared with you if you have any reservation about any question(s) you can raise them before the formal interview start. All the questions are purely academic and absolutely relevant to this research if you need assistance with any technical matter or statistical data you may have the opportunity to
seek assistance from the relevant person, for example, your manager. However, the time consumed in this process will add to the required time to process the interview.

TIME COMMITMENT
The whole process typically takes 60-90 minutes (per session) you may be required (in the rare case) to participate in two sessions. Usually, one session is sufficient.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS
You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation. You have the right to ask that any data you have supplied to that point be withdrawn /destroyed. You have the right to omit or refuse to answer or respond to any question that is asked of you.

You have the right to have your questions about the procedures answered (unless answering these questions would interfere with the study's outcome). If you have any questions as a result of reading this information sheet, you should ask the researcher before the study begins.

BENEFITS AND RISKS
There are no known risks for you or for your organisation in this study. You may be benefitted by the findings and solutions (if any) which this research will produce.

COST, REIMBURSEMENT AND COMPENSATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary. There is no incentives or compensation associated with your participation; however, you will have the opportunity to request for the final outcome of the project which you may use to enhance your knowledge.

CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY
The data collected will not contain any personal information about you except the name of your organisation and your position. No one will link the data you provided to the identifying information you supplied (e.g., name, address, email).
The findings will be published in different journals and conference papers, however, no personal information will be disclosed and neither your or your organisation name will be quoted in any publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
My supervisor Dr Leburn Rose will be glad to answer your questions about this study at any time. You may contact him through email at leburn.rose@gmail.com or through post at

Dr. Leburn Rose  
Supervisor Doctoral Studies  
London School of Commerce  
Chaucer House  
White Hart Yard  
London SE1 1NX  
United Kingdom

If you want to find out about the final results of this study, you should contact the researcher through email at gh.ahmad@gmail.com

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

ADAPTATION

Q:- What is the size of the plantation (hectares)? How many people work on the plantation, approximately? Are there living quarters or accommodation provided on the plantation?

Q:- Why you adopted GlobalGAP certification? Were there any other options, what you know about the certificate before you decided to adopt?

Q:- How much it costs you roughly and what financing options were available to you? Does government provide you with any financial support?
Q: How do the GlobalGAP investments create/enhance improve access to information required to exercise voice, engage in negotiation, and gain access to resources?

COMPLIANCE

Q: How you follow the procedures to ensure compliance with the GlobalGAP standard?

Q: Are there any opportunities for women to work at your facilities? How do you look at the child labour?

Q: How does the GlobalGAP investment enhance participants' financial resources, time, materials, or skills required for the viable association?

Q: How does the GlobalGAP investment improve participants' ability to formulate, articulate and convey opinion?

EFFECTS

Q: How does the GlobalGAP investment create/improve individuals' and organisations' ability to associate?

Q: What difference does it make to your workers' working conditions?

Q: What difference does it make to improve workers' productivity, job satisfaction and motivation?
APPENDIX: 7 – QUESTIONNAIRE

What is the name of your farm where you work? ……………………
Where do you live? ……………………….

Part A: Questionnaire
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement and indicate your response by ticking (√) in the appropriate box as requested.

A1: Workforce Oriented Practices

Q1:- Are you happy with the facilities at work (staff room, restrooms, etc.)? (WFOP1)
Strongly Agree ☐
Agree ☐
Neither Agrees/Disagree ☐
Disagree ☐
Strongly Disagree ☐

Q2:- Are you happy with the number of hours you work in a week? (WFOP2)
Strongly Agree ☐
Agree ☐
Neither Agrees/Disagree ☐
Disagree ☐
Strongly Disagree ☐

Q3:- Are you happy with your wages? (WFOP3)
Strongly Agree ☐
Agree ☐
Neither Agrees/Disagree ☐
Disagree ☐
Strongly Disagree ☐
Q4:- Is your management is friendly? (WFOP4)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q5:- Are you free to do overtime if you want to? (WFOP5)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q6:- Are there health and safety and other safety procedures have been followed throughout? (WFOP6)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q7:- Have you been trained fully before you start to work? (WFOP7)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q8:- Are there rewards and recognitions for extra productive efforts at work? (WFOP8)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
A2: Society Oriented Practices

Q9: Will you be happy to see if your farm sponsors local schools? (SOP1)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q10: Will you be happy to see if your farm sponsors a health facility (hospital/dispensary)? (SOP2)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q11: Will you be happy if your farm sponsors a playground or activity? (SOP3)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q12: Is your farm has a clear policy against child labour? (SOP4)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □
A3: Environment Oriented Practices

Q13: Are your farm only uses the necessary pesticides or chemicals during production as advised? (EOP1)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q14: Are there good measures in place to deal with garbage and waste? (EOP2)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q15: Are there recycling facilities or mechanisms in place at your farm? (EOP3)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q16: Are there good measures in place to control water waste at your farm? (EOP4)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
A4: Job Satisfaction

Q17:- Is your job is secure / permanent? (JS1)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agree/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q18:- Do you have balance in work and home life? (JS2)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q19:- Are you happy the way you have been treated at work? (JS3)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

Q20:- Are you happy with the working conditions at work (machinery and other equipment)? (JS4)
Strongly Agree □
Agree □
Neither Agrees/Disagree □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □
A5: Motivation

Q21: Does your good work always get recognised and appreciated? (M1)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q22: Do you have set targets to achieve? (M2)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q23: Are there equal chances and opportunities for you to grow and improve your job profile? (M3)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q24: Do you like to take extra responsibilities? (M4)
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agrees/Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
Q25:- Do you enjoy your work? (M5)

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Neither Agrees/Disagree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  

Q26:- Are you willing to contribute to the growth of your organisation? (M6)

Strongly Agree  
Agree  
Neither Agrees/Disagree  
Disagree  
Strongly Disagree  

Part B: Demographics

The following questions provide demographic information about yourself, please answer all questions and indicate your response by ticking (✓) in the appropriate box as requested.

Gender

Male  
Female  

Age Group

Between 18 and 24  
Between 25 and 36  
Between 37 and 49  
50 and above  

Number of years in employment

Less than 2 year  
Between 3 and 5 years  
Between 6 and 10 years  
More than 10 years  
Nature of employment contract
Temporary/Seasonal □
Permanent □

Position or Title
Worker □
Supervisor □

Level of Education
Below Matric □
Matric □
Intermediate □
Graduate □
Masters □

Is there anything else you would like to say?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
____________________.