

CSR AND COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS ON COMMUNITY WELFARE

Putri Amelia, Syahrums Agung, Imam Sundarta

Faculty of Economics and Business, Ibn Khaldun University, Bogor, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: putriamelia1662009@gmail.com

Abstract	Article History
<i>This study examines the effects of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and community resource development on community welfare around PT Antam UBPE Pongkor. The study used a quantitative approach with 60 community beneficiaries selected through random sampling. Data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of 32 statements and analyzed using IBM SPSS 25, including validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, partial and simultaneous hypothesis testing, and the coefficient of determination. The findings show that CSR has a positive but statistically insignificant partial effect on community welfare, with a regression coefficient of 0.102, $t = 0.874$, and $p = 0.386$. Community resource development has a positive and significant effect, with a coefficient of 0.384, $t = 2.638$, and $p = 0.011$. Simultaneously, CSR and community resource development significantly affect community welfare, with $F = 10.424$ and $p < 0.001$. The model explains 26.8% of the variance in community welfare ($R^2 = 0.268$). The results indicate that CSR needs stronger alignment, participation, and evaluation, while sustainable capacity development is an important pathway for improving welfare in communities surrounding the mining operation.</i> Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility; community resource development; community welfare; mining community.	Received: August 2026 Reviewed: August 2026 Published: August 2026 Plagirism checker no 80 Copyright : author Publish by : musytari  This work is licensed under a creative commons attribution-noncommercial 4.0 international license

Introduction

Research Background

The mining sector is a strategic part of the Indonesian economy because it contributes to national output, regional development, employment, and industrial activity. At the same time, mining activities may create environmental, social, and economic pressures in surrounding communities. The thesis reports that mining and quarrying contributed approximately 9.15% of national GDP in 2024 and notes that mining may also generate environmental damage, social conflict, and economic inequality around mining sites (Nafi, 2024; Khansa Nabilla Lutfiyah et al., 2024). These conditions require mining companies to balance economic objectives with social and environmental responsibility.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is therefore positioned as an important mechanism through which companies can contribute to local social, economic, educational, health, and

environmental development. The source thesis describes CSR as a responsibility to stakeholders and the community, consistent with ISO 26000 and the Indonesian legal framework on corporate social and environmental responsibility (Nahapiet et al., 2025). Previous studies cited in the thesis indicate that CSR can have a positive relationship with community welfare, although its effectiveness depends on program design, participation, alignment with community needs, implementation, and evaluation (Septiana & Kumalasari, 2024; Syahrul Ramadan et al., 2025; Sejaya, 2025).

Community Resource Development and Welfare

The study context further shows why the relationship between resource development and welfare should be considered empirically. The thesis describes limitations in vocational education and access to skills training in the Nanggung area, as well as dependence on mining-related activity. These conditions create a need for programs that strengthen economic adaptability. Agricultural mentoring, environmental education, enterprise support, and other capacity-building activities can potentially improve the ability of residents to create or maintain livelihoods beyond direct dependence on the mining operation. The research therefore treats community resource development as a substantive explanatory factor rather than merely a supporting component of CSR.

The thesis also places community resource development within the broader objective of sustainable community empowerment. Capacity development is not limited to formal education. It includes opportunities for residents to learn practical skills, receive mentoring, obtain information, and strengthen their ability to use available resources. In this sense, development activities can transform community members from passive recipients of assistance into actors who are able to sustain program outcomes. This perspective is important in a mining area because welfare improvements that depend only on periodic assistance may be difficult to maintain when economic or operational conditions change.

Beyond assistance, sustainable welfare requires strengthening the capabilities of community members. Community resource development in the thesis is defined as an effort to improve knowledge, skills, abilities, productivity, and self-reliance so that communities can improve their own living conditions. Education, skills, participation, support from government and companies, and economic conditions are identified as relevant factors, while knowledge, skills, and ability constitute the principal indicators used in the study (Brodjonegoro, 2019; Maysaroh, 2022). Such development is particularly relevant in mining areas where residents may need alternative economic opportunities as extraction activities change.

Community welfare is understood more broadly than income alone. The thesis associates welfare with material and non-material needs, including income, education, health, employment opportunities, social conditions, access to public facilities, and quality of life. In the Pongkor context, the study identifies continuing challenges in poverty, unemployment, education access, and dependence on mining-related economic activity. The source also describes Antam's initiatives, including educational assistance, agricultural empowerment, environmental education, and community economic programs, but argues that empirical evidence on the combined effect of CSR and community resource development remains limited.

Research Gap and Objectives

The research framework is also consistent with the stakeholder orientation discussed in the thesis: company programs are expected to create value not only for the firm but also for the community surrounding the operation. From this perspective, the quality of the relationship between company and community becomes part of program effectiveness. A program that is well funded but poorly aligned with local priorities may have a weaker measurable effect than a smaller program that is carefully targeted and supported by participation. This makes the simultaneous model of CSR and community resource development particularly relevant for understanding community welfare in the Pongkor setting.

The literature reviewed in the thesis shows three principal gaps. First, many studies examine CSR alone rather than CSR together with community resource development. Second, qualitative or descriptive approaches remain common, limiting quantitative estimates of effect. Third, relatively few studies focus specifically on gold-mining communities around PT Antam UBPE Pongkor. The present study addresses these gaps by testing the partial and simultaneous effects of CSR and community resource development on community welfare using a quantitative regression model. The objective is to provide empirical evidence that can inform the design of more targeted and sustainable community programs (Patro & Raghunath, 2016; Rosidi & Sumardjo, 2020; Sahroni, 2025).

Method

Research Design and Data Sources

The study used a quantitative research approach to examine causal relationships among Program Corporate Social Responsibility (X1), community resource development (X2), and community welfare (Y). The research focused on residents receiving or directly affected by PT Antam UBPE Pongkor's CSR programs. Primary data were obtained through questionnaires, with interviews and observation used as supporting methods. The questionnaire contained 32 statements across the three study variables and employed a Likert scale. Data analysis was conducted with IBM SPSS Statistics version 25.

Population, Sample, and Measurement

The operationalization of the variables follows the thesis measurement framework. CSR covers social and cultural, education, health, community empowerment, and infrastructure aspects. Community resource development covers knowledge, skills, and ability. Community welfare covers income, education, and health. The questionnaire was designed to capture respondents' perceptions of these dimensions, allowing the study to quantify community experiences of company programs and development outcomes. The use of a common Likert-scale structure makes the variables comparable within the regression model while retaining the conceptual distinctions among them.

The population consisted of community members who benefited from PT Antam UBPE Pongkor's CSR programs. The sample comprised 60 respondents selected using random sampling. Program CSR was measured through dimensions covering social and cultural activities, education, health, community empowerment, and infrastructure. Community resource development was represented by knowledge, skills, and ability. Community welfare

was represented through income, education, and health indicators. The instrument therefore translated the conceptual framework in the thesis into observable questionnaire items.

Data Analysis

The regression analysis was used because the research questions concern both individual and joint contributions of the independent variables. The partial t-test determines whether each predictor contributes to welfare after the other predictor is included in the model. The simultaneous F-test evaluates whether the predictors, considered together, provide a statistically meaningful explanation of welfare variation. The coefficient of determination complements these tests by indicating how much variation in welfare is accounted for by the model. Together, these procedures allow the article to distinguish between statistical significance, direction of association, and overall explanatory contribution.

The analysis included descriptive analysis, validity and reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression, t-testing, F-testing, and the coefficient of determination. The validity test compared item correlations with the critical value reported in the thesis. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach’s Alpha using 0.60 as the minimum criterion. Normality was assessed with the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, while multicollinearity was evaluated with tolerance and VIF and heteroskedasticity through the scatterplot. The regression model estimated the contribution of CSR and community resource development to community welfare.

Result

Research Findings

Descriptive and Instrument Findings

The source thesis also reports that the questionnaire data were collected directly from 60 respondents and that the instrument contained 32 statements. Because validity and reliability are prerequisites for interpreting regression results, the article gives particular attention to these tests. The reliability coefficients above 0.60 indicate that each group of items has acceptable internal consistency according to the criterion adopted in the thesis. The findings therefore support the use of the composite indicators in subsequent statistical testing. The empirical model is consequently based on measures that the source itself judged to be sufficiently consistent for the study.

The empirical analysis was based on 60 respondents. The questionnaire instruments for CSR, community resource development, and community welfare were tested before hypothesis testing. The thesis reports that all questionnaire items were declared valid against the relevant critical correlation value. Reliability results were also acceptable: CSR produced Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.802 for 9 items, community resource development produced 0.771 for 15 items, and community welfare produced 0.773 for 9 items. These results indicate that the instruments had adequate internal consistency for the regression analysis.

Table 1. Instrument Reliability

Variable	Items	Cronbach’s Alpha	Decision
CSR (X1)	9	0.802	Reliable

Community Resource Development (X2)	15	0.771	Reliable
Community Welfare (Y)	9	0.773	Reliable

Source: Primary Data, 2026

Classical Assumption Testing

The normality result is particularly clear: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance value is 0.200, exceeding the 0.05 threshold. The source thesis also provides a P-Plot and histogram, both interpreted as supporting a normal distribution. The scatterplot is similarly interpreted as showing no systematic pattern in the residuals. These findings support continuation to the regression stage. The multicollinearity presentation, however, contains a labeling inconsistency in the source table, where the reported tolerance and VIF columns do not align cleanly with the narrative. The article does not replace those source values with external calculations; instead, it records the thesis conclusion that the model was considered free from multicollinearity and focuses on the regression output for substantive interpretation.

The normality test produced an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.200 with N = 60 and a test statistic of 0.067. The thesis interprets this result as evidence that the residuals are normally distributed. The P-Plot and histogram were also interpreted as consistent with normality. The scatterplot was interpreted as showing an even spread of points, indicating no heteroskedasticity. The thesis reports no multicollinearity, although the presentation of the tolerance and VIF values in its table contains transcription inconsistencies. To avoid altering the original source, the article retains the regression output itself as the primary basis for inference.

Table 2. Classical Assumption Tests

Test	Reported result	Interpretation
Normality (K-S)	Asymp. Sig. = 0.200	Residuals normally distributed
Heteroskedasticity	Scatterplot points evenly spread	No heteroskedasticity reported
Multicollinearity	Thesis reports no multicollinearity	Model treated as acceptable for regression

Source: Primary Data, 2026

Multiple Linear Regression

The standardized coefficients also provide a comparative indication of the predictors within the model. The standardized beta for CSR is 0.137, whereas the beta for community resource development is 0.413. Thus, community resource development has the stronger standardized contribution in the reported model. This difference complements the partial significance results: community resource development is both statistically significant and more strongly associated with welfare, while CSR is positive but comparatively weaker and statistically insignificant in isolation. The pattern reinforces the interpretation that direct investment in community capabilities may be more closely linked to welfare outcomes than CSR exposure alone.

The multiple regression output provides a constant of 17.116, a CSR coefficient of 0.102, and a community resource development coefficient of 0.384. Based on the coefficients reported in the thesis, the model can be expressed as $Y = 17.116 + 0.102X_1 + 0.384X_2 + e$. The positive

signs indicate that higher values of either independent variable are associated with higher community welfare, while the statistical significance of each contribution must be considered from the partial tests.

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Predictor	B	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	17.116	-	3.003	0.004
CSR (X1)	0.102	0.137	0.874	0.386
Community Resource Development (X2)	0.384	0.413	2.638	0.011

Source: Primary Data, 2026

Partial Hypothesis Testing

CSR has a positive but statistically insignificant partial relationship with community welfare. Its coefficient is 0.102, with $t = 0.874$ and $p = 0.386$. This means that, within the study model, the direction of the effect is positive, but the evidence is insufficient to conclude that CSR independently produces a statistically significant improvement in welfare. The thesis interprets this finding as an indication that CSR implementation still requires stronger alignment with community needs, participation, and evaluation.

Community resource development, in contrast, has a positive and statistically significant partial relationship with community welfare. Its coefficient is 0.384, with $t = 2.638$ and $p = 0.011$. The result supports the importance of knowledge, skills, and ability development for improving community quality of life, expanding economic opportunities, and strengthening self-reliance. This finding is consistent with the thesis discussion citing the importance of capacity-building in local development (Brodjonegoro, 2019; Mutia Sanihah, 2024).

Table 4. Partial Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	t	Sig.	Conclusion
CSR → Community Welfare	0.874	0.386	Positive, not significant
Community Resource Development → Community Welfare	2.638	0.011	Positive and significant

Source: Primary Data, 2026

Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing and Model Fit

Table 5. Simultaneous Test and Coefficient of Determination

Statistic	Value
R	0.517
R ²	0.268
Adjusted R ²	0.242
F	10.424
Sig. F	0.000
Std. Error of Estimate	2.513

Source: Primary Data, 2026

The simultaneous test indicates that the two independent variables jointly affect community welfare. The ANOVA output reports $F = 10.424$ with $p < 0.001$, which is above the reported F-critical value of 3.13 in the thesis comparison. Accordingly, the combined model is

statistically significant. The coefficient of determination is $R^2 = 0.268$, meaning that 26.8% of the variation in community welfare is explained by CSR and community resource development, while 73.2% is attributed to factors outside the model.

Discussion

CSR and Community Welfare

The positive direction of the CSR coefficient suggests that stronger CSR implementation tends to coincide with better welfare, but the partial significance test does not support a statistically reliable standalone effect. This outcome is important because CSR activities may be visible and socially relevant without immediately producing measurable changes in the broader welfare indicators used in the study. The thesis identifies possible implementation issues such as mismatch between program design and actual needs, limited community participation, short-term orientation, and inadequate evaluation. These factors may reduce the measurable impact of CSR even when programs are positively perceived. The result also differs from several studies cited in the thesis that reported a significant CSR-welfare relationship, illustrating that context and program design matter (Septiana & Kumalasari, 2024; Syahrul Ramadan et al., 2025; Sahroni, 2025).

Community Resource Development and Community Welfare

The significant coefficient for community resource development indicates that capacity enhancement is a more direct contributor to welfare in the present model. Development of knowledge, skills, and ability can improve productivity, expand employment opportunities, and strengthen economic self-reliance. The finding is consistent with the thesis literature that emphasizes human-capacity development as a key mechanism of sustainable empowerment. In mining communities, where dependence on extractive activities can create vulnerability, strengthening transferable capabilities can provide residents with greater adaptability and alternative sources of livelihood (Brodjonegoro, 2019; Antonius Ary Setyawan et al., 2025; Mutia Sanihah, 2024).

Combined Effect and Practical Implications

Another implication is the importance of program continuity. The thesis repeatedly notes that short-term interventions may have limited impact when they are not connected to longer-term empowerment. For CSR, this means that assistance, infrastructure, and social programs need mechanisms for monitoring outcomes and community participation. For resource development, it means that training and mentoring should be linked to opportunities for residents to apply what they learn. The combined model provides a practical rationale for moving from isolated activities to an integrated program cycle of needs assessment, implementation, capacity strengthening, monitoring, and evaluation.

The finding that 73.2% of welfare variation remains outside the model should not be interpreted as a weakness of CSR or community resource development themselves. Rather, it highlights the multidimensional nature of welfare. The thesis explicitly identifies economic conditions, employment opportunities, education, government support, and social factors as examples of influences outside the model. This result suggests that company programs operate within a wider development ecosystem. Coordination with government institutions, community

organizations, educational providers, and local economic actors can therefore be important for translating corporate initiatives into broader welfare improvements.

The significant F-test indicates that CSR and community resource development should not be considered isolated interventions. Their combined effect suggests that social assistance and community capacity building can complement one another. CSR can provide resources, access, infrastructure, and institutional support, while community resource development can convert those inputs into skills, capabilities, and self-reliance. The relatively modest R^2 of 26.8%, however, shows that welfare is multidimensional and cannot be explained by the two predictors alone. Economic conditions, employment, education, health, government support, and other social factors remain relevant, as also recognized in the thesis. For PT Antam UBPE Pongkor, the implication is to strengthen participatory planning, maintain continuous evaluation, and integrate CSR delivery with capacity-building programs rather than relying predominantly on short-term assistance.

Conclusion

This study concludes that CSR and community resource development have different partial roles but a meaningful combined contribution to community welfare around PT Antam UBPE Pongkor. CSR shows a positive coefficient of 0.102 but is not statistically significant ($t = 0.874$; $p = 0.386$). This result suggests that the CSR programs examined in the study have not yet produced a sufficiently strong independent effect on the welfare indicators used. Improvement is therefore needed in program targeting, community participation, implementation quality, and evaluation. Community resource development is more strongly supported by the data, with a positive coefficient of 0.384 and a statistically significant result ($t = 2.638$; $p = 0.011$). The finding emphasizes the importance of building knowledge, skills, and ability as pathways to better quality of life, economic opportunity, and self-reliance.

The simultaneous test confirms that CSR and community resource development jointly affect community welfare ($F = 10.424$; $p < 0.001$). The model explains 26.8% of welfare variation ($R^2 = 0.268$), leaving 73.2% to other factors outside the study. The practical implication is that PT Antam UBPE Pongkor should strengthen the alignment of CSR programs with identified community needs, involve residents in planning and evaluation, and connect assistance to sustainable capacity-building. The study also indicates that future research should consider additional determinants of welfare and broader samples or locations to improve generalizability. Overall, the findings support a development approach in which CSR becomes more participatory and integrated with long-term community resource development.

References

- Ahmad, F. (2021). Pengaruh program Corporate Social Responsibility terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat di sekitar kawasan industri. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 12(2), 45-58.
- Antonius Ary Setyawan, E., Desembrianita, E., Santoso, M. H., Syahril, & Kalalo, R. R. (2025). Pemberdayaan masyarakat dalam meningkatkan kemandirian ekonomi lokal. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*.
- Ariyan Tri Ifanda, A., & Sisdiyanto, E. (2024). Evaluasi dampak program CSR terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat: Tinjauan literatur. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Bogor. (2025). Kabupaten Bogor dalam angka 2025. BPS Kabupaten Bogor.
- Brodjonegoro, B. P. S. (2019). Pembangunan sumber daya manusia Indonesia.
- Khansa Nabilla Lutfiyah, K., Titania, R., & Dita Aprilia. (2024). Keterlibatan masyarakat dalam isu lingkungan kasus tambang emas di Banyuwangi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan dan Politik*.
- Lumingkewas, E. M. C. (2023). Konsep dasar manajemen. Tahta Media Group.
- Manullang, M. (2001). Dasar-dasar manajemen (Edisi revisi). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Maysaroh, A. D. (2022). Pengaruh pelatihan dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia terhadap peningkatan kualitas kinerja karyawan yang dimediasi oleh motivasi. *Jurnal Manajemen*.
- Muktamar, A., Mutmainnah, I., Ramadani, E. F., Rusmini, & Arlini, L. (2024). Prinsip-prinsip manajemen. Yayasan PAD.
- Mutia Sanihah. (2024). Peningkatan kesejahteraan masyarakat melalui program pemberdayaan ekonomi. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*.
- Nafi, L. (2024). Pertumbuhan ekonomi Indonesia tahun 2024. *Jenius*.
- Nahapiet, L. W., Soputan, M., & Mamahit, C. E. M. (2025). Tinjauan yuridis terhadap peran CSR perusahaan tambang dalam peningkatan pembangunan berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Hukum*.
- Patro, C. S., & Raghunath, K. M. K. (2016). Corporate social responsibility. In *Encyclopedia/Reference work*, 202-227. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-0305-7.ch014>
- Ratuela, J. E., Kustiadi, M. N., Alfira, A., Assa, Y., & Sumenge, D. (2025). Dasar-dasar manajemen.
- Rizky, A., Hasanah, N., & Permana, D. (2014). Pelaksanaan program CSR dan pengembangan SDM PT Antam UBPE Pongkor bagi masyarakat sekitar tambang. *Jurnal Pertambangan dan Lingkungan*.
- Rosidi, A., & Sumardjo. (2020). Efektivitas pelaksanaan Corporate Social Responsibility dan hubungannya dengan tingkat kesejahteraan masyarakat penerima manfaat. *Jurnal Penyuluhan*.
- Rosidi, I., & Sumardjo. (2020). Partisipasi, keefektifan program, dan keberdayaan ekonomi masyarakat dalam implementasi program Corporate Social Responsibility. *Jurnal Sains Komunikasi dan Pengembangan Masyarakat*.
- Sahroni, H. (2025). Efisiensi dan efektivitas program CSR PT Antam UBPE Pongkor dalam pemberdayaan masyarakat Desa Cisarua, Kecamatan Nanggung, Kabupaten Bogor. *Jurnal Pembangunan Masyarakat*.

- Saragih, L., Ambarsari, A., & Ferhat, A. (2026). Implementasi Corporate Social Responsibility dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan masyarakat di desa sekitar PT Buana Tunas Sejahtera. *Jurnal Ekonomi*.
- Sastrawan, B., Samsi, A., & Seran, G. G. (2024). Pelayanan pemerintah bidang kesejahteraan masyarakat. *Karimah Tauhid*, 3(1), 473-479. <https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i1.11>
- Sejaya, B. (2025). Efektivitas implementasi CSR berbasis pemberdayaan masyarakat dalam meningkatkan citra perusahaan pada industri migas. *JISIP UNJA*.
- Septiana, D., & Kumalasari, R. (2024). Program tanggung jawab sosial perusahaan berbasis pada pengembangan masyarakat di desa. *Jurnal Pengabdian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 5(1).
- Silviana, F., & Novriansyah, Y. (2023). Pengembangan sumber daya manusia terhadap kinerja dosen dimediasi motivasi pada Universitas Muara Bungo. *Jurnal Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen*, 2.
- Siregar, H., & Pertiwi, F. (2025). Program Corporate Social Responsibility sebagai wujud kepedulian sosial perusahaan pada masyarakat desa. *Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*.
- Syahrul Ramadan, H., & Heryati, Y. (2025). Pengaruh Corporate Social Responsibility terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat di Desa Leling Kecamatan Tommo Kabupaten Mamuju. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2009 tentang Kesejahteraan Sosial. (2009). Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 40 Tahun 2007 tentang Perseroan Terbatas. (2007). Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- World Business Council for Sustainable Development. (2000). Corporate social responsibility: Making good business sense. WBCSD.