International Journal for Research in Engineering Application & Management (IJREAM)
ISSN : 2454-9150 Vol-07, Issue-02, MAY 2021

A Study on Literature Review of Corporate Social Responsibility and Organisational Commitment

*S. Batty Dorance, #Dr. B. Rose Kavitha D. litt

*Research Scholar, Research and Development centre, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, India.

#Director- Research, Silicon City College, Bangalore, India.

ABSTRACT - The purpose of this study is to provide that the various literature on CSR and organisational commitment. There is a long and varied history associated with the evolution of the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility and Organisational Commitment. The aim of this paper is to provide the evolution, definition of CSR and Organisational Commitment by reviewing the most relevant factors that have shaped its understanding such as theoretical contributions. The findings show that the understanding of corporate responsibility and Organisational Commitment has evolved that than the generation of profit the main responsibility of companies should be the generation of shared value. The findings suggest that CSR and Organisational Commitment continues to be relevant within the academic literature. This paper focussed on the various literature supporting the corporate social responsibility on Employee Commitment. This paper gives way for future academic research to explore how CSR and Organisational Commitment can help address the latest social expectations of generating shared value as a main business objective and to achieve performance in the organisation.

Keyword : Corporate Social Responsibility(CSR), Organizational Commitment(OC),

I. INTRODUCTION

Research, review means synthesis of the available knowledge of specific area & literature refers to the knowledge & information about the concepts, definition, and theories used in the concerned field of investigation. The review of literature helps a researcher to know the facts & evidences available to solve the research problem. Review of literature is also helps in framing hypothesis, data sources & appropriate statistical techniques to solve the problem further, the review provides to analyze the gaps, defining the objectives, formulating hypothesis, analysis & interpretations. In context of researcher the depth and breadth of the review emphasizes the credibility of the author (s) in the concerned field & for the professionals these are useful reports to keep them up date with their field.

Research, review means synthesis of the available knowledge of specific area & literature refers to the knowledge & information about the concepts, definition, and theories used in the concerned field of investigation. The review of literature helps a researcher to know the facts & evidences available to solve the research problem. Review of literature is also helps in framing hypothesis, data sources & appropriate statistical techniques to solve the problem further, the review provides to analyze the gaps, defining the objectives, formulating hypothesis, analysis & interpretations. In context of researcher the depth and breadth of the review emphasizes the credibility of the author (s) in the concerned field & for the professionals these are useful reports to keep them up date with their field. Research, review means synthesis of the available knowledge of specific area & literature refers to the knowledge & information about the concepts, definition, and theories used in the concerned field of investigation. The review of literature helps a researcher to know the facts & evidences available to solve the research problem.

The term literature review is combined of two words. Review and Literature. Research and review means synthesis of the available knowledge of the specific area and literature refers to the knowledge and information about the concepts, definitions and theories used in the concerned field of investigation. The review of literature helps the researcher to know the facts and evidence available to solve the research problem. In the recent years, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has gained much attention from companies and considered as a high-profile strategy. Corporate social responsibility refers generally the strategies implemented by Organisations to conduct their business in a way that is ethical, society friendly and beneficial to community. The study aimed to investigate the corporate social responsibility (CSR) impact on organisational commitment and thus how it influence the work performance. This study is literature review which helps the researcher to identify the appropriate methodology, suitable research design, methods of

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

measuring the variables, analysis, and writing the observations.

II. Corporate Social Responsibility

The concept "business responsibility" started to be known in 1949, when Bernard Dempsey published in Harvard Business Review (HBR) the article "The Roots of Business Responsibility", where he brings arguments in favour of the concept. Two months later, Donald K. David, dean of Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, published the article "Business Responsibilities in an Uncertain World". David said that businessmen should be involved in public activities beyond the well-known economic functions of businesses. Dempsey presented a number of philosophical arguments in favour of social responsibility, stating that such arguments derive from the four concepts of justice: trade justice – confidence in market trade; distributive justice – proper relationship between government and individuals; general justice – accept the legal obligation to act ethically; and social/distributive justice – obligation to contribute to the welfare and progress of individuals and society. Both David and Dempsey argue about the need for social justice by means of two reasons: 1. No individual or business is an island; all need to live in a community in order to function; 2. Due to the substantial resources they control, companies have great power to contribute to the progress of society and its individuals. Thus, David and Dempsey appreciated that business leaders have a fundamental obligation to create a just society.

For Chaffee (2017)[8], the origins of the social component in corporate behavior can be traced back to the ancient Roman Laws and can be seen in entities such as asylums, homes for the poor and old, hospitals and orphanages. This notion of corporations as social enterprises was carried on with the English Law during the Middle Ages in academic, municipal and religious institutions. Later, it expanded into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with the influence of the English Crown, which saw corporations as an instrument for social development (Chaffee 2017)[8]. In the following centuries, with the expansion of the English Empire and the conquering of new lands, the English Crown exported its corporate law to its American colonies where corporations played a social function to a certain extent. (Chaffee 2017)[8]

By the 1920's and early 1930's, business managers begun assuming the responsibility of balancing the maximization of profits with creating and maintaining an equilibrium with the demands of their clients, their labour force, and the community (Carroll 2008)[11]. This led to managers being viewed as trustees for the different set of external relations with the company, which in turn translated into social and economic responsibilities being adopted by corporations (Carroll 2008; Heald 1970)[22]. Later, with the growth of business during World War II and the 1940's, companies begun to be seen as institutions with social responsibilities and a broader discussion of such responsibilities began taking place (Heald 1970)[22].

It was during the 1950's and 1960's that the academic research and theoretical focus of CSR concentrated on the social level of analysis (Lee 2008)[24] providing it with practical implications. The most notable example of the changing attitude towards corporate behavior came from Bowen (1953)[3], who believed that the large corporations of the time concentrated great power and that their actions had a tangible impact on society, and as such, there was a need for changing their decision making to include considerations of their impact.

As a result of his belief, Bowen (1953)[3] set forth the idea of defining a specific set of principles for corporations to fulfil their social responsibilities. For him, the businessman's decisions and actions affect their stakeholders, employees, and customers having a direct impact on the quality of life of society as a whole (Bowen 1953)[3]. With this in mind, Bowen defined the social responsibilities of business executives as "the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society" (Bowen 1953, p. 6)[3]. As Carroll (2008)[11] explains, it seems that Bowen (1953)[3] was ahead of his time for his new approach to management which aimed at improving the business response to its social impact and by his contributions to the definition of corporate social responsibility. Furthermore, the relevance of Bowen's approach relies on the fact that this was the first academic work focused specifically on the doctrine of social responsibility, making Bowen the "Father of Corporate Social Responsibility" (Carroll 1999)[11].

Accordingly, during the 1960's scholars approached CSR as a response to the problems and desires of the new modern society. A notable example of this period was Keith Davis (1960)[17], who explained that the important social, economic and political changes taking place represented a pressure for businessmen to re-examine their role in society and their social responsibility. Davis (1960)[17] argued that businessmen have a relevant obligation towards society in terms of economic and human values, and asserted that, to a certain extent, social responsibility could be linked to economic returns for the firm (Carroll 1999; Davis 1960)[12,17]. The significance of Davis' ideas is that he indicated that the "social responsibilities of businessmen need to be commensurate with their social power" (p. 71) and that the avoidance of such would lead to a decrease of the firm's social power (Davis 1960)[18].

Other influential contributors of the time were Frederick (1960)[19], McGuire (1963)[26] and Walton (1967). Frederick (1960)[19] saw the first half of the twentieth century as an intellectual and institutional transformation that changed the economic and social thinking and brought with it an increased economic power to large scale corporations. To

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

balance the growing power of businessmen, Frederick (1960)[19] proposed a new theory of business responsibility based on five requirements: 1) to have a criteria of value (in this case for economic production and distribution), 2) to be based on the latest concepts of management and administration, 3) to acknowledge the historical and cultural traditions behind the current social context, 4) to recognize that the behaviour of an individual businessmen is a function of its role within society and its social context, and, 5) to recognize that responsible business behaviour does not happen automatically but on the contrary, it is the result of deliberate and conscious efforts; then McGuire (1963)[26], who reviewed the development of business institutions and observed changes in the scale and type of corporations, changes in public policies, and regulatory controls for businesses as well as changes in the social and economic conditions of the time.

In the year 1970 there was a recession in the USA that was marked by a high inflation and very low growth followed by a long energy crisis (Waterhouse 2017). As a response to this context, and as a result of the social movements of the 1960's and early 1970's, the federal government of the USA made significant advances with regards to social and environmental regulations. The most notable examples were the creation of the EPA, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), all of which addressed and formalized to some extent, the responsibilities of businesses with regards to the social concerns of the time (Carroll 2015)[11].

The 1970's saw the creation of some of today's most renowned companies with respect to social responsibility. Such is the case of the Body Shop, which was created in 1976 in the United Kingdom and Ben & Jerry's founded in 1978 in the USA. Whether as a response to the new social expectations, a new regulatory framework, or due to a first-mover strategy, these are two notable examples of companies that begun formalizing and integrating policies that addressed the social and public issues of the time, and as a result the 1970's entered into what Carroll (2015, p. 88)[12] called an era of "managing corporate social responsibility".

In 1979, Carroll proposed what is arguably the first unified definition of Corporate Social Responsibility stating that: "The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time" (Carroll 1979, p. 500)[11]. In 1980, Thomas M. Jones (1980)[23] was arguably the first author to consider CSR as a decision making process that influence corporate behaviour. Jones' (1980)[23] contribution gave way to a new area of debate around CSR which focused more on its operationalization than on the concept itself. This translated into the creation of new frameworks, models, and methods aimed at evaluating CSR from an operational perspective.

Strand (1983)[33], who proposed a systems model to represent the link between an organization and its social responsibility, responsiveness and responses and who identified internal and external effects of company's behaviour; Cochran and Wood (1984)[14,36], who used the combined Moskowitz list, a reputation index, to explore the relation between CSR and financial performance; and Wartick and Cochran (1985)[14] who reorganized Carroll's understanding of CSR (1979) into a framework of principles, processes, and social policies.

The 1990's were no exception to the growing interest in CSR, and in fact, it was during this decade that the concept gained international appeal, perhaps as the result of the international approach to sustainable development of the time in combination to the globalization process taking place. As Carroll (2015)[12] explained, during the 1990's the globalization process increased the operations of multinational corporations which now faced diverse business environments abroad, some of them with weak regulatory frameworks. For these global corporations it meant new opportunities that came along with a rising global competition for new markets, an increased reputational risk due to a growth in global visibility, and conflicting pressures, demands, and expectations from the home and the host countries (Carroll 2015)[12].

Many multinational corporations understood that being socially responsible had the potential to be a safe pathway to balance the challenges and opportunities of the globalization process they were experiencing and as a result, the institutionalization of CSR became stronger (Carroll 2015)[12]. The most notable example of the institutionalization of CSR was the foundation in 1992 of the association Business for Social Responsibility (BSR) which initially included 51 companies with the vision of a becoming a "force for positive social change - a force that would preserve and restore natural resources, ensure human dignity and fairness, and operate transparently" (Business for Social Responsibility 2018, para. 2).

Wood (1991)[36] defined three dimensions of CSP: first, the principles of Corporate Social Responsibility, which include legitimacy institutional level), public responsibility (organizational level), and managerial discretion (individual level). Second, she defined the processes of corporate social responsiveness as environmental assessment, stakeholder management, and issues management. Third, she specified the outcomes of corporate behaviour as social impacts, social programs, and social policies. As a result, Wood's model (1991)[36] was broader and more comprehensive than the ones presented earlier by Carroll (1979)[9] and Wartick and Cochran (1985)[14], and its relevance relies on its contextualization of aspects of CSR within the business-social interaction by emphasizing explicitly the outcomes and performance of firms (Carroll 1999)[11].

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

Also in 1991, Carroll (1991)[10] presented the "Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility" with the aim of providing a useful approach to CSR for the executives that needed to balance their commitments to the shareholders with their obligations to a wider set of stakeholders. The Pyramid of CSR, Carroll (1991)[10] represented what he defined as the four main responsibilities of any company: 1) the economic responsibilities which are the foundation for the other levels of the pyramid; 2) the legal responsibilities of the firm; 3) the ethical responsibilities that shape the company's behaviour beyond the law-abiding duties, and; 4) the philanthropic responsibilities of the corporation with regards to its contribution to improve the quality of life of society.

The third notable contribution of the 1990's to the concept came from Burke and Logsdon (1996)[4], who aimed to find evidence to link CSR to a positive financial performance of the firm, and by doing so they were arguably the first to evaluate the benefits of the strategic implementation of CSR. For them, CSR can be used with a strategic approach with the aim of supporting the core business activities and as a result improve the company's effectiveness in achieving its main objectives (Burke and Logsdon 1996)[4].

Moreover, Burke and Logsdon (1996)[4] identified five dimensions of *strategic* CSR which, for them, are essential for achieving the business objectives as well as for value creation:1) centrality, which represents how close or fit is CSR to the company's mission and objectives; 2) specificity, which represents the ability to gain specific benefits for the firm; 3) proactivity, in terms of being able to create policies in anticipation of social trends; 4) voluntarism, explained as the discretionary decision making process that is not influenced by external compliance requirements, and; 5) visibility, which refers to the relevance of the observable and recognizable CSR for internal and external stakeholders (Burke and Logsdon 1996)[4]. Furthermore, Burke and Logsdon (1996)[4] argued that the implementation of *strategic* CSR through these five dimensions would translate into strategic outcome in the form of value creation that can be identifiable and measurable, but limited to economic benefits for the firm.

In fact, Lantos (2001)[25] built on from Smith's definition of CSR and included *strategic* considerations to his own understanding of the concept concluding that: "CSR entails the obligation stemming from the implicit 'social contract' between business and society for firms to be responsive to society's long-run needs and wants, optimizing the positive effects and minimizing the negative effects of its actions on society" (Lantos 2001, p. 9)[25]. Accordingly, Lantos (2001)[25] explained that CSR can become *strategic* when it is part of the company's management plans for generating profits, which means that the company would take part in activities that can be understood as socially responsible only if they result in financial returns for the firm and not necessarily fulfilling a holistic approach such as the triple bottom line.

Marrewijk (2003) gave five interpretations to his concept of Corporate Sustainability, which he recognized as the contemporary understanding of CSR. These interpretations can be understood as the level of integration of CSR into the company's policies and structure. The *holistic* interpretation provided by Marrewijk (2003) is perhaps the most relevant for the purpose of this paper because it represents the full integration of CSR motivated by the search for sustainability in the understanding that companies have a new role within society and consequently have to make strategic decisions to adapt to its social context.

Husted and Allen (2007)[1] built on four of the five dimensions of strategic CSR established by Burke and Logsdon (1996)[4] to then provide their own definition of SCSR as the company's ability to: "1) provide a coherent focus to a portfolio of firm resources and assets (centrality); 2) anticipate competitors in acquiring strategic factors (proactivity); 3) build reputation advantage through customer knowledge of firm behaviour (visibility); 4) ensure that the added value created goes to the firm (appropriability)" (Husted and Allen 2007, p. 596)[1]. It is important to highlight that Husted and Allen (2007)[1] left out the concept of voluntarism proposed by Burke and Logsdon (1996)[4] from their definition of *strategic* CSR but pointed out its relevance as a key dimension in CSR for the creation of value.

A key contribution from Chandler and Werther (2013)[13] is their definition of SCSR which is the result of their exploration of CSR and their pragmatic approach to its effective implementation. Chandler and Werther (2013)[13] defined SCSR as: "The incorporation of a holistic CSR perspective within a firm's strategic planning and core operations so that the firm is managed in the interests of a broad set of stakeholders to achieve maximum economic and social value over the medium to long term." (p. 65). In the fourth edition of the book, Chandler (2016)[13] presents a slightly modified definition which reflects his new perspective on the generation of value: "The incorporation of a holistic CSR perspective within a firm's strategic planning and core operations so that the firm is managed in the interests of a broad that shows that the definition and concept of Corporate Social Responsibility has evolved from being limited to the generation of profits to the belief that companies should focus on generating shared value. From the review, it would seem that the evolution of the concept can be linked not only to academic contributions, but also to society's expectations of corporate behaviour.

III. Organizational Commitment

The term commitment means "engagement or involvement that restricts freedom of action" (Oxford Dictionary). The concept of commitment in the workplace remains a much researched topic and an intriguing trait of employee behaviour. Studies in this area have also affected the conceptualization of commitment towards the job,

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

occupation, the workgroup, representative employee bodies, and work itself. Research in this area has stemmed primarily from the need to establish a relationship between antecedents of organizational commitment and organizational outcomes in order to create and sustain a committed workforce contributing positively towards organizational commitment

The evolution in Organisational Commitment concepts can be categorized into several theories: The Side Bet theory from Becker (1960)[5], Porter"s (1974)[30] Affective Dependence theory, O"Reilley and Chatman (1986), Meyer and Allen"s Multidimension theory (1984, 1990)[1] till Cohen"s Two dimension (2007)[15] and Somers" Combined theory (2009). Each of these theories has its own way of explaining the concept of and a strong bearing on the present status of Organizational Commitment.

According to Becker"s theory, the relationship between an employee and the organization is founded on behaviours bounded by a "contract" of economic gains. Employees are committed to the organization because they have some hidden vested investments or side-bets. These side-bets are valued by the individual because of the accrual of certain costs that render disengagement difficult. In fact Becker"s theory identifies organizational commitment as a major predictor of voluntary turnover.

Porter and his followers hence define commitment as "the relative strength of an individual"s identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday, Steers and Porter 1979; p.226)[27,30]. Based on Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian"s approach to OC, a tool in the form of a organizational commitment questionnaire was developed that captured not only the attitudinal notion of commitment, but also encapsulated the consequences of commitment. Due to the inherent limitations of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Meyer and Allen (1984)[1], O"Reilly and Chatman (1986) proposed the multi-dimension model.

The major proponents of the multi-dimension approach are Meyer and Allen (1984)[1] and O"Reilley and Chatman (1986)[29]. Meyer and Allen"s Three Dimensional Theory (1984, 1990, 1997)[1], has been the leading approach to organizational commitment for more than two decades.

3.1 Models of Commitment – Allen and Meyer, Three Component Model

Meyer and Allen (1991)[1] initially developed a three component model to address the similarities and differences in one – dimensional conceptualization of Organizational Commitment (H.S.Becker, 1960; Mowday et al., 1982; Weiner 1982)[5,27]. Meyer and Allen (1991)[1] investigated that organisational commitment reflects at least three general themes: affective attachment to the organisation, the perceived costs associated with leaving it and the obligation to remain with it. These three approaches are referred to as affective, continuance and normative commitment.

3.2 Affective Commitment

Affective commitment is defined as the emotional attachment, identification and involvement that an employee has with its organisation and goals (Mowday et al., 1997; Meyer and Allen, 1993)[1]. Porter et al., (1974)[2,27,30] characterized affective commitment by three factors: belief in and acceptance of organization's values and goals; willingness to focus effort on help achieving its goals; desire to maintain organisational membership. Affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organisation because they want to (Coetzee, M 2005)[16], Mowday (1982)[27], the antecedents of affective commitment generally fall into four categories:

1. Personal Characteristics
2. Structural characteristics (organisational)
3. Job- related characteristics, and
4. Work experiences

Although various research studies have been conducted to link demographic characteristics such as age, tenure, gender and education to commitment, the relations were neither strong nor consistent, the reason being too many variables such as job status, work rewards and work values moderating the relationship. Relatively few studies have examined the relationship between organisational characteristic and commitment(Coetzee, M2005)[16].

Work experience variables that have been found to correlate with affective commitment include equity in reward distribution (Rhodes & Steers, 1981)[31], role clarity and freedom from conflict (Glisson & Durick, 1988)[21], supervisor consideration (Glisson & Durick, 1988)[21] fairness of performance based rewards and job challenge (Meyer & Allen, 1987)[1], opportunity for advancement (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980)[29] and participation in decision making (Rhodes & Steers, 1981)[31].

Research to date suggests that work experiences play the largest role in employees decisions to remain with an organisation (Coetzee, M 2005)[16]. Mowday et al., (1979)[27] further states that affective communication is when the employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals in order to maintain membership to facilitate the goal.

3.3 Continuance Commitment

Continuance commitment is the willingness to remain in an organization because of the investment that the employee has with non-transferable investments. Non-transferable investments include things such as retirements, relationships, with other employees, or things that are special to the organization (Reichers, 1985)[32]. The potential costs of leaving an organisation include the threat of wasting time and effort spent acquiring non-transferable skills, losing attractive benefits, giving up seniority – based privileges, or

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

having tlo uproot family and disrupt personal relationships. Apart from the costs involved in leaving the organisation, continuance commitment will also develop as a function of a lack of alternative employment opportunities. Employees whose primary link to the organisation is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to. (Coetzee, M 2005)[16]. Continuance commitment also includes factors such as years of employment or benefits that the employee may receive that are unique to the organization (Reichers, 1985)[32]. Meyer and Allen (1997)[1] further explain that employees who share continuance commitment with their employer often makes it very difficult for an employee to leave the organisation.

3.4 Normative Commitment

Normative commitment (Bolon, 1997)[6] is the commitment that a person believes that they have to the organization or their feeling of obligation to their workplace. In 1982, Weiner discusses normative commitment as being a generalized value of loyalty and duty.

Wiener (1982)[37] suggests that the feeling of obligation to remain with an organisation may result from the internalization of normative pressures exerted on an individual prior to entry into the organisation (family or cultural orientation), or following entry (organisational orientation).

Meyer and Allen (1991)[1] supported this type of commitment prior to Bolon's definition, with their definition of normative commitment being a feeling of obligation. It is argued that normative commitment is only natural due to the way we are raised in society. Normative commitment can be explained by other commitments such as marriage, family, religion, etc. Therefore when it comes to one's commitment to their place of employment they often feel like they have a moral obligation to the organisation (Wiener, 1982)[37]. Normative commitment may also develop when an organisation provides the employee with rewards in advance (e.g. paying college tuition), or incurs significant costs in providing employment (e.g. head hunting fees or the costs associated with job training). Recognition of these investments causes employees to feel an obligation to reciprocate by committing themselves to the organisation until the debt has been repaid (Scholl, 1981)[34].

3.5 Model developed by O'Reilly and Chatman

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986)[29] developed their multidimensional framework on basis of the assumption that commitment represents an attitude towards the organisation. According to these authors, commitment takes on three distinct forms, which they labelled compliance, identification and internalization.

Compliance occurs when attitudes and corresponding behaviours are adopted in order to gain specific rewards. Identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship. Internalization occurs when influence is accepted because the attitudes and behaviours one is being encouraged to adopt are congruent with existing values. Employees thus become committed to organizations with which they share values. Figure 2.13 provides a schematic representation of a general model of workplace commitment.

Bragg (2002)[7] identified the following three drivers as the key factors influencing as employee's commitment:

Fairness :To create a perception of fairness, employers should pay competitive wages, create and administer policies that are unbiased, offer competitive benefits, provide timely, accurate and useful performance appraisals, promote the most qualified employees and develop employees by providing opportunities for growth (Coetzee, M 2005)[16]. Research studies demonstrated that an unfavourable outcome is better received by a receiver when he or she is treated in an interpersonally fair manner such as being given an explanation for a decision. In such instances, although the employee might feel that the decision is not distributive fair, he or she will remain committed to the organisation because he or she was treated with respect and fairly.

Trust : To nurture commitment, employers must create an environment of trust. If employers wish to develop and maintain trust, they should do what they say they will do, be consistent, maintain confidences, be a role model of behaviour, encourage employee involvement, allow people to make decisions that affect their work, allow people to make mistakes without fear or ridicule, learn from mistakes and not crucify scapegoats, explain reasons for major decisions and act on employee suggestions.(Coetzee, M 2005)[16].

It is interesting to note that research by Mathieu and Zajac (1990)[28] concluded that the link between commitment and performance was largely non – existent and commitment to supervisors was more strongly linked to performance than commitment to organisations. One implications of these results is that human resource professionals concerned with employee performance focus their efforts on commitment to supervisors rather than commitment to organisations. Supervisors play a crucial role in the perceptions employees form about the organization's supportiveness and the extent to which it can be trusted to look after their interests. According to the author, high quality managers are one of the principal factors in retaining high quality employees, hence the need for organisations to ensure that they select, train, evaluate, and reward managers for trustworthy behaviour. Effective managers inspire loyalty, trust and admiration.

There are numerous studies on both the antecedents and the outcome of organizational commitment and both of these variables offer highly desired information to managers, and others studying organizational behaviour (Schultz),

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

Mowday et al., (1982)[27], Steers (1977)[231], all investigated the role of personal characteristics and found that the characteristics and experiences that a person brings to an organization can predict their commitment to the organization. Allen & Meyer , 1993, Buchanan, 1974, and Hall et al., (1977)[1] have found there to be a positive relationship to between an employee's age and time with the organization and their level of commitment. Studies have also found that employee traits such as leadership and communication styles have an effect on organisational commitment (Decottis & Summers , 1987)[235]. Florkowsi and Schuster, 1992[20], found a positive relationship between profit sharing and job satisfaction and commitment. Meyer and Allen (1987)[225] recognize that in order for there to be continuance commitment between the employee and organization, the employee must be able identify alternatives.

Van Dyne and Graham (1994)[35] contend that various personal, situational and positional factors can affect the commitment of employees and consequently their attitudes and behaviour.

Specifically, they examined internalization, compliance, and identification in two different models. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986)[29] also found organizational identification (and internalization and compliance) has a positive significant relationship with commitment. Brown (1996)[2] discussed antecedent factors to include work experiences, role factors, and organizational and personal factors. Brown, Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972)[2] found that commitment differentially related to such personal variables as sex, marital status and father's occupation; the results of multivariate analyses show the primary importance of role – related factors in explaining organizational commitment.

Steers (1977)[231] was cited by Mowday (1979)[27] to have examined the extent to which commitment was related to personal, work, role and organizational characteristics and individual level outcome variables, including absenteeism, turnover, and job performance.

The affective commitment scale developed was a significant improvement over the OCQ and was able to assess commitment which was exemplified by positive emotions of identifying with the work organization. It was designed to assess the extent to which an employee presents the desire to remain a member of an organization due to an emotional attachment to, and involvement with that organization. Meyer and Allen also argued that the Continuance commitment scale thus put forth would be able to enhance the representation of Becker‟s side-bet approach. This scale was designed to assess the extent to which an employee desires to remain a member of the organization because of the awareness regarding the costs associated with leaving it. Subsequently in the year 1990, Meyer & Allen proposed the third dimension of Organizational Commitment scale, namely, Normative Commitment. Normative commitment stems from the desire to remain a member of the organization due to a feeling of obligation, which includes a sense of debt owed to a superior, a co-worker or the company on the whole.

Becker defined commitment as a consistent line of activity of maintaining membership in the organization and attempted to explain what caused this consistency. Therefore, Becker's view of commitment was more congruent with the behavioural rather than attitudinal approach of Porter and his colleagues. (Ko et al., 1997, p. 970)[30].

IV. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to review the research on the relation of the CSR and Organisational Commitment. From the literature it is clearly found that CSR has developed over years and has gained very prominence in academic literature and business community in many years. In the recent years it is practised in the organisation because businesses are increasingly aware of the role they should perform in the society, in addition to pursue profits. Many studies and research have come across in this field to fulfilling social responsibilities. Organisational commitment is linked with Corporate social responsibility. From the Literature , researchers involved in the studies above have discussed employee commitment to change from different theoretical perspectives related to their own individual studies.

References

[1] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to The Organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1−18.

[2] Brown, R. B. (1996). Organisational commitment: Clarifying the concept and simplifying the existing construct typology. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 49, 230 – 251

[3] Bowen, H. R. (1953). Social responsibilities of the businessman. University of Iowa Press.

[4] Burke, L., & Logsdon, J. M. (1996). How corporate social responsibility pays off. Long Range Planning, 29(4), 495–502.

[5] Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes On The Concept Of Commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32−40.

[6] Bolon, D. S. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Among Hospital Employees A multidimensional analysis involving job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Hospital & Health Services Administration, 42, 2, 221 – 241.

[7] Bragg, T., 2002.Improve Employee Commitment. Industrial Management,7(8): 18-20

DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196

[8] Chaffee, E. C. (2017). The origins of corporate social responsibility. University of Cincinnati Law Review, 85, 347–373.

[9] Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. Academy of management review, 4(4), 497–505.

[10] Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. Business Horizons, 34(4), 39–48.

[11] Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility. Business & Society, 38(3), 268–295.

[12] Carroll, A. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. Organizational Dynamics, 44(2), 87–96.

[13] Chandler, D., & Werther, W. B. (2013). Strategic corporate social responsibility: stakeholders, globalization, and sustainable value creation (3rd ed.). United States of America: SAGE Publications.

[14] Cochran, P. L., & Wood, R. A. (1984). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance. The Academy of Management Journal, 27(1), 42–56.

[15] Cohen, A. (2003). Multiple Commitments In The Workplace: An Integrative Approach. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[16] Coetzee, M. (2005). The fairness of affirmative action: an organizational justice perspective. Published D. Comm thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

[17] Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? California Management Review, 2(3), 70–76.

[18] Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. Academy of Management Journal, 16(2), 312–322.

[19] Frederick, W. C. (1960). The growing concern over business responsibility. California Management Review, 2(4), 54–61.

[20] Florkowski, G & Schuster, M. (1992) “Support for profit sharing and organizational commitment: A path analysis”. Human Relations, 45, 5, 507-523.

[21] Glisson, C. and M. Durick. (1988). “Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations,” Administrative Science Quarterly, 33, 61 – 81.

[22] Heald, M. (1970). The social responsibilities of business: company and community 1900–1960. United States of America: Pr. of Case Western Reserve Univ.

[23] Jones, T. M. (1980). Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. California Management Review, 22(3), 59–67.

[24] Lee, M.-D. P. (2008). A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead. International Journal of Management Reviews, 10(1), 53–73.

[25] Lantos, G. P. (2001). The boundaries of strategic corporate social responsibility. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 18(7), 595–632.

[26] McGuire, J. W. (1963). Business and society. New York: McGraw-hill. Waterhouse, B. C. (2017). The personal, the political and the profitable: Business and protest culture, 1960s-1980s. Financial History, Spring, 2017, 14–17.

[27] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. M., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-Organizational Linkage. New York: Academic Press.

[28] Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychology Bulletin, 108: 171 – 194.

[29] O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 492−499

[30] Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction And Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology,59, 603−609

[31] Rhodes, S. and Steers, R. (1981), "A Systematic Approach to Diagnosing Employee Absenteeism", Employee Relations, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 17-22

[32] Reichers, A. E. : 1986, Conflicts and Organizational Commitments’, Journal of Applied Psychology 71(2), 508-514. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.508.

[33] Strand, R. (1983). A systems paradigm of organizational adaptations to the social environment. Academy of management review, 8(1), 90–96.

[34] Scholl, R. W.)1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. Academy of management Review, 6, 589 – 599.

[35] Van Dyne, L. & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behaviour of contingent workers in Singapore. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 6, 692 – 703

[36] Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. The Academy of Management Review, 16(4), 691–718.

[37] Wiener, Y.: 1982, ÔCommitment in Organizations: A Normative ViewÕ,Academy of Management Review 7,418–428

[38] Wiener, Y.: 1982, ÔCommitment in Organizations:A Normative ViewÕ,Academy of Management Review 7,418–428

[39] Wiener, Y. (1982). “Commitment in organizations: A normative view”. Academy of Management Review, 7: 418–428.

 DOI : 10.35291/2454-9150.2021.0196