"Literature Review: Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement."

Mr. Ravi Rajore Assoc CIPD, Human Resource and Corporate Social Responsibility practitioner, 174 B Dartmouth Road Sydenhams, London. ravi.rajore@gmail.com

Corporate Social Responsibility: Internationally, Corporate Social Responsibility is becoming a heated topic of debate and drawing attention of intergovernmental establishments. It has a crucial and strategic importance in globalised business environment, academicians and developmental agencies are highly criticizing the concept of CSR, believing that the concept has been manipulated by multinational corporations and abused to enhance profitability. European Commission articulates Corporate Social Responsibility as *"concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis."* The corporate Social Responsibility does not mean to fulfill regulatory obligations but to go beyond that. As per McWilliams and Siegel (2001) CSR is just not to abide with the regulatory framework to appease government as a stakeholder but it's a notion to make a volunteer effort to fetch benefits to society beyond legal obligations and firms interest. Up to great extent corporations are expected to be accountable for social welfare, in the favor of society corporations need to fulfill four crucial responsibilities that are philanthropic, legal, ethical and economic, Carroll (2000).

The authors like Maignan and Ralston (2002) perceive corporate social responsibility as a process of strengthening the organization's principles and commitment of valuing its stakeholders and to enhancing social performance. It offers potential solutions to the sensitive issues pertaining to customer, government, community, supplier, environment and employees. Corporate Social Responsibility essentially needs to be integral to strategy of multinational corporations in order to bring effectiveness in stakeholder management system and to value its crucial stakeholders. It has a substantial power to influence the process, structure and culture of the organization. Maignan and Ralston (2002) explicate that the corporate social responsibility does not mean only the notion of being responsible to fulfill the business obligations but it's also meant to be responsive to stakeholders. Similarly in the context of stakeholders

significance Weddock's (2004) stated that corporate citizenship should be evidenced in the business practices and strategies a company formulates in order to functionally its relationship with the environment and other stakeholders.

Possessing larger perspective, Bloom and Gundlach (2001) emphasis on balanced stakeholder management, In the eyes of the corporation all stakeholders should be crucial and obliged equal, they argued that compliance with the law and follow regulatory framework is not sufficient but corporate must go beyond that in order to treat all stakeholders equally. Bloom and Gudlach challenge organizations to move out of their comfort zone to fulfill social responsibility effectively and efficiently. They insist, corporations need to realize that obeying regulatory framework is to satisfy only government as a stakeholder but other stakeholders are also equally crucial, they are also getting influenced by the corporate actions. The notion of keeping wider perspective and holistic approach is to minimize negative impact on society and maximize the organization's contribution to society in the long haul. Thomas Clarke (2007) as per World Bank, *Corporate social responsibility is at heart a process of managing the cost and benefit of business activities to both internal and external stakeholders. Setting the boundaries of how those coast and benefit are managed are partly a question of business policy and strategy and partly a question of public governance.*

Leslie Sklair and David Miller (2010) corporate social responsibility has been defined in several ways but the central ideas refers to organizational commitment to ethical principles and behavior pertaining to environmental sustainability and social justice. As per *human right Dame Anita Roddick*(2006) without including economic, human rights, social justice, worker justice and environment shaping CSR would be a futile exercise. In present scenario, CSR has been hijacked by multinational corporations to derive huge profits. Recently, John Ruggie UN special representative has made remarkable contribution in reducing human rights abuse involve in business by the proposing guiding principleof business and human rights. These principles have been endorsed by the United Nations Human Right Council and lay down the foundation of "protect, respect, remedy" framework. The proposed framework articulates that state primary duty is to protect against human rights abuses. The corporate crucial responsibility is to respect human rights. Effective remedies are required for dupe of human rights abuses. This framework incorporates human right and considered as effective and significant move in the further development of corporate social responsibility regulatory

framework. As per this regulatory guidelines and framework corporations across the globe are expected to absorb human rights in this policy, human right due diligence mechanism to verify non-infringement, assessing and accounting on human rights abidance, ability and initiative to address human rights abuse, John Ruggie (2008).

The application of corporate social responsibility has been widely seen in multinational corporations especially in developing countries where the labor and other standards are poorly implemented in comparison with developed countries. The multinational corporations have a wide market presence; they are more concerned about increased risk in terms of brand image, if their operations seem to be unacceptable either culturally or legally it may depreciate their moral capital, the ramifications of such damages are far reaching which can potentially influence business operations in other territories. In developing countries foreign multinational companies are highly active in managing large scale CSR initiatives whereas small and medium enterprises shows little interest and less willing to make social investment. The CSR structure of multinational corporations is highly external stakeholder centric, internal stakeholders like employees are sidelined. It's ironic, in most of the multinational corporations CSR policies and reports, references of a trade union and employees are rarely seen. It clearly reveals deficiency in CSR culture, the issues pertaining to labor standards and employment relations are overlooked and working people are not given adequate opportunity to improve their conditions. It poses questions on the effectiveness of CSR and willingness of organizations to embrace CSR in true sense.

The mechanism of CSR has been highly debated internationally, in most of the cases multinational corporation has their own CSR principle accordingly they formulate and design policy, structure, initiatives and programs. Largely such corporations are highly influenced by unilateralism; these companies define their own code of conduct, articulate the statement which reflects their core principles and commitment. Numerous corporations having their own code and entirely managed on their own, due to its unilateral nature they are unable to gain strong support.

In the context of labor, the three key issues determine the credibleness of CSR mechanism. Primarily, the eight core labor standard defined by International labor organizations should be reflected in CSR mechanism and its commitment. As per research conducted by the International labor organization on company code and policy (targeted 300 companies) they

found that only 10 percent organizations absorbed 8 core conventions introduced by ILO, 90 percent of the company's code of conducts hardly mentioned labor standards, Roper et al (2010). Secondarily, the CSR mechanisms are underutilized by the organizations; many organizations are not aware and well equipped with the specialized knowledge about human rights and the United Nations. In several cases, the CSR policies and codes adopted by organizations are underutilized and not clearly understood by its employees, management and involved agencies like trade union. In order to make it efficient, the CSR commitment should be articulated clearly, information should be supplied to at all levels so that policies can be followed conveniently. The third issue revolves around the audit, monitoring and evaluation of the mechanism and its commitment. Here, the main argument is, up to what extent organizations are allowed to monitor their own practices and up to what level interference of trade union should be entertained. Alternatively, numerous NGOs and independent auditing companies offer effective audit and monitoring services. These issues have been highly debated in the past few years, with a concern about the usage of indicators to gauge social responsibility.

Sustainable Development: The construct of sustainable development largely interwoven with the corporate social responsibility, it has been highly discussed in business and society literatures. The environment has been a focal point of the sustainable development, the concept of the sustainable development came into light through *The Brundtland Report*. As per *The Brundtland Report* Sustainable development has been interpreted as *"development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"*, here the emphasis has been given on judicious consumption of scarce resources as well as regeneration so that upcoming generations also get benefit of it in order to sustain. Sustainable development process catalyzes the human development process in compressive, united, justified, responsible and secure mode Gladwin et al (1995).

The sustainable development emphasis on Environmental, Economical and Social concern of society, the outcome of the United Nations 2005 summit refers that economic development, environmental protection and social development are crucial pillars of sustainable development and it has a high level of interdependency. In other hand, Temple argues that Sustainability has become a confusing term and overly used in many situations and contexts like sustainable

growth, sustainable corporate, sustainable development, sustainable economies, sustainable agriculture, and sustainable societies. Everything is sustainable.

Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Resource Management: Corporate Social Responsibility can be fulfilled effectively in combination with human resource management and development. Human Resource Management is extremely anticipated to play facilitative role in enhancing the effectiveness of ethics, sustainability and corporate social responsibility in organization. Corporate social responsibility and sustainability is emerging concept, organizations are required to sensitize and educate their employees about this emerging knowledge and issues related to it. Garavan and McGuire (2010) articulate it has great capability to create positive attitude and awareness among employees towards climate change, environmental issues and sustainability. It can substantially nurture CSR ethics and culture that hugs sustainability and absorb green work practices. The employees are considered as crucial agents who nurture the culture of an organization by taking socially responsible actions and decision. Suparn Sharma et al (2009) highlight the employee's strategic location in the context of developing and cultivating a culture that supports CSR and strengthens its commitment and competencies. They throw light on the significance of human resource management professional in corporate social responsibility and demand their substantial contribution to achieve goals of corporate social responsibility.

Redington (2005) with the help of twelve case studies, while underlining the HR professionals' key role in managing the changes required for CSR activities to succeed, stated that employees are the most neglected though most important stakeholder of the organization for conducting CSR activities. Employees are one of the most crucial stakeholders of the organization but more often they are given less importance in corporate social responsibility strategy, they are not highly empowered and educated to make meaningful contributions in Corporate Social Responsibility. Mees& Bonham (2004) opinioned that CSR has become a public relation activity, it has been unsuccessful to make a real sense out of it due to low employee engagement. The organizations and its employees have been failed to facilitate a culture that engraft socially responsible values.

Gradually with slow pace, multinational corporations showing keen interest in embedding the CSR ethics in the crucial human resource function like recruitment, training and development, encouraging the gains of operating within the value grounded culture. Employees are encouraged to involve with the community and participate in Employee volunteering program

so that company's values can be articulated and communicated by them to society, they often play the role of evangelist, penetrate community to create win-win situation for both organization and the community.

Stakeholder Theory: The stakeholders are the foundation pillars of the firm; it has substantial power to influence the organizational performance. The stakeholders play crucial role in the business environment; they are directly or indirectly linked with the micro and macro environment of the business. The term stakeholder has been introduced by the Stanford Research Institute's Long Range Planning Service in 1963. Later on in 1984 Freeman introduced the stakeholder theory, which accentuates on the significance of the stakeholders. He argued that stakeholders have huge potential to influence business performance; he suggests that business operations and activities should be stakeholder centric. According to Ashly H. Pinnington *et el* (2007) it's a concept that define those groups and institutions who brings an organization into existence and lay down its foundation. These groups involve financial institutions, shareholders, employees, supplier, community and customers. Inefficient stakeholder management may lead to adverse circumstances, it may affect the business environment of the organization and turn it hostile. As per Stakeholder theory, stakeholders are the diverse groups keeping deep interest in the organization and having their own reasonable needs and expectations.

Employee as a crucial Stakeholder: As per Donaldson & Preston (1995) the company and its stakeholders both keep interest in each other, the crucial stakeholders could be customer, communities, investors, employees, suppliers, government, tread associations and political parties. In recent times organizations have recognized the importance of the stakeholders and its relevance to human resource practices. Schuler and Jackson (2006) have argued that Human Resource is increasingly called on to create win-win outcomes for organizational stakeholders. These stakeholders include shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, the community, and the wider environment.

Matten and Crane (2003) focuses on employees and their role in organization as a crucial stakeholder, employees suppose to be well recognized among all stakeholder groups because they are well incorporated with the organization and having a crucial role in sustenance. No

organization can move an inch without man power, employees constitute the organization, act in the name of firm and contribute to organization as crucial resource and they deal with the other stakeholders on the behalf of the organization. Employees are substantially committed to organization and invest their crucial time by taking an assignment which may require relocation, a change in social life and environment. In addition Matten and Crane (2003) explains employees may choose to work and get associated with an organization that strengthens their social relationship, create self identity and help them in achieving self actualization. As per organization perspective, the employees have substantial influence over the firm and considered as a highly prominent, they may be a proprietor, a part of the community and a member of a union. In Organization individuals from different cultural & ethnic background with different mental & physical abilities and limitations are employed for the different task and assignments. Such individuals may possess different interest in the organization.

As per Greenwood opinion employees can be perceived as a basal stakeholder group, they can be identified as prominent stakeholder to whom organizations are liable to pay complete duty, it reflects that they are holding great power and potential to influence the organization legitimately. McWilliams and Siegel (2001) state that employees as stakeholders reinforce the requirement for corporate social responsibility, they demand for favorable labor relation policy framework that ensure financial security, safety measures at work place, work place amenities and fringe benefits like childcare etc. The workers lie at the lower bottom of the pyramid has growing expectation from management and influential managers.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The construct of organizational citizenship behavior has been introduced by Dennis Organ. The concept has great relevance in bettering overall organizational effectiveness and typical employee behavior which has great influence on organization work culture. *" organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) to denote those organizationally beneficial behaviors and gesture that can enforced on the basis of formal role obligations non elicited by contractual guarantee recompense. OCB consist of informal contribution that participant can chose to proffer or withhold without regard to considerations of sanction or formal incentive"* Organ (1988). In action, Organizational Citizenship Behavior can be interpreted as helping colleagues with workplace related problems, not being over complaining to small workplace issues, behaving politely to colleagues, act as an evangelist.

Organ further explains that OCB as the individual behavior that enhances efficiency and promotes organizational effectiveness that is generally not recognized by formal rewards system.

The employees exhibit behavior which favorable to organizations, they take initiative to solve organizational or departmental problems without expecting surplus reward and appreciation. The Organizational Citizenship Behavior construct overlap the two other concepts which are Prosocial Organizational Behavior and Organizational Commitment. The preschool organizational behavior *is defined as any behavior enacted in an organizational context that attempts to improve the welfare of the person or persons to whom the behavior is directed.* The concept has wide perspective, it has been considered as an attempt to fetch benefit to community, society or intent to do welfare of the profession by disclosing organization misconduct. In other hand, the construct of organizational commitment is defined as inclination to make extra considerable effort in the interest of the organization. Furthermore, it has been perceived as attachment to an organization, especially such attachment established on the recognition with firm or incorporation of its long-lasting value. The contribution and behavior elicited under the influence of such attachment with firm are close to organizational citizenship behavior.

The corporation highly appreciates above mentioned behavioral traits because it fetches multiple benefits without extra cost. In current scenario, due to the absence of such behavior it's becoming challenging for organizations to retain crucial talent; organizations are spending enormous resources to motivate and engage their employees.

Employee Engagement: Employee engagement has become a popular term among the practitioners, consultants and academicians. The word Employee Engagement its self explicate its meaning, it's about commitment, involvement and dedication towards the organization. Foremost, the concept of Work related engagement had been theorized by Khan in 1990, the author describes engaged employees as *"being fully physically, cognitively and emotionally connected with their work roles".*

Macey et al (2009) defines employee engagement as purposefulness in an individual with focused and well channelized energy that demonstrate adaptability, tenaciousness and traits of

self initiation and motivation to achieve organizational goals. Engaged employees are empowered employees, more often they align their goals with the organizational goals, channelize their energy and efforts to chase organizational goals, they take initiatives and calculated risks at times, willingly move out of their comfort zone to deliver stupendous performance in order to achieve organizational goals. Employee Engagement has been seen as high level of internal motivation and enthusiasm towards work and organization. In high level of engagement state, employees keeps positive state of mind towards their work which makes them more loyal, vigorous and motivated. This state of mind enables employees to take challenging assignments; it propels them to thrash hurdles on the way to achieve organizational goals and in result they deliver a high level of efficiency.

The construct of employee engagement overlap management approaches like commitment, 'organizational citizenship behavior', job involvement and satisfaction. The Institute of employment studies suggests that engaged employees are deeply involved in their job and derive satisfaction, demonstrate extraordinary commitment, they take initiative to perform challenging task and reflect a high degree of empowerment. Job satisfaction is integral to employee engagement; experts believe that the concept of engagement has wider perspective; job satisfaction is only a component of employee engagement, it majorly falls in the purview of employee engagement. As per W.H. Macey and B. Schneider (2008) engagement is far beyond the ordinary satisfaction derived from the employment and satisfactory level of loyalty to the organization. It would not be appropriate to measure employee engagement in a traditional way as organization measure job satisfaction. In contrast to job satisfaction, engagement is about enthusiasm and deep allegiance. It's voluntarily and additional investment of efforts to make an organization succeed.

According to Robinson, D., Perryman S. & Hayday S. (2004) highlights the attitudinal traits of engaging employees. Engaged employees keep a positive outlook about the organization's core values. They are often pretty well aware about the business environment, keeps smooth alignment with colleagues to enhance performance in the assigned job for the betterment of the organization. On the other hand, organizations are also responsible to nurture and cultivate engagement because it's a two way relationship and crucial for both employee and employer. Creating engaged workforce has always been challenging task for the organizations especially in the war for talent. In order to achieve a high level of engagement, employer and employee

share mutual responsibility, liability and obligations towards each other. The employee engagement experts David McLoyed and Nita Clarke (2009) consider integrity as a crucial driver of engagement. *"Most organisations have espoused values and all have behavioral norms. Where there is a gap between the two, the size of the gap is reflected in the degree of distrust within the organisation; if the gap is closed, high levels of trust usually result. If an employee sees the stated values of an organisation being lived by the leadership and colleagues, a sense of trust in the organisation is more likely to be developed, and this constitutes a powerful enabler of engagement".* The organizational ethical values have great significance in defining and controlling employee behavior and work culture, it influences the level of employee engagement at the core. In larger perspective the corporate social responsibility framework demonstrates application of the ethical values of the organization. It throws deep impact on the employee engagement; the investment in community and corporate social responsibility programs not only reveals the firm's ethical nature and behavior but it also reflects societal concern. A study conducted by IPSOS Mori in November 2006 reveals that employee engagement can be drastically influenced positively by aligning employee ethics and corporate values. Moreover, the study suggests that strong Corporate Social Responsibility policies provide an edge to organization to recruit and retain good employees.

An international CSR study of human resource practitioners conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) in 2006 *reveals that CSR practices are seen as important to employee morale (50%), loyalty (41%), retention (29%), recruitment of top employees (25%) and productivity (12%). (Figure reflects Canadian feedback).* Globally, corporations are recognizing the importance of CSR in retaining, motivating and developing work force. Human Resource leaders are hiring personnel who value sustainability and embody these values; they are formulating and executing incentive system that evidences sustainability. The conference board research reflects that 50 percent of the global managers want their organizations to consider corporate social responsibility in the category of performance evaluation. In addition 68 percent respondent mentioned that it's "increasingly important" to link performance appraisal and corporate citizenship (Lockwood, 2004). According to a survey conducted by Leap CR among 1007 UK employees, it has been found that 57 percent employees expect their companies to get engaged more in CSR initiatives, 49 percent employees willing to associate with an employer that encourages its employees to get indulged in fund raising and charity work, David Woods (2011).

Corporate Social Responsibility Culture: Ethics and values determine behavior and culture of an individual or Organization, it has considerable potential to influence the success and failure of the business. As a part of the society every individual is required to full fill the societal norms and moral values in similar manner organizations are also required to act in a socially acceptable way. Anne Barraquier (2011) foregrounds the opinion of various authors, he argues that ethics and values are substantially crucial to improve organizational financial performance, it helps to construct fair brand image to fetch enormous benefits in terms of minimizing social cost, attracting and retaining young talent in order to achieve the ultimate goal of the organizations. In contrary, inconsistent ethical values and behavior influence the organizational growth and performs negatively in the long haul.

Jones T (1995) stupendously criticizes the notion of corporate social responsibility and put forward radical perspective, he potently argued that organizations use ethics and corporate social responsibility practices as a tool to seek out economic objectives. Moreover he mentioned that several studies are evident that these tools have a great capacity to reduce social costs. Anne Barraquier (2011) put forth the views of few renowned authors which state that financial performance and corporate social responsibility has positive linkages. It throws deep impact on the firm's brand image in a positive way and organization's capacity to attract, retain and manage talent effectively. Whereas ineffective ethic policy and unethical business practices does not pay in the long run.

Numerous studies and empirical evidence reveal that *"good ethics is good business"* in the long haul. As per Forbs (2011) "***94 percent of consumers want companies to evolve their business practices*** *to make as positive an impact as possible"*. **Corporate responsibility need to emerge as a gist of cultural ethos.** Primarily, ethical and moral behavior lay down the foundation of trust and built organizations good will not only in a particular industry but in the community as well, it appeals employees, customers, suppliers and distributors.Secondary, responsibly ethical actions reduce the cost of penalties and litigations; it defends organizations from negative publicity and conspiracies especially with today's quick responding media and global communication. The organizations need to be ethically firm and only profit should not be the only motive behind the business. "*Ethics deals with moral standards that override self*

interest. Sometime actions need to be taken because they are right not because they are profitable" Geoffery P. Lantos (2001)

In the contemporary scenario Multinational Corporation's behavior has been controlled by the instruments and regulatory framework. Throughout the world organizations are expected to follow the code of ethics, in a few countries its compulsory to follow such norms if they wish to be a public company and willing to get listed in the stock exchange. Simon Webley and Andrea Werner (2008) argue that it's crucial and necessary to have ethics policies but alone code of ethics is not enough to influence employee behavior and attitude. Furthermore they explain that having a robust ethical policy does not mean acting ethically; there is a huge gap between implementation and intentions. Employees of the organizations, especially leaders and top management need to embrace values and ethics of the organizations which prevails potentially robust ethical culture.

Perceptions and actions of senior leaders foster the ethical culture of organization; it has substantial influence on outcomes. ERC (2009) Great emphasis has been given on the senior or top management leaders to facilitate firm ethical culture; they have huge potential to inculcate strong values which develop influential ethical conduct among the employees. The senior leaders are the source of inspiration to the middle management and young professionals and they are very crucial link especially in transmitting organizational value and culture. The significance of ethics has been recognized in the process of decision making mainly at strategic level, The decisions of the organizations revels the philosophy and ethical values of the organization, the effects of the decision can be predicted, it lucidly revels the intentions and priorities of the organization. The report presented by Ethics Resource Center (2009) says the firm ethical culture keeps employee engaged, motivated and committed to organization, it guards organizations from the misconduct and makes it less vulnerable, reduces the risks involved pertaining sensitive and unresolved ethical issues. Ethical culture has been crucial in creating engaged work force, it has been effective in terms of trust building and enhances employee commitment towards organization and stakeholders as well. It makes the organization more responsible towards it stakeholders which definitely reduced the chances of wrong doing and ethical misconduct. The ethical culture can be promoted in the organization by implementing program and making employees aware about the corporate responsibility towards stakeholders and ethical code of conducts pertaining to their job roles.

The positive implications of robust work ethics are far reaching, it fetches gains to organization in numerous ways that provides sustainability in the long haul. Brenda and Dinah (2002), Highlights the findings of walker information survey 1997 that reflects 42 percent employees admitted that organizations ethical integrity would impact their choice of employer. 86 percent employees were profoundly committed to the organizations because they believe that organization has been holding positive and strong ethical values. In contrary the ramifications of piteous work ethics may hamper trust and commitment among stakeholders especially employees. Inconsistent ethical conduct, poor work ethics and values are the major hindrance in creating engaging work force. It leads to employee disengagement and reduce overall efficiency and performance of the organization. Richard Pech and Bert Slade (2006) discusses employee disengagement and bases Parr (1996) research that recalls sweatshop movement, he stated that poor employee work ethics would be a potential threat to the success of United States manufacturers.

This study revolves around the construct of Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement. The literature reveals deep linkages between the discussed concepts, here attention have been given on the corporate social responsibility and employee engagement. Corporate social responsibility has great relevance in developing organizational fair ethical value system and internalizing it both externally and internally whereas employee engagement is crucial to improve overall organizational effectiveness. The literature pertaining to corporate social responsibility reflects the significance of stakeholders especially employees but it has given least preference in comparison with stakeholders like customers, community and suppliers. The organizations Corporate Social Responsibility operations are keen on creating value to customer and community so it can build fair brand image in the community but negligible efforts have made to create value to employees as stakeholder. In practicality, organizations are less willing to involve and merge human resource and employees in strategic corporate social initiatives because it avail crucial power to them and strengthen them exceptionally. In other hand, organizations just want to exploit corporate social responsibility as external stakeholder centric activities to appease customer, community and government.

In the context of sustainability and corporate social responsibility, organizations perceive these conceptions in isolation and hardly make efforts to integrate it strategically. Sustainability

more often implemented with special focus on environment and climate change. Whereas corporate social responsibility has been implemented externally as a developmental project with special focus on customer and community, as a marketing stunt to strengthen brand image. The irony is that human resource has a huge potential to avail strategic advantage to sustainability and corporate social responsibility but it has been overlooked and underestimated. Corporations show readiness to imbibe sustainability because its practically applicable, quantifiable, effectively monitored and controlled, most importantly it brings immediate financial benefits to corporations. When it comes to incentivized and linking sustainability and corporate social responsibility with performance, sustainability has its own strategic value due to its quantifiable nature and feasibility to link with performance in comparison with corporate social responsibility.

Many studies are evident, still in developing nations employees have been treated inappropriately and forced to perform their duties in poor working conditions, which is one of the root causes of poor work engagement that lucidly indicate poor ethical culture. The urgency and significance of the robust ethical values and integrity has been strongly recognized according to the corporate social responsibility perspective as well. In order to enhance organizational commitment mutual trust should coexist between employees and employer. Corporate Social Responsibility can be effectively used to persuade employees to follow work ethics firmly and foster strong value of integrity which can enhance employee engagement.

References:

1. Anne Barraquier (2011) Ethical Behavior in Practice: Decision outcome and Strategic Implications *British Journal of Management*, 22, pp.S28-S46.

2. *Berner (2005) Smarter corporate giving, BusinessWeek, 28 November, 68-76*; *CN* Smith (2003) Corporate social responsibility: whether or how?, *California Management Review*, 45(4), pp.52-76.

3. Bloom P.N and Gundlach G.T. (2001) *Handbook of Marketing and Society*. Sage Publication. Thousand Oks, CA.

4. Brenda E. Joyner and Dinah Payne (2002) Evolution and Implementation: A Study of Values, Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility, *Journal of Business Ethics,* 41: pp. 297–311.Dame Anita Roddick (2006) *Corporate Social Responsibility?*

Global Issues, Retrieved from: http://www.globalissues.org/video/733/anita-roddick-corporate-social-responsibility [accessed on 12/11/2011].

5. Bruce A.Thyer (2008) *The Handbook of Social Work Research Methods,* London SAGE publication.

6. Bryaman and Bell. (2007) *Business Research Methods.* Oxford; Oxford University Press.

7. Carroll A.B. (2000) The four faces of corporate citizenship, in recherdson, J.E. (Eds), *Business ethics 00/01*, Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, Guilford, CT, pp187-91.

8. Dame Anita Roddick (2006) *Corporate Social Responsibility?* Global Issues, Retrieved from:http://www.globalissues.org/video/733/anita-roddick-corporate-social-responsibility [accessed on 12/11/2011]

9. Devid Woods (2011) *CSR could be the key to boosting engagement and productivity, research suggests.* HR Magazine, Retrieved from: http://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/hro/news/1019386/csr-key-boosting-engagement-productivity-research-suggests [Accessed on 18/11/2011]

10. DevidMcloyed and Nita Clarke (2009) *Engaging for Success: enhancing performance through employee engagement*. London: Department of business innovation and skill.

11. Donaldson, T., & Preston, L.E. (1995) The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 20,* pp.65-91.

12. Dwight W. (2009) Corporate Social Responsibility: Challenges and Opportunities for Trade Unionists. *Corporate Codes of Conduct.* Paper 9.

13. Gladwin, T.N., Kennelly, J.J., & Krause, T. (1995) Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, *20,* pp.874-907.

14. G. Muruganantham (2010) Case study on Corporate Social Responsibility of MNC's in India, *International Trade & Academic Research Conference*, London.

15. Geoffery p. Lantos (2001) The boundaries of strategic corporate social responsibility, *Journal of consumer Marketing*, 18(7), pp.595-630.Geoffery P. Lantos (2001) The boundaries of strategic corporate social responsibility *Journal of consumer marketing* 18, pp.596- 630.

16. Hussey, J. and R. Hussey (1997) *Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*. London,

International Journal of Research in Management Science and Technology

Vol. I Issue. II, September 2013   ISSN: 2321-6174

17. John Ruggie (2008) *Protect, Respect and Remedy: a Framework for Business and Human Rights*. Human Right Council.

18. Kate Stahnke (2011) *Employee Engagement and Corporate Social Responsibility for Generation Twitter.* Forbs, Retrieved from: http://www.forbes.com/sites/causeintegration/2011/11/01/employee-engagement-and-corporate-social-responsibility-for-generation-twitter/ [Accessed on 12/11/2011].

19. Larsen and Toubro (2009) *Sustainability Report*, Retrieved from: http://www.lntecc.com/homepage/documents/SustainabilityReport_2009.pdf [Accessed on 18/09/2011]

20. Larsen and Toubro (2010) *Annual Review*. Retrieved from: http://www.larsentoubro.com/lntcorporate/common/Pdf/L&TAnnalReview-2009-10.pdf [Accessed on 18/09/2011]Lockwood, N. (2004) *Corporate Social Responsibility: HR's Leadership Role.* HR Magazine, Retrieved from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3495/is_12_49/ai_n8583189/?tag=content;col1 [Accessed on 18/10/2011]

21. Leslie Sklair and David Miller (2010) Capitalist globalization, corporate social responsibility and social policy *Critical Social Policy*, 30(4), pp.472–495.Lockwood, N. (2004). *Corporate Social Responsibility: HR's Leadership Role.* HR Magazine, Retrieved from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3495/is_12_49/ai_n8583189/?tag=content;col1 [18/10/2011]

22. Lockwood, N. (2004). *Corporate Social Responsibility: HR's Leadership Role.* HR Magazine, Retrieved from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3495/is_12_49/ai_n8583189/?tag=content;col1 [18/10/2011]

23. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008) The meaning of the employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1), pp.3–30.

24. Macmillan. McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001) Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 26,* pp.117-127.

25. Matten, D. and Crane, A. (2003) *Business Ethics: A European Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

26. National business ethic survey (2009) *Importance of ethical culture*. Arlington, Ethic Resource Center.

27. Neema Robin, Panwar Upendra Singh, (2013) "Organizational Culture: A study of Public Sector Bank in Indore Region." *Paradigm Shift in Innovative Business Management" pp* 654-658,

28. Organ D.W (1988) *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome,* Lexington MA: Lexington books.

29. Richard Pech, Bret Slade, (2006) *"Employee disengagement: is there evidence of a growing problem?"* Handbook of Business Strategy, 7(1), pp.21 – 25.

30. Robinson D, Perryman S & Hayday S. (2004) *The drivers of employee engagement.* IES Report 408.

31. Roper et al (2010) *Critical Issues in Human Resource Management.* London: CIPD.

32. Simon Webley and Andrea Werner (2008) Corporate code of ethics: necessary but not sufficient *Business Ethics: A European Review,* 17, pp.405-415.

33. Suparn Sharma, Joity Sharma, Arti Devi (2009) Corporate social responsibility: The key role of Human Resource Management. *Business Intelligence Journal 2,* pp.205-213.

34. Saunders M, Philip L, and Thornhill A. (2007) *Research Methods for Business Students.* 4th edition, England; Pearson Education limited.

35. Simon L. Albrecht (2010) *Handbook of employee Engagement: Perspective, Issues, Research and Practice.* Glasgow: Edward Elgar Publishing limited.

36. Sian Harrington (2008) *Corporate accountability - called to account.* HR Magazine, Retrieved from: http://www.hrmagazine.co.uk/hr/features/1014494/corporate-accountability-called-account [Accessed on 18/11/2011].

37. Thomas N. Garavan and David McGuire (2010) Human Resource Development and Society: Human Resource Development's Role in Embedding Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability, and Ethics in Organizations, *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 12: pp.487.

38. Ticehurst, G., W. and Veal, A., J. (2000) *Business research methods*. National Library of Australia; Pearson Education Pvt. Ltd.

39. Waddock, S.A. (2004) Parallel Universes: Companies, Academics, and the Progress of Corporate Citizenship. *Business and Society Review, 109*, pp.5-42.