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ABSTRACT

A growing number of studies has investigated the multiple dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR); however, very few have studied its effect on organizational commitment, especially in a country as Egypt. This research examines the relationship between employees’ perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and organizational commitment within a model that draws on Social Identity Theory (SIT).

The analysis is based on a sample of 326 employees from different companies in Egypt. The results emphasize that there is a positive correlation between employee’s perceptions of CSR importance and organizational commitment via a mediating factor, which is satisfaction with CSR activities and programs. It builds upon the SIT which explains the desire of employees to be identified with an entity they are proud of and perceive as a good corporate citizen. This research should act as a guideline for corporations to determine the significance of adding CSR in their mission and vision statements and work to live by these standards in order to maintain the organizational commitment of their respective employees.
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CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
**Introduction:**

With all the economic challenges Egypt is currently facing as a developing country, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) seems to be a survival tool for the country. CSR is not a community service; it is a strategy and a corporate way of thinking. Some corporations are now expanding their strategies beyond making profits and are considering the “doing well by doing good” approach. Several corporations implement those strategies by conducting philanthropic donations and/or projects in their communities. Others pay attention to their internal policies to make sure they are ethical and transparent employers. Another group goes even further by making sure their supply chain is an ethical corporate citizen aligned with the corporations’ ethical standards and strategies.

The extended literature on CSR provides various definitions of the concept (Carroll, 1979, 1991; Davis, 1960; Jones, 1980; McGuire, 1963). According to a well-known definition, the social responsibility of a business includes the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time (Carroll, 1979).

Since the 1980s, the number of empirical studies that have focused on the impacts of CSR has increasingly multiplied. Some of them have attempted to examine how CSR influences the overall organizational behavior and performance. These researches have been able to empirically study the relationship between how corporations act on one hand and their reputation, competitiveness, and sustainability on the other hand (Turker, 2008).
Other researchers have shed light on the effect of CSR on financial performance of corporations (Porter & Krammer, 2002). However, a limited number of researches have studied the relationship between CSR and employees (Turker, 2008).

The objective of this thesis is to examine the impact of CSR on employees’ organizational commitment towards their corporations in Egypt. Based on the framework of the Social Identity theory (SIT), this study follows the footsteps of Turker (2008) in his study titled How Corporate Social Responsibility Influences Organizational Commitment. A survey was disseminated to 326 employees in corporations that conduct CSR and corporations that do not in Egypt. The research findings aim to present corporations’ management to empirical data that suggests businesses best practices. Due to the fact that minimal research discusses the effect of CSR on organizational commitment, especially in Egypt, this study adds to the available literature through shedding light on a neglected topic in previous researches.
Social Identity Theory (SIT):

The social identity theory (SIT) was first introduced by Tajfel (1978, 1979) and was developed later by Tajfel and Turner (1979). As a social-psychological theory, it examines cognitions and human behavior with the help of group-processes. Research on SIT has been primarily driven by thoughts on social settings and group interactions (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In 1979, Tajfel assumed that in our attempt to achieve positive self-esteem and self-enhancement, we exhibit the “group behavior” such as the favoritism to our in-groups and discrimination to the out-groups as part of the social identity processes (Abrams & Hogg, 1988). This has led to subsequent empirical and theoretical research that explores identity and the identification process, in addition to the result and the products these lead to (Cornelissen, Haslam and Balmer, 2007).

The science of psychology tends to illustrate the Social Identity Theory (SIT) as the intention of people to categorize themselves into different social categories with which they are identified. It is within social psychology that the notion of social identity has developed from an awareness of the authenticity of a group and its own unique contribution to social cognition and behavior (Cornelissen et al., 2007). According to Micheal Hogg in the book, Contemporary Social Psychological Theories, “Social identity theory is a social psychological analysis of the role of self-conception in group membership, group processes, and intergroup relations,” (Burke, 2006). SIT explains the attitudes of people towards certain groups. It includes all aspects of self-perception elicited from the categories a person belongs to. “Social identity theory addresses
phenomena such as prejudice, discrimination, ethnocentrism, stereotyping, intergroup conflict, conformity, normative behavior, group polarization, crowd behavior, organizational behavior, leadership, deviance, and group cohesiveness” (Burke, 2006). All of these categories contribute to the manifestation of a person’s self-image and the way they present themselves in their societies.

Individuals seek positive social identity in order to establish their own distinctive personality and attain a personal satisfaction. Tajfel and Turner explained that having being categorized within a group membership and defined themselves within this social categorization, human beings tend to seek distinctiveness by finding positive dimensions whereby their ingroup is more superior than other outgroups (1979). In another study, Hewstone and Jaspars have explained how individuals strive to identify with a positive social identity to establish “psychological distinctiveness.” Hence, the status of a certain group can directly impact the self-description of its members (Turker, 2008). This means that when people define themselves as “we”—social identity—instead of “I,”—personal identity,—they look forward for “us” to become more prominent and distinctive than “them.”
Organizational Identity:

Organizational identity is, in fact, a specific form of social identity. “Organizations are internally structured groups that are located in complex networks of intergroup relations characterized by power, status, and prestige differentials,” (Hogg & Terry, 2000). People gain their sense of self-esteem and self identification from the organizations they work for. According to Hogg and Terry, for many individuals, their professional affiliations can be more pervasive and significant than other identities such as age, race, gender, or even nationality.

Organizational identification has been considered, in many of the literature on organizations, as an indispensible construct impacting the satisfaction of the employee and the effectiveness of the organization on both levels (Bown, 169). Defined as the perception of “oneness with an organization”, organizational identification is a key tool that employees use to define their existence with reference to their organizations (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). According to Ashforth and Mael, employees who can identify with their organizations are expected to exhibit empathetic behavior towards them. Moreover, these employees are expected to make decisions that are aligned with the company’s strategic objectives (Simon, 1997)

Belonging to an organization might provide an answer to the everlasting question, who am I? Since business organizations can be perceived as a social categorization, it is; therefore, argued that organizational identification is a specific grouping of social identification. Employees tend to relate their organizations success as their own and take pride in belonging to such entity with a proven track record. In this sense, SIT, recognized to restore coherence to organizational identification, can even offer successful applications to develop organizational behaviors (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).
Relevance to the study:

In that respect, SIT tends to explain the relationship between CSR and employees’ attitude towards their employer. According to the literature, a corporation is perceived as an important dimension of a person’s identity as well as a social categorization to which a person belongs. “The individual feels that his or her contribution to society has a smaller impact compared with the social contribution that the organization can make, and so the employee’s wish to make a social contribution is fulfilled through the organization. Thus, the employee’s identification with the organization is commensurate with his or her feeling that the organization is a good citizen, (Rodrigo & Arenas, 2008). Organizational identification becomes an indispensable element for employees’ self description affecting employee’s satisfaction and organization effectiveness (Hall, Schneider, and Nygren, 1970). Employees react to their organizational success as their own. They relate to the organization’s growth and are affected by its status in the market. Strength and position are derived from their employer and impact them negatively or positively.

Applying CSR practices and being a socially responsible corporate citizen echoes a positive distinctiveness in the ethical side of the organization. In accordance with SIT, if an employee appreciates his socially responsible organization, his work attitude and organizational commitment will be positively affected (Turker, 2008). The higher levels of CSR an organization exhibits, the higher possibility of employees’ belongingness needs are reached. As Rupp explains, “Any CSR effort is likely to foster certain relationships between the organization, its employees, and the various members of society, while the quality of those relationships may depend on how well employees
understand and agree with the rationale behind their organization’s CSR-related decisions,” (Rupp et. al., 2006). Moreover, according to the theory, it can be concluded that if an employee is developing strong feelings of pride towards his socially responsible organization, it is expected that his work attitude and behavior will be positively impacted (Turker, 2008).

As Mowday et al. put it; employees’ organizational commitment toward their organization is the psychological identification that they develop toward their employing organization (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982). This organizational commitment is a reflection of an employee’s relations with his organization and has direct influence on the decision of maintaining the employee’s organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In every organization, employees join with a set of qualifications, skills, and capabilities and they expect their organizations to provide them with development opportunities to pave their career path. When organizations succeed in providing such needs, the employee’s organizational commitment increases towards their employer.
CHAPTER II:

LITERATURE REVIEW
**Introduction:**

Businesses are organizations operating within societies. These organizations are expected not to be harmful nor exploiters of their societies since they are an integral part of them. The ultimate objective is to positively contribute to the society which allows it to function and use its resources to prosper, and eventually achieve revenues (Fort, 1996). Organizations used to be perceived as mere financial institutions (Friedman, 1970); however, this perception has been extended to include the social liabilities of organizations towards their societies. Accordingly, the CSR role has expanded and companies are now supposed to lead their business activities while maintaining their social obligations towards the public. There have been a number of studies supporting the idea that companies tend to benefit when they respect their social obligations (Drumwright & Braig, 2004).

Businesses can contribute to the welfare of their communities in multiples ways such as offering products and services to satisfy needs as well as providing wealth in a manner that respects the dignity of humans and maintains their basic rights. In addition, it supports the well-being of individuals in an efficient, just, and serene conduct; whether anytime soon or in the future. One of the ways businesses achieve such goals is by adopting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practices, which is a commitment taken by corporations before their stakeholders to maintain good relations and to pay their dues to society.

Despite this, Corporate Social Responsibility is considered one of the most controversial topics for the largest part of the world. “Although much has been written
about Corporate Social Responsibility, the construct seems defined more by the
confusion surrounding it than the clarity that good constructs should bring to scientific
inquiry and practical behavior,” (Godfrey, Hatch, and Hansen, 2008). Many scholars
worldwide find it almost impossible to agree on CSR best practices. Some refer this back
to the difficulty in establishing a unified universal definition of the concept (Okoye,
2009). For some people, CSR is about legal accountabilities, while for others it is a
synonym for charitable efforts. Other people claim it is the socially responsible conduct
from an ethical stand; on the other hand, others believe that it is a commitment from
businesses rather than citizens (Votaw, 1972). In spite of this, CSR remains one of the
most eminent topics from corporate management’s point of view.

The term Corporate Social Responsibility has been commonly linked with the
act of charity, the emotional and financial giving to the less fortunate society members.
However, a deep investigation would reveal that although sharing the common aim of
social welfare, the terms Charity and CSR are inherently different. Many scholars use the
CSR term to describe any charity activity that is related, one way or another, to the act of
giving, whether financially or emotionally, to those who are less fortunate. However,
CSR is not a synonym of charity. CSR is about exhibiting goodwill, it highlights the
corporation’s efforts to strongly signal its transparency, integrity, responsible
development, and enhanced communication to its various stakeholders. According to
Moses Pava (2008) in his article, Why Corporations Should Not Abandon Social
Responsibility, “in providing a language and vocabulary to critique business from both
inside and outside its boundaries, it (CSR) has become a necessary condition for business
ethics and modern capitalism to flourish.”
CSR is a term that describes the relationship between a corporation or a business and its society. In another study by Rumsey and Whitehouse that examines corporate philanthropy, a constituent of CSR, from nonprofit executives’ point of view in the U.S., it was found that achieving business profits and demonstrating social responsibility complement each other for a true business growth. As per the study, the existence of CSR doesn’t obstruct the path of business to have its acceptable share of “self-interest” (Rumsey & Whitehouse, 2009). As noted by Porter and Kramer in their article which is entitled Challenging Assumptions, "every business has an impact on the communities in which it operates, and the business depends on a basic set of social conditions — an educated workforce, available natural resources, health care, good government. — in order to operate and compete" (qtd in Felipe & Prakhar). Porter and Kramer then concluded straightforwardly that "the economic and social welfare of the population is dependent on having companies that can sustain the local economy" (Felipe & Prakhar, 2005).

**Corporate Social Responsibility background and history:**

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), as a concept, enjoys a long and rich history. Although there is evidence of writings that goes back to centuries, proper formal writing about it could only be traced since the 20th century, specifically the past five decades (Garriga & Melé, 2004). This literature is scattered over different parts of the world. However, a substantial amount of it can be found in the United States where formal literature has been built up. According to Carroll, CSR as a topic of research has gone through five major stages, 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (1999).
Despite the existence of research on CSR before the 1950s, this era is considered the start of the “Modern Era” of CSR definitions (1999). During the 1930s, the CSR concept was first introduced as a concern of the management and its ability to take decisions beyond those that are just of the shareholders’ interest (Whitehouse, 2003). Prior to the 1950s, early literature of CSR used to refer to it as Social Responsibility (SR). After writing his book, Social Responsibilities of the Businessman, Howard R. Bowen became an inspiration to a sizable amount of scholars who succeeded him, especially after presenting the argument that SR is a vital fact that must exist in every business guidebook (Okoye, 2009; Garriga and Melé, 2004). Named as the Father of CSR, Bowen managed to drive an initial definition: “It refers to 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,” according to Carroll (1999).

CSR literature started to expand during the 1960s, especially by academics, where more endeavors were evident in an attempt to precisely define the term. Keith Davis was one of the most prominent scholars during this decade, who explained SR as “businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest” (Davis, 1960). He highlighted social impact of business in society and explained that business, as a social institution, is accountable to use its given power to responsibly serve its society (1960). Davis’ contributions were so valuable that Carroll named him Bowen’s successor as in his article, “Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct” (1999).
Not only was the 1960s blessed with Davis, but it also had Joseph McGuire, another outstanding scholar with an unmistakable input. McGuire believed that “the idea of social responsibilities supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations,” (Carroll, 1999). McGuire’s definition was more accurate than previous definitions of CSR in respect to highlighting that CSR is more than economic and legal commitments. Later, McGuire elaborates more on this part by stating that a corporation must have an active role in its surrounding environment, community, the welfare of its employees, and politics. Accordingly, a corporation must be fair in dealing with its employees. This fairness is what is defined as corporate citizenship and business ethics by his successors (McGuire, 1963).

A decade later, the 1970s was known as the era of CSR definition proliferation. In 1973, Davis defined CSR again with more elaboration as:

It is the firm’s obligation to evaluate in its decision-making process the effects of its decisions on the external social system in a manner that will accomplish social benefits along with the traditional economic gains which the firm seeks... It means that social responsibility begins where the law ends. A firm is not being socially responsible if it merely complies with the minimum requirements of the law, because this is what any good citizen would do (Davis, 1973).
In the same year, two scholars, Henry Eilbert and Robert Parket, provided a more elaborated definition of CSR:

Perhaps the best way to understand social responsibility is to think of it as ‘good neighborliness.’ The concept involves two phases. On one hand, it means not doing things that spoil the neighborhood. On the other, it may be expressed as the voluntary assumption of the obligation to help solve neighborhood problems. Those who find neighborliness an awkward or coy concept may substitute the idea that social responsibility means the commitment of a business or Business, in general, to an active role in the solution of broad social problems, such as racial discrimination, pollution, transportation, or urban decay. (Eilbert & Parket, 1973)

Moreover, Votaw, also in 1973, discussed the ambiguity of CSR as a concept as follows:

...To some it conveys the idea of legal responsibility or liability; to others, it means socially responsible behavior in an ethical sense; to still others, the meaning transmitted is that of ‘responsible for’ in a causal mode; many simply equate it with charitable donation; some take it to mean socially conscious; many of those who embrace it most fervently see it as a mere synonym for ‘legitimacy’, in the context of ‘belonging’ or being proper or valid; a few see it as a sort of fiduciary duty imposing higher standards of
behavior on businessmen than on citizens at large. (Whitehouse, 2003)

In 1979, Carroll presented a more complete definition in order to study all aspects of the responsibilities the business is held responsible for. He believed that there was a lack in the definition of CSR beyond the mere obvious concepts of abiding by the law and making profits for the organization. Hence, he provided the definition of: “the social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time.” The economic aspect represents the obligations for business to achieve revenues and be profitable. The legal responsibilities reflect the society’s expectations for business to meet economic objectives within the framework of legal requirements. As for the ethical liabilities, it explains the necessity for business to follow accepted norms that define appropriate conduct. Philanthropic responsibilities are the society’s aspiration to witness society’s active role in the development of its welfare (Carroll, 1979). This highlights that while the economic aspect is the profit the company makes for itself, the remaining components constitute what the company does for its community.

The 1980s witnessed fewer definitions, yet provided more research and complementing concepts. During this era, scholars gave less attention to defining CSR and started defining and researching other concepts associated with it such as Corporate Social Responsiveness, Corporate Social Performance (CSP), stakeholder theory, and
public policy. Thomas Jones offered a definition of CSR with an integrated perspective during this period:

Corporate social responsibility is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract. Two facts of this definition are critical. First, the obligation must be voluntarily adopted; behavior influenced by the coercive forces of law or union contract is not voluntary. Second, the obligation is a broad one, extending beyond the traditional duty to shareholders to other societal groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, and neighboring communities. (Jones, 1980)

The 1990s were an extension of the 1980s in terms of more focus on alternative themes of CSR. Few contributions were made during the 1990s with regard to CSR definitions. Instead, three major themes captured the consideration of scholars: business ethics, CSP, and stakeholder theory. Trends were heading towards operationalization of the CSR concept. Scholars were focused more on communicating concepts that were in coherence with CSR with alternative themes. On the other hand, an exhaustive definition of CSR was not achievable yet. In 1996, Pinkston and Archie believed that defining CSR might still be obscure since the values and ideas related to CSR are in correlation with the everyday changing issues (Snider, Hill, and Martin,
2003). Therefore, a comprehensive and updated CSR definition might be almost impossible to find. One of the latest attempts to provide an inclusive definition of CSR is the “corporate behavior which aims to affect stakeholders positively and go beyond its economic interest,” (Turker, 2008), which will be used later in this study.

By the new millennium, more focus has been directed towards corporate citizenship, which shares the confusion that surrounds CSR (Carroll, 1999). Just as CSR doesn’t imply the same to everybody, neither does corporate citizenship. However, the majority of these approaches are directed towards the roles, responsibilities, partnerships, and duties of businesses in societies and their local communities (Garriga, & Melé, 2004).

From a general point of view, there are three perspectives of corporate citizenship: the limited, the comparable to CSR, and the extended (Matten, Crane, and Matten, 2003). The limited perspective believes that corporate citizenship is a reflection of terms such as social investment, or corporate philanthropy. In such sense, corporate citizenship assumes responsibilities in the direction of the surrounding communities. The second perspective, according to Carroll, corporate citizenship is a novel apprehension of businesses’ responsibility towards the society. This perspective is connected with other theories defining the role of ethical business (1999). The extended perspective claims the intervention of corporations when governments fail to do its role of protecting its citizenship. This view is in agreement with the notion that corporations have started to gain power and authority enough to equal or even exceeds that of governments (Matten et. al, 2003).
On the other hand, the first decade of the third millennium witnessed a significant shift in the strength of CSR, being an attempt to support local economies, not just a PR effort to improve the image of the corporation. In that sense, huge corporations may be an effective participant in the development process of countries. A multinational corporation can be a part of a foreign direct investment plan that can help the economy of both developing and developed countries. Accordingly, there is currently a clear shift in the way corporations view their roles in the society. As stated by Blowfield, from the International Affairs Magazine, "we have started to see a shift in thinking about CSR from being a way of ameliorating the worst consequences of foreign direct investment to also becoming a way of accelerating such investment, especially in the poorest countries" (Blowfield, 2005). Therefore, adopting policies of social responsibility has become an effective tool that would lead to the minimization of corporate scandals.

In this same context, Timothy O'Riordan, in his article, Big Business and Sustainability: A Contradiction in Terms? observes that "big business must be a partner on board for sustainable development to ever triumph. In all of this, the customer can play a critical role." O'Riordan, in this regard, concludes that "combining sustainability with consumer satisfaction and moral commitment will push businesses and politicians closer to sustainability than they will ever go if left to their own devices" (O'Riordan, 2006). Similarly, a socially responsible corporation may attract more and more customers, especially activists and those who are interested in volunteering in community work. This informing role of CSR reports has made many stakeholders and customers interested in reading and evaluating the corporations in order to help them make decisions whether or not to deal with these corporations. The interest of stakeholders in
reading CSR reports is reflected in many polls and surveys. For example, the Second World-wide Survey on Stakeholder Attitudes to CSR Reporting questioned 1700 readers of CSR reports from 58 countries, and traced a real interest of most of the respondents in reading and evaluating the performance of corporations according to these reports (Baue, 2005). Therefore, CSR reports have an undeniable role in informing the public about the social activities and involvement in community service.

In fact, the attempt of some corporations to correct their image and show themselves as socially responsible comes as a result of the current lack of trust between corporations and citizens. In the current age of globalization, corporate scandals have risen to an alarming rate. This rise in corporate crimes has negatively affected the confidence of customers in their corporations. According to a recent Business Week Harris Poll, "79% believe CEOs put their own interests ahead of workers and shareholders," (McRitchie, 2006). Such a statement says a lot about how consumers believe that business are held to make revenues with no regard to their social obligations or commitments to the stakeholders.

Lastly, the increasing significance of CSR reports for stakeholders in recent years is concluded in various studies and surveys. For instance, in his article, Smarter Corporate Giving, Byrnes Nanette refers to an international study published in June 2008, which found out that "52% of the world's 250 largest corporations filed separate reports on corporate responsibility in 2005. That's up from 45% in 2002." According to Nanette, many large corporations spend huge amounts of money on ad campaigns that highlight their social activities (2006). This reflects the recent desire of corporations to show themselves in a positive image for the general public including customers, shareholders,
suppliers, government, and employees using CSR activities. This attempt to reinforce relationships with stakeholders is translated into minimum conflicts and maximum organizational commitment from all stakeholders (Ali, Rehman, Ali, Yousad, Zia, 2010).

**CSR versus Corporate philanthropy:**

In addition to the fact that the term CSR is still an abstract concept for many people, those who are aware of it are faced with the confusion between CSR and corporate philanthropy. The truth is, they describe totally diverse schools. The former is a representation of morally and socially responsible activities that must be conducted by a corporation based on sense of accountability and commitment (Volkmar, 2013). In such a sense, CSR is not a voluntary act; it is dues a corporation is committed to pay as a compensation for being part of the society it functions within. Corporate philanthropy, on the other hand “suggests a voluntary action done out of generosity and beneficence, a charitable act,” according to Jacquie L’Etang (1994). In accordance, the difference relies in the obligatory versus the optional nature of the two concepts.
CSR in the developed countries:

Several studies, such as (Chapple & Moon, 2005; Maigan & Ferell, 2000; Maigan & Ralston, 2002; and Palazzo, 2002) have shown variations in CSR across different nations in terms of its motives (Wei, Egri, and Lin, 2009). In 2008, Matten and Moon suggested that different cultural background, norms, and attitudes result in the difference in the perceptions and expectations of stakeholders. Augilrea and Jackson in 2003 highlighted that while some CSR efforts are praised and succeed, some firms fail to find the appropriate appreciation and applause for such initiatives (Wei et al., 2009). In such context, evaluating the success of CSR initiatives might be better understood with reference to the cultural environment that surrounds firms. In today’s global world, corporations’ management has to realize the customizing CSR initiatives is no longer an option. Aligning CSR practices with stakeholders’ expectations and standards is necessary for the acceptance of these valuable efforts. Duplicating efforts in countries is a promise of failure for the socially responsible acts held by a corporation. Multinational Corporations (MNCs) should be aware of the fact that “to be a good global citizen does not mean that multinationals have to duplicate all the CSR practices viewed as necessary in the home country to other countries,”(Wei et al., 2009). Researchers have proven that western, developed countries have higher expectations towards corporations who apply CSR practices than Eastern, emerging economies. While business conducting CSR is considered as “business as usual,” emerging economies perceive it as a high competitive edge that supports the firm’s image and enhances its reputation (Wei et al., 2009).
CSR in the emerging economies:

A significant amount of academic literature has been found examining the relationship between CSR and organizational enhancement especially the organizational performance in the west; however, very few of this literature examined the effect of CSR initiatives in the emerging countries (Ararat, 2006) especially on the organizational behavior. Moreover, as Blowfield and Frynas put it, the fairly limited body of literature has focused on certain aspects such as motivation to conduct CSR activities, corporate citizenship, or corporate irresponsibility (Rettab, Brik, and Mellahi, 2008). A rationale justification of such scarcity of literature in the emerging markets, including the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), is the common notion that a business’s goal is to provide employment opportunities (Business Solutions for Human Development Report, 2007). Attributes including transparency, economic responsibility towards the society, and environmental and social liabilities are not highly accentuated by the society. Thus, scholars suggest an in-depth assessment of the economic accountability of corporations should be subjected to further research within the MENA region (Ararat, 2006).

Due to the need to define the relationship between CSR efforts and organizational performance in the emerging markets, a recent study conducted by a group of scholars has been carried out on 280 corporations in Dubai. According to Rettab et al., three major findings were found. A positive relation between CSR and financial success within corporations has been proven to exist, which turned to be analogous with similar studies conducted in the developed countries. The second result found was that CSR efforts are positively correlated with employees ‘satisfaction. Research results concluded that employees who work for a company which applies CSR are happier because it is a
reflective of this corporation’s fair policies. This produces employees who think highly of their employers. The third finding was that conducting CSR initiatives allow the corporation to enjoy a constructive reputation (Wei et al. 2009). The reason behind such positive reputation is the fact that these socially responsible acts are applauded by different organizations such as NGOs and other governmental institutions which give room for corporations to publicize for their good acts. Hence, it spreads their good reputation and enhances corporate image. Such publicity stunts allow corporations to enjoy their triumph and shine their competitiveness among their competitors (Rettab et al., 2008).

**Identifying the Governments’ role:**

In order for governments to ensure that corporations are socially responsible towards its societies, universally approved top-down legal regulations should be set. For instance, a formal recognition to the effect of CSR has been lately required which is shown in corporations’ triple bottom line reports instead of concentrating on certain angles presented by a corporation. Many annual reports are now requested by governments to express statement of cash flow, higher level of transparency, as well as more concrete data. As a result, a triple bottom line report covers environmental, economic, and social dimensions. In this sense, management now perceives the triple bottom line strategy as more of a dialogue between themselves and their stakeholders where communication takes place and messages flow in a two-way path, instead of a one-way flow of communication. According to Pava, in his article Why Corporations Should
Not Abandon Social Responsibility?, in an energetic and fast moving market such as ours, it is no longer an option to depend on the one-way flow of communication to target stakeholders. “Businesses are expected to not only set a strategy and to move towards it, but businesses are expected to actively participate in ‘ethical dialogues’ with stakeholders concerning the appropriate boundaries of businesses behaviour” (Pava, 2008).

**CSR: not just a government’s responsibility:**

Although some might believe it should be a government’s responsibility to make sure that corporations are responsibly functioning and are abiding by the rules set by the government, businesses should work in parallel with government agencies and NGOs to ensure a proper application of good business. According to Porter and Krammer, cooperating with NGOs can greatly help in the success of CSR initiatives led by companies since it increases the opportunity of organizations going from mere philanthropic efforts to more sustainable structures creating deeper commitments with the societies (2002). Taking into consideration the nature of NGOs, seeking the ultimate good for the societies, NGOs stand a better chance in reaching out for the public and providing evidence that release their tensions in regard to the company’s ulterior motives. Post the 25\textsuperscript{th} of January revolution, many NGOs started to acknowledge the fact that the only way forward is partnering with the government in order to achieve their goal of a better outreach to those who are unprivileged in Egypt (Hafez, 2011).

It is an undeniable fact that governments, no matter how hard they try, will always have a limited role in the sense of drafting laws and monitoring their activities.
Emerging countries’ governments perform poorly to that extent that other entities within these societies ought to take serious steps to offer assistance and help create better environments to conduct business (Ararat, 2007). NGOs, over the past years, have been able to reflect their powerful impact on providing a better examination of corporations’ ethical attitude via excavation of their abuses. By using the anti-marketing strategies, NGO are capable of compelling MNCs to fear the public’s opinion which would be leached against them should they be caught of any violations. In her thesis titled as, “The Problem of Corporate Social Responsibility: The Need for Solutions for the Future,” Sarhan states that “Strategies like consumer boycotts, civil protest at corporate events and meeting, and disruptive counter-advertising that were typically used against state actors are now directed at transnational corporations,” (Sarhan, 2006.). Hence, since publicity is one of the most important aspects in the promotional mix, corporations fear bad publicity that would be initiated by NGOs and head towards socially responsible acts lest that they face boycotts by angry consumers.

NGOs also have a hand in assisting corporations lead more socially responsible business procedures via the knowledge and understanding of existing business needs and procedures needed to achieve the desired business goals. According to Victoria Rangel, in her dissertation titled as “Multinational Corporations and Corporate Social Responsibility: How History, Non Governmental Organizations And International Groups Are Changing Business,” NGOs’ obligation to scrutinize MNCs ethical work procedures is due to the fact that Multinational Corporations (MNCs) are having more power than they ever had before. This power is directed towards making profits at the expense of violating human rights laws (Edwards et al, 2006). Rangel even claims that
MNCs have gained bigger control role than international law during the World War. Such power is not “matched by an increase in measures designed to make such power legitimate” (Whitehouse, 2003,). In view of this, NGOs’ main focus has gradually shifted from scrutinizing governments to MNCs with their immense power (Rangel, 2007).

In such context, some corporations have not been the happiest with such intervention by NGOs. Rangel states that reactions ranged from denying such roles led by NGOs to implementing imposed ethical standards with no true believing in their ultimate objective. However, according to an NGO manager, (NGOs) are “no longer desiring merely a charitable handout. Non-profit seek a partnership with a mutual value exchange and a roughly equal division of control and governance.” (Rumsey & White, 2009). Companies with less-than-acceptable CSR practices are to incredibly benefit from such partnership, which “can be particularly more helpful in restoring their reputation and offsetting the risk of increasing suspicion of ulterior motives.” (Rim, 2010).
CSR: a must-have rather than an option:

The old assumption that CSR is nothing more than compliance with the labor and environmental laws is now a drained belief, for it has become much more than just abiding by laws set by governments. Companies are now aware of the fact that being an “ethical organization” comes with great benefits for their business sales. A study conducted by Rim has shown that “perceived sincerity of CSR activities leads to a positive public attitudes and supportive behaviour” (2010). Another recent global study by McKinsey & Co. has shown that at least ninety percent of the Questionnaire responding corporations are now engaged in environmental, social, and corporate governance-related activities than they were five years ago (Bright, 2008). Another study has shown that consumers tend to show positive attitudes toward organizations that respects social causes, which in turn affects the purchasing behavior of these organizations’ products (Cone. Inc, 2007). Furthermore, studies reveal that consumers are willing to pay more money for products by ethical companies (Trudel & Cotte, 2008).

Well-developed CSR activities necessitate developing apt CSR strategies that are aligned with the corporation’s strategies. “If corporations act out of desire to do good and out of a sense of social obligation then they should work towards setting up ethical decision-making procedures to determine the nature of their obligations and responsibilities as well as those which evaluate the effects of their donations so that they can be sure that they achieve the good that they claim,” (L’Etang, 1994). Today’s world is faced by numerous human rights violations and countless cases of environmental
pollution which has led to considering CSR as no longer a mere thought for corporations. Concepts such as ‘sustainability’ and ‘going green’ are becoming more than just complementing items on a corporation’s high board meeting agendas (Cokins, 2009, p. 37). CSR initiatives have become more of an indispensible attitude of the day-to-day practices of corporations to show their goodwill towards the society (Edwards et al. 2006). As Hood and Bedard state it in their article “Don’t ignore Corporate Social Responsibility,” CSR is becoming strategic in nature, yet tactical in execution. A corporation which applies CSR initiatives will be ethical to its employees, and in every step of its supply chain process which includes manufacturing, distribution, and marketing (Hood &Bedard, 2008). As Bruke and Lodgson admit, the more profound CSR efforts made by the corporation, the greater benefits and wealth the corporation could reap (1996).

Such change has resulted in the shift in some personnel’s roles within an organization, the most important of which is the Chief Financial Officer’s (CFO). Formerly, CFO’s role was mainly related to collecting, validating, and analyzing and reporting financial data. After this recent approach, a CFO will extend his role to include nonfinancial data since there is now a new definition of the concept “resources.” According to Gary Cokins, reporting how the business functions to management is now far beyond mere performance and quality (2009). It is now believed that there is a positive relation between adopting sustainability and green-friendly practices on one hand and profitable, enduring economic development.
Whilst it is obvious that business has to make profit to be able to gain its board’s satisfaction and blessings, a corporation earns credits and creates a competitive edge through being a socially responsible firm. Hood and Bedrad believe that:

While we cannot lose sight of the fact that business corporations must continue producing profits for their owner to be viable, it is clear that more companies are recognizing that their profits don’t emanate solely from the popularity of the products/ services they provide, but also are dependent on a reputation as a caring and sensitive corporate citizen.

These intangible effects, such as strengthening public’s relationship with the organization have a powerful impact on the corporate reputation (Fombrun & Van Riel, 2003). Defined as “a cognitive representation of a company’s actions and results that crystallizes the firm’s ability to deliver valued outcomes to its stakeholders” (Fombrun, Gardberg, and Barnett, 2000), corporate reputation can impact the efficiency of corporate communication addressed towards the public. Several studies have shown that advertisers with higher levels of positive reputation maintain more favorable attitudes towards their advertisements in addition to higher levels of purchase intentions than their competitors (lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999). In that respect, a corporation’s ultimate goal is to create the appropriate product differentiation that makes its products stand out from the clusters overcrowding the market. Thus, by creating socially responsible and accountable attributes, a corporation is able to polish its image in the eyes of its customers (Smith &Higgins, 2000).
This application of the cause-related marketing creates the win-win situation every corporation hopes to reach. Cause-related marketing is defined as “the process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in a revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives,” (Varadarajan & Menon, 1988). The goal is to improve a corporation’s relations with its customers by adopting ethical and/or social perspectives. This is due to customers’ belief that a responsible firm will offer high quality and reliable products (Mc Williams & Siegel, 2001). The win-win situation is presented when both parties, the business and the charity recipient, benefit from the un-announced deal. “The brand manager uses consumer concern for business responsibility as a means for securing competitive advantage. At the same time a charitable cause receives substantial financial benefits,” (Smith & Higgins, 2000).

Additionally, CSR works as a defense against the day when the corporation is confronted with crises. A corporation who is known to be caring about its stakeholders’ opinions, seeks their satisfaction, and is respectful of its environment is hardly perceived as an immoral corporation when a crisis is on the horizon (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2009). Drucker in 1982 said that, “a company that is seen as having a genuine, long–term relationship with its stakeholders and the community is less likely to be regarded as simply indulging in ‘the hypocrisy of public relations,’” (L’Etang, 1994). Thus, an intelligent corporation is a one who perceives CSR efforts as “business opportunities rather than business costs,” (Hood & Bedrad, 2008)
For corporations to apply thriving CSR practices, they are obliged to adopt decisions that are beyond their immediate self-interests, yet synchronized with their strategic objectives. According to Kim and Reber, “CR (Corporate Responsibility) requires proactive planning and management to make the organization good by meeting or exceeding the expectations of its stakeholders and stake seekers,” (2008).

To CSR or not to CSR?

CSR, as a concept, is faced by proponents, who very much believe in the sacred role a corporation has to play to serve its society, and opponents, who claim that a business’ sole objective should be gaining profits. As Kok et. al state it, the believers in CSR recognize that it is “the obligation of the firm to use its resources in ways to benefit society through committed participation as a member of society, taking into account the society at large and improving welfare of society at large independent of direct gain of the company,” (2001)

Not only do proponents consider CSR to be an obligation towards the society, they believe that CSR provides intangible benefits to the corporations much needed for its sustainability. Luo and Bhattacharya assert that Corporate Social Performance (CSP), which is stakeholders’ assessments of initiatives conducted by corporations, has a direct positive impact on customer satisfaction, enhancing corporate image, and customer organizational commitment. It (CSP) “includes a search for social legitimacy, with processes for giving appropriate responses,” (Garriga & Melé, 2004). Selecting a proper CSR initiative, which is aligned with the corporation’s strategic goals improves the overall CSP of the organization and leads to an enhancement in the corporation’s overall
performance (2009, p). Many studies have highlighted the role of communicating CSR to
the public as an indispensable key factor for the positive perception of the company’s
performance (Maignan & Ferell, 2001).

The fact that the society, customers, employees, governments, media, and the
community are imperatives of the stakeholders, who hold legitimate rights in
corporations, obliges corporations to seek their satisfaction. CSR advocates believe that
stakeholders, a corporation’s most important strategic partners have now become more
aware of the indispensible role a socially responsible corporation plays in a society.
These groups request what they believe to be responsible actions from corporations.
(Garriga & Melé, 2004). As Moses Pava puts it:

It is far better to engage stakeholders in honest, transparent, and forthright
debate about social values and the limitations of what any one business
can accomplish than to simply claim from a philosophically dubious high
ground that businesses possess no responsibilities and leave it at that
(Pava, 2008)

In response, many corporations have decided to establish communications
methods and open dialogues with these groups in order to receive feedback and get
access to comments and opinions by their stakeholders. This open communication “not
only enhances a company’s sensitivity to its environment but also increases the
environments understanding of the dilemmas facing the organization,” (Kaptein & Van
Tulder, 2003).
On the other hand, opponents of CSR, such as, Milton Friedman, question the obligation of a corporation to commit itself to doing CSR. He thinks that a business has the ultimate goal of increasing revenues, using legal methods (Rumsey & White, 2009; Garriga & Melé, 2004). Maximizing the share wealth of the organization is the only important element in the profit and loss analysis. Skeptical views maintain the belief that shareholders expect management to conduct acts that are in favor of the business profits and avoid those that bring financial burdens to the organization or “compete for a firm’s limited financial resources with other critical marketing instruments, such as advertising and research and development (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2009). Accordingly, employing organizational resources “such as donating to charity” becomes a less favorable act as it might hinder the company from achieving its objectives (Snider et al., 2003). However, this view is subject to mild alteration should the social needs be commercial on the long-run (Garriga & Melé, 2004). The problem remains, such views disregard how this business impacts the society whether positively or negatively. According to Robert Reich, professor of Public Policy at Berkeley and the author of Super Capitalism: the Transformation of Business, Democracy, and Everyday Life”, it doesn’t matter if a business acts responsibly or not, as long as its decisions are ultimately taken to lead to making profits. “If it leads to less profits, it’s bad business and shareholders would be ‘justifiably upset,’ (Pava, 2008).
Voluntary choices by corporations:

Luckily, not all socially responsible actions are forced either by governments or NGOs, for some of them are based on voluntarism. Some corporations, based on their belief in the importance of CSR, have deliberately chosen to be engaged in a set of codes of conducts by the UN. In the 1970’s, the UN drafted codes such as the Global Compact and SA8000. The idea behind such codes was for corporations to intentionally compete in an attempt to act more socially by choice and not by being forced to it.

The bottom line here is, government and NGOs, on one hand, and corporations’ management on another hand, are obliged to work hand in hand to be able to survive today’s problems. Social problems such as pollution, global warming, energy, and decent health care cannot be handled by governments on their own. As Steven Ratner puts it:

...If self-monitoring is put into place with little or no regulation, no transparency, uneven implementation, and produces no results, then the perception that MNCs only make half-hearted, publicity-generating efforts with no substance will continue to act as a roadblock for all. (qtd. in Rangel, 2007)

Hence, collective resources are the only way for realistic solutions. It is no body’s benefit to regard business and governments as opposing enemies. Instead, perceiving each other as complementing part where joint efforts are made would definitely propose better solutions.
CSR and Cultural impact:

Few studies have been conducted to explain the relationship between CSR and different cultures (Hu & Wanf, 2009); however, Geert Hosfstedede has been able to provide comprehensive examination of cultural impact on different nations, and how they directly affect people’s attitudes and behaviors. This examination provides a reflection of the context in which CSR exists within various cultures and societies. Despite the fact that scholars, who studied the concept of CSR didn’t initially pay much attention to the cultural impact of countries on CSR, they later started to inspect the cultural effect on weighting social responsibilities within societies (Smith, Sinagl, and William, 2007; Maigan, 2001).

It is now believed that CSR is a “context-specific” concept where the surrounding culture plays an indispensible role in defining the terms through which CSR functions, and directs how business is expected to behave (Ringov & Zollo, 2007). According to Hofstede (2001), individualistic societies suffer from loose bonds among their people. Every person is expected to look after his own benefit and is concerned by his immediate family. On the other hand, in collectivist societies, people are usually part of integrated and incorporated groups where the ultimate goal is the greater good of the society. The description whether a society is a collectivist or individualistic is based on a number of factors that explain its nature and norms. As seen in Appendix I, Hofstede’s research on cultural difference believes that there are five cultural dimensions that affect and explain how nations behave: Power Distance Index (PDI), Individualism (IDV),
Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI), and Long–Term Orientation (LTO) (Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions, n.d.). Hofstede provides a detailed explanation of the Arab world culture (Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, KSA, and UAE) within the first four of his cultural dimensions.

Hofstede believes that the Arab region enjoys a high level of PDI. As per Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions, “these societies are more likely to follow a caste system that does not allow significant upward mobility of its citizens. They are also highly rule-oriented with laws, rules, regulations, and controls in order to reduce the amount of uncertainty, while inequalities of power and wealth have been allowed to grow within the society,” (Arab World section, n.d.). According to Cohen et al., people from nations with higher levels of PDI are believed to accept controversial business issues as ethical more than nations with lower levels of PDI (Cohen et al., 1996).

The Arab region is believed to be low on IDV. Nations with lower rates of IDV translates in a collectivistic society. Collectivistic nations, in contrast to individualistic nations, are committed in a long term relationship with the group. “Organizational commitment in a collectivist culture is paramount, and over-rides most other societal rules,” (Arab World section, n.d.).

Arab regions are explained by Hofstede as slightly above average in the MAS index than other counties, which could be interpreted in relation to female contribution in the society. The subtle increase in the masculinity levels signifies the limitations of women’s roles in the Arab societies. However, since the difference is very minimal
compared to the average of other countries, Hofstede sees this as an impact of religion rather than the culture (Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions, Arab World Section).

People in nations characterized by uncertainty avoidance, such as the Arab region, are nations that seek routine and discipline. Corporations working within such nations avoid new experiences which are critical towards adapting to new social activities. High levels of UAI indicate that societies have little tolerance for uncertainty. In response, regulations and strict rules are set in order to ensure that control is maintained over this uncertainty. As a result, these societies are not prepared to easily accept change (Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions, Arab World Section).

In conclusion, in 2007, Ringiv and Zollo conducted a significant study, which concluded that public attitudes towards the CSR reports of corporations are strongly affected by the national values and beliefs that are spread within a given society. That is, the degree of commitment and responsibilities citizens have towards their communities impacts the way they view and value the CSR reports issued by corporations (Ringiv & Zollo, 2007; Smith et al, 2007). In that sense, in a society that is characterized by higher levels of PDI and UAI among its citizens, negative effects of corporations’ responsibility can result. However, there is not enough evidence to support the assumption that collectivist nations adopt a certain kind of attitude towards CSR reports of corporations. That is, collectivist nations are not usually correlated with higher social accountability. Moreover, the relation between higher rates of UAI and lower rates of social responsibility was not found to be significant. Hence, the authors ask for more research to be conducted in this area to investigate the possibility of such assumptions. (Ringiv & Zollo, 2007)
UN Global Compact:

Announced in January 1999 and put into practice in July 2000, the UN Global Compact is considered a major devotee of a corporate citizenship. Owing it to the UN secretary-General, Kofi Anan, much effort has been exerted in the direction of promoting “responsible global economic community that led to the creation of the Global Compact,” (Whitehouse, 2003). The Global compact encourages companies to abide by the nine agreed upon practices recommended in the fields of human rights, labor law, and environment and based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), International Labor Organization’s (IOL), and Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (1977). Through the creation of a global framework that defines corporate citizenship, the Global Compact is the worldwide leading attempt towards paving the way for corporations’ best practices each within its own line of business. This power entitled to the UN is driven from the fact that it represents a global centre that has the ability to set connections and formulate dialogues amongst states, NGOs, and businesses (Whitehouse, 2003).

Having faith in the corporations’ goodwill, the Global Compact has decided to adopt a voluntary practice or self regulatory model. However, with the concern of the abuse of such voluntary nature, the UN has set disciplinary actions to ensure the maintenance of the said goodwill by corporations, and avoid any untrue publicity stunts. In accordance, corporations claiming to abide by the UN Global compact recommendations are to present evidence and exhibits. Examples of such exhibits are
seen in uploading the corporations’ real case studies on the Global Compact’s website on an annual basis in addition to reporting the commitment to the Global Compact’s nine principles in the corporation’s official documentation such as annual reports and mission statements (Whitehouse, 2003).

Despite this goodwill shown in its attempt to present best practices for corporations to follow during their business operations, the UN Global Compact is confronted with critics. The most important of which is the concern of the voluntary nature of its practices reflected in the questioning of the accountability and legitimacy of its application. Proponents of the compact believe, on the other hand, that the UN Global Compact is not formed to be a regulatory body since the founding concept behind the UN Global Compact is creating a learning opportunity for corporations to share their experiences and develop their areas of improvement. It provides the framework that corporations should follow to achieve internal responsibility. However, for Code scholars, the questions remains, how do we guarantee that a company that says it follows UN Global Compact recommendations is really doing it, and not just claiming to. Some scholars suggest that independent auditors with clear objectives should be assigned to grant organizations their blessings. Nevertheless, this suggestion is also faced by the argument that the Global Compact is, in fact, a compact, not a code and that these scholars are missing the objective when it was first initiated by Kofi Anan, (Williams, 2004).
Reporting CSR to stakeholders:

As Gray et al. (1996) believe, CSR reporting is defined as “the process of communicating the social and environmental effects of organizations’ economic actions to particular interest groups within society and to society at large” (qtd. in Snider et al., 2003) Corporations report their CSR activities in their annual reports and on their websites because they want to position themselves as socially responsible corporations in the eyes of their customers and other stakeholders (Sweeney & Coughlan, 2008; Hooghiemstra, 2000). The level of awareness has significantly amplified during the past decades and corporations are becoming keen to appear in their stakeholders’ eyes as socially responsible entities, especially in Egypt (Business Solutions for Human Development, 2007). According to a study conducted by Hillman and Keim in 2001, “strategic CSR” is able to create intangible benefits such as building a corporation’s competitive edge that helps establish the positioning of the corporation in the market amongst its competitors. This status is essential since customers are interested in the reputation and the perceived image of a corporation in the market (Hu & Wang, 2009).

Historically, most corporations used traditional mass media as a method to convey its CSR news; however, most corporations are now resorting to the internet as a method of reaching out to a larger spectrum of their stakeholders. Internet offers the benefit of a greater exposure with much less cost to corporations to create public awareness of their socially responsible activities. It grants easy access to interest groups at their own convenience. Moreover, internet provides a great variety of options for a
more effective communication such as search options, multimedia videos, and file 
retrieval (Aitkat, 2000). Nevertheless, Internet is not target audience specific, since it 
allows groups to view information targeted to another group of audience. Such 
unrestrained access might cause trouble to the corporations since, for instance, a 
corporation’s idea of self-presentation to the general society is different than what it 
intends to share with its employees, customers, or shareholders (Snider et al., 2003).

While reporting CSR provides countless benefits to the organization, the 
flawed selection of CSR initiatives might reap damaging results. Some corporations tend 
to engage in unplanned CSR acts that are not aligned with the corporation’s overall 
strategic goals or in random tactical initiatives that are not in coherence with each other. 
This results in unsolicited negative impact rather than the desired image enhancement 
effect. “Disconnected responsibility initiatives not in synergy with firms’ marketing 
strategy instruments can obscure many opportunities for companies to benefit society and 
can even lead to more harmful, unintended stock risk.” (Luo & Bhattachaya, 2009).

Another problem arises when the public suspect the ulterior motives of the 
corporation holding CSR initiatives. While it is important to keep the public informed of 
the corporation’s CSR activities, the public might become intimated and doubt the 
sincerity of these communication efforts if the corporation seems to be fixated on the 
promotional benefits of this communication (Porter & Krammer, 2002). According to 
previous research, the public tend to disgrace the communication messages sent by 
corporations when they have reservations on corporation’s hidden agendas (Bae & 
Cameron, 2006). This could further lead to the public showing negative attitudes and 
perceptions towards the corporation (Yoon et al., 2006).
It is pivotal for corporations to involve their key stakeholders by creating dialogues and engagement practices with them to support the corporation’s selected socially responsible strategy (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010). In their research, “Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility: the role of CSR communication, Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen highlight that stakeholders’ lack of knowledge of the corporation’s CSR efforts may hinder those efforts from being maximized (2010). Due to the lack of information, and involvement, stakeholders are subjected to misinterpretation of the CSR activities’ ultimate goal creating unnecessary and unjust prejudice against it. Therefore, Bhattacharya et al. examine a framework that suggests best practices for the messages to be shared with stakeholders, the means to communicate it, and the corporation & stakeholders-related aspects that influence the efficacy of the CSR reporting.
The interrelated nature of PR and CSR:

CSR has succeeded to draw the attention of Public Relations (PR) practitioners due to its ability to show a corporation’s goodwill through publicity. PR people usually deploy powerful PR tools, such as, press releases and media relations, to raise awareness of corporations’ news and create constructive impact on the consumers. They are also keen on highlighting news that reflects the corporation’s responsible behaviors aiming to polish the corporate image, (Kim & Reeber, 2008). Using such tools means that the news spread amongst their target audience is not necessarily controllable by the PR practitioners. Due to this uncontrollable nature, news stories about organizations are more trusted and appreciated by the public than paid advertisements. And the more truthful and accurate the reporting is, the more benefits the corporation can reap for itself and its stakeholders. This is considered a golden opportunity for PR practitioners to achieve better accountability. According to Luo and Bhattacharya, “by being authentic and sincere in the way they (corporations) approach and implement Corporate Social Responsibility programs, managers can enjoy both the opportunity platform and safety net offered by superior CSP (Corporate Social Performance) and thus, steady stock return,”(2009)

Some firms believe that CSR and PR are two different functions within an organization. In such cases, these organizations have philanthropic foundations which don’t report to the PR departments nor are they publicized by them. Others consider that PR and CSR are inseparable entities since CSR directly affects organization’s reputation and creates stories for further communication with the public (Business Solutions for Human Development Report, 2007). Thus, they consider CSR a subsidiary of the PR
functions, managed and run by PR practitioners. An authorized personnel from Kingfisher, UK holding firm, has reported its activities as “we are very clear about the target audience we are trying to reach throughout our social responsibility policies and programmes… we focus very clearly on a number of issues to ensure that we make an impact rather than trying to cover the whole field... in our corporate programme and our different operating companies we attempt to build up a leadership position in particular areas which amount to a ‘competitive edge’ with target audience...,” (L’Etang, 1994).

The problem here is the ethical burden PR practitioners hold. Having the power to influence the public’s opinions and perceptions towards corporations makes it PR personnel’s accountability to fairly report corporations’ real motives. However, some PR practitioners might find themselves caught in quagmires where ethical questions are raised doubting fairness of their reporting. For instance, L’Etang explains that sometimes, PR personnel might be reporting that a corporation is changing its strategies towards being a more socially responsible corporation and a good corporate citizen. In fact, the corporation’s real intention is to market for itself and enhance its corporate image in the eyes of its stakeholders (1994). Another problem is when the corporation refuses to behave ethically or socially responsible without even caring to publicize for it at the first place. According to a research conducted by Kim and Reber on PR practitioners, one of the respondents, a CEO in a PR agency, emphasized the ethical dilemmas PR practitioners face. “Public relations must strive to be socially responsible by influencing corporate behavior, but it cannot enforce social responsibility because it does not have the power to do so. If an organization's top management insists on not acting in a socially responsible manner, the PR practitioner must decide whether to abandon their ethics and
bend to unscrupulous management, or to leave the organization,” (2008). Whereas there are several scholars who have given due attention to analyzing CSR value to the society and its ethical outcomes on the society, there has been a scarcity in the data available that researched the relationship between CSR and PR specifically from the PR practitioners’ point of view as well as defining their role in presenting CSR to stakeholders (Kim & Reber, 2008). The lack of this data makes it difficult to properly assess the ethical implications that PR practitioners face and are confronted with.
CSR Application:

1. CSR External application:

CSR application is divided into internal, which is targeted towards employees and management, and external, targeting the community, environment, suppliers, and other stakeholders. Defined as “those groups or individuals who can affect or are affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives or are those actors with a direct or indirect interest in the company,” it is unfortunate that from the practical side, corporations did not start to pay enough attention to external application of CSR practices until recently (Verdeyen, Put & Buggenhout, 2004). Traditionally speaking, the relationship between organizations and the society was defined within the constraints of law. If a company doesn’t violate the law, it gains respect by its consumers. If it pays its taxes, follows the regulations, and passes inspections and audits, the corporation is a “good one.” Issues related to the environment, transparency, or ethical backgrounds were not of great importance to consumers. As long as the product meets consumers’ needs, they never asked about the labor, animal testing, or if it polluted the environment before it was available in the markets. However, awareness amongst consumers has greatly developed and today’s consumers are more concerned about the process through which a product is developed (Hu & Wang, 2009). More information about the background of a product is now highlighted and sought after. In that sense, the relationship between the society and corporations (especially Multinational corporations (MNC)) is now of a
concern to the public more than it ever used to be, where CSR defines what an organization should be doing instead of what it already does (Hu & Wang, 2009).

Not only did corporations start to pay attention to the application of external CSR practices, but they were also interested in its sustainability. According to the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, sustainable development “requires the integration of social, environmental, and economic considerations to make balanced judgments for the long term,” (2000). Adopting CSR practices is the first step in a long process. Corporations start facing obstacles when they are obliged to develop processes and apply strategies in order to maintain sustainability. From Wheeler et al.’s point of view, sustainability is “an ideal toward which society and business can continually strive, the way we strive is by creating value, creating outcomes that are consistent with the ideal of sustainability along social environmental and economic dimensions,”(Wheeler, Colbert, and Freeman 2003).

Unfortunately, there are many thinkers and analysts who profoundly believe that corporations show themselves as socially responsible not for the benefit of the society, but for their own self interest. Social analyst, Geoffrey Klempner (2005), declares that most corporations "pursue CSR for self-interested reasons" (Klempner, 2005). To put it more clear, Klempner believes that corporations pursue CSR "merely to appear socially responsible by cynically going through the motions and making up a PR song and dance about it." This led many social thinkers to urge corporations to believe sincerely, not superficially, in CSR. For example, Rhys Jenkins (2001) states that "the growing emphasis on corporate social responsibility and the increased adoption of corporate codes of conduct in the 1990s represent a significant new development.
However, the question of what they really represent remains to be unanswered.” (Jenkins, 2001). Consequently, individual virtues are unlikely to survive in the contemporary business world because the performance of corporations reflects their lack of ethical standards to maximize their profit.

There is no definite guide for how to maintain sustainability for corporations applying external CSR practices for it is dependent on many variables associated with a corporation. As Van Marrewijk and Werre demonstrate, corporate sustainability is a tailor-made processes that cannot be applied to masses. Each organization should be able to choose its own approach that is applicable to its current state and future goals. Moreover, this approach should be in alignment with its strategic objectives as a reflection of how the firms see its operations in the future.

II. CSR Internal application-The employees:

Being one of the most important stakeholders of corporations, CSR has an undisputable effect on employees in terms of procedural justice and training which deal with the ethical code of conduct of the corporation and the corporate investment in the labor force respectively. Procedural justice is meant with “fairness in the means by which organizations and their representatives make allocation decisions,” (Tepper & Taylor, 2003). According to Carroll (1979), procedural justice is considered a reflection of corporate citizenship. It is interested in the processes through which organizations asses their employee’s performance and a non-biased treatment to all employees with respect to gender and race. According to Shell, diversity is “all the ways in which we differ,”
(Snider et al., 2003). A good corporate citizen evaluates its employees based on their mere performance with no regards to their background, ethnicity, or gender. This fair working environment creates a healthy culture for employees to depend on their performance to develop their career path. Such principles are closely associated with the guiding values of a socially responsible corporation (Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007).

As for training, it is perceived as a benefit to the individual and the organization by emphasizing the development of the individual and the resulting long-term advancement of the organization. A training might be organization or industry-specific or might provide transferable skills that the employees could use in various organizational settings. Trainings are usually described as subject to the free rider effect, an economics theory which refers to individuals who benefit from a service or a good without having to pay for the cost (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). In such case, corporate trainings are considered a “free” direct benefit to the employees with an associated gain to their organization (Finegold & Wagner, 2002). Therefore, a training offered by the organization is considered an investment in the employees as well as a socially responsible activity. Siemens corporation explains in an in-depth interview in a research on CSR reporting on the internet how it pays attention to employees for their own benefit and for itself to be able to compete in a rapidly grown market.

Learning is the key to continuous improvement. It keeps our employees fit for their present and future activities. And it keeps Siemens fit for competition. By making sure our people are rapidly changing work environment, we protect not only their career opportunities, but also our ability
to compete effectively as a company. Our professional training staff continually updates training programs and materials (Snider et al., 2003).

Employees tend to value the efforts led by their employers to treat them responsibly by applying internal CSR. Employees appreciate organizations that treat them fairly and evaluate them according to their performance without bias to gender or racial background. Also, they value organizations that invest in them to develop their skills. Employee who work for organizations that value them understand that such appreciation is an honest attempt to maintain their emotional and attitudinal attachment to their organizations. “Employees make distinct judgments about their employing organization’s CSR efforts, these perceptions provide evidence regarding the fulfillment of psychological needs, and acts of social responsibility or irresponsibility on the part of the organization and can trickle down to affect employees’ subsequent attitudes and behaviors,” (Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera, and Williams, 2006). Research has proven that employees are greatly influenced by their perception of their respective employers to formulate their perceived level of the organizational justice. According to Rupp et. al, an employee uses his judgment of CSR application within the organization to determine if his employer is trustworthy and unbiased towards its apprentice (2006).
Effect of CSR on Potential and Current Employees:

I. Potential Employees and Positive Corporate Image:

Potential employees are also affected by how a corporation is socially acting. According to a substantial amount of research on CSR, it has been concluded that an organization’s CSR practices is directly liable for its potential applicants perceptions’ of the organizations’ attractiveness (Rupp et al, 2006). Recent studies support the perception that a “good” corporation is an attractive employer for prospective employees.

Viswesvaran et al. explain that socially responsible corporations appeal to potential employees who lack any prior interaction with the named corporation (Turker, 2008). “One reason for a company to invest in socially responsible work is to be positioned as a good corporate citizen in the public’s mind, which will result in a favorable corporate image and a positive relationship with the public, and ultimately contribute to one of its most valuable assets-its reputation” (Rim, 2010). A corporation who is known in the market to value ethical behavior sends positive messages of what to expect to work for such corporation.

A number of other studies have also underlined the effect of CSR on attracting top calibers. It is stated that CSR activities reflect a corporation’s goodwill towards its current employees and its interest in developing their skills which make it a sought-after employer (Peterson, 2004; Greening & Turban, 2000; Albinger & Freeman, 2000). Since one of any organization’s objectives is to be the “employer of choice, polishing the organization’s image as a socially responsible organization is an exceptional attraction to employees as it provides them with a promise of an ethical and fair employer. This offers
corporations the advantage of enjoying a wider pools of applicants to select their potential employees from - an HR department everlasting dream.

II. Current employees and positive impact:

A new trend within the current increasing significance of corporations’ CSR has also directed emphasis on the impact on employees such as improving employees’ organizational commitment, identification with the corporation, and the performance of employees (Peterson, 2004; Rodrigo & Arenas, 2008). A considerable number of studies has been recently conducted to assess the positive impacts that CSR activities may have on employees’ self-esteem and organizational performance from management and marketing perspectives (Peterson, 2004; Rodrigo & Arenas, 2008). The main aim of such studies is to review the reasons behind the fact that “companies’ employees - current, prospective, and even retirees - are a primary audience for CSR programs” (McAdam & Leonard, 2003). In this regard, Amanda Bowman (2004) points out that “global opinion surveys indicate that employees are more likely to be more loyal to their companies if they perceive them to be socially responsible” (Bowman, 2004). Other studies suggest that CSR activities increase commitment level due to associated wellbeing of employees and their respective families. (Ali, Rehman, Ali, Yousad, and Zia, 2010). This conclusion is supported by the results of a survey, which showed that “nearly 50% of employees surveyed in the UK said that an active CSR program would increase motivation and likelihood of staying with the company by 45% and 44%, respectively (Bowman, 2004).

As such, corporations are currently increasingly recognizing the business benefits of sharing CSR practices with employees “by including them not only as a primary
audience but also as key players in the structuring and implementation of CSR goals” (Bowman, 2004). An official 2001 survey that was conducted by the State Chamber of Commerce (CSR Indicator Survey) reported that:

75% of companies were involved (slightly or very actively) in employee engagement. An increasing emphasis on employee engagement is evident by the growing number of employee engagement programmes featured on CSR websites. Corporate volunteering is an important form of social investment, which allows businesses to leverage human capital for public benefit (Bowman, 2004).

Furthermore, Mark Schacter (2000) traces an obvious positive impact of CSR reports of corporations on their employees in positively affecting corporation’s reputation in the eyes of its employees. He achieves this conclusion from the results of a survey of CEOs, which reported that “nearly two-thirds of respondents said they believed corporate reputation was a key factor in attracting and retaining top quality employees, and 40 percent said they believed a positive corporate reputation was an important factor in reducing employee turnover.” What gives more strength and significance to these reviews of CEOs is that they are echoed by most of the employees that were interviewed for this same study. Those employees indicated “a firm belief that a corporate reputation for CSR had a positive impact on their ability to attract and retain top-quality personnel” (Schacter, 2000). In addition, many interviewees told the survey designers also that “socially responsible corporate activity built employees’ sense of pride in working for the
company, a factor which was assumed to have a positive impact on productivity and quality of work” (Schacter, 2000).
Current employees and Organizational Commitment:

Not only does CSR impact the image of a firm for potential employees, but it also builds organizational commitment for current employees. Many studies have found positive contribution of internal CSR to organizational commitment (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). In their study, Maignan et al. (1999) proved that socially responsible firms lead to a better corporate citizenship, which in turn, leads to higher levels of commitment from employees, loyalty by customers, and an increase in the overall business performance (Maignan, Ferrell, and Hult, 1999). A company who believes and applies CSR practices is able to firmly impact the perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of its existing employees. It helps build moral capital as well as works as an insurance for all of the shareholders’ assets (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2009). Studies show that employees’ attitudes and behavior are profoundly affected by how fair they believe their corporations act (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, and Rupp, 2001). Employees depend on the perception of their employer’s fairness to determine whether the management is reliable, objective, and transparent or not.

Empirical research has shown that employees’ perception of CSR application by their corporations will generate emotional, attitudinal, and behavioral reaction. Meta analytic analyses have shown positive responses associated with CSR application such as improved job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and enhanced job performance (Cloquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng, 2001). Since CSR is about organizations nurturing relationships with the communities, employees will often refer to CSR to evaluate to what extent their employers appreciate these relationships. Recognizing high
levels of CSR activities can result in employees’ emotional and belonging needs being met.

Researches examining the types of organizational commitments have identified three types of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative; scholars examining CSR are typically focused on the affective commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) define continuance commitment as, “the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization,” and normative commitment, “reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization.” As for affective commitment, it is perceived as “an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). These definitions are usually coined with turnover and retention periods in a given organization. However, a strong correlation is found between the affective type and positive employee outcomes such as attendance, stress, job performance, and work-nonwork conflict (Meyer et al., 2002). Since affective commitment underlines job behavior and a batch of underlying outcomes pertinent to the well-being of employees, the relationship between affective commitment and CSR is examined by scholars with a reference to the Social Identity Theory.
Conclusion:

CSR field has radically proliferated during the past few decades. The number of theories, terminologies, and approaches associated with this term has made from CSR an exceptionally attractive research topic for several scholars. Corporate citizenship, stakeholder theory, corporate accountability, corporate governance, and public policy are just a few concepts that have become related to CSR in societies. Despite the limited number of corporations who truly believe in the ultimate goal of CSR and the essence of sustainable development, hope still remains that this number would increase in the future.

Literature on CSR has been interested in terms such as financial performance, consumer behavior, or corporate success (McWilliams and Siegel, 2001; Ali et al., 2010), while overlooking its relationship with its internal stakeholders. In a country such as Egypt, employers are concerned with employee retention, turnover, and low motivation. Some researchers suggest a positive correlation between applying CSR and organizational commitment. Some researches on CSR have tackled the relationship between CSR and organizational commitment suggesting better organizational identification with their employers (Ali et al., 2010). However, no solid data is available for the Egyptian market to advocate for the association between CSR application and organizational commitment.
CHAPTER III:

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

DEVELOPMENT
Research Questions:

CSR is defined as “the corporate behavior which aims to affect stakeholders positively and goes beyond its economic interest,” (Turker, 2008). Meanwhile, stakeholders are “those groups or individuals who can affect or are affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives or are those actors with a direct or indirect interest in the company,” (Verdeyen et al., 2004). One of the most important stakeholders of an organization is its employees. Nonetheless, research on CSR, in general, and its relationship with its stakeholders, in specific, is limited in Egypt. Hence, this study is interested to examine the relationship between the employees’ perception of CSR activities and the organizational commitment exhibited towards their employers. Accordingly, the researcher attempts to answer the following research questions:

- What are the factors leading to an employee’s organizational commitment?
- Does an organization’s engagement in CSR activities affect its employees’ organizational commitment?
- Does the perception of employees’ CSR activities led by their employers affect their organizational commitment?
- Do employees have a preference for working for organizations that lead CSR activities?
- What are the employees’ priorities to remain employed at their current organizations?
Hypothesis Development:

According to Jaworski and Kohli, employee commitment is defined as “the extent to which a business unit’s employees are fond of the organization, see their future tied to that of the organization, and are willing to make personal sacrifices for the business unit,” (1993). As Agulera et. al illustrate, “socially responsible or irresponsible acts are of serious consequences to employees.” Employees judge their organizations based on their CSR performance, outcome of the CSR efforts, and the implementation of the process, as Aguilera et al. illustrates (2007). These literatures suggest that organizational priorities that show social well-being and professional development prospects are expected to be more positively associated with a better employee-employer relationship.

According to Peterson, employees may show higher levels of organizational commitment, considering they originally believe in the importance of an organization’s socially responsible activities beyond profit maximization (2004). If an employee believes in the importance of CSR activities, s/he may exhibit higher levels of commitment towards his/her organization which conducts CSR activities. In his study, Peterson highlighted the effect of this aspect on the link between corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. The results of the study show that the relationship was stronger for employees who originally believe in the significance of business’ social responsibility.
Several studies have indicated the importance of CSR to employees and its constructive impact on them. (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Maignan et al., 1999; Peterson, 2004). Studies have also discussed that organizations which conduct CSR often extend their activities to include internal stakeholders reflected in offering their employees transparency, fair evaluation, and socially responsible practices (Rupp et al., 2006). This leads to employees’ appreciation of how the organization appreciates them and values their contribution as effective members in the organization. They develop positive feelings of how their organizations represent a good corporate citizen, whether internally or externally. Consequently, it is expected that employees will reciprocate such behavior, which will be manifested via a positive relationship reflected in employee’s prioritization. The researcher, therefore, hypothesizes that:

**H1a. For employees who work for CSR companies, the importance of CSR will be positively associated with their organizational commitment.**

**H1b. For employees who work for non-CSR companies, the importance of CSR will have no relationship with their organizational commitment.**
It is suggested that the way employees perceive their organization’s identity, and the beliefs they hold that define the organization’s distinctiveness and unique attributes may have an impact on the employee’s organizational identification (Dutton et al., 1994). SIT suggests that employees will gain confidence identifying with organizations that exhibit a positive external reputation because it will enhance their self-concept (Maignan & Ferrell, 2001).

Several studies have indicated the importance of CSR to its employees and its constructive impact on them. (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Maignan et al. 1999; Peterson, 2004). Employees tend to formulate their opinions of their organization’s social performance based on their personal experience with the organization as well as media portrayal of these efforts (Maignan & Ferrell, 2001). Researchers have discussed the status of corporate reputation as an essential resource contributing to the building up of an organization’s competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Deephouse, 2000). Corporate reputation is improved or damaged by an organization’s decision to act responsibly. According to Bhattacharya and Sen, “CSR builds a reservoir of goodwill that firms can draw upon in times of crisis, (2003).

Recent studies have shown that employees’ perception of their organization’s “ethics, values and social responsiveness” are great influencers in shaping perceptions of certain organizations (Greening & Turban, 2000). According to the SIT, employees tend to select activities that are coherent with prominent aspects of their identities which define their existence and support foundations symbolizing those particular identities (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). If an organization attempts to engage in social activities and programs which its employees’ believe in, they will develop strong feelings of pride due
to their belonging to this organization based on its positive contribution as a good
corporate citizen in the society. They recognize that organizations voluntarily make
responsible decisions about the society, environment, and their employees beyond profit
maximization. Therefore, if an employee supports the ideology of his/her organization’s
commitment to social activities and programs, there might be a link between the
appreciation of the importance of CSR and the satisfaction with these activities.
Accordingly, the researcher hypothesizes that:

**H2a:** For employees who work for CSR companies, the importance of CSR will be
positively associated with employees' satisfaction with the organization's CSR
activities.

**H2b:** For employees who work for non-CSR companies, the importance of CSR will
have no relationship with employees' satisfaction with the organization's CSR
activities.
Social identity theory proposes that individuals view themselves as members of social categories (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, 1985). Within the social identity theory, an individual’s view of themselves, their self-concept, is influenced by their membership of social organizations, including the organization for which the individual works (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton et al., 1994). People attempt to establish or enhance their positive self-concept through the comparison of the characteristics of themselves and the groups they belong to with other individuals and groups (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, 1985). Favorable comparisons lead to an enhanced self-concept, unfavorable ones lead to reduced self-esteem.

According to the literature, SIT examines the relationship between CSR and employees’ work attitude. The theory, in general, suggests that people tend to frame themselves in a social context and categorize themselves as well as others into social classifications. SIT suggests that employees tend to select activities that are coherent with prominent aspects of their identities which define their existence and support foundations symbolizing those particular identities (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Each person enjoys a set of memberships in different organizations such as nationality, sports team, university, political affiliation, etc. which constitute his self-image. Consequently, every membership contributes to the social classification of a person which defines how he should feel and think, as well as how he is expected to behave (Burke, 2006).

Recent studies have shown that an employee’s perception of his organization’s “ethics, values and social responsiveness” are great influencers in shaping perceptions of certain organizations (Greening & Turban, 2000). If an organization attempts to engage
in social activities and programs, its employees will develop feelings of pride due to their identification with this organization based on its positive contribution as a good corporate citizen in the society. They realize that organizations voluntarily make responsible decisions about the society, environment, and employees beyond profit maximization.

If an employee is pleased with the CSR activities of their organizations, they may exhibit higher levels of commitment towards their organization. According to Jaworski and Kohli, employee commitment is defined as “the extent to which a business unit’s employees are fond of the organization, see their future tied to that of the organization, and are willing to make personal sacrifices for the business unit,” (1993). Employees are thus expected to demonstrate a positive relationship with their organizations reflected in their prioritization. In his study, Peterson highlighted the effect of this aspect on the link between corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. The results of the study show that the relationship was stronger for employees who originally believe in the significance of business’ overall performance. Therefore, if an employee supports the ideology of his/her organization’s commitment to social activities and programs, there might be a link between satisfaction with CSR activities and employee’s organizational commitment. Consequently, the researcher hypothesizes that:

**H3: Employees satisfaction with the organization CSR activities will be positively associated with employees’ organizational commitment.**
CHAPTER IV:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
• **Significance of the study:**

A minimal number of studies have examined the relationship between organizational commitment and employee’s perception of their organizations external CSR (Brammer et al., 2007). Despite the fact that an ample number of studies have examined the relationship between external application of CSR and external stakeholders (Brammer et al., 2007), very few studies have examined the effect of external CSR on internal stakeholders—employees, especially in Egypt (Peterson, 2004). As a consequence, this study is attempting to fill in the gap of the questions raised of whether there is an evident relationship between external CSR and internal stakeholders in Egypt, specifically employee’s organizational commitment.

The study will test the hypotheses which will provide assistance to corporations to determine the level of importance in developing organizational transparency and adopting a socially responsible ideology. The results will allow the reader to have a clearer vision of the value of socially responsible behavior to the future of a corporation. Based on this, corporations will be able to identify whether it is substantial for them to add CSR to their mission statement to become an integral part of their corporation’s philosophy.
• **Pilot study:**

The researcher conducted a preliminary quantitative study as a pilot study. This pilot study aided the researcher in fine-tuning the final survey questions, refining the questions to be more understandable for the participants, in addition to articulating the study’s hypotheses. The pilot study consisted of 10 employees who work in different organizations that deploy CSR activities and those who do not. The researcher used structured questions to model other questions that would help in responding to many of the study inquires. This pilot study helped in modifying the questionnaire in order to be more elaborate and easily understandable decreasing the possibility of facing comprehension difficulties.
• Research Design:

Sample selection:

In this research, the sample is a group of 326 employees from different companies. The sample was chosen from working men and women in the Egyptian market in Cairo. A survey link was sent to respondents in September 2012 through a contact person in each corporation. The survey was closed by December 2012.

131 respondents answered that they are employed at companies that do not lead CSR activities or that they do not know if their companies lead CSR activities. The other 195 respondents have stated that they are employed at companies that lead CSR activities. The total number of identified corporations who answered this survey is 22 (A list of those companies is provided in Appendix II).

The sample of 326 employees represents different levels of management, ranging from those in high managerial positions, such as supervisors and middle managers, to lower levels of employees such as janitors, office boys, and junior employees. Also, the sample includes variation in gender and age. Around 62.9% of the sample were 20-30 years old, 34% were 31-50 years old, while 3.1% were over 50 years old. As for the level of expertise, 7.4% were from the top management (14+ years experience), 45.1% were professional (4-8 years of experience), middle management (9-13 years experience) were 22.7%, and 24.8% were entry level (0-3 years experience). Approximately half of the respondents were females (52%) while male respondents were (48%). Employees who have been employed for less than a year were 14% of the population while those
employed from 1 and less than 5 years constitutes 54% of the population. Those
employed over 5 and less than 10 years were 24%. Those who were employed for over
10 years were 8%.
• **Research instrument:**

Questionnaire data was collected for the purpose of this research via emails with URLs from **Smart Survey** website, a professional online survey provider developed based on the literature review. The website included an introduction about the project and a consent form which was agreed to by the participants before answering the survey questions (see appendix III).

Through the survey research, the researcher asked all participants identical closed-ended questions in the same order to facilitate the tabulation and analysis of the responses. The researcher was available to clarify any ambiguity in the research as well as two research assistants recruited for this purpose. This consistency allowed meaningful comparison of responses across participant. Accordingly, the researcher used surveys as an effective data collection technique to ensure the validity and reliability of research.

The questionnaire was given to an estimate of 600 respondents, out of which 326 responded. The questionnaire consists of 15 questions that attempt to give an overview of the opinions of the respondents towards their companies. The answers of the respondents were analyzed and tested comparatively between the group which belongs to the companies that do CSR and the group which belongs to companies that do not do CSR. The results of the questionnaire were compared to identify any recognizable and measurable differences between the two groups, in terms of organizational commitment (dependant variable). Thus, the use of the questionnaire technique enables the researcher to clearly and adequately grasp the opinions of the respondents.
**Data Collection:**

Initially, the respondents used a purposive non-probability sample to collect the data. Online questionnaires were sent to lead contacts in companies after identifying their CSR status. Contacts were asked to forward the questionnaires to their colleagues in their respective companies. For those employees who do not have email access, such as office boys, contacts were asked to fill out a self-administered questionnaire for them. A reminder email was sent to the researcher’s contacts after a week to remind their network to complete their surveys.

To decrease anticipated social desirability bias, the question of identifying the respondent’s company was left optional for respondents. However, to maintain a record of which companies were responding to the survey, the researcher ensured that each company will be responding to the survey subsequently. Hence, an email was sent to a contact in a given company and after the required number of responses is collected, the researcher started to target the following company.

By late October, the researcher was able to reach a satisfying number of respondents for companies that lead CSR activities. Nonetheless, the researcher discovered that it was very difficult to reach the targeted number for non CSR companies. Accordingly, the data collection method was switched to convenience sampling where the researcher decided to send the survey to different contacts in unidentified organizations and asked them to forward to their friends and connections working in companies in Egypt. Thus, the subsequent respondents could not be identified by their companies.
Importance of CSR | CSR satisfaction | Organizational Commitment

Measurement and Instrumentation:

1. **Independent variable:**

   In this study, the independent variable is the *importance of CSR*. This study attempts to examine the dynamic influence of the importance of CSR satisfaction on employees’ commitment towards their organization. Since the commitment is reflective of employees’ perceptions, regardless of their accuracy (Peterson, 2004), the CSR measures used in this study are based on employee’s perception of social performance instead of the objective measurement of the organizations’ actual social performance. Hence, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8 to see how many factors are extracted and see the items loading on each factor. Depending on the loadings, the variables, which have the items of the highest loading, were selected and the mean of these items were the score of the variable.
2. **Dependent variable:**

   Dependent variable is the researcher’s aim to measure and examine its relation with the independent variable and how it is affected by it. In this study, the dependent variable is **employee’s organizational commitment**. This study tries to analyze the dynamic effect of CSR on employee’s organizational commitment. The variable is measured by the two questions, Q11 and Q12. Q11 is assessed through a five-point scale, while Q12 is assessed through a rating question where respondents are requested to rank their answers according to their preferences. The score for this variable would be the mean of these two questions.

3. **Meditating variable:**

   The meditating variable is the **CSR satisfaction**. The researcher is attempting to examine whether the importance of CSR will lead to satisfaction with CSR activities, which will lead to organizational commitment. In order to create a measure for the mediating variable, an exploratory factor analysis is conducted on Q9, Q10. Then a score will be created for this variable using the mean of these questions.
Operational definitions of variables:

Operational definition is “definition that operates or functions in your investigation” (Adanza, 2006). It defines the way the researcher observes that variable and how it will be measured. Operational definition sets the specific procedures that will be followed in measuring and understanding a concept.

The main variables that are studied and tested in this research are: corporate social responsibility (CSR), CSR satisfaction, and employee organizational commitment.

**Corporate social responsibility (CSR)** is defined as the corporation’s commitment to be internally and externally responsible towards its employees and the surrounding community.

**CSR satisfaction** is the sense of fulfillment employees get due to their employer’s engagement in CSR activities.

**Employee’s organizational commitment** refers primarily to the feeling of satisfaction and devotion an employee has towards the company he or she works at to the extent that they intend to spend more time working for the employing company.
Construction of questionnaire:

For the online version, respondents were directed not to finish the survey unless all required questions were answered. The researcher used an online feature in the survey that does not allow the completion of the survey unless each question has been answered. The questionnaire consisted of two main sections. The first inquired about the importance of CSR, satisfaction level of each respondent’s job in relevance to CSR activities’ existence, in addition to their organizational commitment. In the last section, respondents provided basic demographic information about themselves, before they were asked to optionally identify their corporation. Demographic variables such as age and level of expertise are ordinal variables while gender is categorical. Other questions were measured on a four, five, or seven-point scales (see appendix III).

Online survey was disseminated in English language since the majority of internet users are familiar with English language. However, an Arabic version was provided in case it was needed (see appendix IV). As for the self-administered questionnaires targeting office boys, the Arabic version was used by the researcher or the research assistants to complete it. The researcher and the research assistants made sure that no questions were skipped.

The questionnaire consisted of 15 close-ended questions on the different scales. The questionnaire mainly consists of nominal and ordinal scales. For the core questions, an ordinal level of measurement was generally selected. Unlike nominal scales, ordinal scales allow comparisons of the degree to which two subjects possess the dependent variable. The ordinal level of measurement was primarily presented through Likert
scales, a five-point scale (extremely satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, extremely dissatisfied), on a differential scale with opposite objectives on the two poles and having five points in the middle. In some questions, it was presented through a four-point scale such as (never, sometimes/occasionally, frequently, very frequently) or (absolutely no, possibly, probably, absolutely yes) as well as Q14 (under 20, 20 to 30, 31 to 50, over 50) and Q15 (entry level (0-3 years experience), professional (4-8 years experience), middle management (9-13 years experience), top management (14+ years experience)). Another question such as Q1 used another example of a four-point scale (less than a year, 1 to 5 years, over 5 and less than 10 years, over 10 years). On the other hand, a nominal scale was used to measure the gender question.
Internal validity:

In this questionnaire internal validity is sought through using more than one question to measure a single variable and using reworded questions to compare their answers.

Validating questions are: Q 4 and 5:

Q4- I can overlook a few things that bother me at my company for the sake of implemented socially responsible programs and activities

Extremely satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Extremely dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

Q5- I get inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities

Extremely satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Extremely dissatisfied
---|---|---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

Missing data:

The online survey requested respondents to submit an answer to each and every item. Consequently, there are no missing data for the variables. Moreover, for self-administrated questions, the researcher and the research assistants were keen to explain the importance of answering all questions (with no liability on the respondent), thus all questions were answered.
Response Rate:

Out of 600 participants initially receiving invitations to participate in the study, 326 completed the survey which means 54.5%. This response rate could be due to several reasons, including the low morale of employees due to the current political situation of the country after the 25th of January revolution and the overall political unrest the country is witnessing. Another reason is the absence of a real incentive that motivates the respondents to complete the survey. Since it was an online survey, it was hard to offer the respondents in-kind incentives. Also, the lack of a research culture within the Egyptian society that does not promote research or encourage it enough is another reason. Moreover, some respondents may have sensed that the survey did not relate to a core business and; therefore’ respondents’ day to day activities.
CHAPTER V:

DATA ANALYSIS
In this chapter, the researcher is demonstrating the analysis of the data collected through the survey, representing the descriptive and inferential analysis.

I. Descriptive Data Analysis

1. Sample Characteristics

In this section, descriptive statistics of sample characteristics of 326 employees is illustrated. Frequency tables as well as graphical representations such as charts are used to visualize these variables.

A. Groups:
The 326 employees are split into 2 groups 195 employees’ work for companies that do CSR activities (CSR group) and 131 employees’ said they work for companies that don't lead CSR activities (non-CSR group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non CSR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Gender

The participants were 170 females and 156 males based on statistics in table #2. It can be induced that the distribution of the sample is evenly distributed.

![Gender Distribution Chart]

Table #.2: Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group of employees who work for companies with No CSR activities are more skewed to females as shown in Tables 3 and 4.
Table #.3: Respondents by Gender by Group – Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #.4: Respondents by Gender by Group – Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Age:

About two third of the participants are from the age group of 20-30 years old. This is followed by 34 % of them are from age group of 31-50 years old. The remaining age group falls in the 51 years or above which constitutes around 3.1%. The majority of the sample age falls between 20 and 50 years with approximately 97 % of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50 years</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years or above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ age distribution is close within both groups, the employees in the No CSR group is slightly skewed to the 20-30 age group.
Table #6: Respondents by Age Group by Group – Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>31-50 years</th>
<th>51 years or above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #7: Respondents by Age Group by Group – Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>31-50 years</th>
<th>51 years or above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Level of expertise:
About half of the participants are entry level and middle management, as they constitute 24.8% and 22.7% respectively. While the participants who are professional level are 45.1%, the lowest category is top management which is nearly 7% of the collected sample.

Table #8: Level of Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #9: Level of Expertise by Group – Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Entry level</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Top management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #10: Level of Expertise by Group – Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Entry level</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Top management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Level of Expertise distribution by Group
2. Statistics of Model Questions

Table #11 represents the descriptive statistics of the important questions that are going to be used in the model and their standard deviations. This is accompanied with histograms for a couple of questions. The scale of the questions is reversed in which 1 represents extreme dissatisfaction (Strongly Disagree) in the case of scale from 1 to 5 or least important in the case of scale from 1 to 7.
Table #11: Descriptive Statistics of Model Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Missing Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Do you feel satisfied with the responsible programs and activities of your company?</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: I can overlook a few things that bother me at my company for the sake of implemented socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: I get inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. How satisfied are you with your company&amp; reputation of its socially responsible programs and activities?</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: I think that companies should be obliged to implement socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: Would you leave your company for another job with a better pay even if the new company doesn’t apply socially responsible programs and activities?</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: How satisfied are you in regard to your employment at your current company?</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: Have you ever thought of changing the company you work at</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11: How loyal do you feel towards your company?</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.1: Salary</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.2: Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.3: Flexible working hours</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.4: Proximity from home</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.5: Socialization opportunities and friendships</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.6: Feeling of pride of the company's business reputation</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.7: Feeling of pride of company’s socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Histograms:

Q3. Do you feel satisfied with the responsible programs and activities of your company?
Q4. I can overlook a few things that bother me at my company for the sake of implemented socially responsible programs and activities?
Q5. I get inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities.

Figure 10
Q6. How satisfied are you with your company’s reputation of its socially responsible programs and activities?

Figure 11
Q7. I think that companies should be obliged to implement socially responsible programs and activities.
Q8. Would you leave your company for another job with a better pay even if the new company doesn’t apply socially responsible programs and activities?

Figure 12
Q9. How satisfied are you in regard to your employment at your current company? That is, overall, in terms of all factors that are important to you, how happy are you with your job?
Q10. Have you ever thought of changing the company you work at?
Q11. How loyal do you feel towards your company?
3. Measures

The constructed indicators are divided into creating measures for the dependent and the independent variables. These measures are going to be used in a regression model. First, the employees overall organizational commitment to the organization, which is the dependent variable, is constructed as a composite indicator of the standardized variables of the two questions: Q11, Q12. The score for this measure is the sum of these two questions.

Second, Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10 to see how many factors are extracted and see the items loading on each factor. Depending on the loadings we will select the factors which have the items of highest loading and get the sum of these items to be score of the variable. The independent variables, CSR satisfaction, and its importance for employees, seven-item measure developed were used to gauge these dimensions. When subjected to factor analysis, with a varimax orthogonal rotation, these items yielded two significant factors (with eigenvalues above 1.0) that accounted for 52.93 percent of the variance. This can be seen in table #12.
Table #12 Factor Analysis: Measures of the CSR satisfaction and its importance for employees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items*</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Do you feel satisfied with the responsible programs and activities of your company?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: I can overlook a few things that bother me at my company for the sake of implemented socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: I get inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: How satisfied are you with your company’s &amp; reputation of its socially responsible programs and activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7: How satisfied are you with your company’s reputation of its socially responsible programs and activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: I think that companies should be obliged to implement socially responsible programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: Would you leave your company for another job with a better pay even if the new company doesn’t apply socially responsible programs and activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: How satisfied are you in regard to your employment at your current company?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>1.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of variance explained</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.64%</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All items were standardized before performing factor analysis
Items that had absolute loadings of 0.50 or above were emphasized in constructing two factors:

- **Factor 1: CSR satisfaction (4 items):** This factor indicated the satisfaction of employees with the CSR programs and activities of their company. This is reflected in Q3, Q6, Q9, and Q10.

- **Factor 2: CSR importance for employees (2 items):** This factor indicated the impact of CSR on employee’s inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities. This is reflected in Q4 and Q5.
II. Inferential Data Analysis

1. Regression Analysis

Linear regression model was performed to test for research hypothesis that importance of CSR to employees will lead to CSR satisfaction which will lead to their organizational commitment. This is a mediation model as seen in the figure below.

Organizational commitment is employed as the dependent variable while importance of CSR to employees is used as the independent variable and CSR satisfaction as the mediating. The controls are Q1, Q13, Q14, and Q15 which are the length of employment in the company, gender, age, and employees’ expertise, respectively. Controls were included to tell us that the relationship proposed in the model is not explained by the fact that these people were staying longer in the organization, younger, males, or have more expertise.
2. Mediation

Mediation is a hypothesized causal chain in which one variable affects a second variable that, in turn, affects a third variable. The intervening variable, M, is the mediator. It “mediates” the relationship between a predictor, X, and an outcome, Y. Paths a and b are called direct effects. The meditational effect, in which X leads to Y through M, is called the indirect effect. The indirect effect represents the portion of the relationship between X and Y that is mediated by M (MacKinnon et al., 2007). Graphically, mediation can be depicted in the following way:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c'} \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{a} & \text{b} & \downarrow \\
\text{X} & \text{M} & \text{Y}
\end{align*}
\]

Testing for mediation

A three-step approach was proposed to test for mediation (Baron and Kenny, 1986). This includes several regression analyses are conducted and significance of the coefficients is examined at each step. First step is to conduct a simple regression analysis with X predicting Y to test for path c alone. Second step is to regress X predicting M to test for path a. The third step is to estimate a multiple regression analysis where X and M are predicting Y. The purpose of Steps 1-2 is to establish that zero-order relationships among the variables exist. If one or more of these relationships are non-significant, researchers usually conclude that mediation is not possible. Assuming there are significant
relationships from Steps 1 through 2, one proceeds to Step 3. In the Step 3 model, if X is
no longer significant when M is controlled, the finding supports full mediation. If X is
still significant (i.e., both X and M both significantly predict Y), the finding supports
partial mediation. Testing the mediation effect is done through Sobel mediation test. The
Sobel test assumes that mediation effect is so small that it need not be accounted for, and
simply removes it from the analysis completely (MacKinnon et al., 2007).
3. **Mediation Regression Results**

To check the mediation effect, the three-step approach has to be tested. Starting with the step one, there is a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment which is Y and importance of CSR to employees’ which is X (Table #13). Moving to the second step, the relationship between the mediator, which is the CSR satisfaction, and independent variable, which is importance of CSR to employees, is significant (Table #14). Therefore, we can proceed to step 3 to check the type of mediation. In step 3, it can be seen in table #15 that importance of CSR to employees, which is X, is no longer significant when CSR satisfaction, which is M, is controlled. The finding; therefore, supports full mediation, since the Sobel mediation test supports the significance of the effect of mediation. Therefore, there is strong evidence that CSR satisfaction mediates the relationship between importance of CSR and organizational commitment of employees who have CSR activities and programs. The indirect effect accounts for 52% of the total effect.

In the final model in table #15, the R Square, which is the coefficient of determination is the squared value of the multiple correlation coefficients, shows that 28% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model; while the ANOVA tests measure the acceptability of the model from a statistical perspective. The significance value of the F statistic is less than 0.05, which means the model used reflects reality between dependent and independent variables. It can also be seen that there is a significant inverse relationship between organizational commitment as a dependent variable from one side and length of employment in the company and age as independent variables from other side.
Table #13 Model with dependent variable regress and on independent variable (path c)

| Organizational commitment | Coef. | Std. Err. | T    | P>|t| |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------|------|-----|
| Importance of CSR         | 0.105 | 0.038     | 2.72 | 0.007 |
| Q1                        | -0.252| 0.108     | -2.32| 0.021 |
| Q13                       | 0.015 | 0.129     | 0.12 | 0.905 |
| Q14                       | -0.35 | 0.188     | -1.86| 0.065 |
| Q15                       | 0.04  | 0.1       | 0.4  | 0.688 |
| Constant                  | 0.1   | 0.389     | 2.57 | 0.011 |

# of Observation =195

R-square = .0947

F (6, 191)= 4.02  [p-value= .0017]
Table # 14 Model with mediator regressed on independent variable (path a)

| CSR satisfaction | Coef. | Std. Err. | T    | P>|t|  |
|------------------|-------|-----------|------|------|
| Importance of CSR| 0.367 | 0.117     | 3.15 | 0.002|
| Q1               | 0.231 | 0.329     | 0.7  | 0.484|
| Q13              | -0.613| 0.39      | -1.57| 0.118|
| Q14              | -0.286| 0.57      | -0.5 | 0.616|
| Q15              | 0.179 | 0.304     | 0.59 | 0.557|
| Constant         | -0.369| 1.178     | -0.31| 0.754|

# of Observation =195

R-square = . 071

F (6, 191)= 2.94  [p-value=.014]
Table # 15 Model with dependent variable regressed on mediator and independent variable (paths b and c')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P&gt;t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR satisfaction</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of CSR</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>-0.308</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Observation = 195

R-square = .280

F (6, 191) = 12.37 [p-value = .000]
Table # 16 Sobel Mediation Tests

| Coef   | Coef   | Std. Err. | Z     | P>|Z| |
|--------|--------|-----------|-------|------|
| Sobel  | 0.055  | 0.019     | 2.871 | 0.004|
| a coeff | 0.367  | 0.117     | 3.14342 | 0.002|
| b coeff | 0.149  | 0.021     | 7.008 | 0 |
| Indirect effect | 0.055  | 0.019     | 2.87 | 0.004|
| Direct effect | 0.05  | 0.035     | 1.411 | 0.158|
| Total effect | 0.105  | 0.038     | 2.718 | 0.006|

Proportion of total effect is mediated: 0.524

Ratio of indirect to effect: 1.099

Ratio of total to effect: 2.099
Hypothesis testing:

To check the mediation effect, the three-step approach has to be tested. Starting with the step one, there is a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment which is Y and importance of CSR to employees’ which is X (Table 18/ Step 1). This supports the first hypothesis of the study, which is the importance of CSR to employees, will be positively associated with employees’ organizational commitment. Moving to the second step, the relationship between the mediator, which is the CSR satisfaction, and independent variable, which is importance of CSR to employees, is significant (Table 18/ Step 2). This supports the second hypothesis of the study, which is the importance of CSR to employees will be positively associated with employees’ satisfaction with the organization’s CSR activities. Therefore, we can proceed to step 3 to check the type of mediation. In step 3, it can be seen in table 2/ Step 3 that importance of CSR to employees, which is X, is no longer significant when CSR satisfaction, which is M, is controlled, the finding supports full mediation. Thus, the third hypothesis cannot be rejected that employees satisfaction with the organization CSR activity will be positively associated with employees organizational commitment. The Sobel mediation test supports the significance of the effect of mediation. Therefore, there is strong evidence that CSR satisfaction mediates the relationship between importance of CSR and
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organizational commitment of employees who have CSR activities and programs. The indirect effect accounts for 52% of the total effect.

In the final model in table#18 Step 3, the R Square, which is the coefficient of determination is the squared value of the multiple correlation coefficients, shows that 28% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model; while the ANOVA tests measure the acceptability of the model from a statistical perspective. The significance value of the F-statistic is less than 0.05, which means the model used reflects reality between dependent and independent variables. It can also be seen that there is a significant inverse relationship between organizational commitment as a dependent variable from one side and length of employment in the company and age as independent variables from other side.
Table 17: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation among Study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Importance of CSR</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.1508*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CSR satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.4281**</td>
<td>0.2194**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Length of employment Q1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>~0.1549**</td>
<td>0.1011</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gender Q13</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.0724</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Age Q14</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.1478*</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.2071**</td>
<td>~0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Employees’ expertise Q15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.0702</td>
<td>0.1032</td>
<td>0.5403**</td>
<td>~0.011</td>
<td>0.2815**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 and ** p<.01

Table 17 provides the means, standard deviations, and correlations between the variables of the regression model.
Table 18: Mediated Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of employment</td>
<td>-0.252*</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>-0.286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.350*</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>-0.308*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ expertise</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of CSR</td>
<td>0.105**</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.369</td>
<td>1.055**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0947</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 and ** p<.01

n=195
Overall Organizational Commitment:

All the above tests were performed on the participants whom their companies lead CSR activities to be able to prove the relationship between the CSR importance, CSR Satisfaction and the Organizational Commitment.

In this section a T-test for equality of means is performed to compare the “organizational commitment” between the 131 participants who work for companies with No CSR activities and the 195 participants who work for companies that do CSR activities.

The organizational commitment average is higher for the companies that do CSR activities with narrower standard deviation than that of the companies with No CSR activities as elaborated in Table #19.

Table # 19 Organizational Commitment T-Test Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 20 proves that the organizational commitment is significantly higher with the companies with CSR activities where p-value is .000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 20 Organizational Commitment T-Test for equality of means
CHAPTER VII:

FINDINGS
This study tries to investigate whether investing in CSR is worth the effort. It attempts to provide evidence to the top management and decision makers that applying CSR best practices is a win-win strategy. Since a corporation’s most indispensible asset is its high calibers, this study sheds light on the benefits that are assumed to be associated with being a responsible corporation; that is, to maintain its employees’ organizational commitment.

The research model links the independent variable “importance of CSR to employees” and “CSR satisfaction” as the mediating variable to the dependent variable “organizational commitment.” The researcher aims to build a model to understand the effect of CSR programs and activities on the organizational commitment of employees. The researcher created the independent variable and the mediating variable to align with the research objectives. Some other control variables were added which are “the length of employment in the company,” “gender,” “age,” and “employees’ expertise.”

The Statistical analysis of the survey supports the significance of the effect of mediation on the organizational commitment where the research has proved that the independent variable “importance of CSR to employees” and the mediating variable, “CSR satisfaction” have a positive relationship with the dependent variable “organizational commitment.” This model was introduced by the researcher to the research model. Also, “importance of CSR” variable showed significance with CSR satisfaction reflecting its significance to the research. The mediating model relation is described with the following linear equation: 
organizational commitment = 1.055 + 0.149 * CSR + 0.050 * Importance - 0.286* Q1 + 0.107* Q13 - 0.308* Q14 + 0.014* Q15.
Inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities represented the highest satisfaction with a mean of approximately 3.98 and standard deviation of 0.834 followed by companies that should be obliged to implement socially responsible programs and activities with a mean of 3.9 and standard deviation of 0.982. This shows the important role of CSR activities and programs for the company.

Salary has the highest ranking for measuring organizational commitment of the employees followed by promotion opportunities then feeling of pride of the company's business reputation. These choices come as a logical explanation to the common sense of being an employed, which are the financial reward and growth opportunities. The least measure contributing to organizational commitment is the feeling of pride of company’s socially responsible programs and activities. This conclusion obtained from the descriptive analysis is investigated later by the mediating regression model. The finding of the model supported full mediation, which strongly supports that CSR satisfaction mediates the relationship between importance of CSR and organizational commitment of employees who have CSR activities and programs. Therefore descriptive analysis was not enough in investigating the organizational commitment of employees due to CSR activities and programs led by the company.
Study Limitations:

In general, the study was confronted by some limitations:

- In this research, as the case with every empirical study, this study depends on individual perceptions. Although the researcher assumed that the respondents will provide accurate and reliable information about their organizations’ CSR involvement, it is probable that they may provide inaccurate or incomplete information based on their lack of knowledge or biased perceptions. The researcher treated those respondents as working for companies who do not carry out CSR activities while their corporation might be, in fact, CSR doers. Hence, there is an expected disparity between employees’ perceptions and actual involvement level. This limitation is similar to earlier studies in the literature (Turker, 2008).

- A couple of inquiries were sent to the researcher questioning the objective of the study and its confidentiality. The researcher was well-aware of these potential inquires, especially the concern that the information might be used by competitors to gain a competitive advantage. Hence, the researcher provided all relevant information that confirmed that this study was for the research purpose only and that all data was anonymous.

- Non-CSR group was extremely hard to reach. This is because most companies in Egypt are now applying CSR activities, even on a small case, which has led to elongating the time of the study to fulfil the competitive analysis requirement.
The researcher’s initial intention was to compare two groups (CSR group and Non-CSR group) while identifying all companies, through simultaneously studying each company at a time; however, this process has greatly elongated the data collection process since each company took at least 7 working days. Moreover, in some companies, the lead contact was unable to collect the number required by the researcher. After around two months, the researcher decided to open the data collection, which resulted in the un-identification of the companies under study since it was difficult to follow the preliminary methodology.

- Defining the CSR activities that each corporation is leading was very hard due to the wide variety of activities each corporation might be leading. Since each corporation might be leading CSR activities according to a set of pillars that are aligned with its strategic goals, be it environment, health, education, economic development, etc, it was almost impossible to identify the activities of each corporation.

- Due to the general depression in the country associated with the political unrest, many potential respondents were not interested to make an effort to respond to surveys that they did not feel were directly related to them.

- Due to many political events taking place after the revolution, data collection was interrupted several times, since many of the researcher’s lead contacts were not able to follow up with their contacts.

- In general, Egypt is not a research-friendly environment. People are reluctant to participate in any study and are not willing to waste time in responding to surveys.
CHAPTER VII:

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Conclusion:

Over time, corporations have encountered countless challenges, which have not only affected their image in the eyes of their consumers, but also could potentially affect the perception of its employees, one of the most important assets of a corporation. The data that was gathered in the survey added to the perspective of the current literature on this subject. Furthermore, it could help highlight the importance of CSR in Egypt and inspire the managements utilize this information to reconsider their mission and vision statements, and reprioritize their corporate beliefs. Further research in this topic should be able to highlight to corporations’ board of directors in Egypt the benefits they will reap when they direct their businesses towards a more socially responsible path.

This is an exploratory research since the researcher has no idea what the results might be. The research is intended to search for data indications rather than to attempt to find causality. According to the data analysis, research data confirms the earlier findings by the literature review about the significance of having CSR in relation to employee retention. It is also recommended that businesses should search for assistance from corporations within their own industry to determine the best practices to apply a well-established sustainable business model. These corporations should start collaborating with governments, NGOs, and civil societies to create a profound sustainable CSR programs that will assist those organizations maintain the desired image in the eyes of their key stakeholders: their employees.

Employees’ organizational commitment reflects a strong management focuses on today’s businesses. It resonates positive behavioral outcome, in addition to amplified
voluntarily hard work (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). This, in turn, results in higher profitability and superior values to the shareholders. Unfortunately, a number of corporations have previously used CSR for the mere purpose of creating publicity stunts and advertising for their businesses. Others, in spite of the challenges they face to apply CSR practices, have become well aware of the fact that CSR will be a guiding vision for the future for businesses who are striving to reach their optimum. “CSR is a moving target, making it increasingly necessary to adopt and change according to shifting stakeholder expectations, but also to influence those expectations” (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Hence, some corporations’ management has come to value the importance of CSR for the success of their business models and creating a competitive advantage for their employees (Porter, 2006). This study aimed to contribute to the evidence that supports the notion of positive correlation between CSR and employees’ commitment towards their organizations.

In conclusion, the results suggest that employees in Egypt have a preference of working for organizations that have social performance and their organizational commitment is positively affected by these social activities. The study’s findings confirm the potential significance of CSR as a competitive advantage for corporations to attract and maintain good calibers. The analyzed data demonstrates the positive effect of CSR on employees’ organizational commitment. Based on the theoretical framework of the SIT literature, three hypotheses were tested through regression analysis. The findings of the research exposed that the status of an organization affects the self-esteem of its employees, which results is showing higher levels of organizational commitment towards
the employer. The results of the study concur with the suggested model of SIT.

Nevertheless, further studies and analyses are recommended to substantiate these results.
**Recommendations:**

It is recommended the communication of CSR activities to the corporation’s employees as a managerial implication to form corporate identification. According to Peterson, 2004, corporations are encouraged to keep their employees aligned with their CSR activities via various means such as newsletters, employee engagement, intranet, and corporate meetings. Involving employees in the decision making process and communicating the process with employees will even reap better results. Corporations who manage to involve their employees in identifying the community needs process, complying with government regulations, and working for a better environment will result in a deeper influence on employee commitment and organizational performance. Corporate communication directed towards employees is as important as the communication directed towards external stakeholders. Since SIT suggests that employees’ perceptions of their organization is more effective than the objective measure of the organization’s actual social performance, communication helps employees become aware of the organization’s objectives, values, and achievements. These recommendations confirm the previous literature found on SIT emphasizing the fact that exposure to organizational identification is indispensible to group identification (Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 19994). In addition to keeping employees informed to build upon their self-identification with the employer, these employees are ambassadors of their corporations. Having a positive image of their corporations will lead to a positive word of mouth by employees, alleviating the corporation’s reputation in the market as well as keeping employees’ engaged and maintaining their positive perceptions.
CSR supports Strategic HR objectives by maintaining employees’ organizational commitment. This study builds on earlier researchers’ work (Bhattacharya & Wright, 2005), which suggest that strategic application of CSR will positively affect employees’ retention. The researcher suggests further research in order to understand the implication of such retention. Also, further research will examine the best possible CSR applications that will positively influence the employees’ self-identification with their corporations, and in turn, their organizational commitment.

On the other hand, given the current political situation in Egypt, it is hard to predict the future of any corporation within the unstable political scene the country is going through. Thus, leading CSR activities might seem as an indispensible action through which corporations play an important role in exhibiting their good corporate citizen side (Barma, 2012). With the lower GDP and the accumulating debts the country is witnessing, CSR could be the only breeze the unprivileged people might enjoy while the government is struggling to maintain the current status quo. To some, CSR might not just be a declaration of good will, it could exceed that to help the economy survive during a much needed time.
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Appendices

Appendix I: Hofstede’s cultural Dimension:

**Power Distance Index (PDI)** that is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. This represents inequality (more versus less), but defined from below, not from above. It suggests that a society's level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders. Power and inequality, of course, are extremely fundamental facts of any society and anybody with some international experience will be aware that 'all societies are unequal, but some are more unequal than others'.

**Individualism (IDV)** on the one side versus its opposite, collectivism, that is the degree to which individuals are inte-grated into groups. On the individualist side we find societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family. On the collectivist side, we find societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families (with uncles, aunts and grandparents) which continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning organizational commitment. The word 'collectivism' in this sense has no political meaning: it refers to the group, not to the state. Again, the issue addressed by this dimension is an extremely fundamental one, regarding all societies in the world.
**Masculinity (MAS)** versus its opposite, femininity, refers to the distribution of roles between the genders which is another fundamental issue for any society to which a range of solutions are found. The IBM studies revealed that (a) women's values differ less among societies than men's values; (b) men's values from one country to another contain a dimension from very assertive and competitive and maximally different from women's values on the one side, to modest and caring and similar to women's values on the other. The assertive pole has been called 'masculine' and the modest, caring pole 'feminine'. The women in feminine countries have the same modest, caring values as the men; in the masculine countries they are somewhat assertive and competitive, but not as much as the men, so that these countries show a gap between men's values and women's values.

**Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)** deals with a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity; it ultimately refers to man's search for Truth. It indicates to what extent a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations. Unstructured situations are novel, unknown, surprising, different from usual. Uncertainty avoiding cultures try to minimize the possibility of such situations by strict laws and rules, safety and security measures, and on the philosophical and religious level by a belief in absolute Truth; 'there can only be one Truth and we have it'. People in uncertainty avoiding countries are also more emotional, and motivated by inner nervous energy. The opposite type, uncertainty accepting cultures, are more tolerant of opinions different from what they are used to; they try to have as few rules as possible, and on the philosophical and religious level they are relativist and allow many currents to flow side
by side. People within these cultures are more phlegmatic and contemplative, and not expected by their environment to express emotions.

**Long-Term Orientation (LTO)** versus short-term orientation: this fifth dimension was found in a study among students in 23 countries around the world, using a questionnaire designed by Chinese scholars. It can be said to deal with Virtue regardless of Truth.

Values associated with Long Term Orientation are thrift and perseverance; values associated with Short Term Orientation are respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations, and protecting one's 'face'. Both the positively and the negatively rated values of this dimension are found in the teachings of Confucius, the most influential Chinese philosopher who lived around 500 B.C.; however, the dimension also applies to countries without a Confucian heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human rights</th>
<th>Labour standards</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights</td>
<td>Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining</td>
<td>Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure they are not complicit in human rights abuses</td>
<td>The elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour</td>
<td>Undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The effective abolition of child labour</td>
<td>Encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate discrimination in respect of employment and occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Global Compact Office, 2001: 2.*
Appendix II: List of companies participated in the survey

1. Abu Dhabi Islamic Bank
2. BNP Paribas
3. Coca-Cola Atlantic Industries
4. Danone
5. DSD-Ferrometalco
6. Egyptian Banking Institute (EBI)
7. Etisalat Misr
8. Integral Environmental Consultancy
9. ITWorx
10. Living In Interiors
11. Metro Markets, Mansour Group
12. MSA University
13. MZECH
14. NSGB
15. Petrojet egypt
16. Savola Group
17. SITA Networking and Computing
18. Sprint group
19. The American University in Cairo
20. Turner Construction International
21. United Bank
22. Step-up business training centre
Appendix III: English Questionnaire

Dear Participant,

I kindly appreciate your participation in this study conducted for research purposes only and in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the M.A degree at the American University in Cairo.

The data collected by this questionnaire is exclusively for research purpose and will not be used or distributed elsewhere.

You will be asked to fill out a questionnaire in which you select the options that best represents your experiences and views. The completion time of the study is approximately 10 minutes. Participation in this study is voluntary. Results are completely confidential.

For your response to be counted, it is very important that you fully answer the questions.

By clicking “Next” and completing this study, you are agreeing to the following statements:

- I understand the requirements of this project, and my role as a participant.
- I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw at any time.
1. How long have you been employed at your current company?
   - Less than a year
   - 1 to 5 years
   - Over 5 and less than 10 years
   - Over 10 years

2. In the last five years, was your company involved in any socially responsible programs and activities? (e.g. Sponsorships of charitable events, Charitable Contributions, Community Programs/Projects, Environmental Beautification / Preservation)
   - Yes (please proceed to Q.3)
   - No (please proceed to Q no 8.)
   - Don’t know (please proceed to Q. no 8)

3. On a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating extreme satisfaction and 5 indicating extreme dissatisfaction, Do you feel satisfied with the responsible programs and activities (e.g. Sponsorships of charitable events, Charitable Contributions, Community Programs/Projects, Environmental Beautification / Preservation) of your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I can overlook a few things that bother me at my company for the sake of implemented socially responsible programs and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. I get inner satisfaction and a feeling of happiness because of belonging to a company that implements socially responsible programs and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How satisfied are you with your company’s reputation of its socially responsible programs and activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I think that companies should be obliged to implement socially responsible programs and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Would you leave your company for a another job with a better pay even if the new company doesn’t apply socially responsible programs and activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How satisfied are you in regard to your employment at your current company? That is, overall, in terms of all factors that are important to you, how happy are you with your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you ever thought of changing the company you work at?

- Never
- Sometimes/occasionally
- Frequently
- Very frequently

11. How loyal do you feel towards your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely loyal</th>
<th>Loyal</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>NOT loyal</th>
<th>Extremely NOT loyal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Please rank the following 7 reasons for remaining employed at your current company. 1 being the most important and 7 being the least important

- Salary
- Promotion opportunities
- Flexible working hours
- Proximity from home
- Socialization opportunities and friendships
- Feeling of pride of the company’s business reputation
- Feeling of pride of company’s socially responsible programs and activities

13. Gender:
   - Male
   - Female

14. What is your age?
   - Under 20
   - 20 to 30
   - 31 to 50
   - Over 50

15. What is your level of expertise?
   - entry level (0-3 years experience)
   - Professional (4-8 years experience)
   - Middle management (9-13 years experience)
   - Top management (14+ years experience)
Appendix IV: Arabic Questionnaire

الاستبيان

عزيزي المشارك

أرجو مشترككم في هذه الدراسة التي أجريت لأغراض البحث العلمي فقط وكجزء من متطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير من الجامعة الأمريكية في القاهرة.

البيانات التي سيتم جمعها بواسطة هذا الاستبيان سوف تستخدم حصريا لغرض البحث ولن تستخدم أو توزع في أماكن أخرى.

سوف يطلب منك ملء استبيان حيث تقوم بتحديد الاختيارات التي تتوفر عندك وعن وجهات نظرك. الوقت المطلوب لانتهاء من هذه الدراسة هو حوالي 10 دقائق. المشاركة في هذه الدراسة طوعية ونتائج سرية تماما.

من المهم جدا أن تجيب على الأسئلة بشكل كامل.

بالنقر على "الدائم" واستكمال هذه الدراسة فإنك توافق على العبارات التالية:

- أنك أي شخص يمكن أن يشارك في المشاريعادروها.
- أنك أي شخص يمكن أن يشارك في المشاريعادروها.

1. منذ متى وانت تعمل في شركتك الحالية؟

   أقل من سنة
     1 إلى 5 سنوات
   أكثر من 5 سنوات وأقل من 10 سنوات
   أكثر من 10 سنوات

2. في السنوات الخمس الماضية، هل شاركت شركتك في أي برامج أو أنشطة المسؤولية الاجتماعية؟ (على سبيل المثال الرعاية للأحداث الخيرية التبرعات الخيرية والبرامج المجتمعية / المشاريع تجربة البيئة)

   نعم (يرجى الانتقال إلى س.3)
   لا (يرجى الانتقال إلى س.8)
   لا أعرف (يرجى الانتقال إلى س.8)

3. على مقياس من 1 إلى 5، حيث يمثل 1 الرضا للغاية و 5 تشير إلى عدم الرضا تماما، هل تشعر بالرضى عن برامج أو أنشطة المسؤولية الاجتماعية (على سبيل المثال الوعي بالأحداث الخيرية التبرعات الخيرية والبرامج المجتمعية / المشاريع تجربة البيئة الخاصة بالشركة الخاصة بك؟

   راض للغاية
   غير راض
   محايد

   5
   4
   3
   2
   1
4. أستطيع التغاضي عن عدد قليل من الأشياء التي تزعجني في الشركة التي أعمل بها في مقابل تنفيذ برنامج وأنشطة المسؤولية الاجتماعية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موافق جدًا</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير موافق</th>
<th>غير موافق تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. أشعر بالارتياح الداخلي بالسعادة لكوني أنتوني لإحدى الشركات التي تطبق برامج المسؤولية الاجتماعية والأنشطة الاجتماعية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موافق جدًا</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير موافق</th>
<th>غير موافق تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. ما مدى سعادتك بسمعة شركتك عن برامجها الخاصة بالمسؤولية الاجتماعية والأنشطة الاجتماعية؟?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موافق جدًا</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير موافق</th>
<th>غير موافق تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. أعتقد أن واجب الشركات أن تلتزم بتنفيذ برامج وأنشطة المسؤولية الاجتماعية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موافق جدًا</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير موافق</th>
<th>غير موافق تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. من الممكن أن أترك الشركة التي أعمل لديها للحصول على وظيفة أخرى بأجر أفضل حتى لو كانت الشركة الجديدة لا تنطبق برامج المسؤولية الاجتماعية والأنشطة الاجتماعية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موافق جدًا</th>
<th>موافق</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير موافق</th>
<th>غير موافق تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. ما مدى رضائك فيما يتعلق بعمرك في شركتك الحالية؟ بمعنى آخر ما مدى سعادتك في عملك مع الأخذ في الاعتبار جميع العوامل التي هي مهمة بالنسبة لك

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>راض للغاية</th>
<th>راض</th>
<th>محيد</th>
<th>غير راض</th>
<th>غير راض تمامًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. هل يبقي لك أن تفكر في تغيير الشركة التي تعمل بها؟

- أبداً
- في بعض الأحيان
- كثيراً
- أغلب الوقت

11. إلى أي درجة تشعر بالولاية/وفاء نحو شركتك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>وفي جداً</th>
<th>وفيعاً</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>غير وفي على الإطلاق</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. يرجى ترتيب التالية 7 أسباب التالية التي تتقيكم كموظف شركتك الحالية حيث رقم 1 هو الأهم و 7 الأقل أهمية

الراتب
- فرص الترقى في السلسلة الوظيفية
- ساعات العمل المرنة
- الاقرب من المنزل
- البيئة الاجتماعية والصداقات
- الشعور بالفخر للسمعة التجارية للشركة
- الشعور بالفخر من برامج المسؤولية الاجتماعية للشركة والأنشطة

13. الجنس:
- ذكر
- أنثى

14. ما هو عمرك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>تحت 20 سنة</th>
<th>20 حتى 30</th>
<th>31 حتى 50</th>
<th>أكثر من 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. ما هو مستوي خبرتك الوظيفي؟

- مبتدئ (0-3 سنوات خبرة)
- متخصص (4-8 سنوات خبرة)
- إدارة متوسطة (9-13 سنوات خبرة)
- الإدارة العليا (14-15 سنوات خبرة)