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6.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to exhibit the summary of findings of the study. The summarized findings are classified into general findings and main findings. The general findings provide detailed understanding of the demographic profile of the respondents and include supplementary findings of the study. The main findings are based on Hypotheses testing and have been classified into Findings from Financial and Non Financial performance parameters.

6.2 Summary of General Findings

1. The sample distribution has an adequate representation of all age categories of employees working in different IT companies in Karnataka. The average age of the respondents is 30.76. Out of the total sample of 708, the respondents from the age group of 26-30 years constituted the single largest category of respondents at 33%. The respondents from the age groups of 31-40 years and <=25 years constituted 31% and 27%, respectively, of the sample. The respondents from the age group of more than or equal to 41 years constituted 9% of the sample out of 708 sample count. (Table 5.2.2 and Fig. 5.2.2)

2. The sample distribution has an adequate representation of both male and female respondents. The largest group of sample respondents (76%) belonged to male category. Out of the total sample of 708 respondents 76% were male and 24% of them were female. (Table 5.2.1 and Figure 5.2.1)

3. The large group of the sample respondents (55%) belongs to unmarried group. Out of the sample of 708 respondents, 55% belonged to unmarried/single category and 45% belonged to married category. (Table 5.2.3 and Figure 5.2.3)

4. The sample distribution has representation of employees having different levels of experience in the current organization. Out of the total sample size of 708, the single largest category of the respondents at 39% had experience at current organization of 3-5 years. The respondents who constituted less then and equal to 2 years constituted 37% and more than 5 years constituted 24% of the sample. (Table 5.2.4 and Figure 5.2.4)

5. The sample distribution has representation of employees having different levels of total work experience. Total experience represents overall work
experience of IT professionals including experience in current organization as well as earlier organizations they had worked. Out of the total sample of 708 respondents, the single largest category of employees who had total work experience of 6-10 years constitutes 32%. It is closely followed at 30% by those who had total experience of between 3-5 years. The respondents having total experience of more than 10 years and less than 2 years constituted 22% and 17%, respectively of the sample. (Table 5.2.5 and Figure 5.2.5)

6. The employees responses on CSR activities to environment had the factor of 'Participates to the activities which aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment' achieved the highest mean score of 5.12. It was closely followed by 'Makes investment to create a better life for the future generations', 'Implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment' and 'Targets a sustainable growth which considers the future generations' which achieved mean scores of 5.09 each. 'Supports the non-governmental organizations working in the problematic areas' and 'Contributes to the campaigns and projects that promote the wellbeing of the society' achieved the least mean scores of 4.41 each. The overall mean score achieved by 'CSR to Environment' was 4.97. (Table 5.3.1)

7. In the responses of the employees’ perceptions of CSR to employees of 'CSR to Employees' brings out that 'Policies encourage the employees to develop their skills and careers' achieved the highest mean score of 4.78. It was followed by 'Supports employees who want to acquire additional qualification' and 'Encourages employees to participate in voluntary activities intended towards well-beingness of the society' which achieved mean scores of 4.76 and 4.68, respectively. While 'Implements flexible policies to provide a good work and life balance for its employees' achieved a mean score of 4.57, the same achieved by 'The managerial decisions related with the employees are usually fair' and 'The management of our company is primarily concerned with employees needs and wants' were 4.54 and 4.53, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by 'CSR to Employees' was 4.64. (Table 5.3.2)

8. In the responses of employees’ perceptions of CSR to customer the component of 'Customer satisfaction is highly important for our company' achieved the highest mean score of 4.48. This was followed by 'Provides full and accurate
information about its products to its customers' and 'Protects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements' which achieved mean scores of 4.41 and 4.38, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by 'CSR to customers' was 4.42. (Table 5.3.3)

9. In the responses of the employees’ perceptions of CSR to government, the component of 'CSR to government' brings out that both 'Always pays its taxes on a regular and continuing basis' and 'Complies with the legal regulations completely and promptly' achieved mean scores of 4.48 each. The overall mean score achieved by 'CSR to government' was also 4.48. (Table 5.3.4)

10. In the responses to ICSR components of the employees the factor of 'According to me, Business has a social responsibility beyond making profit' achieved the highest mean score of 4.57. It was closely followed by 'Being socially responsible is the most important thing a firm a can do', which achieved a mean score of 4.56. While 'Social responsibility of a firm is essential to its long-term profitability' and 'The overall effectiveness of a business can be determined to a great extent by the degree to which it is socially responsible' achieved mean scores of 4.32 and 4.31, respectively, the same achieved by 'According to me, Social responsibility is critical to the survival of a business enterprise' was least at 4.29. The overall mean score achieved by ICSR Scale was 4.41. (Table 5.3.5)

11. In the responses representing overall CSR as perceived by the employees, the component of overall CSR as perceived by the employees, the component of analysis of 'CSR to Stakeholders' achieved the highest mean score of 4.87. This was followed by 'CSR to employees' and 'CSR to Government' which achieved mean scores of 4.64 and 4.48, respectively. 'CSR to customers' and 'ICSR Scale' achieved mean scores of 4.42 and 4.41, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by Corporate Social Responsibility was 4.56. (Table 5.3.6)

12. In the analysis of affective commitment of the employees the factors that 'This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me' achieved the highest mean score of 4.58. This was followed by 'I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization' and 'I feel like part of the family at my organization' which
achieved mean scores of 4.55 and 4.52, respectively. While 'I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own' and 'I feel emotionally attached to this organization' achieved mean scores of 4.51 and 4.48, respectively, 'I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this company' achieved the least mean score (of 4.46). The overall mean score of 'Affective' was 4.52. (Table 5.3.7)

13. In the case of Normative commitment of the employees the factor of 'If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might have considered working elsewhere' achieved the highest mean score of 4.16. This was followed by 'Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire' and 'Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now' which achieved mean scores of 4.53 and 4.49, respectively. While 'One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives' and 'It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now even if I wanted to' achieved mean scores of 4.49 and 4.47, respectively, the same achieved by 'It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now even if I wanted to' was least (at 4.45). The overall mean score achieved by 'Normative' was 4.51. (Table 5.3.8)

14. In response to Continuance commitment, the employees feel that factor of 'I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it' achieved the highest mean score of 4.81. It was followed by 'I owe a great deal to my organization' and 'Even if it were to my advantage I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now' which achieved mean scores of 4.51 and 4.50, respectively. While 'This organization deserves my loyalty' and 'I would feel guilty if I leave this company now' achieved mean scores of 4.48 and 4.25, the same achieved by 'I have an obligation to remain with my current employer' achieved by 'I have an obligation to remain with my current employer' was least (at 4.21). The overall mean score achieved by 'Continuance' was 4.46. (Table 5.3.9)

15. In the analysis of overall organization commitment of the employees, the component of Affective commitment achieved the highest mean score of 4.52. This was followed by Normative and Continuance which achieved mean
scores of 4.51 and 4.46, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by Organization Commitment was 4.49. (Table 5.3.10 and Figure 5.3.10)

16. An analysis of the table on components of 'Job Satisfaction' brings out that 'I feel good about my job' achieved the highest mean score of 4.78. This was followed by 'All my talents and skills are used at work' and 'I feel secure of the job' which achieved mean scores of 4.74 and 4.55, respectively. While 'I feel close to the people at work' and 'I get along with my supervisors' achieved mean scores of 4.53 and 4.42, respectively. While 'I receive recognition for a job well done', 'I believe the management is concerned about me' and 'My wages are good' achieved mean scores of 4.35, 4.32 and 4.29, respectively, both 'I feel good about working at this company' and 'On the whole I believe work in this company is good for my physical health' achieved mean scores of 4.26 each. The overall mean score achieved by 'Job Satisfaction' was 4.45. (Table 5.3.11)

17. The analysis of emotional Appeal' brings out that 'I admire and respect this company' achieved the highest mean score of 4.89. This was followed by 'I trust this company' and 'I have a good feeling about this company' which achieved mean scores of 4.86 and 4.77, respectively. While 'I feel quite secure to work in this company' and 'I am proud to work at this company' achieved mean scores of 4.56 and 4.52, respectively, the same achieved by 'This company offers products and services that are a good value for money', 'This company stands behind its products and services' and 'This company develops innovative products and services' were 4.51, 4.49 and 4.48, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by 'Emotional Appeal' was 4.64. (Table 5.3.12)

18. The responses of the employees to the components of ‘Vision and Leadership’ bring out that ‘This company has a clear vision for its future' achieved the highest mean score of 4.50. This was followed by 'This Company recognized and takes advantage of market opportunities’ and ‘This Company has excellent leadership’, which achieved mean scores of 4.49 and 4.44, respectively. The overall mean score achieved by ‘Vision and Leadership' was 4.48. (Table 5.3.13)
19. The responses suggest that for the components of 'Workspace Environment' brings out that 'This Company is an environmentally responsible company' achieved the highest mean score of 5.11. This was followed by 'This company looks like a good company to work for' and 'This company looks like a company that would have good employees' which achieved mean scores of 4.77 and 4.59, respectively. While 'Our company maintains high standards in the way it treats people' and 'This company is well managed' achieved mean scores of 4.57 and 4.45, respectively, 'This company supports good cause' achieved the least mean score of 4.42. The overall mean score achieved by 'Workplace Environment' was 4.65. (Table 5.3.14)

20. The responses to the components of 'Financial Performance' brings out that 'This Company tends to outperform its competitors' achieved the highest mean score of 4.46. While 'This company looks like a low risk investment' and 'This company has a strong record of profitability' achieved mean scores of 4.43 and 4.42, respectively, 'This company looks like a company with strong prospects for future growth' achieved the least mean score of 4.40. The overall mean score achieved by 'Financial Performance' was 4.43. (Table 5.3.15)

21. In the analysis of overall internal reputation of the organizations, the component of workplace environment achieved the highest mean score of 4.65. This was followed emotional appeal which achieved mean of 4.64 and vision and leadership which achieved 4.48. The component of Financial performance achieved 4.43. The overall mean score achieved by reputation was 4.55. (Figure 5.3.16)
6.3 Summary of Major Findings based on Hypotheses Testing

The findings have been categorized into Findings from analysis of Non-financial Parameters and Findings from Financial parameters.

6.3.1 Findings from analysis of Non Financial Parameters:

1. An analysis of the relationship between Employees’ perceptions of overall CSR and Job satisfaction brings out that Job Satisfaction has positive and significant (at 1% level) correlation with Employees’ perceptions of CSR with Pearson correlation coefficient R being 0.626. The individual components of CSR also show a positive relationship with Job Satisfaction. Employees’ perceptions of CSR to employees has highest levels of positive and significant correlations with overall job satisfaction (R=0.541) followed by CSR to customers with R=0.422 and then by CSR to environment with R= 0.415 and least correlation is found between CSR to government and job satisfaction with R=0.287. (Table 5.4.1)

2. An analysis of relationship between Employees’ perceptions of CSR and employee commitment to organization, it is found that both have positive and significant correlation(at 1% level) with each as R=0.0451. The relationship of employees’ perceptions of CSR with various components of commitment (i.e. Affective, Normative and Continuance) are positive as well. Employees’ perceptions of CSR and continuance commitment have highest correlation with R value being 0.469 followed by Employee’s perception of CSR and Affective commitment with R=0.394. The least Correlation is between Employee’s perception of CSR and Normative commitment with R=0.297. (Table 5.4.2)

3. An analysis of relationship between Employees’ perception of CSR and internal reputation indicates that there is a positive and significant correlation (at 1% level) with R=0.586. The individual components of Employees’ perceptions of CSR also show a positive relationship with internal reputation. (Table 5.4.3)

4. An analysis of Employees’ perceptions on various CSR parameters across genders has given the following results:
   a) CSR to Environment achieved mean score of 4.55 from female respondents and from male respondents it was 4.97 with T value being -2.23 and
significance is 0.03. Significance value is found to be less than 0.05 while the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are significant at 5% level suggesting that employees’ perceptions of CSR to environment are not same across genders. (Table 5.4.6)

b) CSR to Employees achieved a mean score or 4.15 from female respondents while that from male respondents was 4.80 with t-value being -3.78 and significance is 0.00. The significance value was less than 0.05 and the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are significant at 5% level suggesting that Employees’ perceptions of CSR to employees are not same across genders. (Table 5.4.6)

c) CSR to Customers achieved mean score of 4.15 from female respondents while that from male respondents was 4.51. The t value was -1.56 and significance is 0.12. Since the significance value was more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders were not significant at 5% level thus suggesting that employees’ perceptions of CSR to customers are same across genders. (Table 5.4.6)

d) CSR to Government achieved mean score achieved by this parameter from female respondents was 4.32 while that from male respondents was 4.53. The t-value is -0.89 and significance is 0.37. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level thus suggesting that employees’ perceptions of CSR to Government are same across genders. (Table 5.4.6)

e) In the case of responses to ICSR scale, the mean score achieved by the parameter from female respondents was 4.38 while that from male respondents was 4.42. The t-value is -2.58 and significance is 0.84. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders is not significant at 5% level. (Table 5.4.6)

f) In the analysis of employees’ perceptions of overall Corporate Social Responsibility, the mean score achieved by female respondents was 4.31 while that from male respondents was 4.65. The t-value is -2.58 and significance is 0.01 and as the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean difference existing for overall Corporate Social Responsibility across the
two genders are significant at 5% level thus suggesting that employees’ perceptions of overall CSR parameters across genders are not same. (Table 5.4.6)

5. An analysis of Organization commitment parameters across genders has given the following results:

a) In the analysis of affective commitment attributes, the mean score achieved from female respondents was 4.14 while that from male respondents was 4.64. The t-value was -2.91 and significance being 0.00. Since the significance value was less than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are significant at 5% level thereby suggesting perception of affective commitment parameters is not same across genders. (Table 5.4.4)

b) In the case of normative commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from female respondents was 4.31 while that from male respondents was 4.57. The t-value was -1.59 and significance is 0.11. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level thus suggesting that perception of normative commitment parameters by the employees is same across different genders. (Table 5.4.4)

c) In the analysis of continuance commitment attributes, the mean score achieved from female respondents was 4.26 while that from male respondents was 4.52. The t-value was -1.91 and significance is 0.06 with the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level. This suggests that perception of continuance commitment by employees is same across different genders. (Table 5.4.4)

d) The analysis of Organizational commitment parameters indicates that the mean score achieved by overall organizational commitment from female respondents was 4.24 while that from male respondents was 4.58. The t-value was -2.55 and significance was 0.01. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean difference existing for overall organizational commitment across the two genders are significant at 5% level thus
suggesting that overall organization commitment of employees is not same across different genders. (Table 5.4.4)

6. In the analysis of Job satisfaction across genders brings out that the mean score achieved by overall job satisfaction from female respondents was 4.11 while that from male respondents was 4.56. The t-value was -3.46 and significance was 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean difference existing for overall job satisfaction across the two genders are significant at 5% level thereby suggesting that perception of job satisfaction by employees is not same across different genders. (Table 5.4.5)

7. An analysis of reputation parameters as perceived by employees across genders is as below:

a) In the case of emotional appeal which is one of the reputation parameter, the mean score achieved female respondents was 4.45 while that from male respondents was 4.70. The t-value is -1.77 and significance is 0.08. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level suggesting that the parameter of emotional appeal of the company as perceived by employees is same across genders. (Table 5.4.7)

b) In the case of Vision and Leadership the mean score achieved by this parameter from female respondents was 4.38 while that from male respondents was 4.51. The t-value is -0.65 and significance is 0.52. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level suggesting that the perception of Vision and leadership parameters is same across genders. (Table 5.4.7)

c) The analysis of attributes of Workplace Environment the mean score achieved by this parameter from female respondents was 4.44 while that from male respondents was 4.72. The t-value is -1.90 and significance is 0.06. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that employee perceptions of workplace environment is same across genders. (Table 5.4.7)
d) In the analysis of Financial performance as perceived by employees, the mean score achieved by this parameter from female respondents was 4.32 while that from male respondents was 4.46. The t-value is -0.83 and significance is 0.40. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that the perception of employees on financial performance is same across both the genders. (Table 5.4.7)

e) In the analysis of overall internal reputation it has been found that mean score achieved from female respondents was 4.40 while that from male respondents was 4.60. The t-value is -1.47 and significance is 0.14. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean difference existing for this parameter across the two genders are not significant at 5% level thus suggesting that overall internal reputation is same across genders. (Table 5.4.7)

8. An analysis of Employees’ perceptions of CSR across age groups is as below:

a) In the analysis of employees’ perceptions of CSR to environment, the mean score achieved from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.87 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 5.09. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.68 and 4.51, respectively. The F-value is 1.85 and significance is 0.15. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that employees’ perceptions of CSR to environment are same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.10)

b) In the analysis of employees’ perceptions of CSR to Employees, the mean score achieved from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.75 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.64. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.51 and 4.44, respectively. The F-value is 0.65 and significance is 0.58. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are
not significant at 5% level thus suggesting that employees’ perceptions of CSR to employees are same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.10)

c) In the case of CSR to Customers, the mean score achieved from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.38 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.22. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.49 and 4.64, respectively. The F-value is 0.60 and significance is 0.61. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that employees’ perceptions of CSR to Customers are same across different age groups (Table 5.4.10).

d) In the analysis of employees’ perceptions of CSR to Government, the mean score achieved from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.46 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.22. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.71 and 4.32, respectively. The F-value is 1.31 and significance is 0.27. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level suggesting that employees’ perceptions of CSR to Government are same across different age groups (Table 5.4.10).

e) In the case of ICSR scale, the mean score achieved from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.59 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.24. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.49 and 3.83, respectively. The F-value is 2.67 and significance is 0.05. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are significant at 5% thus indicating that ICSR attributes as perceived by employees are not same across different age groups (Table 5.4.10).

f) In the analysis of Employees’ perceptions of overall Corporate Social Responsibility, the mean score achieved by overall Corporate Social Responsibility from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.61 while that
9. An analysis of organizational commitment of employees across age groups is as below:

a) In the analysis of affective commitment attributes, the mean score achieved by respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.87 while that from respondents aged 26 and 30 years was 4.45. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.63 and 4.53, respectively. The F-value is 0.62 and significance is 0.60. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that affective commitment parameters is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.8)

b) In the case of normative commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.45 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.44. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.66 and 4.49, respectively. The F-value is 0.61 and significance is 0.61. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that normative commitment attributes is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.8)

c) In the analysis of Continuance commitment as perceived by employees, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.47 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.31. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents...
aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.54 and 4.53, respectively. The F-value is 0.88 and significance is 0.45. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating continuance commitment of employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.8)

d) In the analysis of overall organization commitment, it was found that from respondents aged less than 25 years the mean achieved was 4.43 while that from respondents aged between it was 26 and 30 years was 4.40. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.61 and 4.52, respectively. The F-value is 0.76 and significance is 0.51. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall organization commitment across various age groups are not significant at 5% level. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted indicating that overall commitment of employees to organizations is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.8)

10. In the analysis of Job Satisfaction, the mean score achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.39 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.43. The mean scores achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.44 and 4.43, respectively. The F-value is 0.05 and significance is 0.99. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall job satisfaction across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that job satisfaction as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.9)

11. An analysis of internal reputation as perceived by employees across age groups is as below:

a) In the case of emotional appeal, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.62 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.57. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.69 and 4.41, respectively. The F-value is 0.59
and significance is 0.62. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that emotional appeal as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.11)

b) The analysis of vision and leadership indicate that the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.47 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.29. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.53 each. The F-value is 0.48 and significance is 0.69. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that vision and leadership as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.11)

c) In the case of attribute of Workplace Environment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.67 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.61. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.66 and 4.41, respectively. The F-value is 0.42 and significance is 0.74. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level. Hence, null hypothesis is accepted thereby indicating that workplace environment as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.11)

d) In the analysis of Financial Performance, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.38 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.32. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.57 and 4.25, respectively. The F-value is 0.83 and significance is 0.48. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that financial performance as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.11)
e) The mean score achieved by overall internal reputation from respondents aged less than 25 years was 4.54 while that from respondents aged between 26 and 30 years was 4.45. The mean scores achieved by overall reputation from respondents aged between 31 and 45 years and above 41 years were 4.61 and 4.40, respectively. The F-value is 0.56 and significance is 0.64. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall reputation across various age groups are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that overall internal reputation as perceived by employees is same across different age groups. (Table 5.4.11)

12. The analysis of various Employees’ perceptions of CSR across current experience levels is as below:

a) In the analysis of Employees’ perceptions of CSR to stakeholders, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.95 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.82. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.83. The F-value is 0.26 and significance is 0.77. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that Employees’ perceptions of CSR to stakeholders is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)

b) In the analysis of Employees’ perceptions of CSR to employees, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.79 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.49. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.67. The F-value is 1.51 and significance is 0.22. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to employees is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)
c) In the analysis of CSR to Customers, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.48 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.18. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.66. The F-value is 1.82 and significance is 0.16. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that CSR to Customers is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)

d) In the case of CSR to Government, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.79 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.04. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.64. The F-value is 6.15 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to Government is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)

e) In the analysis of ICSR Scale, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.70 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.11. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.39. The F-value is 5.55 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thus indicating that ICSR parameters is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)

f) In the case of overall Corporate Social Responsibility, the mean score achieved by overall corporate social responsibility from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.74 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.33. The
mean score achieved by overall corporate social responsibility from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.64. The F-value is 5.62 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall corporate social responsibility across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that Employees’ perceptions of CSR is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.13)

13. The analysis of various Organization commitment parameters across current experience levels is as below:

a) In the case of affective commitment parameter, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.72 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.28. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.65. The F-value is 3.74 and significance is 0.03. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that affective commitment is different across experience levels. (Table 5.4.12)

b) In the case of normative commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.79 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.25. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.54. The F-value is 5.83 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that normative commitment of employees is different across different experience levels. (Table 5.4.12)

c) In the analysis of Continuance commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.66 while that from respondents having less than five years of current
experience was 4.25. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.52. The F-value is 4.64 and significance is 0.01. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thus indicating that continuance commitment parameter is not same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.12)

d) In the analysis of overall Organization Commitment, the mean score achieved by overall organization commitment from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.72 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.26. The mean score achieved by overall organization commitment from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.57. The F-value is 6.53 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall organization commitment across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that overall Organization commitment is not same across different current experience levels. The analysis finds that employees with current experience less than 2 years display higher organization commitment followed by employees with more than 5 years current experience levels and finally by employees with work experience between 3-5 years. (Table 5.4.12)

14. An analysis of Job Satisfaction across current experience levels out that the mean score achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents having less than two years of current experience as well as from the respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.52. The mean score achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.58. An analysis of the above table brings out that the F-value is 2.04 and significance is 0.13. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall job satisfaction across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that job satisfaction is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.14)
15. The analysis of various internal reputation parameters across current experience levels is as below:

a) In the case of emotional appeal, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.74 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.58. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.59. The F-value is 0.84 and significance is 0.43. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that the parameter of emotional appeal is not same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.5.15)

b) In the case of parameters of vision and Leadership, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.63 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.39. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.43. The F-value is 0.84 and significance is 0.43. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that the parameter of vision and leadership is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.15)

c) In the case of workplace environment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.81 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.46. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.69. The F-value is 3.03 and significance is 0.05. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that the parameter of workplace environment is not same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.15)
d) In the analysis of financial Performance, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.50 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.40. The mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.37. The F-value is 0.28 and significance is 0.75. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that the parameter of financial performance is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.15)

e) In the case of overall internal reputation parameters, the mean score achieved from respondents having less than two years of current experience was 4.67 while that from respondents having less than five years of current experience was 4.46. The mean score achieved by overall reputation from respondents having more than five years of current experience was 4.52. The F-value is 1.34 and significance is 0.52. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall reputation across various current experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that overall internal reputation is same across different current experience levels. (Table 5.4.15)

16. The analysis of various Employees’ perceptions of CSR across Total experience levels is as below:

a) In the analysis of CSR to Environment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 5.24 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.78. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.66 and 5.01, respectively. The F-value is 2.16 and significance is 0.09. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to stakeholders is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.18)
b) In the case of CSR to Employees, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.76 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.56. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.58 and 4.77, respectively. The F-value is 0.52 and significance is 0.67. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to employees is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.5.18)

c) In the analysis of CSR to Customers, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.08 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.33. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.62 and 4.50, respectively. The F-value is 1.21 and significance is 0.31. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to customers is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.18)

d) In the case of CSR to Government, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.92 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 3.91. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.64 and 4.66, respectively. An analysis of the above table brings out that the F-value is 4.95 and significance is 0.00. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are significant at 5% level thereby indicating that CSR to government is not same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.18)

e) In the analysis of ICSR Scale, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.51
while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.28. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.39 and 4.50, respectively. The F-value is 0.46 and significance is 0.71. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby suggesting that ICSR is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.18)

f) In the analysis of overall Corporate Social Responsibility across total experience levels, the mean score achieved by overall corporate social responsibility from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.70 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.37. The mean scores achieved by overall corporate social responsibility from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.58 and 4.69, respectively. The F-value is 1.83 and significance is 0.14. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall corporate social responsibility across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby suggesting that overall CSR is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.18)

17. The analysis of organizational commitment of employees across different Total experience levels is as below:

   a) In the analysis of parameter of affective commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.35 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.33. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.74 and 4.62, respectively. The F-value is 1.98 and significance is 0.12. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that affective commitment parameter is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.16)
b) In the analysis of normative commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.47 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.34. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.60 and 4.65, respectively. The F-value is 1.01 and significance is 0.39. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that normative commitment parameter is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.16)

c) In the analysis of Continuance commitment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.42 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.35. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.49 and 4.61, respectively. The F-value is 0.83 and significance is 0.48. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that continuance commitment parameter is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.16)

d) In the analysis of overall Organization Commitment, the mean score achieved by overall organization commitment from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.41 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.34. The mean scores achieved by overall organization commitment from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.61 and 4.63, respectively. The F-value is 1.58 and significance is 0.19. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall organization commitment across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that overall commitment parameter is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.16)
18. An analysis of Job satisfaction against Total experience brings out that the mean score achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.31 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.33. The mean scores achieved by overall job satisfaction from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.48 and 4.68, respectively. An analysis of the above table brings out that the F-value is 2.04 and significance is 0.11. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall job satisfaction across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that overall job satisfaction is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.17)

19. The analysis of various reputation parameters across Total experience levels is as below:

a) In the analysis of Emotional Appeal, the mean score achieved by the parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.46 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.70. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.66 each. The F-value is 0.60 and significance is 0.61. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that parameter of emotional appeal is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.19)

b) In the case of vision and leadership, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.21 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.31. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.74 and 4.58, respectively. The F-value is 2.07 and significance is 0.10. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that parameter of vision and leadership is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.19)
c) In the analysis of Workplace Environment, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.76 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.47. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.73 and 4.69, respectively. The F-value is 1.25 and significance is 0.29. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thereby indicating that parameter of workplace environment is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.19)

d) In the case of financial Performance, the mean score achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.08 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.40. The mean scores achieved by this parameter from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.58 and 4.53, respectively. The F-value is 2.08 and significance is 0.10. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for this parameter across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that parameter of financial performance is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.19)

e) In the analysis of overall reputation across total experience levels, the mean score achieved by overall reputation from respondents having less than two years of total experience was 4.38 while that from respondents having less than five years of total experience was 4.47. The mean scores achieved by overall reputation from respondents having less than ten years of total experience and more than ten years of total experience were 4.68 and 4.62, respectively. The F-value is 1.31 and significance is 0.27. Since the significance value is more than 0.05, the mean differences existing for overall reputation across various total experience levels are not significant at 5% level thus indicating that parameter of reputation is same across different total experience levels. (Table 5.4.19)
20. In the analysis to find the effect of various demographic and CSR parameters on organization commitment, it has been found that in case of independents variables being only demographic variables, the R value is 0.181 while when the independents variables included CSR parameters also, the R value became 0.500. The R square value gives us the goodness of fit of the regression model. That is, the amount of variability explained by the whole of the selected predictor variables in the model. In the above case, when the independents variables were only demographic variables, the R square value was 3.3% while when the independent variables included CSR parameters also, the R square value became 25.0%, which is a major increase. An analysis of the values of significance for the two models bring out that the demographic variables didn't have a significant effect on organization commitment while the CSR parameters had a significant effect (that is over and above the effect of various demographic parameters) on it. In terms of impact of specific CSR parameters, Employee’s perception of CSR to employees, CSR to customers and ICSR scale were found to have a linear relationship with organization commitment. (Table 5.4.20 and 5.4.21)

21. In the analysis done to find the effect of various demographic and CSR parameters on job satisfaction, it is found that in case of independents variables being only demographic variables, the R value is 0.188 while when the independents variables included CSR parameters also, the R value became 0.669. The R square value gives us the goodness of fit of the regression model. That is, the amount of variability explained by the whole of the selected predictor variables in the model. In the above case, when the independents variables were only demographic variables, the R square value was 3.5% while when the independent variables included CSR parameters also, the R square value became 44.8%, which is a major increase. An analysis of the values of significance for the two models bring out that the demographic variables didn't have a significant effect on job satisfaction while the CSR parameters had a significant effect (that is over and above the effect of various demographic parameters) on it. In terms of effect of specific demographic CSR parameters, total experience, Employee’s perception of CSR to stakeholders, CSR to employees, CSR to customers and ICSR scale were found to have a linear relationship with job satisfaction. (Table 5.4.22 and 5.4.23)
22. An analysis of Employee’s perception of CSR and reputation and job satisfaction, the three dimensions were found to have positive and significant correlations (at 1% level) with overall reputation as well as its various components (i.e. Emotional Appeal, Vision and Leadership, Workplace Environment and Financial Performance) (Table 5.4.24 and Figure 5.4.23)

6.3.2 Findings from Analysis of Financial Parameters:

In this section, it is analyse the findings from financial parameters.

1. In the analysis of relationship between CSR rating and Return on Capital employed, Correlation Coefficient R has value of 0.698 (at 1% level) indicating a positive correlation. (Table 5.4.26)

2. The analysis of relationship between CSR ratings and Net Profit Margin shows that Correlation Coefficient R has value of 0.356 (at 1% level) indicating a positive correlation. (Table 5.4.27)

3. In the analysis of relationship between CSR ratings and Operating Profit Margin, Correlation Coefficient R has value of 0.276 (at 1% level) indicating a positive correlation. (Table 5.4.28)

4. The analysis of relationship between CSR ratings and Return on Equity, Correlation Coefficient R has value of 0.556 (at 1% level) indicating a positive correlation. (Table 5.4.29)

5. In the analysis of relationship between CSR ratings and Return on Asset, Correlation Coefficient R has value of 0.098 (at 1% level) indicating a positive correlation. (Table 5.4.30)

6. In the Correlation analysis between CSR Ratings and financial parameters which include Operating Profit Margin, Return on capital employed, Return on Equity, Return on Asset and Net profit Margin indicate that CSR Ratings are positively related to financial constructs namely OPM, NPM, ROCE, ROE, ROA which is 0.27, 0.35, 0.69, 0.56 and 0.09 respectively. (Figure 5.4.30)

7. In the analysis of relationship between CSR & avg OPM, While Educom, Rolta, 3i, ICSA, Hexa, NIIT are low low high and First Sou, Patni, HCL, Spanco, Prithvi comes under low and Wipro, Infosys, Tcs, TechMah, Oracle, Mphasis, Mindtree comes in High High but Polaris, Zensar and Sonata comes
in high low. While R2 =0.076 where CSR has 7% of influence on OPM. (Figure 5.4.31)

8. In the analysis of the relationship between CSR & avg NPM, While Educom,Rolta,3i,patni,HCL are low high and Oracle, Mphasis, Wipro, TCS, Infosys comes under High High and ICSA, Hexa, NIIT, Firstsou, Spanco, Prithvi comes in low low but Polaris, Zensar, Sonata, TechMah, Mindtree comes in high low. While R2 =0.1267 where CSR has 12% of influence on NPM. (Figure 5.4.32)

9. In the analysis of relationship between CSR & avg ROCE, While ICSA, NIIT,3I are low high and Mphasis, Wipro, TCS, Infosys, Zensar,S, Tech Mahindra comes under High High and Hexa, HCL, Patni, Rolta, Spanco, Firstsou, Prithvi, Educom comes in low low but Polaris, Oracle, Mindtree comes in high low. While R2 =0.4874 where CSR has 48% of influence on ROCE. (Figure: 5.4.33)

10. In the analysis of relationship between CSR & avg ROE, While ICSA, NIIT, 3I, Educom, Hexa are low high and Mphasis, Wipro, TCS, Infosys, Zensar, Sonata, Tech Mahindra, Mindtree comes under High High and HCL, Patni, Rolta, Spanco, Firstsou, Prithvi comes in low low but Polaris, Oracle comes in high low. While R2 =0.319 where CSR has 31% of influence on ROE. (Figure 5.4.34)

11. In the analysis of relationship between CSR & avg ROA, While ICSA, Prithvi, Spanco, Educom, patni are low high and 3I, Oracle, Tech Mah, TCS, Infosys, Zensar, Mindtree comes under High High and Hexa, HCL, Rolta, Firstsou,NIIT comes in low low but Polaris, Wipro, Sonato, Mphasis, comes in high low. While R2 =0.0096 where CSR has very less influence on ROA. (Figure: 5.4.35)

12. Correlation analysis between employees’ perceptions of CSR and Financial performance indicate that overall CSR which includes CSR to stakeholders, CSR to employees, CSR to customers, CSR to Government and ICSR Scale has positive and significant relationship with Financial performance further reinforcing our earlier findings through secondary data that CSR has high level of positive correlation with Financial Performance. (Table 5.5.31)
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6.4 Summary of Suggestions Based on Results of Research

Based on the findings, the researcher points few suggestions which are as below:

6.4.1 Suggestions to Organizations:

1. Institutionalizing CSR to improve financial performance:

   There is a need for IT organizations to institutionalize CSR as an important strategy and integrate it as a core activity to improve financial performance. Any organization which is facing challenges of financial performance on any of the parameters of NPM, ROE, ROCE, ROA and OPM should apart from reviewing customer, marketing, production and human resource strategies should also review the CSR strategy of the organization. A proper CSR strategy can help support other functions to achieve higher levels of positive results.

   Organizations need to set aside financial budgets exclusively for CSR spends at the beginning of every year just as it is done for other core functions of the organization. Since the benefits of CSR accrue to the organization in the form of financial performance over a period of time, it is crucial that organizations continue to implement CSR activities for longer period and not treat it as a short term exercise. Organizations need to implement CSR activities at least for a period of four years and above continuously rather than treating it as an one time activity.

2. Attrition Management:

   IT industry is faced with attrition of employees on a continuous basis which result in negatively affecting the performance of organizations. It is important for organizations to improve Employee commitment and job satisfaction to control attrition.

   As the study indicates that Employees’ job satisfaction is positively related to Employees’ perceptions of CSR activities, organizations need to use CSR as a core strategy to increase job satisfaction among the employees and hence overall organizational performance. There is also a need for organizations to prioritizing the category of CSR activities. The major focus should be on category of CSR activities benefiting employees directly followed by CSR activities benefiting customers and then followed by CSR activities to environment and other categories.
Similarly, organizations need to increase CSR activities to improve employee commitment levels in a very highly competitive environment where many other tactics have failed. Thus by having a focused set of CSR activities, organizations can increase employee job satisfaction and commitment thereby reducing attrition levels. This further result in increase performance of organizations over a period of time.

3. **Internal Communication of CSR:**

The research reveals that some of the employees are not aware of the CSR initiatives of their organizations which indicate that man organizations fail to communicate CSR activities to their employees effectively. Organizations need to increase the awareness of CSR activities they implement among their employees. The organizations should have holistic communication approach by using various mediums like email campaigns, organization website, posters on notice boards, display of CSR activities and its benefits on wall spaces, cafeteria, training rooms and other common areas. Besides, all employee induction and training programs should essentially contain the modules of CSR activities implemented and the benefits accrued to the society at large.

4. **Reputation Management:**

Organizations in IT industry are faced with the challenge of recruitment as there is a shortage of qualified manpower and a good reputation is important to attract new recruits to join the organization. As the study reveals CSR activities improve reputation of organizations. There is a need for organizations to publicize the CSR activities both within and on public media to increase reputation and ensure that marketing teams integrate CSR activities while building up marketing campaigns. This will also attract customers and vendors to the organizations.

5. **Model for Successful CSR Strategy:**

Successful CSR strategies should have the elements given below in the picture. CSR department should exist exclusively to design and implement CSR activities. Employees representation and CSR consultants should be part of the CSR strategy team and continuous feedback needs to be sought from past CSR beneficiaries to increase the effectiveness of CSR strategy.
6. **Model for increasing Performance:**
Organizations need to implement CSR activities and communicate it effectively to all its employees which would lead to increased commitment to organization, job satisfaction and internal reputation. This would cause decreased attrition levels, increased productivity and attract as well as retain skilled manpower which would lead to increased performance of organizations.

*Source: Survey data*
Figure 6.2: Model of Increasing Performance
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6.4.2 Suggestions to Policy Makers:

1. **Rewards and Recognition:**

   The Government needs to aggressively encourage organizations to undertake CSR activities by instituting awards for good CSR initiatives. The awards can be instituted for various levels like district, state, national and international levels. The winners of these awards should be widely publicized to encourage other organizations to follow.

2. **Knowledge Sharing:**

   The government needs to encourage information and knowledge sharing of CSR among organizations and practitioners. The domain expertise needs to be shared through CSR conferences and workshops to educate both professionals and consultants to handle CSR strategy effectively. Besides there is also a need for equipped CSR consultants who can help companies to engage in CSR activities.

3. **CSR Law:**

   While the new CSR law is in the positive direction, there are many companies who have not adhered to the mandate. Hence there is a need to have punitive clauses to ensure mandatory implementation and disbursal of funds by companies to CSR activities as per norms. There is a need to set up an independent CSR authority like IRDA and TRAI which can channelize, monitor the use of funds and effectively advise governments on future CSR laws policies. The authority can also audit and prevent malpractices like Paper CSR and increase higher NGO accountability.

4. **CSR Rating of Organizations:**

   The study indicates the need to set up a CSR Ratings organization like KLD ratings in USA. The core functions of the rating organization are to evaluate CSR activities of every company and rate it accordingly. This will equip customers, vendors, employees and government agencies with credible information about the company’s CSR activities and support them. This can further encourage the launch of socially responsible funds in India which would help investors and customers to identify socially responsible organizations and encourage them.
6.4.3 Suggestions on Scope for Future Research:

1. Further research can be done on Impact of CSR on companies in other industries on immediate local communities.
2. Study of CSR Ratings and CSR reporting standards can be done considering the importance CSR is gaining.
3. Research can be done on developing effective CSR Ratings scale for the industry.

6.5 Conclusions

Corporate Social responsibility has achieved critical levels of importance in the current socio-economic global scenario. A large share of global resources both material and otherwise is being controlled by corporations some of whose annual revenues surpass GDP of many countries. The abilities of these corporations to influence socio economic change in the countries they operate have increased drastically. In times, when many governments are not in a position to spend resources on social development activities the corporations with their huge resources can become crucial partners in socio economic development processes in the form of CSR. While the basic objectives of any corporations are to make profits, they have realised the importance of the larger society in which they operate to thrive. This is to sustain their very own survival because if the larger societies in which they operate don’t survive their very own existence is at stake in the longer term. Hence the corporations should actively participate and invest in social economic development in the form of CSR.

This study has further confirmed as to how it is beneficial for corporate to spend on CSR by indicating a positive relationship between CSR activities and performance of organizations in IT sector. Corporations need to integrate CSR as part of strategic planning in all their domains including marketing, human resources, financial planning and operations. CSR has had positive impact on financial indicators of ROCE, OPM, NPM, ROA and ROE which further encourages corporates to integrate CSR as part of business strategy. The impact of CSR on attrition indicators of employee commitment and satisfaction has suggested that employees like to work for organizations who engage in CSR activities. This suggests for corporations to include CSR in their HR strategies since the most important challenge that an IT
organization encounters is job satisfaction among its employees, it would be beneficial for organizations and managers to make conscious efforts to make employee friendly human resource policies thereby motivating employees to contribute more to the organization.

Overall, the available information compiled from all sources indicate that IT companies are well positioned to work under the next regime of CSR mandate as prescribed by the new Companies Bill. Being well connected with the global corporate world, they not only take CSR as a brand enhancing activity, but also adopt long-term strategies to carry out CSR initiatives There would be a substantial increase in the funds that would be available for spending on CSR which may change the overall scenario of CSR in India. Individual company would apportion more funds for CSR activities which essentially means each company should have a exclusive department with dedicated manpower to handle and manage CSR activities.

Currently most of the Indian companies do not have a dedicated department for CSR and managed by corporate communication or human resources division as additional responsibilities. Hence CSR activities in most of the companies are handled by managers who don’t focus exclusively on CSR and hence the performance on this front as a whole suffers. As a result, the managers assigned with CSR as additional as charge rely mostly on external agencies and NGO’s for conceiving, managing and implementing CSR activities. The government has made an effort to plug this by mandating that a CSR committee at the level of board of directors should be formed to oversee and report CSR activities of the companies. This would definitely percolate down to having dedicated CSR staff and departments to execute CSR activities. As a result the demand for and employability of professionals in CSR area is expected to increase in the next few years. Further, as the domain would require trained manpower to understand and managing social sector activities, graduates with specialization of social work or CSR would be employed increasingly. Their role can be compared to agricultural graduates working for financial institutions as field representatives to analyze the agricultural sector and recommend on lending decisions of banks and other institutions. Most Indian companies don’t involve employees adequately who are one of their strongest assets in implementing and improving community welfare activities. Involving their employees would lead to many benefits both to the organization and employees in multiple ways.
Considering the nascent stage at which CSR as a domain is evolving in India, it is an urgent necessity that an exclusive statutory authority for CSR be established by government of India on the lines of Insurance development regulatory authority. The huge amount funds which would be dedicated to CSR have to be effectively channelized and utilized in an integrated manner so that it would benefit the Indian society at large. CSR authority has to have a holistic policy and work ethics which can result in synergizing multiple activities of different organizations including NGOs towards common social goals.

Governments across the world have started using legislations to coerce and make companies to disclose and report on environmental and social impacts. Many stakeholders increasingly are expecting companies to practice triple bottom-line reporting. Governments in general expect companies to contribute for balanced development to counter rise of dissatisfaction of large populations and bridge the gap between the rich and poor citizens. Every single activity done as a part of CSR to reduce the frustration and dissatisfaction of less fortunate citizens would will aid in the goal of creating a equitable society. CSR is an enormous opportunity for companies to utilize and help contribute to the development of the country and society at large.