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Chapter 1

Introduction

Most research on corporate social responsibility (CSR) is conducted at the macro level, with much of it focused on convincing organisations that they have social responsibilities (Eells and Walton, 1961; Carroll, 1979; Garriga and Mele, 2004; Windsor, 2006) and that there is financial benefit to meeting them (Cochran and Wood, 1984; Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield, 1985; Orlitzky, Schmidt, and Rynes, 2003; Nelling and Webb, 2009; Flammer, 2015). This makes sense; in practice, CSR requires organisation-level policy and action, thus the argument for acceptance of the CSR construct needs to be directed at this level. However, now that CSR is an established construct in the literature and a fact of organisational life, we are left with a significant gap in our knowledge of the role of micro-level stakeholders, which is problematic because these stakeholders are often responsible for the implementation of CSR policies (Rupp et al., 2006; Rupp et al., 2013).

In particular, the body of research on employees is very much in its developmental stages. For example, of the limited research that has focused on employees, most has explored their perspectives within context of the organisation’s CSR efforts, such as their responses to specific CSR initiatives (Lee et al., 2013; Rupp et al., 2013; Chen and Hung-Baesecke, 2014) or the effect of an organisation’s CSR on employee attraction, commitment and retention (Collier and Esteban, 2007; Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007; Kim et al., 2010; Bhattacharya, Sen, and Korschun, 2008). Research on employees is particularly important as CSR is a complex process that stakeholders interpret in different ways depending on their individual frames of reference, which are in turn affected by their organisation, their position in the organisation, and their personal background and history (Maitlis, 2005). This ultimately means that people will make sense of CSR in different ways (Cramer, Jonker, and Heijden, 2004). Therefore, our current approach of examining employees’ role in CSR through the lens of the organisation means we do not gain knowledge on how employees make sense of CSR, only what they think of a particular activity that the researcher or the organisation labels CSR.

The lack of knowledge about employees’ role in CSR has practical implications. It has been established that employees are important actors in an organisation’s CSR strategy (Rupp et al., 2006; Rupp et al., 2013), therefore understanding whether, how, and why employees choose to engage with the organisation’s strategy is necessary for CSR leaders and
change-makers to engage in “sensegiving” about CSR that resonates with employees and results in the desired action (Maitlis, 2005). For example, an employee may choose not to engage in an organisational CSR initiative because they believe the organisation has self-serving motives, therefore CSR leaders would be most effective if they shaped their rhetoric to guard against this type of cynicism. On the other hand, an employee may engage in a CSR initiative to get the day off work, or to be perceived favourably by their superior. In this case the employee isn’t engaging in CSR behaviour with an explicitly socially responsible intention so internal marketing efforts focused on the good that participation offers the community are unlikely to be persuasive. Therefore, without understanding how employees make sense of CSR - what it means to them and why they engage, the organisation cannot develop or effectively communicate its strategy to reach and engage its employees. In addition, employees’ ability to engage in socially responsible behaviour at work that is not directly encouraged or sponsored by their organisation remains unexplored in the literature. I put forward that this independent behaviour is a major component of employee CSR. As employees are independent actors with different individual factors that affect their behaviour, identifying and leveraging the behaviours they engage in of their own volition is a powerful method for enhancing and shaping the organisation’s strategy.

I believe that many employees will make sense of CSR in a way that is significantly different to other types of organisational behaviour, and also different to the way their organisation makes sense of it. Accordingly, this will lead employees to engage in a range of different behaviours with socially responsible intent in line with their conceptualisation of CSR, rather than just their employer’s. As I will elaborate, I believe that the socially responsible intention underlying employee CSR behaviour differentiates it from other types of employee behaviour such as organisational citizenship behaviour and extra-role behaviour. Therefore, I introduce the construct of employee corporate social responsibility behaviour (eCSR). As I will elaborate in Chapter 3, eCSR refers to employee behaviours, engaged in at work, with the intention of benefiting the environment or broader society. It is important to note that the ‘e’ in eCSR refers to employee, rather than electronic as per some other constructs such as e-mail. In relation to the socially responsible intention underlying eCSR, I believe the variety in employee’s socially responsible orientations warrant a separate construct and inductive exploration of said construct. In addition, because an employee’s conceptualisations of CSR may differ significantly from their organisation’s, exploration of eCSR contributes to the literature in a very different way than studies examining employee reactions to an organisation’s CSR.

Acknowledging the lack of understanding of eCSR, I undertake an extensive review of both the CSR literature and organisational behaviour constructs that I believe share similarities with eCSR. I draw on these literatures to propose a definition and spectrum of eCSR, as well as a framework of antecedents for each behaviour on the spectrum. I conduct qualitative interviews with employees in both a non-profit and a for-profit organisation to explore what CSR means to employees and the types of behaviours they engage in that fit with their
conceptualisation of eCSR. These interviews are conducted and analysed using an inductive approach, to ensure that I explore CSR and its important aspects as determined by the participants (rather than the researcher or the participant’s organisation). Finally, a quantitative survey is administered to employees in a range of different organisations to test the findings of the qualitative study and the antecedent-behaviour relationships put forward in the theoretical framework. The results of both studies and their contributions to the CSR literature are discussed.

This chapter establishes the contribution of this thesis: it outlines the theoretical background and justification, refines the scope with a clear statement of the problem, and emphasises the significance of its contribution to CSR and organisational behaviour scholarship.

1.1 Theoretical Background and Justification

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a construct with a history rife with disagreements not only around its definition, but also its fundamental usefulness and necessity (Carroll, 1999). Broadly speaking, CSR refers to the responsibilities of a firm in addition to its primary profit obligations (Davis, 1960; Eells and Walton, 1961). CSR is underpinned by the belief that a firm’s ability to operate is dependent on society’s approval, known as the social licence to operate: the general agreement that the firm contributes more to society than it takes away and is taking reasonable action to prevent any potential damage to society (Warhurst, 2001). A perspective that is prominent within CSR scholarship, put forward by economist Milton Friedman, is that the firm meets its responsibilities simply by delivering economic value, and any effort by the organisation directed anywhere other than shareholder value is a waste of shareholder money. Despite this view being mostly rejected and firms accepting that they have social responsibilities, it has significantly shaped CSR literature. It led to the somewhat “middle ground” of trying to find a link between CSR and firm financial performance that countless scholars have pursued (Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield, 1985; Nelling and Webb, 2009). This research supports the idea that firms have social responsibilities without questioning or undermining the firm’s goal of creating economic value (Windsor, 2006; Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield, 1985). Despite the mixed results of the research, both scholarship and general society are at a point where CSR is an accepted part of organisational life (Bice, 2015).

If we accept CSR as valid and necessary, the next step is determining what a firm’s responsibilities are. Several scholars argue that the nature of the responsibilities that the firm should meet are largely determined by the social context of the time. For example, CSR literature in the 1970s identified prominent societal issues that they believed firms should take action against, such as racism, racial and gender discrimination, pollution, and poverty (Economic Development, 1971; Hay, Gray, and Gates, 1976; Carroll, 1979). Carroll (1979)
introduced four ‘categories’ of corporate social responsibility: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary and suggested that firms would hierarchically allocate resources to these dimensions; while the economic dimension would still be the primary interest of the firm, there were increasing legal and ethical concerns that required consideration such as Equal Employment Opportunity legislation and rapidly changing social norms. Finally, it was put forward that the firm may be well-served to consider ‘above and beyond’ discretionary action in both anticipation of and response to the changing demands of its stakeholders (Carroll, 1979). As most of the concerns of that era are now legislated or socially normalised, the focus of CSR has shifted from the areas that can cause concern for the firm (economic, legal, ethical and discretionary), to the areas in which the firm can cause concern for society. The three domains of CSR that have prevailed in the literature since their introduction in the Our Common Future report (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987) are economic, social and environmental (sometimes referred to as people, planet and profit).

This shift in focus from “should we do it?” to “how do we do it well?” has led to several scholars and publications calling for the development of the micro-foundations of CSR (Morgeson et al., 2011; Glavas, Jones, and Willness, 2015; Cooper et al., 2015; Glavas, 2016[b]; Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015). Particular attention has been placed on the role of micro-level stakeholders, such as employees, in acknowledgement of the fact that multiple stakeholders need to be engaged in order to develop and enact effective CSR strategy (Aguilera, Rupp, and Williams, 2007; Wood, 1991). However, this thread of CSR research is still embryonic; recent reviews reveal that less than 10% of CSR literature is carried out at the micro level, and less than half of extant micro-CSR research is undertaken at the individual level of analysis (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012). Most of the research on CSR and employees has examined how employees are affected by CSR, finding consistently that employee attitudes, performance, and behaviour improve as a result of participating in CSR (Glavas and Piderit, 2009; Gond et al., 2011; Jones, 2010; Lee et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2010; Mueller et al., 2012). It has also been suggested that firms with prominent CSR strategies experience greater employee attraction and retention (Delmas and Pekovic, 2013; Coldwell et al., 2008; Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008; Evans, Davis, and Frink, 2011). Some literature has emerged examining employee participation in CSR, finding that organizational philanthropic efforts lead to similar behaviour at the employee level over time (Smith, 2013), that leader behaviour can affect employee participation in organizational CSR initiatives (Chen and Hung-Baesecke, 2014), and proposing that employees are more likely to participate in CSR if they are personally committed to the cause and feel that the organization’s commitment to the cause is genuine (Bingham et al., 2013).

Despite the recent attention on employees and CSR, there remains very little exploration of the different types of CSR behaviour that employees can engage in (see Slack, Corlett, and Morris (2015) for an exception). Is eCSR simply engaging in a company’s CSR initiatives? I argue that this is too narrow and that instead a number of related constructs can be
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Although there is a lack of consensus regarding a precise definition of CSR, most firms accept that in order to operate successfully they need to meet responsibilities to their operating environment (Bice, 2015). Several frameworks have been put forward in the academic literature to determine what a particular firm’s responsibilities are and the actions suggested to meet and evaluate them (Steiner, 1972; Wilson, 1975; Carroll, 1979; Wood, 1991) though in reality, the process remains varied across organisations (Carroll and Shabana, 2010). Despite the lack of standardised practice, recent literature recognises that firms often rely on employees to enact their CSR strategies (Rupp et al., 2006) and, accordingly, employees have various attitudes about and responses to organisational CSR efforts (Rupp et al., 2013; Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008). However, very little research has examined what CSR means to employees, how they engage in it, why they engage in it, and how the firm’s CSR fits with their behaviours and attitudes.

I put forward that this represents a substantial gap in the literature that has both academic and practical implications. If firms are to rely (albeit to varying extents) on employee behaviour to achieve their CSR goals, understanding what CSR behaviour means to employees and how and why they engage in it is critical to effectively involving employees in the CSR process. Understanding eCSR extends beyond employee attitudes and actions towards the organisation’s CSR efforts; I believe that many employees will conceptualise CSR differently to their organisation and this will affect their behaviour. For example, an organisation that chooses to emphasise the environmental dimension of CSR through green initiatives while their employees are generally more passionate about social issues will struggle to attract support beyond compliance behaviour from their employees. Further, the vast majority of micro level CSR research explores the role of employees through the lens of the organisation’s CSR activities which I believe overlooks independent behaviours that employees can engage in that align with their socially responsible interests rather than the firm’s. I put forward that understanding the CSR values and attitudes of employees and
the motivational processes that underpin eCSR (particularly those behaviours that don’t re-
require organisational encouragement or reward) is a significant and necessary step towards
effectively engaging employees and, in turn, developing an effective CSR strategy.

From an academic perspective, the acknowledgement of employees as important ac-
tors in CSR opens up a broad field of study. In order to fully understand employees’ role
in CSR we need to explore what CSR means to them (versus what it means to their par-
ticular organisation or organisations in general) and how they engage in CSR. In relation
to behaviour, we need to understand why they engage in those behaviours and why these
particular opportunities or causes elicit action over other potential behaviours or causes.
Therefore, eCSR is apt for exploration as we do not know if employees’ conceptualisations
of CSR align with that of organisational CSR, nor do we know how this type of behaviour
differs from other types of employee behaviour. Given the ongoing focus on CSR in both
practice and scholarship and the increasing importance of employees in the CSR picture,
it is critical to establish if and how eCSR differs from other types of employee behaviour
in order to explore and understand the motivation for this behaviour. This understanding
will shed light on the actions a firm can take to harness eCSR motivation and behaviour to
meet the firm’s social responsibilities. Further, knowing the types of behaviour employees
engage in with a socially responsible intention is fundamental to examining the effects of
this behaviour on both the individual and the organisation.

In sum, this thesis extensively explores the role of employees in CSR through the ex-
ploration of the behaviours they engage in with a socially responsible intention and the
motivations for this type of behaviour. This line of study has implications for both practice
and scholarship. From a practical perspective, exploring employees’ attitudes and behaviour
towards CSR without the assumption that the organisation’s perspective is shared by the
employee is critical to effectively engaging employees in CSR at work in a mutually ben-
efficial way. From an academic perspective, understanding how employees engage in CSR
behaviour and the motivational processes behind it is crucial to determine whether this be-
haviour differs from other types of employee behaviour and thus whether future research
needs to consider employee CSR behaviour as a separate construct. This distinction (or
lack of) between eCSR and other types of employee behaviours provides the foundation for
examination of the effects of eCSR on the individual and the organisation.

1.3 Significance of the Present Study

This thesis examines employee corporate social responsibility (CSR) behaviour both the-
oretically and empirically. This is a significant contribution to organisational behaviour
scholarship as micro-level CSR research is still developing, and research at the employee
level is particularly embryonic. Further, most explorations of the role of the employee in
1.3. Significance of the Present Study

CSR are underpinned by several inherent assumptions that I posit will not always hold. For example, studies that have examined employees’ perceptions of CSR have done so without examining what CSR means to employees. Instead, a definition of CSR is provided or employee reactions to particular organisational acts that the researcher identifies as CSR are sought without investigating whether the employee agrees that the definition or the actions align with what they believe constitutes CSR. While this approach is valuable for specific examples of organisational CSR behaviour (e.g., whether employees or potential employees view the organisation more favourably because of its volunteering program), ultimately it does not create an understanding of eCSR. First, exploring employee reactions to or attitudes towards CSR does not capture eCSR either within the constraints of the assumed CSR behaviour (e.g., volunteering) or the broader set of behaviours that they engage in with socially responsible intent. Second, it does not shed light on what CSR means to employees. To continue with the volunteering program example; does the organisation having a volunteering program constitute CSR from the employees perspective? Why or why not? Does the employee’s favourable attitude towards the volunteering program translate to participation in the program? Do they perceive participating in the volunteering program as a socially responsible act? How does participating affect the employee? How does it affect the organisation?

Therefore, this thesis is significant as it lays a foundation for study of the role of employees in CSR: what CSR means to them, the behaviours engage in with a socially responsible intention, their motivations for said behaviours, and organisational antecedents of these behaviours. I posit that eCSR is conceptually distinct from other types of employee behaviour because of the intention to benefit stakeholders external to the organisation and the resulting absence of reward expectancy. However, in order to determine whether eCSR needs to be approached differently than other types of employee behaviour by organisations and scholars in practice, we need to empirically examine whether different types of eCSR and their corresponding motivational factors operate differently to other types of employee behaviour.

To facilitate micro-level examination, a comprehensive review of the CSR literature is conducted to explore the different perspectives and approaches to CSR research. This review also serves to further highlight the lack of micro- and particularly employee-level research. A theoretical framework is then developed which puts forward how eCSR relates to macro-level CSR and, more importantly, other types of employee behaviour, and proposes different types of eCSR and antecedents of these behaviours. Then, an inductive approach to data collection is chosen with semi-structured interviews that allow each employee interviewed to identify the behaviours they engage in with a socially responsible intention, their motivations, and how they relate to the organisation’s CSR approach and expectations of employees in the CSR space. Then, the findings from the interviews as well as the theoretical framework put forward through examination of extant literature are tested with a survey administered to a larger, broader sample. This thesis does not claim to definitively
state what eCSR is or is not. Instead, it identifies a major gap in the literature - research on employees in the CSR context is being conducted with minimal engagement with the employee themselves about what CSR is to them - and begins to address this gap by first, asking them, and second, exploring how their conceptualisation of CSR, along with individual and organisational factors, affect their CSR behaviour.

1.4 Chapter Outlines

Chapter 2 outlines the evolution of the CSR construct, exploring definitional divergence, different suggested CSR practices, antecedents and outcomes, and the more recent micro-level explorations.

Chapter 3 puts forward a theoretical framework of eCSR, proposing, similar to CSR, that it takes the form of a spectrum. The chapter then relates the different behaviours on the spectrum to similar types of employee behaviour in the extant literature, while noting the distinguishing features. The exploration of extant literature results in a proposed framework of antecedents and moderators.

Chapter 4 outlines the epistemological position of the empirical work, the rationale for utilising mixed methodologies, and explains the methodological development and procedures of the work.

Chapter 5 presents and discusses the results of the inductive qualitative interviews, exploring the themes found in the data.

Chapter 6 presents and discusses the results of the quantitative component of the thesis, a 180-degree survey taken by employees and their managers exploring the different aspects of CSR proposed in the theoretical framework.

Chapter 7 discusses the findings of both the qualitative and quantitative data: the findings, how they relate to each other (qualitative and quantitative), how they relate to extant literature, and the theoretical framework.

Chapter 8 summarises the contribution and findings of the thesis, identifies its limitations and suggests future research directions.
Chapter 2

Corporate Social Responsibility

The following chapter will introduce the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and various definitions, perspectives and approaches that have been explored in the literature. It will examine both theoretical and empirical contributions, with a view to justifying the need for study of the construct at the employee level. First, the development of the CSR construct through academic literature will be outlined, then the way firms have and should focus their CSR efforts will be explored, followed by an examination of the proposed, desired and actual outcomes of CSR, including the more recent exploration of employee outcomes resulting from CSR, which paves the way for the deeper exploration of this thesis into how employees fit into the CSR picture.

2.1 Construct Development

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers to the obligation that firms have to make efforts, often outside of their primary economic role, to better society and offset any negative impact that their operations may have (Eells and Walton, 1961; Davis, 1960). The manner in which an organisation meets these responsibilities varies from firm to firm based on the issues that are relevant to the particular operating environment, and can range from internal practices such as equal opportunity employment or waste reduction schemes, to policies designed to compensate for the negative impact that they have, such as donating to charity (Carroll, 1979).

Although the construct of corporate social responsibility (CSR) can be traced back to the 1930s and ‘40s (more commonly referred to as just ‘social responsibility’ at that time), academic interest in CSR began to increase in the 1950s with Bowen’s (1953) book ‘Social Responsibility of the Businessman’ (Carroll, 1999; Wood, 1991). After Bowen’s (1953) introduction, the issue of defining exactly what is meant by ‘social responsibility’ and which businesses are responsible for what arose. Davis (1960, p70) suggested that CSR encompasses “decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s economic or technical interest”. Eells and Walton (1961, pp457-458) proposed that there are “ethical principles that ought to govern the relationship between the corporation and society”, whilst McGuire (1963), in a similar fashion, put forward that CSR pertains to business’s
obligations to society that extend beyond their economic and legal obligations (p144). A little later, Frederick (1986, p4) stated that "the fundamental idea of CSR is that business corporations have an obligation to work for social betterment".

It is the ‘responsibility’ in corporate social responsibility that lead to the exploration of the term ‘corporate social responsiveness’ in the 1970s. Ackerman and Bauer (1976) suggest that the connotation of responsibility extends only to motivation, not performance, as responsibility refers to assuming an obligation. They suggest responsiveness as a more preferable term as it encompasses deciding what to do and how to do it. Sethi (1975) suggested a somewhat hierarchical structure of socially responsible corporate behaviour, beginning with ‘social obligation’; behaviour in response to market forces or legal constraints, moving on to ‘social responsibility’, the alignment of corporate behaviour with social norms and values. Finally, there is ‘social responsiveness’ that refers to businesses assuming a long-term role in a dynamic social environment by engaging in anticipative and preventative corporate behaviour (Sethi, 1975). Wartick and Cochran (1985) suggest that integration of CSR, corporate social responsiveness and contextually relevant social issues must happen in order to derive a complete picture of corporate social performance. However, the distinction between responsiveness and responsibility was not widely accepted and corporate social responsibility prevailed as the preferred nomenclature. Thus, for the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the findings of the comparatively limited body of literature on social responsiveness can be applied to the CSR construct.

The difficulty associated with conceptualising the CSR construct is evident in the academic literature, with some authors suggesting that socially responsible behaviour must be voluntary on the corporation’s part (Manne and Wallich, 1972), and others suggesting that there are spectrums of socially responsive behaviours and strategies (Steiner, 1972; Wilson, 1975; McAdam, 1973; Davis and Blomstrom, 1975). Steiner’s (1972) continuum of social responsiveness ranged from the traditional business role of economic production, to government dictated behaviour, and finally on to a vague idea of ‘voluntary behaviour’. Wilson (1975) suggested that there are four different approaches that firms can take in relation to CSR; reaction, defence, accommodation and proaction. McAdam (1973) identifies four quite similar approaches, ‘fight all the way’, ‘do what is required’, ‘be progressive’ and ‘lead the industry’ whilst Davis and Blomstrom (1975) suggest withdrawal, a public relations approach, a legal approach, bargaining or problem solving as ways for companies to engage CSR.

The enlightened self-interest model also received attention in the literature, suggesting that firms undertake ‘socially responsible’ behaviour knowing that the benefit to the overall corporate sphere, and thus stakeholders, is enough to justify the initial perceived ‘loss’ of the investment (De Roeck et al., 1978). More recently, Garriga and Mele (2004) propose that there are four different approaches to CSR - instrumental, whereby social activities are only undertaken for profit making purposes; political, which states that corporations are
powerful and must use that power responsibly in the political arena; integrative, where a company should focus on meeting social demands, and ethical, in that corporations have ethical responsibilities to society. The authors suggest that these four approaches should be used in conjunction when making CSR decisions (Garriga and Mele, 2004). Windsor (2006) identifies three approaches a firm can take when tackling CSR: economic, ethical and citizenship. The economic philosophy focuses on the financial benefits of CSR and risks of not engaging in CSR, the ethical philosophy focuses on the negative impacts of business conduct without moral grounding and the benefits of a moral business practice that considers the impact of all stakeholders, whilst the citizenship approach highlights the reputational and political influence benefits that a firm can reap by being a good corporate citizen. Therefore, despite a lack of consensus on the specific approaches a firm can take in addressing CSR issues, many authors identify that there are ranges of CSR behaviour that organisations can choose to engage in, from the mandated minimum to over and above stakeholder expectations.

To ease the difficulty of conceptualising CSR, some authors have suggested theoretical frameworks for measuring a firm’s corporate social performance, such as Carroll’s (1979) three dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. The first dimension consists of four social responsibility categories: economic, legal, ethical and discretionary (Carroll, 1979). Carroll (1979) proposes that these categories are hierarchical in that the firm will dedicate the most resources to economic responsibilities, as without the economic function the firm cannot sustain itself, then legal, as violation of its legal obligations will have clear and direct consequences for the firm, followed by ethical and finally discretionary. This notion of hierarchical concern was echoed in Bansal’s (2005) study which found that firms in the Canadian oil and gas industry were concerned with economic and environmental concerns before social equity, with media pressure, international experience and organisation size being positively related to sustainability efforts. Environmental issues being of greater concern than social issues to the oil and gas industry fits the hierarchy, as legislation and public scrutiny are focused on the environmental impacts associated with resource-based industry. The second dimension of Carroll’s (1979) model is the social issues involved, which will vary from firm to firm due to different operating environments and the varying impacts their operations have on society (Carroll, 1979).

The final dimension is the firm’s philosophy of social responsiveness, for which Carroll (1979) uses Wilson’s (1975) aforementioned social responsiveness continuum, suggesting that a firm can respond to social issues through reaction, defence, accommodation or proaction. The latter two dimensions of Carroll’s (1979) framework assist in maintaining the firm’s ‘social licence to operate’. A three dimensional approach is necessary to fully understand a firm’s CSR behaviour. For example, a firm may excel in meeting its economic obligations, but may falter in meeting its ethical obligations, therefore only taking one dimension into account would provide an inaccurate picture of the firm’s corporate social
performance. The social issues relevant to the firm provide a reasonable scope for the assessment of the firm’s behaviour - a firm cannot reasonably be expected to solve problems that it does not contribute to, and that occur outside of its operating environment. The philosophy of social responsiveness is important as it establishes the intent of the firm when engaging in CSR behaviour, as a firm can do good without meaning to, or to be unsuccessful in well-intentioned attempts to improve conditions for their stakeholders.

Building on Carroll’s (1979) notion of a multi-dimensional approach being necessary in analysing a firm’s CSR activities, Wood (1991) conceptually proposes that corporate social performance can be assessed through a firm’s motivating principles, behavioural processes and observable outcomes. The motivating principles occur at three levels: institutional, organisational, and individual (specifically, managerial). It is yet to be established empirically how these levels operate in relation to each other, for example, if they are hierarchical, completely separate or interdependent. The institutional principle of legitimacy, based around Davis and Blomstom’s (1975) iron law of responsibility, establishes that there is a relationship between business and society and, consequently, a business has social responsibilities. At the organisational level, the motivating principle for corporate social performance is public responsibility. This principle seeks to define the specific relationship between a particular business and the society in which it operates by stating that businesses are responsible for outcomes related to their primary and secondary involvement in society (Wood, 1991). The final principle is managerial discretion, which states that managers are moral actors who are obliged to use the discretion available to them in every domain of corporate social responsibility (economic, legal, ethical and discretionary).

The behavioural processes of the corporate social performance model outline how a firm stays abreast of and responds to social issues it faces, for instance, what should it respond to? Why should it respond (is it a recurring issue, could it have serious consequences?) How should it respond? How are the impacts of the response going to be evaluated? Is the problem significant enough that it requires policy development and institutionalised action? Wood (1991) identifies three behavioural processes a firm should engage in: environmental assessment to establish the social context that the organisation is operating in, stakeholder management to identify key actors that the organisation needs to consider in engaging in CSR, and issue management to determine the interests of specific stakeholders and the organisation as a whole. Environmental assessment is necessary to create awareness of the issues that the organisation faces in its operating environment, so as to know what it needs to respond to. Stakeholder management is necessary to know which stakeholders the organisation needs to consider and how to demonstrate their consideration (e.g., through public ‘CSR’ reporting, memorandums and e-mails, annual general meetings etc.) Issue management involves devising and monitoring internal and external processes for managing the organisation’s response to social issues.
The final constructs of the corporate social performance model are the observable outcomes: social impacts, social programs, and social policy. Wood (1991) emphasises that the organisation’s social impacts must be analysed in conjunction with, not separate to, more traditional types of business performance so as to not lose sight of the interrelationship between business and society, and the simple fact that business does have impacts on the society within which it operates. There are several ways of measuring this impact, from focusing on disasters, focusing solely on economic benefit, econometric models, and, most commonly now, corporate social reporting, reports prepared by the organisation, often audited by a third party organisation, that communicate the effects that the organisation has on the environment and broader society, and the actions the firm takes to mitigate any negative effects (Crowther, 2004). These reports are made publicly available through the organisation or external bodies. Corporate social programs and policies refer to actions the firm undertakes with the explicit intention of managing its social impacts (Wood, 1991). Corporate social programs can range from one-off instances, such as sponsorship of a specific event, longer-term programs for a particular cause such as a permanent donation box, or institutionalised into the organisational culture. Corporate social policy is designed to stop recurring problems or address areas of major concern to the organisation. For example, a paper company may start using exclusively recycled materials to produce its products in order to address the major issue of deforestation that its industry contributes to. The distinction between programs and policies lays in the intent. Programs are designed to make the company look desirable by achieving a specific outcome, whilst policies are designed to be preventative and lessen vulnerability to organisation or industry-specific threats and weaknesses.

Wood (1991) argues that these three constructs, motivating principles, behavioural processes and observable outcomes, must be analysed in conjunction in order to comprehensively understand a firm’s corporate social performance, as there are often difficult results when a firm engages in CSR, for instance, good motivating principles don’t necessarily lead to positive observable outcomes if they are not supported by appropriate processes (Wood, 1991), but these ideas are yet to be examined empirically. As I will elaborate, Wood’s (1991) notion that motivations, processes and outcomes need to be understood and examined together in order to understand corporate social performance provides a foundation for our argument that employee CSR behaviour and the motivations for this behaviour need to be explored in order to facilitate corporate social performance.

2.2 Focus of CSR

As it is now relatively accepted that organisations have a responsibility to ensure that their impact on society is constructive (Bice, 2015), more recent literature has explored various factors within the organisation that influence the implementation and potential success of CSR strategies, such as how best to decide what issues to tackle, the cultural and human
resource issues at play, and also how to measure and report these efforts so as to continuously improve and ensure maximum benefit is being delivered to stakeholders, including the organisation itself. Therefore, this section will explore factors that have been explored in the literature that influence the way in which a firm focuses its CSR efforts, and how these factors influence the effectiveness of said efforts.

Some authors have sought to shed light on how organisations focus their CSR efforts and make suggestions on how they should target their efforts in order to ensure optimal outcomes. Bondy and Starkey (2014) suggest that firms should target issues specific to their operating environment, but note that large corporations tend to ‘internationalise’ CSR issues in an effort to simplify the complexity and vast array of CSR issues, thus ignoring local issues. Although specific to the Australian mining industry, Esteves (2008) developed a social investment decision analysis tool which allows firms to link community investment to organisational goals. Esteves (2008) states that mining companies accept the business case for corporate social responsibility, but do not want to embody a governmental role, so they must find a point where business goals and community needs intersect. This process is broken down into phases, beginning with identifying business rationale for social investments, engaging multiple stakeholders to identify and rank community needs, developing initiatives that can satisfy both parties’ goals, selecting and implementing initiatives, and finally, evaluating the outcomes of the project. McWilliams and Siegel (2001) used a supply and demand model to help determine how much a firm should spend on CSR, hypothesising that a firm’s CSR level should depend on its size, level of diversification, research and development, advertising, government scales, consumer income, labour market conditions and stage of industry life cycle, and that cost benefit analysis of these factors can help managers determine “ideal” level of CSR. The general suggestion of these authors is that an organisation’s CSR efforts should be directed in a manner that is relevant to the impact it has on society and proportional to its size and capacity.

Organisational culture has been proposed by many authors as fundamental to the implementation and success of an organisation’s CSR strategy. For instance, Baumgartner (2009) proposes that CSR efforts will be better received and implemented if they form part of the organisational culture as without permeation of the minds of leaders and members of the organisation, CSR efforts will not affect the way the core business is run. Maon, Lindgreen, and Swaen (2010) suggest three different ‘levels’ of organisational CSR culture, CSR cultural reluctance, CSR culture grasp and CSR cultural embedment. The authors suggest that the firm’s level of organisational CSR culture will impact their CSR approach, from the core philosophy (ranging from avoiding the negative impact of not having CSR to incorporating it as part of the core business function), managerial support, resource allocation and implementation. Linnenluecke and Griffiths (2010) use the competing values framework to predict how organisations with certain values approach CSR. The authors posit that organisations with strong, structured internal process values, characterised by stability maintained through formal communication and processes, will engage in CSR that supports
the firm’s economic goals, such as cost reduction and process efficiency, whilst organisations with a strong human relations culture, focused on through training and development, as well as participative decision making to bolster morale and employee participation, will invest in CSR directed at internal stakeholders (Linnenluecke and Griffiths, 2010). Firms with a rational goal culture, that promote efficiency and productivity through clear goals and centralised decision making, understand the broader negative impacts of business on the environment, and will focus on efficient, sustainable use of resources, and organisations taking an open systems view will use innovative means to achieve environmental and social sustainability, motivated by the understanding that they are not separate from their operating environment, but integrated and dependent upon it (Linnenluecke and Griffiths, 2010). Several authors theorise that the culture of the organisation will affect the implementation and success of the organisation’s CSR strategy in various ways, by affecting the resources allocated to CSR, the intended targets of CSR, and the internal response to CSR, highlighting the importance of focusing some effort on adapting the organisational culture when introducing CSR efforts.

The effect of leadership on CSR efforts have recently been explored in the literature. Basu and Palazzo (2008) suggest that managers’ mental models around how they make sense of the world will affect their decisions about CSR and as such, the researchers redefine CSR as “the process by which managers within an organisation think about and discuss relationships to stakeholders as well as their roles in relation to the common good, along with their behavioural disposition with respect to the fulfilment and achievement of these” (p10). Van Aaken, Splitter, and Seidl (2013) suggest that a leader’s CSR decisions are a way to leverage the economic capital they have access to, into individual social power. Chin, Hambrick, and Trevino (2013) measured the political ideologies of a sample of CEOs in the United States using their individual political donations, and found that, compared with conservative (Republican) CEOs, liberal (Democrat) CEOs exhibit greater advances in CSR and liberal CEOs’ CSR initiatives are less contingent on recent performance than those of conservative CEOs. Jiraporn and Chintrakarn (2013), using CSR ratings from an organisational CSR database and comparing it to CEO compensation, found a diminishing returns relationship between CEO power, operationalised as their pay as a fraction of the top five executive pays in a given company, and CSR efforts, where power increased CSR efforts to a threshold, then after that point the CSR efforts decreased. From the data, the authors propose that once the CEO has held power for a certain point, they feel entrenched and invulnerable, thus CSR presents little benefit to them compared to when they first gain power and need to consolidate their position (Jiraporn and Chintrakarn, 2013).

Okeye (2013), using case studies of major corporate failures, suggests that certain types behavioural characteristics that are common amongst the leaders of the failed corporations, such as instability, excessive dominance or authoritarianism, extreme risk taking, and lying, present risks for corporate social irresponsibility and should be managed through legislation, certification processes, information and disclosures, and economic incentives and
disincentives. A more preventative measure suggested is to undertake research to identify the ideal leadership characteristics for the company and use personality tests to ensure that the leaders hired fit that ideal (Okoye, 2013). Somewhat counter-intuitively, Ormiston and Wong (2013) found that prior socially responsible decisions by leaders are positively correlated to subsequent corporate social irresponsibility, defined as corporate decisions that negatively impact stakeholders, and measured by averaging the number of reported CSR concerns an organisation has across seven stakeholder groups. This relationship is especially prominent when the leader is high on moral identity symbolisation, in that they project their moral orientation to the public (Ormiston and Wong, 2013). Park (2005) studied buyers for large (profits greater than $100 million annually) United States apparel companies and found that when making CSR decisions, decision-makers will only respond to cues from the operating environment that fit with their pre-determined views on social responsibility issues. A firm’s leaders have a lot of power in determining how the needs of stakeholders are managed, which is particularly relevant in the context of CSR, where the complex and often conflicting needs of stakeholders must be considered (Waldman et al., 2006). The effect of several leader traits on CSR decisions and their motivations have been explored in the literature, such as personality traits, firm performance, particularly firm CSR performance under direction of the leader, political orientation and mental models. While not comprehensive, this body of literature argues that individuals, namely leaders, can impact an organisation’s CSR efforts and therefore an organisation needs to consider leaders and leadership when making CSR efforts. I, too, argue that individuals within the organisation can impact CSR, but instead of leaders, I seek to investigate how and why employees contribute to CSR.

In terms of measurement, most firms report on their CSR activities, whether it be included within the traditional annual report, or a report dedicated solely to CSR, often referred to as sustainability, corporate governance, or other comparable terms. These reports typically include statements outlining the organisation’s vision of their place in society, how they try to enhance the communities in which they operate, and financial statements about the money they dedicate to CSR, often reported as a proportion of profit. Calabrese et al. (2013) puts forward that corporate sustainability reports must be used in conjunction with stakeholder perceptions and expectations in order to get a full picture of a firm’s CSR performance. Meznar, Chrisman, and Carroll (1990) state that corporate social performance shouldn’t be about “quantity” of CSR that a firm engages in, but rather the alignment of the CSR behaviour with the firm’s competences and stakeholders needs and interests, and Miles, Munilla, and Darroch (2006) state that stakeholders should be engaged when a firm is developing CSR strategy to ensure this. Similarly, Porter and Kramer (2006) posit that CSR strategy needs to not focus on the tension between business and society, but rather on the interdependence and, in line with this, each company should analyse where it impinges on society, as well as its competences in offsetting the ‘collateral damage’ of its operations, and develop strategy from that position; and Tuzzolini and Armandi (1981) suggest that conducting an analysis of organisational needs can assist an organisation in selecting and
prioritising CSR activities. Therefore, these authors posit that it is not possible for an organisation to focus its CSR efforts without consideration of its various stakeholders. Given that organisations often rely on employees to enact CSR policies and embody the socially responsible values of the organisation, I believe employees to be a major factor in effective CSR efforts, yet there is still very limited research on how employees fit into the CSR picture.

This section has highlighted the literature that has looked at CSR from a more logistical perspective, by investigating how and where an organisation should focus their CSR efforts for optimal outcomes. Some authors have addressed the issue of scope, suggesting that organisations should respond to social responsibilities that are relevant to their operations in a manner that is proportional to the firm’s size and impact. The importance of organisational culture is also highlighted, with authors suggesting that the deeper CSR is embedded into an organisational culture, the better the outcomes of the organisation’s CSR efforts. Various leader traits and the factors that result in managerial decisions about CSR are also explored, highlighting the importance of individuals to an organisation’s CSR success. The importance of evaluation and measurement of CSR outcomes is also presented, with authors suggesting integrating stakeholder perceptions and the measures used in CSR reports to better understand the firm’s social performance. When proposing the factors that influence a firm’s CSR success, authors highlight the importance of various factors, such as leadership, culture, scope, measurement and evaluation. One group that has received comparatively little attention in the literature is employees. Whilst the organisational culture literature highlights the importance of having leaders and members on board as they are often responsible for enacting the CSR strategy, the exploration of how and why employees engage in socially responsible behaviour at work is severely lacking. This project begins to explore the role of employees in CSR efforts by investigating employee behaviours that constitute CSR, and the individual and organisational factors that influence these behaviours.

2.3 Outcomes of CSR

Various arguments have been made in the literature to ‘convince’ firms to engage in CSR. Drucker (1984) makes a philosophical argument for CSR, arguing that business needs to understand that in order to do well, it needs to do good, and adapt its strategy accordingly, for instance by viewing social needs as opportunities. He further states that governments are expected to achieve more than is feasible during an elected period given the difficulty and multi-faceted nature of social problems, so the onus is on firms to do their part (Drucker, 1984). However, the philosophical argument is not always convincing to business leaders concerned with the financial bottom line, which has led to many authors attempting to establish an empirical link between CSR and firm financial performance, with various results reported (Cochran and Wood, 1984; Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield, 1985; Alexander and Buchholz, 1978; Moskowitz, 1972; Bowman and Haire, 1975; Lu, Wang, and Lee, 2013).
Using various proxies for corporate social performance, Moskowitz (1972), never revealing his cause for labelling his fourteen recommended firms as socially responsible, Bragdon and Marlin (1972), using a pollution index and Parket and Eilburt (1975), with organisational self-reports of CSR effort, found that corporate social performance was positively related to financial performance. Bowman and Haire (1975) found that firms in the ‘mid-range’ of CSR performance, as measured by the proportion of the annual report dedicated to corporate social responsibility discussion, had the best financial performance, whilst Vance (1975) found a negative relationship between corporate social performance, as reported through surveys in Business and Society Review, and financial performance. Alexander and Buchholz (1978), using the same Business and Society Review surveys as Vance (1975), Abbott and Monsen (1979) who developed a Social Involvement Disclosure metric, and Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield (1985) using a forced-response survey based on Carroll’s four dimensions and answered by CEOs of companies listed in Forbes’ annual directory, found no relationship between corporate social performance and financial performance. Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield (1985) attributed the positive relationships reported in previous studies to methodological limitations and biases, for example, Moskowitz (1972) did not reveal how the firms used in his study were selected, and the various studies used differing measures. McGuire, Sundgren, and Schneeweis (1988) interestingly, found that a firm’s prior financial performance predicted their CSR performance, measured by responses to a Fortune corporate reputation survey, more than CSR efforts predicted subsequent financial performance, which was attributed to risk management, in that a financially successful firm is subjected to greater risk of fines and lawsuits if they do not have strong CSR performance. Several authors have, and continue to, try to link corporate responsibility to traditional outcomes of the firm, an endeavour made difficult by the lack of universal measures of corporate social performance, which creates conflicting results.

Due to the lack of consensus regarding the relationship between CSR and financial performance, some literature has emerged centred on how to ensure that CSR ultimately leads to financial benefits for the firm. It has been proposed that CSR is more likely to lead to financial benefits for the organisation if it is integrated into the core business function and strategy, and happens regularly, as ‘one off’ efforts are perceived as disingenuous (Barnett, 2007). Carroll and Shabana (2010), from their review of the various arguments for and against corporate social responsibility, suggest an indirect link between CSR and financial performance through cost and risk reduction, as well as reputation management. However, it is posited that some of the benefits of CSR, such as favourable stakeholder attitudes, better support behaviours and positive corporate image; can only be realised if the firm’s CSR efforts are effectively communicated - ensuring awareness, reducing scepticism by understanding what and where to communicate, as well as stakeholder characteristics, such as the extent to which the stakeholder cares about social issues and which particular issues they care about, that impact communication outcomes (Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen, 2015).
2.4 Employees and CSR

Other, non-financial benefits of CSR have been proposed in the literature. For instance, Banerjee (2008) suggests that CSR is not just necessary to appease stakeholders, but rather it is a means for large organisations to consolidate and legitimise the power they have in society. Benn, Dunphy, and Griffiths (2006) use case studies of large organisations such as Fuji, Panasonic and Xerox to argue that sustainability efforts lead to greater competitiveness when paired with leader and employee involvement. The lack of a comprehensive, empirically demonstrated framework that clearly links CSR to organisational outcomes has been argued to hinder the success of an firm’s CSR efforts (Knox and Maklan, 2004). This means that while firms accept that they have responsibilities to their operating environment, they do not see the explicit benefit to the firm of meeting these responsibilities and thus CSR is often just the production of expensive reports for the purpose of compliance (Knox and Maklan, 2004). To optimise the outcomes of CSR efforts, multiple stakeholders must be engaged (Knox and Maklan, 2004; Miles, Munilla, and Darroch, 2006; Meznar, Chrisman, and Carroll, 1990). I believe the engagement of employees in CSR is crucial to the success of initiatives, yet there is still a lack of understanding of how employees engage in and contribute to CSR.

2.4 Employees and CSR

Though there is a substantial body of literature examining CSR, a very small amount of this research is conducted at the individual level of analysis (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012). In response, there have been several recent calls for research to develop the micro-level of CSR (Morgeson et al., 2011; Glavas, Jones, and Willness, 2015; Cooper et al., 2015; Glavas, 2016[b]; Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015), and subsequently a significant growth in research exploring the relationship between employees and CSR.

Much of the research at the individual level has focused on employee-level outcomes of a firm’s CSR, such as attraction, job performance, employee commitment and retention. Turban and Greening’s (1996) much cited article found, through comparison of participants’ perceptions of organisational reputation and a firm’s externally-rated corporate social performance with another group of participants’ perceptions of organisational attractiveness as an employer, that CSR can be a source of competitive advantage as it makes organisations more attractive to job applicants and employees. Mueller et al. (2012) found that an employee’s perceptions of their organisation’s CSR are positively related to their affective organisational commitment, even after controlling for job satisfaction. Similarly, Brammer, Millington, and Rayton (2007) found that CSR contributes, more than job satisfaction, to affective commitment. In addition, Glavas and Kelley (2014) found that employee perceptions of CSR were positively related to organisational commitment, partially mediated by work meaningfulness and perceived organisational support, as well as job satisfaction, partially
mediated by work meaningfulness. Delmas and Pekovic (2013) found through employee-employer surveys of 5220 French firms that organically certified firms enjoy labour productivity that is one standard deviation higher than non-certified firms. In the context of a casino, Lee et al. (2013) found that a firm’s CSR efforts, when paired with supplementary, not compulsory, responsible gambling strategies; fostered employee trust, satisfaction and customer orientation.

Recent research has explored the mechanisms behind the relationships between CSR and employee-level outcomes. With regard to employee retention, Costas and Karreman (2013) gathered qualitative data at two management consultancy firms and found that CSR is a tool organisations can use to control employees by tying their ethical concerns and conscience to the aspirational image of the organisation. Similarly, Thauer (2013) uses case studies to illustrate that labour-based CSR can be a method for managers to solve HR-based managerial issues; because organisations depend on employee behaviour, implementing CSR initiatives can satisfy employees, preventing the efficiency losses associated with potential industrial action. Collier and Esteban (2007) found that CSR led to organisational commitment, particularly if the organisation’s CSR strategy aligned with the organisation’s values, as well as the employee’s personal values. Organisational identification has been well-explored as an employee-level outcome of CSR, and as a mediator of CSR-employee outcome relationships. Several mechanisms behind the positive relationship between CSR and organisational identification have been empirically examined, such as organisational pride (Jones, 2010), perceived organisational prestige (Kim et al., 2010) and justice (De Roeck et al., 2014). Specifically, De Roeck et al. (2014) found that CSR, moderated by justice and mediated by perceived external organisational prestige and organisational pride, leads to organisational identification. In the context of a petrochemical organisation, De Roeck and Delobbe (2012) found that environmentally-targeted CSR led to organisational identification, mediated by organisational trust. Jones (2010) found that CSR led to organisational identification, via organisational pride, and Kim et al. (2010) found that employee participation in CSR directly, positively affected organisational identification, while CSR associations (the firm’s CSR initiatives) increased perceived organisational prestige, which enhanced organisational identification, leading to employee commitment. Similarly, Farooq et al. (2014) found that an organisation’s CSR targeted towards the community and its employees led to organisational identification and trust, which increased affective organisational commitment.

Therefore, a substantial amount of recent research has examined how employees react to CSR and the mechanisms behind these relationships (Rupp and Mallory, 2015). Overall, the research suggests that CSR facilitates affective attachment to the organisation, in the form of trust, commitment and identification. However, understanding how employees react to the firm’s CSR efforts does not shed light on how and why employees themselves engage in CSR. The notion of employees reciprocating or mirroring CSR efforts has been explored. Gond et al. (2007) propose that an organisation’s CSR efforts influence employee
attitudes in the form of organisational trust, commitment and job satisfaction, and also behaviours, namely organisational citizenship and workplace deviance behaviours, through social identity, feeling as though they belong in and with the organisation, and social exchange, feeling like they owe the organisation something in return for their CSR efforts. Jones (2010) found that employees that responded positively to their organisation’s volunteerism program were more likely to engage in organisational citizenship behaviours, as reported by their supervisor. In their longitudinal study, Smith (2013) found that strong organisational philanthropic identity and efforts, over time, increased employees’ charitable attitudes and behaviour.

Some studies have explored how employees participate in CSR, or based studies around the assumption that employees are engaged with it. Two studies by Rupp and colleagues, Rupp et al. (2006) and Rupp et al. (2013), investigated the impact of CSR on employees, finding that because employees are concerned about, contribute, and react to the organisation’s CSR efforts, those CSR efforts impact employee behaviour (organisational citizenship behaviours and performance) and attitudes (satisfaction and commitment). The authors propose that a firm’s CSR activities (or lack thereof) influence employee justice perceptions, mediated by the extent that the employee’s justice perceptions meet the control, belongingness and meaningful existence needs of the employee (Rupp et al., 2006). In the 2013 study, the authors studied both job applicants and employees to understand the impact of CSR on both parties. Job applicants’ job pursuit intentions were more influenced by their first party justice experiences (how they were treated by the organisation) than CSR perceptions (conceptualised as third party justice experiences, i.e., how the firm treats external parties), CSR perceptions were amplified by (high) moral identity, and employee CSR perceptions influence the employee’s justice perceptions and organisational citizenship behaviours, especially if the employee ranks highly on moral identity (Rupp et al., 2013). These studies explored the mechanisms between an organisation’s CSR efforts and traditional employee behaviours more deeply, but very few studies have explored socially responsible behaviour by the employee and the factors that influence said behaviours.

As exceptions, Bingham et al. (2013) propose that employees are more likely to participate in organisation-sponsored causes if they are committed to the cause and feel the organisation is genuinely committed to the cause. Ones and Dilchert (2012) put forward a typology of employee green behaviours, namely conserving, working sustainably, avoiding harm, influencing others and taking initiative. Conserving involves reducing consumption, reusing materials, and recycling; working sustainably is choosing responsible alternatives and creating sustainable processes; avoiding harm pertains to reducing pollution and monitoring environmental impact. Influencing others involves encouraging and educating colleagues about environmental consciousness and, finally, taking initiative involves actions such as starting environmentally-friendly programs or policies, or lobbying to that end. Hemingway (2005) proposes four types of employee actors in the CSR process: the active social entrepreneur, the socially motivated employee that actively pursues a CSR agenda,
underpinned by collectivist values and supported by a strong organisational CSR culture; the frustrated corporate social entrepreneur, a socially motivated employee that is stifled by an unsupportive organisational culture. The conformist, a morally apathetic employee that will comply with the organisation’s CSR (or lack thereof), and the apathetic employee, who is disinterested in CSR and unconvinced of its value.

In a similar vein, from a study of two Chilean construction firms with strong, established CSR strategies Rodrigo and Arenas (2008) put forward three types of employees: the committed employee who believes in social welfare and welcomes the firms CSR efforts, the indifferent who doesn’t feel strongly about CSR and instead focuses on their career, and the dissident, who is opposed to CSR and is frustrated at the organisation spending time on CSR. Building on this, Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen (2015) propose and examine four different types of employee attitudes to CSR. The idealists, who balance their developmental, ideological and economic needs reported the highest CSR demand. Enthusiasts placed their developmental and ideological needs above their economic needs, and were accordingly most likely to forego salary in favour of working for a socially responsible organisation. Indifferents placed their economic and developmental needs above their ideological needs and thus had the lowest demand for CSR and were least likely to report willingness to forego salary for CSR. Further, Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen (2015) found that CSR leads to job satisfaction through the achievement of the aforementioned job needs, moderated by CSR proximity (the extent to which employees are aware of and involved with CSR).

While this research is extremely valuable, particularly in terms of understanding how organisational factors interact with individual factors (such as job needs) to reap employee-level outcomes of CSR, it does not empirically explore the full range of behaviours that employees can engage in with a socially responsible intention, nor the factors that lead to this engagement (as opposed to reaction to the firm’s CSR). As a result, we don’t have a complete understanding of what CSR is to employees, which has significant implications. For example, without first understanding what employees consider CSR to be, a firm cannot evaluate whether its CSR efforts are being well-received by employees, simply because the employee may not recognise the firm’s activity as socially responsible. There is no agreed-upon definition of CSR (Bice, 2015), so if a firm ascribes to the stakeholder approach to CSR, targeting its CSR efforts at customers, employees, the government and social and non-social stakeholders (Turker, 2009) while the employee views along economic, environmental and social dimensions (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987), how does this affect employee reactions to and engagement with the firm’s CSR. This is particularly pertinent given the complex mechanisms between CSR and employee-level outcomes described above. Further, how the firm should position its CSR to maximise employee engagement, given that employees are often responsible for enacting firm-level strategy (Collier and Esteban, 2007), or whether there are extant employee activities that can be leveraged to maximise organisational CSR still warrants significant further examination.
Some research has explored the factors that lead to employee engagement in specific types of CSR. For example Chen and Hung-Baesecke (2014) found that leader behaviour, in the form of leading by example, advocacy and facilitation predicted employee intention to participate in particular CSR initiatives offered by the studied organisation. Glavas (2016[a]) found that CSR, particularly when it was integrated into the employee’s job (in-role), led to greater employee engagement, mediated by authenticity (one’s ability to show their whole self at work). In the case of workplace giving (charitable payroll deductions), Haski-Leventhal (2013) found that high income earners and those with Bachelor degrees or higher were more likely to be high-level givers. Both high- and low-level givers cited the organisation matching donations was an important factor in their decision to donate, convenience and tax-effectiveness was more important for high-level givers, while the donation going to a cause that was personally important was more important for low-level givers than high. One study that did undertake an inductive exploration of employee engagement in CSR is Slack, Corlett, and Morris (2015), who found that, in an organisation with a clearly articulated and strong CSR strategy, employees seemed to initiate CSR activities, such as asking for sponsorship or sharing charitable pursuits, much more frequently than the organisation initiated CSR communication. In addition, ardent CSR supporters were driven by personal interest, while the majority of employees were apathetic or even disparaging towards the organisation’s efforts (Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015). The aforementioned research affirms the importance of employees to the success of an organisation’s CSR strategy, however, the work of Slack, Corlett, and Morris (2015) represents only the beginning of this line of inquiry.

In sum, recent literature has explored the competitive advantages that a firm benefits from by engaging in CSR, and several employee outcomes such as attraction, retention, trust, commitment, performance and citizenship behaviours. I believe this focus on employees is a step in the right direction towards a fuller picture of CSR in practice, but that looking at employees as an integral part of a firm’s CSR efforts rather than merely how a firm’s efforts may impact employee outcomes is a necessary next step. Employees enact a firm’s CSR strategy from within and may even contribute in ways the organisation had not even considered, therefore getting a clear picture of how employees engage in socially responsible behaviour at work and looking at the factors that influence this behaviour is vital to forming a complete picture of CSR and identifying the factors that impact a firm’s CSR success. As the next chapter will explore in depth, I believe the complex interaction of organisational and individual factors that apply to the CSR-employee outcome relationships will also be at play when it comes to employee engagement in CSR.
2.5 Summary

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a well-established construct in the literature, with much effort dedicated to defining and conceptualising it. Determining which firms are responsible for what, and what behaviour on the part of the organisation constitutes corporate social responsibility is a contentious issue. However, all authors that believe organisations have responsibilities to society agree that CSR is a multi-faceted construct that requires consideration of multiple dimensions and stakeholders, which has led to the emergence of various models of CSR. Carroll’s (1979) three-dimensional model gained the most traction in the literature (Wartick and Cochran, 1985; Wood, 1991), with its four categories - economic, legal, ethical and discretionary as one dimension, the varying social issues a firm faces on another and the third dimension being the firm’s social responsiveness philosophy - reaction, defence, accommodation, or proaction. Some literature has taken CSR past conceptualisation and explored how an organisation should focus its efforts to optimise CSR efforts, such as narrowing scope to issues that relate to the organisation’s operations and response proportional to the firm’s size and impact, shaping the organisational culture so leaders and members are open to the organisation’s CSR efforts, identifying traits and contexts that influence leader decisions about CSR, and evaluating and measuring CSR performance across multiple metrics.

Significant effort has been invested into identifying links between an organisation’s CSR efforts and direct and indirect benefits, such as financial outcomes, social power, and traditional employee outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment and performance. The results of these studies vary, with some saying that CSR leads to increased profit, others finding a negative relationship between CSR and profit, and others finding no relationship. The hypothesised mechanisms of these relationships between a firm’s CSR efforts and organisationally beneficial outcomes also vary, with some suggesting that employee outcomes are derived from the firm’s CSR efforts making it more attractive, others proposing that the employee ties their values to the organisation when the organisation is socially responsible, and others still suggesting that CSR in and of itself is a way to diminish other qualms the employee may have with the organisation. Despite the inconclusive findings of the CSR-profit relationship, the vast majority of firm’s today recognise the need to address their social responsibilities. The lack of consensus or even convergence on how and why employees are affected by their organisation’s CSR efforts indicates that research is required on how employees fit into the CSR picture. This thesis deviates from the trend of investigating the impact of CSR on employee outcomes to explore how and why employees engage and participate in socially responsible activities at work.

There are many factors for a firm to consider when engaging in CSR, from the strategy development stage through to the evaluation of the firm’s corporate social performance. The majority of authors highlight the importance of considering multiple stakeholders, with some literature dedicated to said stakeholders, with the exploration of organisational culture
and leadership traits and their impact on CSR success. However, the employee’s role in CSR is still in the process of being established. For example, research is still identifying behaviours that they can engage in that constitute employee CSR, their motivations for engaging in these behaviours, and how the organisation can facilitate and harness these behaviours. These are the areas that this project hopes to contribute to, by conceptualising employee CSR behaviour, proposing individual and organisational factors that impact this type of behaviour, and empirically exploring the relationships between these factors and the various behaviours that constitute employee CSR.
Chapter 3

Employee Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theoretical Framework

As the previous chapter highlighted, the construct of corporate social responsibility is well established in the literature, with much effort dedicated to defining and developing it. Accordingly, how best to focus firm-level efforts has been investigated, and some emphasis has been placed on the outcomes of CSR, including consideration of some employee-based outcomes for the firm such as satisfaction, commitment and performance. However, relatively little emphasis has been placed on the role that employees play in CSR enacted by the firm, i.e., how they contribute to CSR rather than just how they are affected by it. This represents a gap in our understanding of CSR as it is employees are often responsible for enacting an organisation’s CSR policy and strategy, yet we have little understanding of how or why they engage in CSR behaviour. This chapter seeks to begin to address this by introducing the construct of employee CSR behaviour, distinguishing it from other types of employee behaviour and firm-level CSR, and drawing on extant literature to propose a theoretical framework of antecedents of these behaviours.

3.1 Defining and Distinguishing Employee CSR Behaviour

The relatively limited understanding of how and why employees engage in CSR behaviours represents a significant gap in our knowledge of corporate social responsibility. Much academic effort has been put into defining CSR and conceptualising how firms can best implement CSR initiatives; through company reporting we understand CSR actions and outcomes that are taking place at the firm level, yet very little is known about what actions employees take and the motivations behind these outcomes. Based upon the conceptualisation of CSR at the organisational level as behaviours outside of the firm’s primary economic role intended to better society (Eells and Walton, 1961; Davis, 1960; Carroll, 1979), I define employee CSR behaviour (eCSR) as employee behaviour, occurring in the context of the organisation that is intended to benefit broader society. The definition of eCSR is limited to the intention of the employee to benefit rather than the outcome of the behaviour to control
for variation in individual ability to have an impact. For example, an entry level employee may recycle, use electricity conservatively, participate in all CSR opportunities offered by the organisation, make countless suggestions to their superiors and just generally dedicate significant time and energy into socially responsible behaviours but, as an individual, still have less impact than an executive making one single big decision, such as changing the organisation’s paper supply to recycled, introducing an employee donation match scheme or corporate volunteering program.

Employee CSR behaviour differs from most other employee behaviours in terms of the target of the behaviour, the intention of the behaviour, and the amount of direct and indirect feedback received following the behaviour. While most employee behaviours are directed at supervisors, colleagues or others within the organisation, eCSR is intended to affect parties external to the organisation, or broader society. For example, if an employee were to attend a corporate volunteering day at a food bank, the intended beneficiaries are the food bank itself, the staff of the food bank and the people who use the service. Further, when external parties are positively affected by typical employee behaviour, it is usually as a by-product of the employee performing their job, such as when an employee delivers a service to a customer, the customer benefits but the employee’s primary intention is to do their job. On the other hand, eCSR is engaged in with the explicit intention of benefiting parties external to the organisation. In terms of feedback, because of the external target(s) of eCSR, the employee usually does not see the effects of their CSR behaviour, whereas employee behaviour directed within the organisation will result in some level of feedback, whether it is praise, positive interpersonal relations or promotional opportunities, to list a few examples (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Therefore, I propose that the target of eCSR, the intention with which an employee undertakes said behaviour and the feedback the employee receives from this behaviour differentiate eCSR from more conventional employee behaviour, and that these key differences will affect the antecedents and factors that lead an employee to engage in eCSR. I will elaborate on these differences using examples from types of behaviour that I believe overlap with eCSR.

Employee CSR behaviour can be differentiated from organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) because, while they are both types of independent employee behaviour that cannot be explicitly expected of the employee, the targets of OCBs are connected to the employee’s work environment, meaning the employee can reasonably expect a positive response from their behaviour, which in many cases may be the primary motivator (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002). Employee CSR behaviour, on the other hand, affects parties external to the employee, thus when an employee engages in such a behaviour, they cannot reasonably expect extrinsic reward for the behaviour, meaning the behaviour is not motivated by an anticipated reward. For example, a supervisor cannot reasonably ask a employee to come in ten minutes prior to their starting time so they can plan the day before the supervisor’s morning meeting, but if the employee were to independently choose to do so, it would represent OCB. Further, OCBs cannot be officially rewarded, but the employee could experience
benefits resulting from their OCB. Following with the above example, whilst the supervisor could not offer pay or bonuses to the employee for arriving early, the employee would likely experience better interpersonal relations with their supervisor, greater perceived performance, or leniency if they needed to leave early or their performance lapsed temporarily (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002). Therefore, although OCBs cannot be explicitly expected or rewarded, engaging in them can potentially influence the work environment for the employee because members within the organisation are most often the beneficiaries of OCBs, which can lead to reciprocal relationships. In addition, even if the employee does not receive any feedback or recognition for their OCB, it is still directed at somebody they know or the organisation they work for, which may be enough motivation for them to engage in the behaviour (Deluga, 1994). On the other hand, engaging in eCSR would not reap the same potential rewards because the beneficiaries of eCSR are external to the organisation, and therefore cannot influence the working environment of the employee. The target of the behaviour (intra-organisational for OCB and external for eCSR) and the potential for positive response (significant for OCB, minimal for eCSR) affect the intention of employees engaging in eCSR, and therefore will influence the antecedents that lead to said behaviour.

Similar arguments can be made for both extra-role behaviour (ERB) and suggestion making. An employee who makes a successful suggestion may anticipate a reward, expect that their job will become easier upon implementation of the suggestion, or simply derive satisfaction from the knowledge that their idea is now in place (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne, 1998). An employee who engages in ERB may be perceived as more attractive should they apply for a promotion, have a better relationship with their supervisor or receive praise for their hard work (Wright et al., 1993). Put simply, in most cases of employee behaviour in the workplace, the employee is aware of the potential costs and benefits to themselves and those around them, and is likely to see the outcomes of their behaviours. This is not usually the case with eCSR. For example, if an employee donates to a charity sponsored by the organisation, they do not get to see or experience where the money is allocated. Even if the fundraising effort is for something specific, such as building a school, the employee will not see the building or the benefits it brings to the children attending.

However, it is important to note that there are varying degrees of feedback with different types of eCSR. For example, an employee who finds a more local supplier for their organisation with the intention of supporting the community would be aware that the supplier is being used, but would not see the impact that the organisation’s business has on the local supplier or the community at large. An employee who performs waste disposal as prescribed by the organisation will not directly see how doing their job properly positively impacts the environment, or conversely, how not doing it properly would damage it. An employee that makes a suggestion to improve the environmental efficiency of some of the organisation’s operations will get the satisfaction of knowing their idea was implemented, but it is unlikely that they will know the difference that the change made to the firm’s emissions or waste or what the impact is on the broader environment. Similarly, an employee
who articulates their dissent about a CSR issue will get the satisfaction of expressing themselves and knowledge as to what the organisation is going to do about the issue, but again, they will not usually see the impact of resolving the issue. The external, and often unknown, targets of employee behaviour and the absence of feedback resulting from engaging in the behaviour mean that when an employee engages in eCSR they are doing so with intentions that are not related to personal gain. I propose that employee behaviours being primarily intrinsically motivated will influence the antecedents of such behaviours, as the following sections will illustrate.

3.2 Conceptualisation of Employee CSR

In conceptualising the eCSR construct, I propose that there is a spectrum of eCSR, in a similar vein to the aforementioned spectrums of firm level CSR (Steiner, 1972; Wilson, 1975; McAdam, 1973; Davis and Blomstrom, 1975; Sethi, 1975). An employee can engage in CSR behaviour within their role, merely by doing their job. For example, if a company had a certain method of eliminating waste products from their production so it did not pollute waterways, an employee would be engaging in CSR behaviour as long as they dispose of waste in the prescribed manner. This can be likened to a firm ‘doing only what is required’ (McAdam, 1973) or the ‘reaction’ response of Wilson’s (1975) firm-level continuum. An organisational example of this would be a mining firm following government regulations when closing a mine - the firm is just following the rules so it can continue to operate, but the action still has a relative benefit to the environment. Next on the spectrum of eCSR is non-compulsory (extra-role) behaviour that is still aligned with the organisation’s CSR policy, such as attending non-mandatory meetings or reading memoranda related to the organisation’s CSR approach, or donating to and participating in organisation-sponsored charities. This would be similar to an organisation ‘being progressive’ in its CSR approach (McAdam, 1973) or ‘accommodating’ CSR into its function (Wilson, 1975), such as a firm choosing to provide sustainability reports to organisations such as the Global Reporting Initiative. The firm doesn’t have to do this in order to perform its primary economic function, but can choose to with minimal effort as most of the required data is already collected for standard annual reports.

An employee could also engage in behaviours that go beyond the scope of the organisation’s CSR policies but fall under the category of CSR, for instance, a person responsible for sourcing supplies for the firm could suggest a local or more environmentally conscious supplier. At the organisational level, this type of behaviour would fall under ‘proaction’ or ‘leading the industry’ (McAdam, 1973), and an example could be an energy company choosing to invest in renewable energy over traditional sources. Finally, an employee could engage in behaviours that may not be conducive to organisational success but are still CSR behaviours, such as whistleblowing or principled dissent. For example, if an employee knew that the company was exploiting workers, reporting this behaviour would cause, at least, a
disruption to the firm’s economic production, but it would likely halt socially irresponsible action by the firm. This behaviour represents an extreme end of the spectrum that is unrepresented in organisational-level models, as it is highly unlikely that an organisation would act in a manner so contradictory to its primary goal of economic success, yet I argue that it is feasible that an individual might do so. A prominent example of this is Edward Snowden, who gave up a six figure salary, a comfortable life with his partner, and even risked his life because he believed that the actions of his organisation were to the detriment of society.

A useful way of distinguishing the various points along the spectrum of eCSR described above is also by making use of the categorisation of extra-role behaviour developed by Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks (1995). The authors developed a classification of ERB as either affiliative/promotive, affiliative/prohibitive, challenging/promotive or challenging/prohibitive. According to their scheme, ERB can be behaviour that is intended to enhance organisational efforts that the employee believes to be positive (affiliative/promotive ERB, such as participating in an organisationally-endorsed fundraiser; and challenging/promotive e.g., suggestion making) or can be designed to stop procedures that the employee believes to be damaging to the organisation or to society in general (challenging/prohibitive ERB, e.g., whistle-blowing, principled organisational dissent). Affiliative/prohibitive ERB differs slightly from the other types of ERB as it is generally directed towards an individual and is most often in situations of unequal power, for instance, a supervisor protecting a junior employee (Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks, 1995), hence there is no direct mapping onto eCSR, which is directed at broader targets. Affiliative/promotive eCSR is going beyond role expectations, but still following the organisation’s CSR strategy. Challenging/promotive eCSR involves taking action or making suggestions outside of the organisation’s prescribed strategy that still address the CSR issues. Finally, challenging/prohibitive eCSR involves taking action that is potentially damaging to the organisation in the name of CSR. A table of the proposed eCSR spectrum appears below.
### Table 3.1: Employee CSR spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employee CSR Behaviour</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Relevant Literatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Role</td>
<td>Doing your job.</td>
<td>Disposing of production waste in the correct manner.</td>
<td>Civic Virtue and Sportsmanship from organisational citizenship behaviour literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Role Affiliative/Promotive</td>
<td>Going above role expectations but within the scope of organisational CSR policy.</td>
<td>Attending non-mandatory CSR meetings; donating to/participating organisationally-endorsed charity events e.g., fun runs, food drives.</td>
<td>Suggestion making and extra-role behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Role Challenging/Promotive</td>
<td>Taking action above role expectations and beyond organisational CSR policy.</td>
<td>Suggesting more environmentally-friendly methods of doing things; finding a local (versus international) supplier for the organisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Role Challenging/Prohibitive</td>
<td>Behaviours potentially damaging to the organisation’s economic function, but necessary to meet social responsibilities.</td>
<td>Whistleblowing, principled dissent e.g., reporting worker or environmental exploitation.</td>
<td>Dissent and whistle-blowing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee CSR behaviours can be conceptualised as a spectrum as the degree of effort and potential resistance that the employee could experience increases along the four different types of eCSR. As a result, I propose that the antecedents of these behaviours vary. Trevino (1986) puts forward that situational and individual factors interact to predict an employee’s ethical (or unethical) behaviour. Similarly, I propose that organisational factors will interact with individual-level moderators to predict an employee’s engagement in eCSR. I propose organisational factors because CSR is typically an organisation-level construct; the organisation determines the CSR strategy and the actions required to bring that strategy to fruition, including how employees are involved in an official, organisationally-endorsed capacity. Further, the way in which the employee feels about the organisation’s CSR is likely to be influenced by their perceptions of the organisation (Rupp et al., 2013). However, the employee has discretion over how and the extent to which they engage in eCSR, so organisational factors are moderated by individual-level factors.

In determining which organisational factors are related to which types of eCSR, I considered the nature of each behaviour type along with related constructs in the literature to determine the most empirically grounded antecedents to explore. In-role eCSR entails an employee doing only what they have to do, so the antecedents of this type of behaviour centre on clarity and importance, that is, factors that make it clear exactly what is expected of the employee and how important each expected behaviour is. Affiliative/promotive eCSR involves an employee engaging in behaviour that the organisation encourages, but does not explicitly expect, therefore the factors that would stimulate this type of behaviour are about the level of support the employee feels. Challenging/promotive eCSR is about an employee doing what they can do, above and beyond the organisation’s strategy and well above their role description, therefore the antecedents of this behaviour are about the ability the employee has to engage in these behaviours, specifically through the level of autonomy they have in their job, as well as the organisation’s readiness for change. Finally, challenging/prohibitive eCSR involves an employee doing what they feel they morally and ethically have to do, so the factors that would lead to this behaviour centre on a lack of support, because this type of behaviour is a last resort that usually comes at great cost to the employee. Therefore, if the employee felt organisational justice or trust, they would be more likely to believe that the organisation was not knowingly engaging in socially irresponsible behaviour and would halt it immediately if they brought it to their attention.

The antecedents for the different types of eCSR can be viewed as a continuum of organisational support factors that build on each other. For example, an employee is less likely to engage in affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour unless they first know what is expected of them (the clarity antecedents of in-role eCSR) and feel the support of the organisation and their supervisors. The antecedents for challenging/promotive eCSR reflect the next level of support, with the employee feeling a level of autonomy and organisational readiness for change that enables them to engage in constructive, but non-mandated or explicitly expected behaviours. Finally, antecedents of the challenging/prohibitive dimension of eCSR...
centre on a lack of support, which is unlikely to be felt if the employee experienced the clarity, organisational and supervisory support, and autonomy required for the preceding types of eCSR.

Both individual and organisation level factors influence an employee’s participation in eCSR. An organisation can facilitate employee engagement through job factors, broader organisational culture, appropriate policies and procedures, and clear, accessible opportunities to participate. However, due to the individual nature of the behaviour being examined, the moderators between organisational effort and employee behaviour will be individual traits. The moderators of the relationships between the antecedents and the types of eCSR are individual characteristics that can be viewed on a spectrum of resilience.

Engaging in in-role eCSR does not require any extra effort on the part of the employee, and the employee will encounter minimal, if any, resistance from the organisation. Therefore conscientiousness, the drive to be a good employee, is the major individual characteristic that strengthens the relationship between the proposed antecedents and in-role eCSR. Affiliative/promotive eCSR, while still endorsed by the organisation, requires the employee to exert effort additional to performing their core job, often on behalf of the organisation, thus the level of organisational commitment an employee feels will positively influence the relationship between the antecedents and affiliative/promotive eCSR. Challenging/promotive eCSR involves action outside of the scope of the organisation’s CSR strategy, as well as the organisation’s expectations of the employee. Accordingly, the employee has to exert substantial effort and risk resistance from the organisation when engaging in this type of CSR behaviour, as it is a change from the status quo. Therefore, the moderator of the relationship between autonomy and job knowledge, and challenging/promotive eCSR is self-efficacy, which reflects the employee’s strength of belief in their ability to successfully engage in the behaviour. As challenging/prohibitive eCSR will always receive significant resistance from the organisation and thus represents significant risk to the employee, the employee’s level of conformity will moderate the relationship between organisational trust and justice, and challenging/prohibitive behaviour.

It is important to note that this model should be viewed as an emerging spectrum. While our knowledge of employees and CSR is rapidly growing, particularly in terms of employee outcomes of CSR (Mueller et al., 2012; Evans, Davis, and Frink, 2011), we are still developing our understanding of how and why employees engage in acts of social responsibility at work (Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008; Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015; Caldwell et al., 2005). Accordingly, the purpose of this chapter is to draw on the literature examining CSR and the literature examining employee behaviour to put forward a model of antecedents that can be tested. I do not suppose that this model represents all of the relevant antecedents and moderators; instead, it presents what I believe, based on extant literature, to be the most likely. The model is also underpinned by the assumption that eCSR, like other types of employee behaviour, is affected by intrinsic motivation in that an employee is more likely to
engage in a particular eCSR if they’re intrinsically motivated towards it (Deci and Ryan, 1975). For example, an employee who is passionate about the environment will be more receptive to the organisation’s environmental initiatives. Further, knowing that eCSR is a relatively new concept, in addition to testing the proposed antecedents, this thesis will explore the eCSR construct inductively to allow for deeper understanding of the types of CSR behaviour employees are actually engaged in and further development of the theoretical model.
Figure 3.1: An integrative model of employee CSR
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3.3 In-Role Employee CSR

3.3.1 Description

In-role eCSR occurs when performing the mandatory tasks associated with one’s job role in the manner prescribed by the organisation involves an intention to benefit the environment, community or broader society. This benefit can be relative to not performing the task or performing it incorrectly, or it can be a task that is specifically designed to offer this benefit. For example, a hospital worker disposing of clinical waste in the correct manner offers benefit to broader society by not exposing people to infectious material. While the organisation will have policies to dispose of waste correctly so that they comply with regulations in order to continue with their primary economic function, the worker must choose to dispose of the waste correctly which still offers a benefit to society, relative to disposing of it incorrectly. These decisions to do one’s job correctly will often require more effort from the employee than alternative methods - it is more effort for a garbage plant worker to separate recyclables and general waste than to throw them all in together, it is easier for a manager to ignore an email from an employee with environmentally friendly suggestions than to action them, so engaging in in-role eCSR requires a conscious effort from the employee. Another way in-role eCSR can occur is when an organisation develops tasks for employees separate to their primary business, explicitly for the purpose of benefiting society. For example, an organisation could make it a requirement that all executives perform 20 hours of community service annually in order to retain their position. This has no direct connection to the business role of most organisations, but it does offer benefit to society. In this form of eCSR, the employee is explicitly aware of the socially responsible nature of their actions and has to choose to either engage in them or work for an organisation that does not place this requirement on them.

While it is difficult to isolate the exact intent of the employee, i.e., whether it is to benefit society or merely to keep their job, this type of behaviour still involves a choice from the employee: they can choose to engage in the correct way, they can choose to risk repercussions and not do it in the prescribed way, or they can choose to work for an organisation that does not require them to take environmentally or socially conscious measures in their work. In the spectrum of eCSR that I propose, employees will encounter the least amount of resistance from the organisation and have to exert the least amount of effort when engaging in in-role CSR behaviour. This, and the fact that the behaviour occurs within the employee’s specific job role, means that the antecedents of this type of behaviour will centre around job factors that increase the perceived importance of the behaviour to the employee. The next section will explain further.
3.3.2 Related Literature

As in-role employee behaviour is required as part of the job, literature on employee performance will shed light on the factors that lead an employee to engage in their job and complete tasks at a high standard.

Various individual-level factors have been demonstrated to affect employee performance. Rodwell, Kienzle, and Shadur (1998) found that employee perceptions of teamwork, satisfaction and commitment significantly predicted self-rated performance. Shore and Martin (1989) found that satisfaction, more so than organisational commitment, was strongly related to supervisor performance ratings for samples of both bank tellers and hospital professionals. Luthans et al. (2008) hypothesised that employee psychological capital (hope, resilience, optimism and efficacy) is positively related to their performance, satisfaction and commitment, and found that psychological capital mediates the relationship between a supportive organisational climate and self-rated employee performance. However, the two individual-level predictors found to consistently predict job performance across studies are general mental ability and conscientiousness (Hunter and Hunter, 1984). Tett and Burnett (2003) theorised that situational factors, such as job demands, distractors, constraints and facilitators affect the way in which personality traits (such as conscientiousness) are expressed in the form of job performance, in that traits are expressed in work behaviour as responses to trait-relevant cues. The sources of these trait-relevant cues can be broadly categorised as task, social or organisational. Therefore, when developing propositions about the relationships between eCSR behaviours and their antecedents, we must examine task, social and organisational factors.

In light of the literature highlighting that both organisational and individual factors influence employee in-role performance, I propose that three organisational factors will be related to in-role eCSR, but that conscientiousness as an individual trait will moderate this relationship. I select conscientiousness as a moderator because of its prominence in both the employee performance and OCB literature. We do not consider general mental ability, the other consistent predictor of employee performance in the literature, as a moderator because when testing the interactive effects of conscientiousness and ability, Mount, Barrick, and Strauss (1999) found that ability does not moderate the relationship between conscientiousness and employee performance. Therefore ability and conscientiousness considered together do not predict job performance better than when they are considered separately (Mount, Barrick, and Strauss, 1999).

Many authors have examined the relationship between conscientiousness and employee performance. In a study of undergraduate business students attempting basic arithmetic problems, Gellatly (1996) found that performance expectancy and goal choice mediated the relationship between conscientiousness and performance. Performance was measured by
the number of problems the participants attempted, and performance expectancy was measured by participant-ratings of certainty that they could complete certain amounts of problems (Gellatly, 1996). The author suggests that people who score high on conscientiousness set higher goals for themselves because they believe they can perform well (Gellatly, 1996). Chen, Casper, and Cortina (2001) found that self-efficacy mediates the relationships between cognitive ability and conscientiousness and simple tasks, but the relationship did not hold for complex tasks. In relation to the interaction of conscientiousness with other personality traits, Witt et al. (2002) found that conscientious employees who scored low on agreeableness generally received lower supervisory performance ratings than conscientious employees who scored high on agreeableness, and Witt (2002) found that conscientious employees who score highly for extraversion receive higher supervisory performance ratings than those who score low on extraversion. However, extraversion has a negative impact on performance ratings of those employees who are low on conscientiousness (Witt, 2002). The studies did not determine whether the higher supervisor ratings can be attributed to employees high on agreeableness and extraversion actually performing better, or being better liked by the supervisor. Dudley et al. (2006) propose that narrow measures of conscientiousness, such as achievement, dependability, order and cautiousness, can predict performance better than aggregated global conscientiousness when the conscientiousness measure and performance criterion have strong, empirically established links. In sum, there is well-established empirical support of the relationship between conscientiousness and various measures of employee performance.

Given that performance is contextual, in that there are no universal behaviours and outcomes that constitute performance, one must consider the factors that will enable an employee to understand and demonstrate performance in their particular work situation (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955). The effect of role definitions on employee performance has been explored in the literature. Morrison (1994) found that each employee determined the boundaries between in-role and extra-role behaviour individually, and they were more likely to perform tasks if they perceived them to be in-role. Morrison (1994) found that the higher employees scored on satisfaction and affective commitment, the broader the range of behaviours they considered in-role. Similarly, Kamdar, McAllister, and Turban (2006) found that employees who considered certain behaviours to be part of their role were more likely to engage in said behaviours, particularly if they perceived there to be procedural justice at work. Directly related to in-role behaviours, Turnley and Feldman (2000) found that psychological contract violations, that is, violations of the employee’s beliefs about the terms and conditions of the exchange agreement between themselves and the organisation, are related to neglect of in-role job duties.

Whilst employees who have clear ideas regarding the behaviours expected of them tend to perform these behaviours, ambiguity around expected behaviours has a negative impact on employee performance. Yun, Takeuchi, and Liu (2007) found that employees with strong self-enhancement motives were less likely to perform well in their job if they felt there
was ambiguity around their role. The negative relationship between role ambiguity and job performance was also found in Tubre and Collins (2000) meta-analysis. Role conflict, which occurs when the demands placed on an individual are incompatible, is often explored alongside role ambiguity (Jackson and Schuler, 1985). Role conflict can occur within a job, where different tasks given to an employee conflict with each other, meaning that both cannot be performed within the same time frame, or without compromising the desired outcome of each task. Alternatively, an employee may face a situation where their job demands conflict with other roles they play in life, for instance, a mother may be asked to work overtime on a child’s birthday (Kahn et al., 1964). Role conflict places employees in a position where they have to decide which task to perform, which leads to negative affect and, naturally, an opportunity cost of performance of the task that was not selected (Jackson and Schuler, 1985). Role definitions play a significant role in determining employee behaviour, with role conflict and role ambiguity being associated with negative emotional states and lower performance, and positive affect being associated with broader role definitions and higher job performance.

There are various things that an organisation can do to ensure that employees both understand what is expected of them, and want to meet these expectations. Effective organisational communication is perhaps the most obvious method of ensuring that employees understand what is expected of them. There are various ‘genres’ of communication that organisations can engage in, such as meetings, e-mails or memos, with the appropriateness of each genre dependent on what needs to be communicated and the precedent for the type of communication in each individual organisation (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992). As mentioned above, the more satisfied and committed an employee, the more likely they are to embrace a broader range of behaviours as in-role, and perform said tasks (Morrison, 1994).

An organisation can foster satisfaction and commitment through a number factors, such as justice, task variety, employee expectations management, participative leadership, equity and communication (Williams and Hazer, 1986). Jones (1984) proposes that employees will be more motivated to perform if there is an organisational structure that allows them to demonstrate their individual contributions, and receive the expected rewards for said contributions. Specifically, Jones (1984) posits that smaller groups are more conducive to employee performance as individual performance is easier to recognise and reward when there are less individuals to take into account, thus employee motivation to perform increases. Supporting the rewards-performance link, Keller and Szilagyi (1976) found that positive rewards from leaders were powerful in clarifying the requirements of employees and eliciting performance, whilst punitive rewards (and employees’ fear of them) were only able to elicit effort. Interestingly, monetary incentives through organisational behaviour modification (rewarding specific behaviours that both the employee and supervisor are aware of) was more effective in driving performance than typical pay for performance programs, social recognition and performance feedback (Stajkovic and Luthans, 2001). Therefore, there are various things an organisation can do to broadly increase employee performance and ensure
that in-role tasks are done correctly, such as establish reward systems, ensure employees understand how to achieve performance rewards, and ensure that the terms and conditions of the employee-employer relationship are clear and met by both parties.

### 3.3.3 Propositions

The aforementioned literature has established that an employee is significantly more likely to perform if they understand what is expected of them i.e., if their roles are clearly defined. We believe that this link is particularly important for in-role eCSR as these behaviours will often require extra effort from the employee than less socially responsible methods of completing their tasks. Therefore, clarity around the expected tasks to ensure that the importance of these expected CSR behaviours is emphasised and they are not forgotten will increase the likelihood of the employee engaging in them. There are various ways that organisations can ensure that employees engage in these behaviours, such as effective communication and reward/punishment systems. For example, if an organisation was seeking to introduce certain CSR behaviours as compulsory, they could effectively communicate through memos, Intranet notices, e-mails, notices at relevant sites (e.g., if the behaviour is about recycling, then notices would be placed at both regular and recycling bins), and raising it in regularly scheduled meetings. After a reasonable adjustment period, it could then be announced that non-compliance would be punishable and explain what punitive measures will be implemented. The most effective communication would set the expectation baseline, but allow the employee to exceed the bare minimum by developing their own boundaries around what constitutes in-role versus extra-role behaviour (Morrison, 1994). For instance, an instruction such as ‘do not print out any unnecessary e-mails’ will lead to an employee doing exactly that, not printing out e-mails unnecessarily, whilst a statement such as ‘We are reducing our paper usage with an aim to become a paperless organisation by 2018. Please do not print any e-mails unnecessarily, and reduce your paper usage whenever you can’ will potentially lead to an employee thinking about other ways they can reduce paper usage and wastage (recycling, sending a memo electronically rather than printing, not printing e-mails etc.)

In sum, an employee is more likely to engage in in-role eCSR if they understand the expectations and importance of these behaviours. Clear role definitions create this understanding and will therefore increase employee engagement in in-role eCSR.

**Proposition 1** Clear role definitions will be positively related to in-role eCSR.

Workload and the stress associated with it are known to impact employees in a number of ways. Employees that experience strain in their jobs through high demands and
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low control have lower psychological wellbeing (Van Der Doef and Maes, 1999). Jamal (1984) found support for a negative relationship between job stress and performance (that is, increased stress resulted in decreased performance), but lower support for a positive relationship (decreased job stress leading to increased performance). A possible explanation of this is the findings of LePine, Podsakoff, and LePine (2005) which distinguish between hindrance stressors, which negatively impact performance, and challenge stressors, which can stimulate it, meaning that there are positive stressors, and a lack of these can discourage performance. Spector, Dwyer, and Jex (1988) found that four stressors, namely workload, autonomy, hours worked, and number of people worked for, were consistently negatively related employee performance, with this link being stronger between self-reports of stressors than supervisor reports. Encountering stressful events at work is negatively related to both interpersonal and motivational aspects of performance, with frequent exposure to job stress often leading to depression, creating a cycle of poor performance (Motowidlo, Packard, and Manning, 1986). Some factors have been found to moderate the negative relationship between workload-related stress and performance, such as social support (Glaser et al., 1999), emotional exhaustion (Wright and Cropanzano, 1998) and vacation experiences (Fritz and Sonnentag, 2006).

The impact of workload on employee engagement in in-role eCSR is particularly relevant because these behaviours often involve extra effort on the part of the employee relative to other methods of doing one’s job. For example, if it is organisational policy to print all documents double-sided but the employee is overwhelmed with work, they are less likely to change the printer settings before pressing print, because at that time the importance of environmentally friendly printing practices is lower than getting the document they need as fast as possible. Therefore, although some eCSR is ‘mandated’ by being in-role, employees who are overloaded are more likely to engage in short-cuts, the bare minimum amount of work, or measures to make it appear as though they are doing their job as prescribed when in reality they are not.

The organisation can mitigate this in a number of ways, such as offering rewards or punishments contingent on the desired behaviours, making engaging in the behaviours as easy as possible (e.g., have the printer set to double-sided printing as default), and being aware of overloading employees with new policies and procedures by rolling them out carefully. For example, announcing the implementation of a new CSR policy that affects the work of all employees and expecting it to be effective immediately and solely the responsibility of the employee is unreasonable. Instead, employees should be informed well ahead of time so that they can plan the optimal way to integrate the new policy into their work, the organisation should take measures to make it as easy as possible for the employee, and the rationale and importance of the policy should be emphasised so the employee knows that the behaviour is a priority and understands the reasoning behind it. Employees will be less inclined to whole-heartedly engage in in-role eCSR when their workload and associated stress levels
are high, particularly if the expected in-role behaviour is newly introduced and/or not allocated extra time or rewards (i.e., the employee is doing more work in the same time for the same amount of pay) so the organisation must take steps to ensure that the strain on the employee is minimised.

**Proposition 2**  
*An employee’s workload will be negatively related to in-role eCSR.*

The impact that leader expectations have on employee performance and the mechanisms through which this relationship operates is quite prominent in the management literature. These effects can be long-lasting, for example Liden, Wayne, and Stilwell (1993) found that the expectations that both the employee and leader have of each other when an employee enters an organisation predicts the quality of the relationship between supervisor and employee. The effect of leader expectations on employee performance is commonly referred to as the Pygmalion effect (Eden, 1992), whereby the higher leader’s performance expectations are, the higher the employee’s performance. Several reasons for this effect are explored in the literature, such as high leader expectations increasing employee motivation (Chen and Klimoski, 2003), increasing employee self-efficacy and self-performance expectations (Eden, 1992). Martinko and Gardner (1987) suggest that if the employee perceives the leaders expectations as appropriate, then they will adjust their behaviour to meet them. Further to this, several authors have suggested that positive interactions between supervisor and subordinate facilitate the expectations-performance relationship i.e., the employee is more likely to take the supervisor’s expectations into account when the relationship with the supervisor is positive. For example, Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found that leader-member exchange (LMX), the positive relationship between a leader and an employee formed through meeting each other’s expectations, predicted both OCB and employee performance. Wang et al. (2005) found that LMX completely mediated the relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and employee performance.

I believe that high performance expectations will influence in-role eCSR as high expectations from the supervisor will increase the perceived importance of these behaviours to the employee. If the employee knows that their supervisor has high expectations of their performance, they are more likely to be motivated to meet these expectations, and have the self-belief that they can do so. Further, they are likely to set higher performance expectations for themselves, which is quite important for in-role CSR behaviour, as it often demands effort beyond what the employee perceives as the essential aspects of doing their job. Therefore, knowing that their supervisor expects these behaviours, believing that they can meet said expectations and setting these expectations for themselves all serve to increase the likelihood of employees engaging in in-role eCSR.
**Proposition 3** High performance expectations will lead to in-role eCSR.

While there are several steps the organisation can take to encourage the employee to engage in in-role eCSR, such as clearly defining the expected behaviours and emphasising their importance, as it is individual behaviour, the employee still must choose to engage. Therefore, I propose that conscientiousness will moderate the relationships between the aforementioned organisational antecedents and in-role eCSR. The relationship between conscientiousness and employee performance is well explored in the literature, with some studies exploring conscientiousness as a moderator of relationships between other variables and employee performance (Bakker, Demerouti, and Brummellhuis, 2012; Blickle et al., 2008) and others investigating a primary relationship between conscientiousness and performance (Douglas, Frink, and Ferris, 2004; Frink and Ferris, 1999). With regard to role definitions, I propose that a conscientious employee is more likely to respond to their role definitions and, in turn, engage in in-role eCSR. Barrick and Mount (1991) suggest that a conscientious employee may acquire greater job knowledge and have better performance as a result, thus it can be put forward that when a conscientious employee is given clear role definition by the organisation, they will aim to achieve and exceed the expectations of them. On the other hand, an employee scoring low on conscientiousness is less likely to engage in in-role eCSR beyond the absolute bare minimum, regardless of the clarity of their role definitions.

The relationship between workload and performance of in-role eCSR will be moderated by conscientiousness, as although workload will logistically impact the extent to which an employee can engage in in-role eCSR, employees high on conscientiousness are more likely to ensure that they perform at all tasks assigned to them, regardless of workload. Further, employees low on conscientiousness are less likely to perform as well generally, likely translating to less than optimal performance of in-role eCSR. In terms of the relationship between high performance expectations and in-role eCSR, the conscientiousness dimension of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) refers to being a generally good worker, demonstrated by acts such as showing up on time, performing tasks well, decreased absenteeism. High performance expectations have been associated with the conscientiousness dimension of OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000), thus I put forward that this relationship should hold for the in-role dimension of eCSR as, like conscientiousness, in-role eCSR is required of the employee as it is part of their core tasks, however, the extent to which employees engage in it is up to them. Therefore, high performance expectations from the supervisor will encourage employees to engage in in-role eCSR in order to meet the expectations and conscientiousness as a trait will moderate this relationship as a conscientiousness employee is more likely to work hard and perform well consistently, regardless of the level of expectation felt from supervisors (Barrick and Mount, 1991).
Proposition 4 The relationships between clear role definitions, workload and high performance expectations and in-role eCSR will be moderated by conscientiousness, such that the positive relationships between clear role definitions and high performance expectations and in-role eCSR will be increased by an employee’s conscientiousness, and the negative relationship between workload and in-role eCSR will be decreased by an employee’s conscientiousness.

Although in-role eCSR is somewhat mandated by the organisation, employees still must choose to engage in these behaviours correctly and these behaviours often require extra effort relative to less socially responsible methods of performing one’s tasks. Therefore, I propose that there are three organisational factors to consider to encourage employees to engage in in-role eCSR. The first is providing clear role definitions - the employee cannot behave in the manner prescribed by the organisation if they are not aware of what the organisation wants from them or how important these behaviours are. Second is workload, as the employee is less likely to be receptive to making extra effort to be socially responsible at work if they are overloaded with tasks and perceive the in-role CSR behaviour as a hindrance stressor that is not essential to completing their core work. Finally, high performance expectations will stimulate the performance of in-role CSR behaviours as employees will feel motivated to meet the expectations of their supervisor, be it to maintain a positive relationship with the supervisor, or to gain rewards as a result of the behaviour. Each of these relationships will be moderated by conscientiousness, as conscientious employees are hard-working, thorough and achievement-oriented (Costa and McCrae, 1992), which suggests that they are more likely to voluntarily take on broader role definitions, as is often required when an organisation is trying to introduce in-role eCSR, persevere through tough workloads rather than take shortcuts, and seek to meet high performance expectations.

3.4 Affiliative/Promotive Employee CSR

3.4.1 Description

Affiliative/promotive eCSR entails non-mandatory acts by employees that align with the organisation’s extant CSR policy. These behaviours can range from expressing interest and participating in the organisation’s policies, such as attending meetings about CSR and talking to colleagues about initiatives the organisation has in place, to volunteering for or donating to organisation-sponsored causes. There are many examples of opportunities for employees to engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR. Organisations often try to inform employees of new policies and initiatives they have in place, as a form of internal marketing, through memoranda, meetings and presentations. Attending these in order to stay informed and potentially participate is a form of affiliative/promotive eCSR. Organisations often participate in food drives, particularly around Christmas, so donating non-perishable food or gifts to the organisation’s food drive is another example. Partaking in one of the many fundraisers that occur throughout the year within organisations, in the form of fun-runs, cake
stalls, raffles and the like, would constitute eCSR. Finally, volunteering at soup kitchens, mentoring underprivileged children or attending a beach clean up day, in programs run by the organisation, would all be classified as affiliative/promotive eCSR.

As these behaviours are outside of the employee’s specified job role, the employee must expend more effort to engage in them relative to in-role CSR behaviour. However, the employee is highly unlikely to receive any resistance from the organisation in engaging in this type of CSR behaviour as the actions are within the organisation’s strategic boundaries and, indeed, the organisation would prefer that employees partake in them. Therefore, the employee has to display less resilience than if they were engaging in a behaviour that is not explicitly endorsed by the organisation, as with challenging/promotive CSR behaviour. Given that the employee must expend non-mandatory effort at the behest of the organisation, the factors that I propose will influence affiliative/promotive CSR behaviours centre around how the employee feels about the organisation and its CSR efforts, moderated by the organisational commitment of the employee. The following section will examine employee behaviours that share similarities with affiliative/promotive eCSR and their established antecedents, followed by the introduction and explanation of my proposed antecedents of this type of eCSR.

3.4.2 Related Literature

The extra-role behaviour (ERB), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), employee volunteerism and prosocial organisational behaviour (PSOB) literatures all touch on employee behaviours that relate well to affiliative/promotive eCSR. These types of employee behaviours involve voluntary employee actions with resulting benefits that are directed towards persons other than the employee. The core distinction between these behaviours and affiliative/promotive eCSR is that the beneficiaries of OCB, ERB, and PSOB are generally known by the employee, so the employee can expect some degree of feedback and/or benefit. There is also similarity and confusion between these well-established employee behaviours. Although there is substantial definitional similarity between ERB and OCB, and much work examining ERB in fact uses OCB to conceptualise ERB (Bowling, 2010; Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks, 1995; Belschak and Den Hartog, 2009; Miles et al., 2002), for the purposes of this study there is a necessary distinction. Whilst OCB focuses on behaviours that enable contextual performance by supporting the social and psychological organisational environment (Organ, 1997), the ERBs that we believe will represent employee level CSR behaviours expand further than the social and psychological context of the organisation to encompass behaviours that affect individuals outside of the organisation. Understanding the factors that influence these ‘above and beyond’ helping behaviours can shed light on affiliative/promotive eCSR, as this particular dimension of eCSR involves non-required effort towards the organisation’s CSR objectives. The following section will introduce these related bodies of literature, which will then lead into development of propositions for the factors that will influence affiliative/promotive eCSR.
Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) was developed largely in response to the assertion of Katz (1964) that an organisation’s employees must, in addition to remaining with the organisation and reliably performing their duties, “be innovative and spontaneous...beyond role prescriptions” (Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). It is defined as “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (Organ, 1988, p4). In response to difficulties conceptualising the OCB construct with this definition, such as issues classifying behaviours as discretionary or establishing that there is definitely no reward for certain behaviours, Organ (1997, p91) simplified his definition of OCB as “contributions to the maintenance of the social and psychological context that supports task performance”.

Organ (1988) classifies OCBs into five dimensions: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. Altruism refers to helping behaviours that are directed at colleagues, conscientiousness is being a generally good worker, for instance, arriving on time, not taking longer than prescribed breaks and not wasting time. Sportsmanship refers to ‘rolling with the punches’ and tolerating organisational situations that are not ideal with minimal complaint, civic virtue pertains to keeping up with organisational matters and being an active ‘citizen’ within the organisation and courtesy, much like its general meaning, pertains to considerate behaviours that minimise workplace conflict, for example, asking fellow colleagues before re-arranging a workspace (Organ, 1988). Although some work has been published using the original classification of OCBs into ‘altruism’ and ‘generalised compliance’ behaviours (Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983), the vast majority of literature uses Organ’s (1988) five dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

OCB is a construct of particular relevance to eCSR for a number of reasons. Firstly, as OCB cannot be explicitly expected of employees, the motivation for engaging in these behaviours varies from ordinary job performance (Bateman and Organ, 1983). While it is difficult to believe that an employee that engages in OCB would not receive benefits, as highlighted by Bolino’s (1999) suggestion that OCBs are undertaken by employees to improve others’ impressions of them, these rewards are not guaranteed by the organisation’s formal system, nor can the employee be punished for not engaging in OCB. Therefore, I believe that some of the antecedents and motivations examined in relation to OCB may be applicable to eCSR. However, an important distinction is that OCB is directed at the interpersonal level, and eCSR is inherently directed at a more macro level with the intention of positively affecting the environment or the community. We believe that this central distinction will mean that, while some of the motivations may be applicable both to OCB and eCSR, there will be different motives and reasoning for an employee engaging in CSR behaviour, as we will elaborate below.

Many authors have introduced concepts such as contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, and Cross, 2000),
organisational spontaneity (George and Brief, 1992; George and Jones, 1997), and prosocial organisational behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) that overlap with OCB, without analysing the similarity between the construct and OCB and Organ’s (1988) five dimensions (LePine, Erez, and Johnson, 2002). In addition, the manner in which authors have examined OCB has varied greatly, with some authors choosing to only examine selected dimensions (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007), some have used the categorisation of OCBs into altruism and generalised compliance introduced by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), whilst others have divided OCBs into behaviours targeted at individuals within the organisation (OCBI) and those that are directed at the organisation level (OCBO) (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cropanzano, Rupp, and Byrne, 2003). LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) found that Organ’s five dimensions are not empirically distinct beyond factor analysis, and thus it is suggested that OCB be viewed as a latent construct that leads to the behaviours that can be categorised into the five dimensions. The aforementioned factors, as well as our belief that eCSR is conceptually distinct from OCB mean that the OCB literature will form an important part of our theorising and empirical testing of eCSR, but will not provide a complete theoretical framework.

For the purposes of this study, I focus on the dimensions of OCB that I view as constituting eCSR, namely sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue. I omit altruism and courtesy as these behaviours are directed specifically towards colleagues and are dedicated to the maintenance of the social machinery of the organisation (Organ, 1988), thus these behaviours are unlikely to be linked to eCSR. In accordance with the conceptualisation of eCSR, some acts of sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue could fall under the category of affiliative/promotive eCSR. Sportsmanship includes tolerating minor changes to the work environment and processes without complaint. For instance, if the organisation implemented a recycling program that required the employee to walk an extra ten metres to dispose of rubbish, sportsmanship would dictate that the employee would comply without complaint. A conscientious employee would ensure that they actually participate in the recycling program, perhaps even encouraging others to do so, whilst an employee engaging in civic virtue would ensure that they are aware of the recycling program and know what materials and items the organisation is wanting to recycle.

Prosocial organisational behaviour, although conceptually very similar to OCB, has been explored quite extensively in the literature. Brief and Motowidlo (1986, p710) define prosocial organisational behaviour (PSOB) as "positive acts carried out to produce and maintain the wellbeing of others", and go on to list thirteen different types of employee behaviours that would constitute PSOB, from assisting coworkers with job related or personal matters, to volunteering for additional assignments and staying with the organisation. Prosocial organisational behaviour contributes to the conceptualisation of affiliative/promotive eCSR as it involves non-mandatory behaviour that is beneficial to the organisation. However, it does not fully encompass all of the behaviours that I believe fall
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under the affiliative/promotive umbrella as PSOB focuses on behaviours that build interpersonal relationships within the organisation, whereas I believe that affiliative/promotive eCSR has beneficiaries outside of the organisation, and also outside of just interpersonal relations. For example, an employee staying up to date with organisational policies on CSR and acting according to them would constitute affiliative/promotive eCSR, but it would not necessarily benefit the employee’s co-workers, nor would it enhance the relationships between them.

Employee volunteerism is a body of literature that we believe is related to affiliative/promotive eCSR. Employee volunteerism involves the organisationally-supported active giving of time and/or skills by employees, usually to a project run by a non-government organisation (Rodell, 2013). It can be distinguished from OCB and acts of PSOB as it is planned and proactive, rather than spontaneous (Rodell, 2013). I believe employee volunteerism warrants inclusion in the conceptualisation of affiliative/promotive eCSR as many organisations have introduced non-compulsory employee volunteering programs as a CSR initiative, therefore literature on employee volunteerism can inform the understanding of this behaviour as a particular type of affiliative/promotive eCSR. Therefore, while I believe the aforementioned types of employee behaviour (OCB, ERB and PSOB) relate to affiliative/promotive eCSR, employee volunteerism can be a specific type of affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour. Not all types of employee volunteerism will constitute affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour, as there will be instances where the intention and motivation are not external to the employee, for example an employee could participate in a volunteering event to get out of a day of work, or because their manager offered rewards or punishment. However, there will also be instances where an employee participates because they wish to positively impact the cause and do not foresee any work-related benefit for themselves.

3.5 Propositions

Although affiliative/promotive eCSR cannot by mandated, various organisational factors can lead to employees engaging in such behaviour. In order to develop propositions regarding the organisational factors that will lead to affiliative/promotive eCSR, I draw from the antecedents that have been empirically explored in the aforementioned relevant literature. Specifically, I propose that perceived organisational support, authentic organisational communication and supervisor support will be positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR. The effectiveness of these organisational factors will depend on the individual’s level of organisational commitment, therefore organisational commitment will moderate these relationships. To elaborate, I propose that because affiliative/promotive behaviours are explicitly encouraged by the organisation, the employee’s receptiveness to the firm’s efforts to get employees to engage in these behaviours will depend on how committed they are to the organisation. The following section will explore how these factors have been investigated in the related literatures, and how I believe they fit with affiliative/promotive eCSR.
Various individual factors have been found to influence employee behaviour in the related literature. Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) found that positive job attitudes, workplace values, motivating job characteristics, tenure and job level positively influenced OCB categorised into obedience, loyalty, functional participation, social participation and advocacy participation, whilst cynicism was negatively related. Using this categorisation of OCB, functional participation behaviours would be most aligned with affiliative/promotive eCSR. Unfortunately, as this categorisation is not widely used in the OCB literature, it is difficult to validate these antecedents. Employees who engage in PSOB are predicted to be more empathic to the feelings of others, have a strong belief in a just world, score highly on extraversion and be of a higher education level (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986). Prosocial organisational behaviour is similar to affiliative/promotive behaviour as the employee’s decision to engage in both is independent and both types of behaviour have external beneficiaries. However, like OCB, PSOB is only considered within the organisational context, and specifically the social context of the organisation, whilst affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour will generally be targeted towards people external to the organisation and will have little to no impact on the work environment. Demographic characteristics, personal beliefs and values, and prosocial personality are proposed to affect an employee’s decision to volunteer (Penner, 2002).

As affiliative/promotive eCSR is actively encouraged by the organisation, employees engaging in this behaviour may do so with the intent of helping the organisation in addition to the external beneficiaries of the behaviour. Therefore, when proposing an individual factor that will interact with organisational factors to influence employee participation in affiliative/promotive eCSR, I thought about the factor that would be most likely to result in the employee wanting to help the organisation while pursuing their socially responsibility, which led me to organisational commitment. Organisational commitment has been explored in the related literature, with Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer’s (1996) meta-analysis finding that it was significantly correlated with all five dimensions of OCB, which is particularly relevant as I believe the conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue categories constitute affiliative/promotive eCSR in certain contexts. Meyer et al. (2002) also found that employee reports of affective commitment were positively correlated with both supervisor and self-reports of OCB measures categorised into altruism and generalised compliance, further confirming the link between commitment and these types of behaviours. In the context of volunteering, organisational commitment was higher for volunteers from organisations with formal volunteer programs (Peterson, 2004). This raises an interesting question about the direction of the commitment-behaviour relationship that extends beyond the scope of this thesis, but a relationship between organisational commitment and employee volunteering, a behaviour that I consider an example of affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour supports the proposition of organisational commitment as a moderator in our model.
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Perceived organisational support, an employee’s belief that their organisation cares for them and values their contributions (Eisenberger et al., 1986) has been explored in the literature as an antecedent to several individual outcomes, and also as an outcome itself. In a comprehensive meta-analysis of 70 studies, Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002 found perceived organisational support to be positively related to employee outcomes, namely positive affect and job satisfaction, as well as organisational outcomes such as affective commitment, employee performance and decreased withdrawal behaviours. These outcomes are important to affiliative/promotive eCSR as they are non-mandatory behaviours that are enacted in on behalf of the organisation, which means that the way the employee feels about the organisation (their levels of commitment, satisfaction and engagement) will be linked to their inclination to engage in behaviours that the organisation seeks. In terms of viewing perceived organisational support as an outcome, the role of fairness (conceptualised as organisational justice and politics), supervisor support, and organisational rewards and favourable job conditions led to increased perceived organisational support (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002).

These antecedents and outcomes are underpinned by organisational support theory which states that the employee will feel supported by the organisation and act accordingly only if they feel the organisation’s actions are discretionary, if the employee’s socioemotional needs are being fulfilled at work, if the employee’s performance-reward expectancies are met and if the employee feels an obligation to help the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The latter can be attributed to reciprocity norms which lead to the employee feeling the need to reciprocate what they perceive to be positive treatment by the organisation (Gouldner, 1960). I propose that these reciprocity norms will have some impact on an employee’s engagement in affiliative/promotive behaviour because the encouragement to partake in said behaviours comes from the organisation, the employee often represents the organisation whilst engaging in these behaviours, and the organisation potentially receives benefit from the employee’s behaviour, such as positive public relations reports, internal marketing and annual sustainability reports. However, I argue that the impact of reciprocity norms on engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR will be less than traditional employee behaviours due to the direct and main beneficiaries of the employee’s behaviour being external (the cause being supported) and the fact that organisational members are more likely to see and benefit from traditional employee behaviours than affiliative/promotive behaviours. This means that the employee can receive positive feedback and, subsequently, extrinsic reward more readily from traditional behaviours, therefore when compared with traditional behaviour, affiliative/promotive eCSR is motivated less by reciprocity norms.

The antecedents and outcomes of perceived organisational support are also examined in the literatures that I believe are related to affiliative/promotive eCSR. For example, a meta-analysis exploring justice in organisations found that procedural and distributive justice predicted various measures of OCB, including generalised OCB, altruism, conscientiousness
and OCB directed towards the organisation (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). Conscientiousness is a dimension of OCB that I believe can constitute affiliative/promotive eCSR, and this type of eCSR can deliver benefit to the organisation as well as external beneficiaries. Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff (1998) found that procedural justice was an antecedent of perceived organisational support, which fully mediated the relationship between procedural justice and the interpersonal helping, personal industry and loyal boosterism dimensions of Graham’s (1989) OCB conceptualisation. Moorman (1991) found that procedural and interactional justice predicted all but one (civic virtue) of Organ’s (1988) OCB dimensions.

Perceived organisational support is also empirically linked to employee satisfaction (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), another antecedent identified in the related literature. Bateman and Organ (1983) had employees rate their satisfaction using the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969) and supervisors evaluate employee citizenship behaviours, and found that satisfaction with supervision and promotional opportunities was positively related to citizenship behaviours, particularly behaviours directed at the supervisor. In a comprehensive meta-analysis of 22 studies examining leadership behaviours and substitutes and their impact on employee attitudes and behaviours, Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer (1996b) found that a generalised measure of satisfaction was positively related to all five dimensions of OCB. I believe that perceived organisational support will be linked to affiliative/promotive eCSR, more so than the satisfaction it likely leads to, as these types of behaviours are sought after by the organisation, therefore employees will be more likely to partake if they feel cared for and valued. Reciprocity norms (Gouldner, 1960), that is, whether the employee feels their efforts will be adequately repaid, have been proposed to influence prosocial employee behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) as well as the aforementioned outcomes associated with perceived organisational support (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), therefore it can be expected that they will have some impact on affiliative/promotive eCSR.

As affiliative/promotive eCSR is enacted on behalf of the organisation, and can offer a benefit to the organisation as well as the cause in question, I propose that engagement in this behaviour will be more likely if the employee feels strong organisational support. The mechanisms between perceived organisational support and affiliative/promotive employee behaviour will vary. An employee may engage in these behaviours to repay the organisation, in line with the social exchange notion that employees are more likely to act for the organisation if they feel the organisation acts on their behalf (Eisenberger et al., 1986), or for selfish motivations such as making themselves look more attractive for future opportunities such as promotions (Shore, Barksdale, and Shore, 1995). I suggest that these motivators will be secondary in the case of affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour relative to other types of employee behaviour because of the primarily external beneficiaries of the behaviour and the consequently decreased chance of benefit to the employee at work.
While the organisation may benefit from an employee’s participation in this type of CSR behaviour, there are a multitude of other ways the employee can ‘repay’ the organisation for perceived support, such as OCB, ERB or PSOB, which suggests that there are other motivational factors at play with affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour, such as an overlap of employee values with the CSR opportunity available or a general desire to ‘do good’ on the part of the employee (Glavas, 2016[a]). Another possibility is the potential risk and resistance the employee faces by participating in this type of behaviour. While affiliative/promotive eCSR is low risk as it is actively encouraged by the organisation, it is still behaviour outside of the strict job role which could make the employee hesitant if they don’t feel supported. Employees who feel supported by the organisation generally, will feel that the support extends to CSR opportunities that the organisation offers, reducing the perceived risk and opportunity cost for employees wanting to participate in affiliative/promotive eCSR.

**Proposition 5** Perceived organisational support will be positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR.

Although organisational communication is not a well-explored antecedent in any of the identified related literature, I still believe it to be significant to affiliative/promotive eCSR because it is behaviour that the organisation would ideally like the employee to partake in, but it is not mandatory and therefore cannot be articulated through official job descriptions or organisational policies. Therefore, the manner in which an organisation communicates opportunities for these types of behaviour will affect whether an employee decides to partake in these behaviours, as they cannot participate in affiliative/promotive eCSR if they are not aware of initiatives the organisation offers or what the organisation is aiming to achieve with its CSR agenda.

As affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour entails employees acting on behalf of the organisation for an external beneficiary, such as a charity, I propose that the authenticity of the organisation’s communication will influence an employee’s willingness to engage in the behaviour. A cynical view of corporate social responsibility purports that organisations only engage to avoid negative consequences or to enhance their public relations (Frankental, 2001), therefore I believe that if an employee perceives that the organisation is not being authentic in their communication of the affiliative/promotive behaviours that they wish for the employee to engage in, then the employee is less likely to want to engage. For example, if an organisation wanted employees to join the company team in a fun run to raise money for cancer research, and communicated it as a purely altruistic event, emphasising the good cause and the fitness opportunity for the employee and then ran a story in the newspaper titled “Company X works towards a cure for cancer” with no mention of employee efforts or how readers can contribute to the cause, that would be perceived as inauthentic and discourage the employee from participating. If instead, the company had communicated it
as an opportunity to band together and show that the organisation and its members care about charitable causes, while ultimately doing something positive for the cause in question and then run a PR piece after the event was successful, that would appear much more genuine and the employee would be much more inclined to participate as they are aware of the benefits to all stakeholders.

The perceived authenticity of the organisation’s communication will depend on many factors. One of these factors is how the message communicated fits with the organisation’s general discourse, as meaning is not derived from a single message, but the message’s relation to other messages within the organisational context (Monge and Poole, 2008). If an organisation were to spend months communicating a cost-conscious message, emphasising the importance of productivity and adherence to core organisational goals, then suddenly ask employees to spend a work day volunteering, the employee is going to struggle to interpret the ‘true’ meaning of the volunteering message. Instead of believing that the organisation wants employees to volunteer and contribute to a cause, they are more likely to view the call for volunteering as something the organisation has to say but doesn’t mean, and stick to the recommendations of the ‘usual’ organisational communication - be as productive and work-focused as possible. Another factor that will influence the perceived authenticity of the organisation’s communication is the media selected. With the constant availability of information through technology, it is easy for employees to get overloaded so in order for messages to be understood, the organisation must present information in such a way that the message is clear (Edmunds and Morris, 2000).

Byrne and May (2006) found that different communication media influenced satisfaction with and perceived quality of organisational communication in different contexts. Rich media such as face-to-face communication was most effective for messages about one’s job or department, lean media such as a company newsletter was best for general information from senior management while moderate media such as e-mail was only considered effective for urgent news, though face-to-face was still better (Byrne and May, 2006). In line with this, the media selected to convey messages about affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour will affect the perceived authenticity of the message, which will influence employee satisfaction with the message and their desire to participate. For example, if a company wants employees to sign up and tutor underprivileged children one day a week outside of work time as a representative of the organisation, this is a significant effort on the part of the employee so a cursory, mass e-mail is unlikely to be interpreted as an authentic request by the organisation for the employee to use their unique skills to benefit the cause. Instead, if senior management held a question and answer session, and explained how particular employee competences would bring value to the cause in question and gave employees a chance to raise any queries, employees are more likely to feel that the organisation is genuinely invested in both them and the cause in question, thus increasing their inclination to participate.
Simpson and Prusak (1995) suggest that value can be added to information that the organisation disseminates through weight, truth, guidance, accessibility and scarcity. Weight is achieved through relevant and timely presentation of information in an appealing style through an appropriate medium, truth refers to the accuracy, validity and comprehensiveness of the information, guidance involves the information being presented in such a way that the desired action is obvious. Accessibility refers to the ease of access, use and understanding of the information, and scarcity is about the originality of the information. In addition to weight as discussed above, I believe accuracy and guidance will be important for organisations communicating about opportunities for employees to engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR, as these factors will ensure that the employee fully understands what initiatives the organisation has in place, why they’re in place, what the desired outcome is, and how they want the employee to assist. This comprehensiveness and transparency will lead to the employee believing the organisation is genuine in its efforts encouraging them to participate.

Therefore, organisational communication will be positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR, but only if the employee perceives the organisation’s CSR efforts as genuine. The perceived authenticity of communication will depend on a number of factors, such as the medium utilised, the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the messages being conveyed. If the organisation’s efforts are not authentic, regardless of how well they’re communicated, employees will be less inclined to spend time furthering an agenda that they perceive to be inauthentic (Mazutis and Slawinski, 2008), either on principle or because the lack of authenticity of communication leads them to believe that organisational efforts towards CSR also lack authenticity, which will likely decrease the effectiveness of said efforts (Avolio et al., 2004). I predict that authenticity of communication will be a necessary qualifier as most modern organisations need to engage in some level of CSR in order to meet societal expectations and maintain their social licence to operate, therefore, prior to committing significant personal resources, the employee will want to discern between the organisation merely doing what it has to do and trying to rope employees in to lighten the load on the organisation, and an organisation genuinely trying to better the environment in which it operates.

**Proposition 6**  
*Authentic organisational communication will positively influence affiliative/promotive eCSR.*

The role of the supervisor in influencing employee behaviour is well explored in the related bodies of literature. Leadership behaviour and perceived supervisory support have been found to significantly predict OCB in many studies. Podsakoff et al. (1990) examined the impact of transformational leadership behaviour, namely articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model for achieving that vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals,
high performance expectations, individualised support and intellectual stimulation on the five dimensions of OCB. The authors found that both transactional and transformational leader behaviours indirectly influenced OCB by facilitating employee trust in the leader. Mackenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich (2001) found that in the case of salespeople, transformational leader behaviours had greater impact than transactional leader behaviours on sales performance and supervisor reported OCB.

A meta-analysis by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer (1996b) found that leader behaviours of providing contingent rewards, task feedback, intrinsically satisfying tasks and facilitating cohesive work groups were positively related to all five OCB dimensions. Leader clarification was positively related to all dimensions except civic virtue. Indifference to rewards and routine tasks were negatively related to all five dimensions, whilst non-contingent punishment was negatively related to all except civic virtue. Rewards outside of leader control, role ambiguity and role conflict were negatively related to altruism, conscientiousness and courtesy (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer, 1996b). Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Bommer (1996a) found that transformational leadership behaviours were related to some aspects of OCB. Providing individualised support was positively related to all five dimensions, high performance expectations were positively related to courtesy and articulating a vision was related to sportsmanship. Wang et al. (2005) found that leader-member exchange (LMX), the extent to which employees and leaders fulfil the roles they expect of each other, fully mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB, supporting the notion that transformational leadership promotes positive LMX. This relationship was also found by Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996). Raub and Robert (2010) found that empowering leader behaviour led to more helping behaviours on the part of employees, and Brief and Motowidlo (1986) propose that supportive and empowering leader behaviours are more likely to elicit prosocial organisational behaviour. In the context of safety, Hofmann, Morgeson, and Gerras (2003) found that positive leader-member exchange and safety climate expanded employee role definitions and, consequently, safety-related OCB.

Supervisor support refers to the degree that employees believe their supervisor cares about their well-being and values their contributions (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988). Given the prominence of supervisor behaviour in predicting the employee behaviours I believe are related to affiliative/promotive eCSR, I propose that supervisor support will be related to this type of eCSR. As supervisors are often the employee’s most direct link with the organisation as a whole, employees will be more likely to engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR if they have a supervisor that they believe is looking out for their best interests and values them as an employee. When a supportive supervisor encourages employees to utilise the opportunities that the organisation offers employees to participate in initiatives that benefit the environment and community, the employee will know that this encouragement comes from a positive place of knowing what the employee can contribute and believing it is good for them.
Therefore, supportive leadership will mean that employees feel safe in participating in affiliative/promotive CSR. For example, if an employee had an unsupportive supervisor, they could fear that their supervisor would perceive their participation in affiliative/promotive eCSR as a distraction from their core work and rate their performance negatively as a result, whereas an employee can trust that a supportive supervisor sees and understands their contributions to the organisation and will not act to the employee’s detriment. As affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour requires employee effort beyond the strict job description, the employee can view this behaviour as an unnecessary strain (Karasek, Triantis, and Chaudhry, 1982). Supervisory support has been found to lessen feelings of strain (Babin and Boles, 1996; Kirmeyer and Dougherty, 1988), therefore an employee with a supportive supervisor is less likely to view affiliative/promotive behaviours as such. An employee with a supportive supervisor is also less likely to view the behaviour as a strain, as they are more likely to be satisfied with their job (Griffin, Patterson, and West, 2001) and therefore less stressed and more likely to feel positively towards the organisation (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002) and therefore be more inclined to engage in behaviour on behalf of the organisation. Therefore, supervisor support will minimise the risk and opportunity cost of participating in affiliative/promotive behaviour, lessen the perceived strain and facilitate genuine encouragement of this behaviour.

**Proposition 7** Supervisory support will be positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR.

The relationship between perceived organisational support, authentic organisational communication, supervisory support and affiliative/promotive eCSR will be moderated by organisational commitment. Organisational commitment, broadly defined as the bond between an individual and an organisation and characterised by the employee’s belief and acceptance of the organisation’s goals, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation, and desire to remain with the organisation (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982), has been extensively explored in the literature. The employee’s belief and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and willingness to work towards them are of particular interest with regards to affiliative/promotive eCSR as this behaviour involves effort in addition to the employee’s job role towards goals that the organisation decides upon. Katz and Kahn (1978) support this idea, suggesting that committed employees are more inclined to engage in extra-role behaviours. Empirically, internal motivation, job involvement and job satisfaction are meta-analytically correlated with organisational commitment, whilst increased performance, decreased perceptions of job alternatives and turnover intentions have been found to result from organisational commitment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

I propose that organisational commitment moderates the relationship between perceived organisational support and affiliative/promotive eCSR as an employee low on organisational commitment is less likely to engage in the extra behaviours of affiliative/promotive
eCSR, even if they feel supported by the organisation and feel the associated reciprocity desire. Instead, if they are so inclined to ‘repay’ the organisation’s behaviour towards them, I propose that an employee low on commitment would invest time and effort in in-role behaviours or traditional employee behaviours such as OCB or PSOB, which directly benefit known members within the organisation and can result in benefits to the employee, rather than exert extra effort for the organisation as an entity. On the other hand, if an employee scoring high on commitment feels strong organisational support, then that commitment will serve to enhance the satisfaction and desire of the employee to do things on behalf of the organisation.

In addition, organisational commitment will moderate the relationship between organisational communication and affiliative/promotive eCSR because an employee will be more likely to take notice of what the organisation would like them to do if they feel strong commitment, as the strength of the bond between the organisation and themselves will make them more receptive to organisational messages. Some authors also suggest that commitment can serve as a buffer between stressors and strains (Meyer and Maltin, 2010). In the context of communicating desired affiliative/promotive CSR behaviours to employees, this means that instead of viewing partaking in the encouraged behaviours as a strain and avoiding them, the employee’s organisational commitment could facilitate positive interpretation of the messages and lead them to participate. On the other hand, if an employee receives clear, authentic communication from the organisation but feels minimal commitment, they are unlikely to go out of their way to act on this information as they are more likely to view it as a strain and, due to a lack of commitment, lack the motivation to participate on behalf of the organisation.

With regard to the relationship between supervisor support and affiliative/promotive eCSR; regardless of the support that comes from leadership, affiliative/promotive eCSR still requires individual action, and is thus subject to individual whims. Accordingly, I propose that organisational commitment will moderate the relationship between supervisor support and affiliative/promotive eCSR.

The supervisor is most often the organisational representative for the employee, and the employee is aware that organisational perceptions of them depend on the message the supervisor conveys, so supervisory support is a major factor in encouraging affiliative/promotive eCSR. If the supervisor does not support the affiliative/promotive behaviour, the employee may believe they will face negative consequences if they participate. Also, general supervisory support helps to mitigate the stress of work and increase satisfaction, which makes ‘extra’ behaviours on behalf of the organisation seem more feasible and attractive to the employee (Settoon, Bennett, and Liden, 1996; Chen et al., 2009). As employees high in commitment adopt the organisation’s goals (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990), they would recognise encouraged affiliative/promotive behaviours as organisational goals and be more
likely to act towards them, enhancing the effect of supervisor support. Alternatively, an employee low on commitment is less likely to be receptive to the organisation’s goals and less likely to exert effort on the organisation’s behalf. Therefore, an employee that received strong supervisor support but is low on commitment may choose to engage in behaviours that more directly affect their supervisor rather than behaviours benefiting the organisation (Chen and Chiu, 2008). Alternatively, an employee that does not feel strong supervisory support but feels organisational commitment may still engage in behaviours that are beneficial to the organisation (Williams and Anderson, 1991; O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

**Proposition 8** Organizational commitment will moderate the relationships between perceived organisational support, authentic organisational communication, supervisory support and affiliative/promotive eCSR, such that the relationships will be more strongly positive amongst highly committed employees.

Affiliative/promotive eCSR involves the employee exerting effort in addition to their normal job role towards an external beneficiary on behalf of the organisation. As these behaviours are encouraged by the organisation, the employee is unlikely to encounter any resistance from the organisation. However, the employee still has to be inclined to engage in non-mandatory behaviours that the organisation desires, so the factors I propose will influence employee engagement in affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour centre around how the employee feels about the organisation and its CSR efforts. Namely, I suggest that perceived organisational support, authentic organisational communication and supervisor support will be positively related to employee participation in affiliative/promotive CSR behaviour, and that these factors will be moderated by organisational commitment. Perceived organisational support and supervisory support let the employee know that they are supported in engaging in these behaviours, and also makes them more open to acting on behalf of the organisation, whilst authentic communication from the organisation allows the employee to understand what behaviours are desired, why they should engage in them and how the organisation benefits. Organisational commitment, the bond the employee feels with the organisation, which manifests in adoption of the organisation’s goals, will moderate these relationships as an employee that has high commitment is more willing to act on behalf of the organisation and is more likely to be receptive to organisational encouragement of behaviours.

### 3.6 Challenging/Promotive Employee CSR

#### 3.6.1 Description

Challenging/promotive CSR behaviour involves employees engaging in independent behaviours, that is, behaviours that are not actively encouraged or required by the organisation, that are intended to benefit the environment or broader society while still being
productive to the organisation. This means that the behaviour must not conflict with the objectives of the organisation as a whole or the CSR strategy of the organisation. For example an employee engaging in environmental activism at work may do so with a socially responsible intention, but if their behaviour is detrimental to their work performance or contradicts the organisation’s CSR efforts then it is not challenging/promotive behaviour. Challenging/promotive eCSR can involve actions that the organisation is not necessarily aware of, such as modifying the manner in which one performs their specific job role so as to reduce waste or individual decisions such as an employee turning off the lights and computers in their office when they know they’re going to be away for an extended period of time. Alternatively, challenging/promotive eCSR can involve making suggestions to the organisation that, if implemented, could reduce the organisation’s negative impact on the environment and/or increase their positive impact on the community. The organisation could have channels in place making these suggestions, however, the act would still be considered challenging/promotive extra-role behaviour because these suggestions are not mandatory and they extend beyond the employee’s job role and the organisation’s extant policies.

As these behaviours are not mandated or explicitly encouraged, the employee must identify and choose to engage in them independently. For example, the employee must think of the idea they wish to suggest and then discover or establish the process to suggest it and do so. As an example of smaller, more independent behaviours, an employee that reduces the environmental impact of their work by selecting grayscale printing as a default setting must first notice that grayscale is not the default and choose to change, or go to the effort of learning how to change their printer settings. Further, as the organisation is not soliciting the behaviour and, particularly in the case of smaller behaviours, may not even know about it, the employee is unlikely to receive any recognition for engaging the behaviours and may actually encounter resistance if they target their behaviours in areas the organisation wants to avoid. For instance, an employee at a mining company may suggest that the main headquarters of the organisation become carbon-neutral to offset damage caused at mine sites, but the organisation may block these efforts under the belief that such action would draw negative attention to the environmentally damaging aspects of the organisation’s operations.

Therefore, I suggest that challenging/promotive eCSR requires more effort on the part of the employee, both in thinking of the behaviours and executing them, and that these behaviours are less likely to garner praise and more likely to encounter resistance. As a result, I propose that the organisational factors that will influence these behaviours will be those that indicate to the employee that the organisation is open to them. Specifically, I suggest that the level of autonomy the organisation provides the employee and the organisation’s readiness for change will positively influence engagement in challenging/promotive eCSR. These relationships will be moderated by self-efficacy, the employee’s belief that their efforts
will be successful. The following section will outline literature that relates well to this conceptualisation of challenging/promotive eCSR, followed by the rationale for our proposed antecedents.

### 3.6.2 Related Literature

In considering what extant literature may relate well to challenging/promotive eCSR, I thought about its conceptualisation. Challenging/promotive eCSR involves non-mandatory, socially responsible behaviours undertaken at work that extend beyond, but do not conflict with, the organisation’s core operations and CSR strategy. The non-mandatory aspect of this behaviour immediately led to the significant body of work on extra-role behaviour. When thinking of potential ways an employee could step outside of their organisation’s policy in a productive way, I thought that contributing ideas would be a prime example of a challenging/promotive eCSR, which led to suggestion making and employee voice.

Much like OCB, extra-role behaviour is most often directed at an interpersonal level, or at least within the organisation, whilst challenging/promotive eCSR is intended to benefit a party external to the organisation, and most often unknown to the employee. The external target and the fact that these behaviours are not mandated or actively encouraged by the organisation, which means a minimal chance of positive feedback and an increased chance of organisational resistance indicates that, while the literature on extra-role behaviour can certainly inform the conceptualisation of challenging/promotive CSR behaviour and its antecedents, it is a separate construct. Similarly, whilst I view suggestion making and exercising employee voice as examples of challenging/promotive eCSR, they do not represent the full scope of behaviours that could be categorised as such. Therefore, while some literature has explored behaviours that share features with or could be examples of challenging/promotive eCSR, there are conceptual distinctions that will in turn affect the antecedents of the construct. The following section will review literature relevant to challenging/promotive eCSR, and the antecedents explored within it.

Proactive behaviour is self-initiated, anticipatory action that an individual engages in in order to improve a situation or themselves (Parker, Williams, and Turner, 2006). I believe that this fits well with challenging/promotive eCSR, which is individual behaviour that the employee engages in independently, that is, without prompt from the organisation. This means that the employee cannot reasonably expect rewards from the organisation for engaging in the behaviour, which indicates that their motivation is to affect the situation rather than to receive reciprocation from the organisation. Parker and Collins (2010) identify three types of proactive behaviour: proactive work behaviour, aimed at bringing about change within the organisation; proactive strategic behaviour, aimed at changing the fit of the organisation with its environment; and proactive person-environment fit behaviour, aimed at increasing the fit between the individual and the organisation. An example of
proactive work behaviour in the eCSR context would be a department head switching the department’s paper supply to recycled - it is an individual decision that brings about change within the organisation, that is unlikely to render any rewards to the department head or have any significant financial benefit for the organisation, therefore the likely motivation is to reduce the department’s environmental impact. An example of proactive strategic behaviour would be a customer service manager at a bank directing customers to computers rather than tellers and teaching them how to use online banking to handle their enquiries. This helps the bank and its customers to adapt to the online banking environment, but will also reduce the number of paper-based transactions and the number of people travelling to a bank branch, which will have a positive environmental impact.

Proactive behaviour has many similarities to challenging/promotive eCSR. Both involve self-initiated behaviour on the part of the employee that is intended to be constructive for the organisation. The main point of difference is that traditional proactive behaviour is intended to benefit the organisation or stakeholders within the organisation, whilst challenging/promotive CSR behaviour has an external beneficiary, sometimes with a side-effect of benefiting the organisation.

Employee voice is a method of organisational communication whereby the employee chooses to actively or passively express their opinion about organisational matters, though it is often explored in the context of dissatisfaction (Gorden, 1988). I believe that this is relevant to challenging/promotive eCSR as each employee holds a unique perspective of the operating of the organisation and will therefore have different ideas about how the organisation can function in a more socially responsible way. Employee voice is a mechanism that individuals can utilise to articulate these ideas, as well as any other feedback they have for the organisation. Employee voice can constitute challenging/promotive or challenging/prohibitive eCSR, depending on the manner in which an employee expresses it. For example, an employee could notice that an organisational practice is having negative consequences on the environment. They could then choose to raise it internally, potentially even with a solution, or they could report the organisation to an external body and have the firm’s operations shut down for an investigation.

Understanding how to foster constructive employee voice mechanisms is an important part of ensuring employee ideas are expressed and addressed, and ensuring that the employee does not feel the need to approach external parties and engage in a process that is not conducive to organisational success. This means that employee voice is extremely important to organisations. I believe it can inform our conceptualisation of challenging/promotive CSR behaviour as it represents a mechanism that employees can use to engage in this type of behaviour. Therefore, the antecedents explored in relation to employee voice may also relate well with challenging/promotive eCSR. Employee voice is a mechanism that employees can use to engage in challenging/promotive eCSR, however, it is only one mechanism.
Therefore, the antecedents of employee voice can inform our conceptualisation of the antecedents of challenging/promotive eCSR, but employee voice does not fully encompass challenging/promotive eCSR.

The exploration of employee suggestions came from the introduction of the construct of job involvement, and its association with employee motivation (Beuch, Michel, and Sonntag, 2010). It can be argued that the 1980s represented the height of the suggestion system, where many firms had formal systems and reward structures for increased efficiency resulting from an employee’s suggestion (Savageau, 1996; Hatcher, Ross, and Collins, 1989). Firms can encourage suggestions with an official employee suggestion system, for example, the traditional suggestion box or more recent electronic suggestion system, or they can rely on employee voice mechanisms (Oldham and Cummings, 1996). Making suggestions that would make the organisation more socially responsible, or less socially irresponsible, represents one way an employee can engage challenging/promotive eCSR. As well as not encompassing all of the ways an employee can engage in challenging/promotive CSR behaviour, a limitation of the employee suggestion making literature for informing our knowledge of this dimension of eCSR is that it largely focuses on formalised suggestion systems, that do not always exist in organisations. Employee suggestion making is one aspect of challenging/promotive eCSR. I posit that because each employee has a different perspective of the organisation, its operations, and of their specific job role, these suggestions can be a powerful way of improving CSR at the organisational level that cannot be accessed without the employee’s unique input.

### 3.6.3 Propositions

Autonomy at work, “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures used to carry it out” (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, p162), is a well-established antecedent in the bodies of literature on employee behaviour that I believe are related to challenging/promotive eCSR. Autonomy provides employees with the freedom to alter their behaviour at work. This is relevant to challenging/promotive eCSR, which inherently requires that employees have the freedom to utilize their unique perspectives and will to initiate positive CSR-related change. Autonomy has been identified as an important antecedent of proactive behaviour as it contributes to the employees’ a sense of self-determination - they can determine when and how to do things (Grant and Ashford, 2000). This includes behaviours outside of the employee’s job role (Deci and Ryan, 1997). Further, autonomy was found to support intrinsic motivation, creativity, and cognitive performance (Deci and Ryan, 1987). Therefore, I propose that autonomy will affect engagement in challenging/promotive employee eCSR by providing the freedom to engage; as challenging/promotive eCSR needs to be conceptualized and initiated by the employee, the employee needs autonomy to both think of ways to engage (Deci and Ryan, 1987), and to actually undertake the behaviour (Hackman and Oldham, 1975).
I believe that autonomy is most applicable to challenging/promotive eCSR as this behaviour requires independent action by the employee. While in-role and affiliative/promotive employee behaviours are prescribed or encouraged by the organisation, challenging/promotive behaviours are conceived and enacted by the employee, most often without organisational assistance. Therefore, it can be argued that a degree of autonomy is required to engage in the behaviour, and further that the more autonomy the employee has, the greater their capacity for challenging/promotive CSR behaviour. I believe that autonomy will be a more likely antecedent for challenging/promotive rather than challenging/prohibitive behaviour as the former is intended to be constructive for the organisation, and if an employee is given the power (autonomy) to control their behaviour and consequently change their situation, they are more likely to act in a constructive way, than the more destructive behaviour that we will explore in the challenging/prohibitive section.

**Proposition 9** The level of autonomy an employee has in their role will be positively related to their engagement in challenging/promotive eCSR.

Challenging/promotive eCSR involves action against the organizational status quo and may involve workers having to change their behaviour, or the organisation modifying some aspects of its operation. While not all change will be major, I propose that the organization’s readiness for change will influence an employee’s decision to engage in challenging/promotive eCSR. Organizational readiness for change, broadly defined as organizational members’ commitment to a change and belief that they can implement the change, has been proposed to increase change initiation behaviour, persistence in the face of challenges to the change, and cooperative behaviour during change (Weiner, 2009). The latter is particularly relevant for challenging/promotive CSR behaviour as it often involves action outside of the organization’s perceived core business and practices, and therefore will require an employee to engage in behaviours that are challenging to the organization and colleagues. An organization’s readiness for change as an attitude will be adopted by its employees, the people who have to implement the change (Jones, Jimmieson, and Griffiths, 2005). As a result, organizations that are ready for change present less resistance and barriers to an employee looking to make a suggestion or change.

There is limited empirical research on the outcomes of organizational readiness for change (Eby et al., 2000). However, several authors posit that the vast majority of failed attempts to implement change can be attributed to a lack of organizational readiness for change (Weeks et al., 2004; Pettigrew, 1990; McNabb and Sepic, 1995). As a large component of challenging/promotive eCSR involves initiating some form of organizational change, whether it is on a small scale at the individual or peer level or at the broader, organizational level, I believe that the employee’s perception of organizational readiness for change will
influence their decision to engage in this type of CSR behaviour. Several forms of challenging/promotive eCSR involve only the individual, such as if an employee decides to turn off their lights and computers if they are going to be out of the office for a significant period of time to reduce their environmental impact at work. If the employee knows that they are going to get resistance from this, they are likely to view the organization, or at least their office, as not ready for even minor changes and are less likely to try (Weiner, 2009). On the other hand, some actions outside of the organization’s perceived core business may require behaviour from colleagues that they may not believe to be “their job”. An organization that is ready for change will be more receptive to ideas, which will transfer to its employees, the people who have to implement the change (Jones, Jimmieson, and Griffiths, 2005).

**Proposition 10** Organizational readiness for change will positively influence challenging/promotive eCSR.

Due to the risk of resistance from the organisation and co-workers in engaging in challenging/promotive eCSR, the individual factor I believe will moderate the relationship between organizational factors and challenging/promotive eCSR is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy, the degree to which an employee believes they can successfully execute a task or achieve an objective (Gardner and Pierce, 1998) has well-established links to employee behaviour. Employees with higher self-efficacy are more likely to take on more and broader tasks (Axtell and Parker, 2003) and more likely to persist in the face of challenges (Fuller, Marler, and Hester, 2006). Broadly, self-efficacy also enhances the effect of organizational factors (Den Hartog and Belschak, 2012). In the context of eCSR, we believe that self-efficacy will moderate the effect of autonomy on challenging/promotive eCSR as autonomy increases the likelihood of employees engaging in the behaviour by providing the freedom and ability to do so, but self-efficacy provides reassurance to the employee that their efforts will result in the outcome that they want. As challenging/promotive eCSR involves a change to the status quo, the risk of resistance in enacting it is high relative to affiliative/promotive or in-role eCSR. An employee that has the autonomy to engage in this type of eCSR is more likely to perceive this risk as lower if they believe it will be successful (Fuller, Marler, and Hester, 2006). On the other hand, an employee that is low in self-efficacy, because they’re less likely to believe that their effort will be successful, is more likely to perceive the risk of resistance as higher and not engage in it, regardless of their freedom to do so.

While the organisation being ready for change will increase the employee’s belief that organisational change will be successful and open them up to the possibility of initiating change through challenging/promotive employee eCSR, self-efficacy, the belief that their individual action will be successful will enhance this relationship. Organisational readiness for change and self-efficacy have some similar effects on employee behaviour, such as increasing persistence (Weiner, 2009; Fuller, Marler, and Hester, 2006) and engaging in a
broader scope of behaviour (Axtell and Parker, 2003; Jones, Jimmieson, and Griffiths, 2005) and I expect them to have a synergistic effect. Organisational readiness for change will lead the employee to be confident that change in general will be successful within the organisation, and self-efficacy will help the employee to believe that their change will be successful. Both will increase the employee’s likelihood of engaging in challenging/promotive eCSR, with self-efficacy enhancing the effect of organisational readiness for change. On the other hand, if an employee doesn’t believe that their change will be effective, organizational readiness for change is more likely to make them receptive to the initiatives of others, rather than implement their own.

**Proposition 11** Self-efficacy will moderate the relationships between an employee’s autonomy and the organisation’s readiness for change, and challenging/promotive eCSR, such that the relationships will be more positive for employees higher in self-efficacy.

Challenging/promotive eCSR involves an employee engaging in socially responsible behaviour beyond the strict scope of the organisation’s CSR strategy, but does not contradict it. As the employee has to conceive of and initiate these behaviours independently, I propose that antecedents for this behaviour are those that provide the employee with the freedom and thus opportunity to engage, and foster the belief that they will be successful when engaging. Specifically, I posit that an employee’s autonomy and their perception of the organisation’s readiness for change, moderated by the employee’s self-efficacy, will be positively related to employee engagement in challenging/promotive eCSR.

### 3.7 Challenging/Prohibitive Employee CSR

#### 3.7.1 Description

Challenging/prohibitive employee behaviour involves action that is not necessarily conducive to the achievement of the organisation’s primary objectives, but is enacted under the principle of benefiting or preventing harm to the environment or broader society. These behaviours are termed challenging/prohibitive because they involve action against the status quo that will inevitably disrupt the organisation’s operations, albeit to varying extents. As an example of a minor disruption, if an employee at a grocery store caught a colleague misappropriating funds from the charity collection tin at their register, reporting it to the supervisor would likely lead to the colleague being fired or at least removed from the registers. The organisation would then have to go through the recruitment and training process to replace the employee, while other employees worked harder to ensure that operations continued to run at the same standard.
On the other hand, a major disruption would occur if a chemical engineer found that their organisation was knowingly disposing of hazardous waste inappropriately. The employee would likely have to report it to government authorities and/or the media, which would lead to the company’s operations being shut down throughout an investigation, and potentially the prosecution of executives and employees. Regardless of the extent of the disruption and the fact that the disruption may net an overall benefit for the organisation (take the donation tin example - it is much better for the employee to notice and report internally than the charity or customers to find out), challenging/prohibitive behaviour will mean at least a small, negative disruption for the organisation. This separates it from other types of eCSR and will influence the factors that lead to an employee engaging in it. In addition to the impact engaging in these behaviours will have on the organisation, the employee will consider that by doing so they are encountering the real and significant risk of damaging their relationship with the organisation, sometimes to the extent of not being able to continue it. The chemical engineer from the above example is not likely to comfortably retain their position with the organisation, if the organisation even exists after the employee’s report.

The risk of personal consequences to the employee from the organisation when engaging in challenging/prohibitive eCSR, as well as the guarantee of at least a minor disruption to the organisation mean that the employee will be influenced by various organisational and individual factors when choosing to engage. Specifically we suggest that organisational justice and organisational trust will influence an employee’s decision to engage in challenging/prohibitive CSR behaviour, and that these factors will be moderated by an employee’s level of conformity. These factors affect the employee’s likelihood of engaging in the behaviour while creating the least amount of disruption to both the organisation and themselves. Due to the greater personal risk encountered in engaging in this behaviour, the employee is more likely to engage in more destructive forms of challenging/prohibitive CSR behaviour if they feel they have no other options. If the employee believed that justice was lacking within the organisation, they would not believe that their issues would be handled fairly and comprehensively by the organisation, which would increase their likelihood of consulting external parties, increasing the risk to the organisation. Similarly, if an employee did not trust their organisation, this mistrust would likely extend to social irresponsibility on the part of the organisation, meaning that the employee is less likely to trust the organisation to handle the irresponsible behaviour appropriately if they brought it up alternatively. However, due to the aforementioned risks to the employee, I propose that the employee is likely to look to their peers or to similar situations to see how best to handle it.

Accordingly, I believe that the employee’s level of conformity, the degree to which they will follow the behaviours of others, will moderate the relationships between organisational trust and justice, and challenging/prohibitive eCSR. The following sections will introduce literature I believe relates well with challenging/prohibitive eCSR and propose antecedents of the behaviour.
3.7.2 Related Literature

To develop the conceptualization of challenging/prohibitive eCSR I draw on literature examining dissent and whistleblowing, two voice behaviours that the employee can use to engage in challenging/prohibitive eCSR. However, neither construct fully encompasses this type of eCSR. I chose to omit ethical behaviour from the conceptualisation because, although challenging eCSR fits with the conceptualisation of ethical behaviour, the majority of the literature has centred on employees making ethical decisions for their own behaviour (Trevino, 1986; Trevino and Youngblood, 1990), whereas challenging/prohibitive eCSR involves the employee taking action against the unethical behaviour of others. As a result, antecedents of ethical behaviour are those that affect an individual’s decision making process for their own behaviour, which will differ greatly than those that predict an employee’s actions against someone else’s behaviour.

Deviance, broadly defined as a departure from norms (Warren, 2003) has emerged in the literature as an umbrella label for a number of behaviours such as taking charge, expressing voice, whistleblowing, dissent, extra-role behaviour and prosocial behaviour. Deviance can be classed as either constructive or destructive depending on whether it is socially or organisationally beneficial (Warren, 2003). I explored several types of constructive deviance in relation to challenging/promotive eCSR as I conceptualise this type of CSR behaviour as both socially and organisationally beneficial. Challenging/prohibitive eCSR, on the other hand, is beneficial to the environment or society, but organisationally disruptive. This means that the different types of behaviours that are labelled as “constructive deviance” are explored separately in the conceptualisation of eCSR.

Therefore, although deviance is conceptually similar to challenging/prohibitive eCSR as both involve departure from norms, it is more beneficial for understanding CSR behaviour to consider the bodies of literature that can be classified under the umbrella of deviance individually. I believe there are key distinctions in the context of CSR between behaviour that is challenging/promotive, that is, beneficial for the organisation and society, and challenging/prohibitive, beneficial for society but disruptive to the organisation. Challenging/prohibitive eCSR involves a lot more risk for the employee in terms of their future at the organisation than challenging/promotive. To relate this to similar literatures, an employee expressing voice by making a suggestion takes on less personal risk than an employee expressing voice by whistleblowing. Although making a suggestion deviates from the established ‘normal’ way of doing things, the organisation does not suffer as a result of the suggestion, thus the employee encounters less risk. This will affect the employee’s motivation for engaging in the respective behaviours as there is personal risk in addressing the concerning organisational behaviour, but most often the concerning organisational behaviour will not directly affect the employee. Thus, although both challenging/promotive and challenging/prohibitive eCSR can technically be categorised as deviance, there are important distinctions between them that mean that I will consider specific types of deviant behaviour in relation to their relevant CSR behaviour.
Dissent involves the expression of dissatisfaction with the organisation or some aspect of the it (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2002), and is motivated by the way it makes the employee feel at work and is engaged in to remedy the factors that make the employee feel that way (Kassing, 1997). Challenging/prohibitive eCSR occurs when the employee is aware of something that is damaging the environment and/or society, and is motivated by the felt need to stop said damage. It can be argued, therefore, that dissent is used to make the employee feel better about a situation that affects them directly, and challenging/prohibitive eCSR is engaged in to prevent or stop negative effects on the environment and/or society. I believe that the motivational bases of these behaviours will affect the employee’s process when deciding to engage in these behaviours, therefore challenging/prohibitive eCSR cannot simply be classified as dissent. However, dissent is useful for conceptualising this type of eCSR as it is the expression of a negative opinion about some organisational behaviour, that, like challenging/prohibitive eCSR, could potentially result in negative consequences for the employee.

Similar to dissent, utilising voice to whistleblow is one method an employee can use to engage in challenging/prohibitive eCSR. However, few employees are willing or able to accept the personal consequences of whistleblowing, nor are most cases of organisational indiscretion extreme enough to warrant such action. Therefore, the whistle-blowing literature serves to inform only a small portion of challenging/prohibitive eCSR, namely action against organisational behaviour that poses substantial risks to the environment and/or society in the employee’s eyes, and only in cases that the employee is willing to engage rather than just find another job or not partake in the behaviour. Therefore, dissent and whistleblowing are helpful to the conceptualisation of challenging/prohibitive eCSR and its antecedents, but as neither construct encompasses challenging/prohibitive behaviour completely, I consider it a unique construct and will hypothesise its antecedents accordingly.

3.7.3 Propositions

Justice has been found to be negatively related to a number of behaviours that are destructive to the organization. Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001) found that employee perceptions of justice reduced emotional strain at work, negatively affecting participation in counter-productive work behaviours.

In the context of micro-level CSR, Rupp et al. (2006) posit that if an employee were to witness corporate injustice directed at external parties, they may react in a similar fashion as when the injustice is directed towards internal organisational stakeholders. In empirically testing the relationship between CSR and justice for employees, Rupp et al. (2013) hypothesised that employees care about the organisation’s CSR behaviour partially due to
an inherent belief that everyone should be treated fairly, that their perceptions of the organisation’s CSR are affected by both first- and third-party justice experiences, and that these beliefs and perceptions will affect employee behaviour, particularly in those with readily available moral schemas. The work of Rupp et al. (2006) and Rupp et al. (2013) supports the suggestion that employee perceptions of CSR are affected by justice experiences, and that these perceptions affect employee behaviour - in this case, challenging/prohibitive eCSR.

I posit that justice will influence an employee’s decision to engage in challenging/prohibitive eCSR in two ways. Firstly, as this type of eCSR is taken up in response to observed wrongdoing (injustice) towards parties external to the organisation, previous observations or existing perceptions of first- or third-party injustice will lead the employee to interpret injustice towards external parties as being ‘par for the course’ for the organisation (Simons and Roberson, 2003). This means that the employee is more likely to believe that the organisation is complicit in the injustice, and also unlikely to have any faith in the organization’s willingness or ability to adequately resolve the injustice internally (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002). As a result, the employee is more likely to view challenging/prohibitive eCSR that is destructive for the organization, such as whistle-blowing to external parties, as the most effective response to the observed wrongdoing (Dozier and Miceli, 1985; Gundlach, Douglas, and Martinko, 2003).

On the other hand, previous observations of justice will foster confidence in the organisation’s procedures, leading the employee to believe that the organisation is capable of rectifying any wrongdoing without the need for external intervention (Folger and Greenberg, 1985). Therefore, organizational justice will reduce the likelihood of employees engaging in destructive forms of challenging/prohibitive eCSR because they are less likely to attribute observed wrongdoing to malicious and intentional behaviour by an otherwise just organization, and is more likely to have confidence in the organization’s procedures for resolving concerns raised internally.

**Proposition 12** Organizational justice will be negatively related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR.

Organizational trust refers to the positive expectations that employees have of the intentions and behaviour of the organization and its members (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis, and Winograd, 2000). I believe that trust is relevant to challenging/prohibitive eCSR in a similar way as justice. For example, an employee deciding whether and how to take action against perceived social irresponsibility will be influenced by the level of trust (their perceptions and expectations of the organization), in that employees with higher levels of trust are more likely to believe that the organisation acts in a manner worthy of that trust. As a
result, they’re more likely to interpret the irresponsible acts as unintentional or unknown by the organisation, and take the least disruptive and destructive course of action against it (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002). Further an employee high in trust that observes social irresponsibility may be more likely to report this to their supervisor rather than resorting to external channels (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis, and Winograd, 1978).

**Proposition 13** Organizational trust will be negatively related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR.

I suggest that the relationship between organizational justice and challenging/prohibitive eCSR will be moderated by conformity. I argue that because of the magnitude of the challenging/prohibitive eCSR and the personal risk that employees have to take in order to engage in it, employees are likely to look at others’ responses to the injustice to inform their own response (Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004). In the context of challenging/prohibitive eCSR, I suggest that employees high on conformity who observe socially irresponsible behaviour on the part of the organisation will be influenced by both the drive for social acceptance and desire for accurate information (Deutsch and Gerard, 1955). On observing the injustice, the employee will use the reactions of their peers to form their perception of the seriousness of the injustice, as well as the appropriate response. If the majority of their peers do not react strongly or take any action, the conformist employee is more likely to dismiss the injustice as not that serious and therefore refrain from engaging in challenging/prohibitive eCSR, diminishing the importance regardless of the employee’s own perceptions of organisational justice. On the other hand, if the employee is low on conformity, they will look to the organization’s past behaviour, such as how just it is, to evaluate the observed social irresponsibility and determine the best course of action, moreso than the responses of their peers.

With regard to organizational trust and challenging/prohibitive eCSR, I propose that employees low on conformity are more likely to evaluate the observed organisational social irresponsibility using their own perceptions of the organisation, including the level of trust they feel, rather than the attitudes and actions of their colleagues. On the other hand, an employee high in conformity is more likely to seek out and be influenced by their colleagues’ opinions and reactions to the socially irresponsible organizational behaviour, regardless of the level of trust they feel towards the organisation as an individual.

**Proposition 14** Conformity will moderate the relationships between organisational justice and trust and challenging/prohibitive eCSR, such that the negative relationship will be stronger in employees high in conformity.
Challenging/prohibitive involves employee action, undertaken in the name of social responsibility, that results in varying degrees of disruption to the organisation. Due to the significant personal risk to the employee in engaging in this type of behaviour, I propose that the factors that will lead the employee to engage in the least destructive manner are those that enable the employee to believe that the organisation can and will address the socially irresponsible behaviour appropriately. Specifically, organisational justice and organisational trust will be negatively related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR, and this relationship will be stronger for employees high in conformity.

3.8 Summary

This chapter has introduced a spectrum of eCSR and a model of the organisation-level antecedents and individual-level moderators that I believe will affect these behaviours, informed by extant, related bodies of organisational behaviour literature. I argue that, although all of the eCSR behaviours share the core characteristics of being externally directed, intended to benefit those external parties, and unlikely to result in any reciprocation or feedback for the employee, they involve very different actions by the employee and are therefore affected by different antecedents. These antecedents can build on one another, for example the an employee may be more likely to engage in challenging/promotive eCSR if they experience support factors that precipitate affiliative/promotive eCSR in addition to the required ability factors. However, not all of the antecedents will affect all of the eCSR types. For example, an employee does not need autonomy in order to engage in in-role eCSR. Further, there are several antecedents in the related organisational behaviour literatures that I do not believe relate to eCSR. Perhaps most obviously, central to the conceptualization of eCSR is the notion that eCSR cannot be affected by extrinsic rewards, unlike several other affiliative employee behaviours (Williams and Anderson, 1991). As another example, individual characteristics are often related to deviant behaviours such as whistle-blowing because the organisation’s offence directly affects the employee. Challenging/prohibitive eCSR, on the other hand, is engaged as a result of injustice affecting external parties, thus I do not believe that individual characteristics will play such a role.

This model is very much a ‘stepping stone’ on our journey to understanding eCSR. Though I do believe that the factors we propose will affect the different behaviours in the manner theorised, empirical testing may reveal that different antecedents better predict engagement. Acknowledging this, the empirical aspect of this thesis will begin with an inductive, qualitative exploration of eCSR which will facilitate better, empirically-grounded conceptualisation of eCSR. This will inform the quantitative exploration, namely the items to be used to build eCSR scales and any additional antecedents that the qualitative exploration uncovers, in addition to testing the antecedents proposed in this chapter.
Chapter 4

Method

4.1 Utilising Mixed Methodologies

This study utilized a mixed methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data and analysis (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner, 2007). Employee CSR behaviour (eCSR) is a construct that has received very little attention in the literature. Although there is some exploration of certain aspects of eCSR such as employee volunteering (Muthuri, Matten, and Moon, 2009; De Gilder, Schuyt, and Breedijk, 2005), there is, as far as I know, no development of eCSR as an overarching construct, nor investigation of how or why employees engage in this behaviour. In previous chapters I have drawn on some of the employee behaviour literature to develop a conceptualisation of how the behaviour may operate; however, due to the distinguishing features of eCSR - the behaviour being directed towards external beneficiaries, without reasonable expectation of feedback, this conceptualisation cannot be accepted without empirical support. Therefore, the empirical investigation of the eCSR construct must initially remain exploratory so that the construct can be shaped by the data and I can gain a deep understanding of its multiple facets. This type of exploration is best facilitated by a qualitative instrument that allows the researcher to go back and forth with the subjects to get a comprehensive understanding of how the behaviour operates in practice (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Once I have used the qualitative data to develop my understanding of eCSR and the motivations for engaging in it, I want to establish whether the themes found in the qualitative data, as well as the antecedents and moderators put forward in the propositions and adjusted as necessary in accordance with the qualitative findings, hold for a broader sample. A carefully refined quantitative tool, namely a survey, is what I believe is most appropriate to reach this broader sample.

All research is a process, and it is beneficial here to summarise the process of this research to solidify the rationale for using quantitative methods as the final empirical phase. This research question arose from the observation that employees are often responsible for enacting firm CSR policies, for example, they are the people wearing the organisation’s logos at charity events and are responsible for ensuring that internal strategies such as recycling programs are enacted in practice. However, a literature search revealed no conceptualisation of employee acts of social responsibility, and only a very limited body of literature on single behaviours such as employee volunteering. This led me to put forward
what I believe are the key characteristics that distinguish eCSR from traditional employee 
behaviour - the notion that the employee is engaging in behaviour that primarily benefits 
external parties and can therefore have no reasonable expectation of feedback or reciproc-
cation. I then explored the employee behaviour literature for behaviours that share some 
characteristics with my conceptualisation of eCSR and develop a conceptual framework and 
associated propositions. These propositions are used to give the qualitative research direc-
tion by refining my research question, but the qualitative data collection takes an inductive 
approach, with my participants guiding us through the important parts of their experience. 
Quantitative research then provides an ideal final empirical phase for my research as a test 
for the theory developed, and facilitates greater confidence in the conclusions put forward.

Therefore, I mix research methods for both triangulation and expansion purposes. Tri-
angulation enables me to increase my confidence in the findings of the qualitative data, as 
the quantitative data will either support or contradict the qualitative findings, so the conclu-
sions I draw will be supported by two methods (Miles and Huberman, 1984). This minimises 
biases, for example, if the quantitative data supports the qualitative findings, I can be more 
sure that the findings are not the result of common method bias, interviewer bias, or social 
desirability biases arising from the subjects not being completely honest because they’re 
face to face with the interviewer, for example (Mathison, 1988). Further, having the two 
data sources to draw on for interpretation of results gives better insight as to the reasons 
behind any convergence or contradiction (Mathison, 1988). For example, if I find through 
the qualitative data that working in a not for profit organisation is related to a certain type 
of eCSR, I can place a question in the quantitative survey about the type of organisation 
the subject works for in case it explains behaviour or lack of behaviour in the quantitative 
sample. The inclusion of two methodologies also allows me to expand the breadth of the 
research (Caracelli and Greene, 1993). As this thesis explores a new construct that lacks the-
oretical and empirical development in the extant literature, a large portion of the research 
is centred around establishing the construct. First, a theoretical framework is arrived at 
through extensive interrogation of the employee behaviour literature and then qualitative 
methods are utilised to build on this theoretical foundation. Adding the quantitative phase 
of the research enables broader testing of the theory of eCSR, enabling the thesis to con-
tribute not only a theoretically rigorous idea of how the construct operates, but also some 
empirical insight of how the theory holds up in reality.

In conclusion, I utilise mixed methods for the purposes of triangulation and expansion. 
The data is collected sequentially, first through a qualitative phase and then a quantitative 
phase, enabling both research paradigms to be informed by the results of the other, but to 
operate separately and therefore avoid philosophical conflict during the design and data 
collection stages of the research (Sale, Lohfeld, and Brazil, 2002). Neither the quantitative 
or the qualitative methods are favoured in the research design, instead they are employed 
for separate but equally important purposes, the qualitative to deeply explore whether my 
theoretical propositions are mirrored in reality, and the quantitative to test whether the
propositions adjusted for the findings of the qualitative data hold across a broader sample. The next sections will elaborate on the rationale for qualitative and quantitative methods for each of their respective phases of the data collection.

4.2 Qualitative Methods

Broadly defined, qualitative research is “any type of research that produces findings not arrived at by statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p10-11). It seeks to understand the reality of its subjects through representations such as conversations, photographs, observations and recordings, with a view to interpreting the phenomena of interest in terms of the meanings that subjects assign to them (Denzin, 2000). Qualitative research methods arose from the limitations of traditional quantitative methods in understanding complex phenomena; because the social world is constructed and interpreted differently by each individual and can change in response to such a multitude of factors, applying static, a priori hypotheses is not always effective for gaining thorough understanding of the phenomena (Seale, 1999). Qualitative research is now a widely accepted method for answering a variety of research questions (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003), but it has seen many different debates and approaches over its relatively short lifespan.

Rubin and Rubin (2005) state that if a researcher anticipates that their research questions are not going to be able to be answered simply or briefly and they’re going to have to ask participants to elaborate and explain, then qualitative research is the best method. Given that I seek to understand a type of employee behaviour that I believe encompasses quite a broad range of potential activities, and will be influenced by an array of different factors, qualitative methods are the most fitting choice for the first phase of the research. In this phase I seek to establish a conceptualisation of eCSR that is backed by empirical evidence, explore the reasons why employees engage in this type of behaviour, and the meaning that this behaviour has for them. I believe that the qualitative method of conducting interviews with participants best position us to achieve this as it allows us to explore the meanings and complexity of each participant’s reality and socio-psychological context (Ambert et al., 1999). Although the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in this thesis will be an iterative process, going back and forth between the data and my concept of eCSR to shape it in response to observations, the interviews are conducted using an inductive approach, allowing us to explore the themes that the subjects find important rather than verifying if their views fit with the extant literature (Ambert et al., 1999). Both of these processes will be discussed further in the instrument and analysis sections of this chapter.

To summarise, qualitative methods can be employed to gain a deeper understanding of complex social phenomena. However, the qualitative approach is not without limitations; theorists and practitioners alike acknowledge that broad generalisability is not a feasible
goal for qualitative research as the methodology builds its foundation on the fact that reality is socially constructed and therefore constantly changing and experienced differently by each subject (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). Instead, qualitative research seeks to illuminate issues, gain a deeper understanding, and extrapolate knowledge gained to similar situations (Hoepf, 1997). I feel that these aims are congruent with what the first empirical phase of this research hopes to achieve: understanding how and why employees engage in CSR behaviour, and what it means to them. The second phase of this research seeks to determine whether the themes discovered in the qualitative data, along with the propositions developed from related employee behaviour literature, apply to a broader sample of subjects. For this, I believe that quantitative methods are most appropriate, as the next section will elaborate.

### 4.2.1 Instrument

This thesis utilises the qualitative research tool of interviewing for the first phase of data collection. (Morgan and Smircich, 1980) state that the appropriateness of qualitative methodology in social research “derives from the nature of the social phenomena to be explored” (p491), with (Huberman and Miles, 2002) specifying that qualitative research is essential to understanding individual perceptions and social interactions. This is particularly fitting for eCSR, which is inherently complex due to being individual behaviour, meaning that there are several different ways in which employees can engage, as well as a multitude of motivations for the behaviour. Further, there is no existing theoretical or empirical conceptualisation of eCSR as a construct, so the initial data collection phase of the research is exploratory to ensure that the eventual conceptualisation of this type of behaviour is reflective of how it is enacted and experienced in real life. I select interviews with employees as the most appropriate tool for exploration of this type of behaviour, as it allows for confirmation with participants whether my interpretation of what they are saying is correct, to ask them to elaborate on their answers where appropriate, and to let the participants broach themes independently, without being led by the interviewer (Silverman, 2006).

Kvale (1996) states that an interview is simply a conversation between two people that are interested in a similar issue. In research, the interviewer guides the content of the conversation with the participant with a view to answering their research question (Kvale, 1996). A range of different issues and the factors contributing to these issues can be explored, and that is the primary advantage of interviewing as a qualitative research technique for this thesis. I posit that employee CSR behaviour can take many forms, which is why I propose a spectrum of behaviour from simply doing your job, through to risking your place in the organisation and potentially your livelihood for the benefit of the environment or broader society. There is a vast array individual acts that could fit on this spectrum, so a major part of this research involves identifying the kinds of behaviours that occur, whether they are commonly engaged in or if there are individual ‘brands’ of employee CSR, and
whether my notion of a spectrum is an appropriate and accurate way of conceptualising eCSR. The second goal of the interviews is to uncover the motivations for engaging in these behaviours, and again, the range of possibilities is extensive. An employee could engage in CSR behaviour because they feel supported by their boss, or the organisation, or they could feel ethically obligated because of their upbringing, faith or value system, or they could particularly identify with the cause for which they’re acting. Further, each different behaviour is likely underpinned by different motivations, for example, the motivation for doing your job to benefit the environment or society probably differs from the motivation to fundraise for the organisation to help the environment or society. The level of complexity is high, and when I do not have a construct established in the literature, I need to ensure that I thoroughly explore the experiences of the participants so that the conceptualisation of eCSR that I put forward is grounded in reality.

A semi-structured format of interviews is used, with general questions designed around discovering how and why employees engage in CSR behaviour. Although I draw on employee behaviour literature that I believe shares similarities with eCSR to develop propositions prior to data collection, the interviewing process remains inductive to ensure that the data collected accurately represents the subject’s reality. The exploratory nature of the first phase of the data collection meant that the expected themes and results were not concrete prior to the commencement of the interviews, so the interview structure remained flexible enough to enable extensive exploration of a range of different factors (Appendix A outlines the interview schedule). I first began by asking about behaviours the employee engaged in in the prior 12 months that they hoped benefited the environment or broader society. By providing my proposed definition of eCSR without any examples of behaviours, I sought to understand the acts that the employee believes fit with the definition rather than answering whether they do or don’t participate in specific activities.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) state that a good qualitative researcher is able to question what they see and hear, and move back and forth with the participant to better understand the data that they are providing. In line with this, and in order to let the participant guide the flow of the interview; I let the employee think about and list all of the behaviours they engaged in without interrupting. Then I asked for further details of each behaviour, one at a time, such as whether they do it regularly, whether it is compulsory, the reasons that lead them to engage, facilitators and barriers to engagement, and how it makes them feel. If the employee struggled to think of behaviours, I asked more specific questions such as when the last time they did something within their job role that benefited the environment or society or the things their organisation expects employees to participate in. If employees listed a number of behaviours in one dimension of CSR, such as the social dimension, I enquired about whether they did anything at work to benefit the environment and investigated the reasons why or why not.
4.2.2 Sampling Procedure

Qualitative interviews were conducted with 32 employees at two different organisations. Organisation One is a prominent faith-based not-for-profit organisation that has operations worldwide. The workforce of Organisation One consists primarily of volunteers, however, as this research focuses on employee behaviour, the sample was 17 paid employees in professional positions across various areas of the organisation. Nine were female and eight were male. Twelve participants worked in the headquarters of the organisation and occupied a range of positions from management, call centre operation, building management, accounting and finance, training and development, and counselling. Three worked at an adult mental health facility in managerial and clinical positions and two worked in a youth homelessness centre in managerial and counselling roles. Both facilities are run by the organisation. All of the locations were within the metropolitan area of Perth, Western Australia. Employees were recruited via e-mail initiated by the CEO of the organisation inviting employees to contact the researcher if they were interested in participating. Once the participants contacted me, I found a mutually beneficial time and I travelled to their workplace and conducted the interviews. These interviews were conducted individually (one per day) at the convenience of the participants over the first half of 2014.

Organisation Two is a large organisation in the banking and finance industry. The sample consisted of 15 employees, also employed in a range of areas across the business, including information technology, marketing, management, and strategic planning. Nine of these participants were female, six were male. The interviews were conducted over two days in November 2014 in the headquarters of Organisation Two. A member within the organisation recruited and arranged appointments for participants to be interviewed, and the organisation offered a 5AUD donation to charity on behalf of each participating employee as an inducement. This was organised independently of the researchers.

As described in the instruments section of this chapter, the interview schedule (Appendix A) was designed to be flexible. I began by describing the core characteristics of eCSR behaviour engaged in at or through work with the intention of benefiting the environment or society; and asking the participants if they could recall any instances of engaging in such behaviour over the last twelve months. This provided insight into how employees thought about their behaviour at work and the benefits they believed their actions offered to the environment or society. Rather than simply asking if they engage in a specific behaviour (e.g., donating to charity through their workplace), I left the question open to gain insight into a broader range of actions that employees engage in with a socially responsible intention. I then delved in to the behaviour, asking why they engage, factors that facilitated it as well as any obstacles encountered, and how engaging makes them feel. If employees could not think of behaviours from the general prompt, I prompted them with more specific scenarios, such as the last time something they did within their job role helped improve the environment, or the initiatives the organisation has in place to help society. Interview
length ranged from 20 minutes to an hour and a half per person, averaging approximately 35 minutes.

With regards to ethics, all participants were verbally informed that they would not be personally identified at any stage of the research, they did not have to answer any questions they were uncomfortable with and could withdraw at any time. They were given a participant information form outlining the purpose of the research and the data procedures, as well as the contact details for both myself and my supervisor should they have any questions or concerns at any time. Adequate time was provided prior to the commencement of the interview for the participant to read the information form, and I verbally checked if they had any questions prior to commencement, and if they were happy to proceed. Each participant signed a consent form confirming that they had been provided with the information form and had read it, and were happy to participate in the interview. I confirmed again that the participant was comfortable with me recording the interview prior to starting the recording, and the recording device was kept in clear view and reach of the participant at all times. Neither myself or my supervisor have had any communication from participants after the interviews.

### 4.2.3 Analysis Procedure

Qualitative analysis seeks to organise the concepts and themes discovered in raw data into an organising framework (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Analysis in research is often described as a mixture of science and art as it is the interplay between the data and the researcher - whilst procedures must be in place to ensure rigour, it is the researcher who has to make choices about how to interpret and interrogate the data to extract meaning that is useful and true to the data (Flicke, 2009). Several qualitative analysis techniques have been developed under the premise that the end goal of the research is largely descriptive, that is, to report the findings as they apply to the sample studied (Seale, 1999). Grounded theory is a qualitative analysis technique that is employed when the researcher wants to build theory from the data in addition to reporting on the results (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Given that the first goal of this research is to establish eCSR as a construct, then put forward a framework of the behaviour and its antecedents that is reflective of how the behaviour operates in the real world, the analytical approach must be inductive. I am seeking to draw on the data to build on or completely reshape, if necessary, the construct.

Strauss, whose technique has become widely adopted (Strubing, 2011), suggests that the data should be subject to open coding, line-by-line analysis of and assigning each line a theoretical concept that is relevant to the phenomena being explored, followed by axial coding, grouping the open codes through empirically grounded links, and then selective coding, which involves integrating axial codes into a coherent theoretical framework that answers the research question. I follow the latter procedure in this research. The recordings
of the interviews were transcribed verbatim through a professional transcription service in Australia, resulting in 331 single-spaced pages of transcriptions. All transcripts were imported into the R-based Qualitative Data Analysis (RQDA) package and open coding was conducted on each transcript, with each line of each transcript assigned a descriptive label. These descriptive labels were then placed into similar groups (axial coding) and, finally, selective coding took place to form the theoretical framework presented in the results chapter.

In the context of this research, my knowledge of the employee behaviour literature and the antecedents identified within it allows us to see if subjects are describing behaviour that matches other types of employee behaviour or if there are unique qualities to the behaviour that distinguish it as eCSR. Further, I am able to recognise whether the motivations the participants identify for engaging in the behaviour are contextually specific or if they are antecedents typically associated with employee behaviour such as employee commitment and satisfaction. I believe this knowledge of the extant research on employee behaviour, along with an open approach when analysing the data, combine to form the more grounded theory I present in the results and discussion chapters.

Reliability and validity in qualitative research are hotly debated issues. Several researchers have suggested the adaptation of reliability and validity checks used in quantitative methods for qualitative methods (Cho and Trent, 2006), while others believe that if there is validity and reliability, the qualitative study is ineffective because qualitative inquiry is only supposed to shed light on the context at hand (Golafshani, 2003). Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue for trustworthiness instead of validity, which is established through member checks, revisiting the data with the subject to ensure interpretation and analysis are correct. In grounded theory, the theory developed is not right or wrong, it just has varying degrees of fit, relevance, workability and modifiability (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Fit resembles validity, as it refers to the fit between the data and the categories the researcher develops from the data, while workability is the theory’s ability to explain the phenomena at hand, variations in the phenomena, predict what will happen or interpret what is happening to people in similar contexts (Milliken, 2010). Relevance is the degree to which the theory is relevant to the phenomena, an accepted test is whether the subject can identify the theory as reflective of their experience. Finally, modifiability is the extent to which the theory can be expanded and adapted in response to new data (Milliken, 2010). The constant comparison method put forward in grounded theory, whereby the researcher is continuously going back and forth with the data and analysing, writing memos, seeking both homogeneous and heterogeneous examples in the data; if employed correctly, should ensure that the theory is grounded in the data and has high degrees of fit, workability, relevance and modifiability (Strubing, 2011).

To obtain the greatest possible levels of fit, workability, relevance and workability, the constant comparison method is employed in this research, with the researcher constantly
4.3 Quantitative Methods

Any research method that represents empirical reality through numbers is a quantitative method (Walliman, 2006). Quantitative methods present many benefits to the researcher. Carefully designing quantitative tools by employing techniques such as pre-testing with a small sample that is representative of the target sample, ensuring questions are grounded in theory, using previously tested measures where possible, and measuring variables with multiple items ensure that the instrument accurately measures the phenomena at hand (Schutt, 2012). The data collected can then be put through statistical testing to ensure results are valid and reliable, which in turn enables the results to be generalised to a broader sample (Garwood, 2006). This is a major advantage of quantitative methods in social research. While qualitative methods seek illumination and understanding with a goal of only extrapolating results to very similar contexts (Hoepfl, 1997), quantitative research focuses on causal determination with the aim of results that can be generalised to the broader population (Golafshani, 2003). This is particularly relevant to the present research. Qualitative methods will ensure that the theory I develop is grounded in reality, which is extremely important given the lack of both theoretical and empirical development of the eCSR construct. However, the constraint of requiring such in-depth data from each participant to establish this theory is that logistically, only a smaller sample of participants can be accessed, thus the theory developed lacks widespread testing. Introducing quantitative methods allows us to test the propositions (Garwood, 2006), as well as the findings of the qualitative research, across a wider sample to develop a theory that is not only grounded, but has greater generalisability.

I employ the quantitative method of surveys in this research. Surveys are commonly used in social research, and thus have well established procedures associated with their administration (Vaus, 2013). Modern technology allows surveys to be deployed online and participants to be recruited via e-mail. This reduces biases associated with in-person administration and enables the researcher to approach a wider sample.
4.3.1 Instrument

The quantitative survey instrument is used in this study both to test the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter 3, and to investigate whether particular findings of the qualitative exploration (those that appear frequently across the sample and add to my initial theoretical conceptualisation of eCSR and its antecedents) hold across a larger number of cases (Vaus, 2013). The qualitative results were particularly informative for conceptualising control variables. Specifically, gender differences were noted in the qualitative sample, particularly with regard to challenging/promotive eCSR where men reported greater engagement and challenging/prohibitive eCSR, where men were more likely to express a desire to go to the person committing the socially irresponsible acts rather than to external parties. Also, the few participants in the qualitative sample whose role was within the CSR function of their organisations reported that it inhibited their ability to engage in eCSR. Therefore, gender and whether one’s role was in the CSR function of the organisation were included in the survey instrument. The contrast in how NFP and corporate participants conceptualised CSR also warranted the inclusion of a question asking whether the participant worked for a not-for-profit organisation.

Effective and systematic determination of the nature of the relationships between eCSR and the variables that affect it call for a structured approach that, in the social sciences, is best captured through quantitative analysis (Garwood, 2006). As I aimed to collect data across a broad range of organisations, industries, job roles, organisational level and demographic characteristics, it was determined that an online survey was the most efficient method of collecting the type and amount of data required. I utilised the Qualtrics survey platform via the University of Western Australia licence to deploy the survey.

As a major goal of the survey is to test the framework of antecedents, moderators and behaviours, the survey was organised into four main sections, corresponding with the four eCSR behaviour types: in-role, affiliative/promotive, challenging/promotive, and challenging/prohibitive. In order to increase construct validity, established measures of the constructs I posited as antecedents and moderators were used wherever possible. The table below outlines the constructs and the sources of the items used to measure them in the survey, as well as the Cronbach’s alpha for the present study for each construct:
### Table 4.1: Survey item sources for established scales and reliability for the present sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliative/Promotive Employee CSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment - Employee</td>
<td>Meyer, Allen, and Smith, 1993. Affective Commitment Scale and Continuance Commitment Scale.</td>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organisation.</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Support</td>
<td>Adapted from Survey of Perceived Organisational Support as in Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro, 1990.</td>
<td>My supervisor cares about my opinions.</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging/Promotive Employee CSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have influence over policies and procedures that relate to my job.</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Readiness for Change</td>
<td>Adapted from Holt et al., 2007. Readiness for Organisational Change scale.</td>
<td>Management communicate change well in this organisation.</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging/Prohibitive Employee CSR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice</td>
<td>Moorman, 1991. Unnamed organisational justice scale.</td>
<td>My organisation has procedures that ensure that decisions made are consistent.</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust</td>
<td>Brockner et al., 1997. Three items measuring trust.</td>
<td>I trust management to treat me fairly.</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the absence of an established scale for authentic organisational communication, it was measured with five items pertaining to the receipt of CSR related communication and the perceived authenticity of the communication. Sample items include “I receive e-mails about causes the organisation is supporting” and “The organisation is transparent about why it wants me to participate in CSR initiatives”. Alpha was acceptable at .720. In conceptualising the dependent variables, the eCSR, I drew on the qualitative results and the behaviours that were considered when developing the theoretical framework. For behaviours that appeared prominently in the qualitative results, for example employee volunteering and workplace giving, the survey included questions about the nature of the activity such as how frequently it was undertaken, how long the participant had been engaging in it, and the average amount of time each engagement took. These questions were only presented if the participant reported engaging in these behaviours. Chapter 5 explains in more detail how the qualitative results influenced the eCSR scales and Appendix B presents a full list of the items used to measure affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR. Challenging/prohibitive eCSR was conceptualised in the survey as reporting to outside authorities, as this is the most disruptive way of engaging. Therefore, it is arguably most pertinent to examine how the proposed antecedents affect this type of engagement in challenging/prohibitive eCSR. Demographic questions such as age, gender, industry, organisational role, and length of time with the organisation were placed at the end of the survey.

Items for the eCSR scales were developed from a combination of the theoretical conceptualisations of each type of eCSR outlined in Chapter 3 and the qualitative findings. The in-role eCSR scale sought to measure the degree to which employees felt their job provided them with opportunities to engage in eCSR, and the extent to which they did. This draws from both the definition of in-role eCSR and the finding that not-for-profit employees felt that they had opportunities to engage in CSR at work while corporate employees did not. As the qualitative results indicated that volunteering was a common way of engaging in affiliative/promotive eCSR, several items focused on volunteering. The scale also included other behaviours qualitative participants identified such as participating in fundraisers and being a member of CSR-related committees, as well as other examples conceptualised in Chapter 3 such as the attendance of non-mandatory CSR meetings and keeping up to date with the organisation’s CSR policies. As challenging/promotive eCSR requires employees to conceive of socially responsible behaviour to engage in at work, the items focused on who the employee makes suggestions to (i.e., a supervisor, upper management, colleagues) and, in line with themes from the qualitative study, what they have made suggestions about (e.g., different charity partners, recycling initiatives). Finally, acknowledging that most qualitative participants had not engaged in challenging/prohibitive eCSR, a very preliminary, exploratory examination of challenging/prohibitive eCSR asked employees if they would report internally or externally if they encountered unethical or illegal behaviour at work.

Feedback from a pilot test indicated that the survey was too long for participants. As
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As a result, the section on in-role employee behaviour was omitted and replaced with a single question about whether the participant’s job role was within the CSR function of their organisation. In-role eCSR was omitted because I believe that, out of the different types of eCSR, it is most likely to be engaged in as a compliance behaviour and is therefore the least theoretically interesting to thoroughly explore. This is not to say it is not interesting at all; I argue it is very important for CSR scholarship to understand whether CSR-related in-role behaviours attract different feelings and processed than other work behaviours, but understanding elective CSR behaviours is more complex and therefore a more interesting exploration for this part of the thesis. Asking employees whether their role is in the CSR function still enables exploration of whether integration of CSR into a role affects discretionary eCSR. Appendix C contains the full survey. As the survey utilised Qualtrics’ ‘display logic’ function, questions appear based on participants’ answers, thus not all questions presented in the offline version were posed to all participants.

4.3.2 Sampling Procedure

Obtaining a survey sample proved to be a very difficult task. Over a period of 18 months, between November 2014 and April 2016, more than 50 companies in Australia were approached to participate in the study. Most of these companies were identified and approached through contacts my co-supervisor Professor Paul Flatau had worked with in his capacity as Director of the Centre for Social Impact at the University of Western Australia, though some were ‘cold calls’. In these emails (Appendix D), Professor Flatau would introduce me and the study, outline its potential benefit to the organisation, and invite them to contact either one of us for further information or to participate. An information sheet (Appendix E) with greater detail about the study was also attached. Twenty companies responded with enthusiastic willingness to participate and questions about how to proceed. Ultimately, however, only 3 companies actually participated. There were a large variety of reasons for withdrawal from the study, such as economic downturn reducing the organisation’s capacity for discretionary activities, failure to receive executive approval, concerns about employee survey fatigue, and two organisations had commissioned CSR-related studies within their organisations that were running concurrently with my study.

From the aforementioned recruitment effort, 95 complete employee responses were received, but only 35 corresponding supervisor responses were completed. To ensure that responses were voluntary and to reduce the burden on the organisation, I sought to have the employee recruit their own supervisor. I experimented with various methods of facilitating this, such as automated e-mail triggers through Qualtrics, providing employees with links to send their supervisors, and giving employees a unique code for their supervisor to enter when completing the survey. Unfortunately, none of these methods resulted in the desired response rate. As such an extended period of quite intensive recruitment simply did not work, I investigated alternative methods of getting survey responses. The United
Kingdom-based service Prolific Academic was identified as a viable option as it is designed for academic studies, has pools of respondents registered, has a clear reward system for respondents, and offers many ways to refine the potential pool of respondents. The only drawback was that, as a relatively new service, Prolific Academic did not have support for 180-degree surveys. Therefore, in April 2016, I hosted the employee survey on Prolific Academic and gave respondents the option of entering their supervisor’s contact details for them to complete the corresponding survey in return for bonus payment. Out of 120 respondents, 20 provided their supervisor’s email and 9 supervisors responded. In sum, from both recruitment efforts, 215 complete responses to the employee survey were obtained and 44 complete supervisor responses. Due to the low number of responses to the supervisor survey, this thesis examines only employee responses. My future research will look to undertaking 180-degree and 360-degree studies. All usable employee responses were retained; \( n \) ranged from 192-252.

A slight majority, 57.9%, of the sample were female. Most participants were employed in the private sector, with only 10.3% working in the not-for-profit sector. 29.7% of the sample identified that their job role was within the CSR function of the organisation. 81.7% reported having participated in a CSR-related activity. In terms of age, the 25-34 age bracket held the largest number of respondents (38.1%), followed by 35-45 (23.2%); 22.8% were aged 18-24, 12.4% were 46-55, and 3.5% were over 55 years of age. Most (53.2%) identified their seniority in the organisation as mid-level, 22.2% as entry-level, 19.2% as management, and 5.4% as upper management. With regard to organisational tenure, 31.3% had been with the organisation for 3-5 years, 23.8% had been with the organisation for 1-2 years, 20.9% for 6-10 years, 9.4% for less than one year, 8% for over 16 years and 6.5% for 11-15 years.

### 4.3.3 Analysis Procedure

Data for this thesis were analysed using SPSS. First, reliability analysis of the predictor variables was conducted. Cronbach’s alpha for each construct is presented in Table 2, above. Appendix F details the descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations of these constructs. Principal component analysis was also conducted, first on the affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR scales as these were formed for the purpose of this thesis and are not externally validated. As Chapter 6 details, some items that loaded on a third factor were removed from the eCSR scales. Principal component analysis was then conducted on the entire model - both predictor and dependent variables - to ensure that the number of factors proposed best fits the data.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis, based on ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, was then conducted to explore the relationships between the antecedents proposed in Chapter 3 and the eCSR behaviours, as well as conduct some exploratory analysis suggested by the qualitative findings on the effect of employee values on eCSR. As the quantitative
component of this thesis is largely exploratory, the utilisation of OLS regression represents a good 'baseline' or starting point for quantitatively examining eCSR (Field, 2009). Appendix G outlines the regression diagnostics for the models presented in Chapter 6.
Chapter 5

Qualitative Results

The qualitative component of this thesis seeks to explore the construct of eCSR, that is, employee engagement in socially responsible behaviour at work. As this type of employee behaviour has received little attention in the literature it was important that the interviews remained open to ensure that each participant’s perspective could be analysed and contribute to understanding of eCSR. However, the interviews aimed to explore three main questions:

**What is employee CSR behaviour?** The role of employees in CSR remains relatively unexplored in the literature. Most research that considers employees in the CSR context examines employee perceptions of the organisation’s CSR, how employees are affected by the organisation’s CSR policy, or specific CSR constructs such as employee volunteering (Gond et al., 2017). I believe this overlooks the perspective of the employee; asking the employee to interpret CSR only in relation to their organisation inhibits understanding of what the employee thinks and feels as an individual. Without understanding what the employee believes CSR is, one cannot fully grasp the factors that lead to their engagement or lack of engagement in CSR. This is problematic for organisations as they rely on employees to enact much of their CSR strategy, and developing and marketing an effective CSR strategy that relies upon employee action without understanding employees motives for this action is extremely difficult.

I explore what eCSR is by asking what constitutes an act of social responsibility from the employee’s perspective. Exploring eCSR from a behavioural perspective - what employees do instead of what the organisation does or wants them to do - grounds the understanding of what CSR to employees is in reality. This allows for examination of a broad range of behaviours that employees consider CSR, differences in conceptualisation of CSR behaviour and levels of engagement between employees and across different organisations.

**Why do employees engage in eCSR?** Key to harnessing the enthusiasm and actions of employees towards CSR is understanding the factors that motivate their behaviour. I put forward that antecedents of eCSR will differ from traditional employee behaviour due to the employee not knowing the beneficiary of their eCSR and the low likelihood of the employee
receiving feedback or seeing the benefit of their eCSR. Therefore, another key question this chapter will explore is why employees engage in acts of social responsibility at work. For example, whether motivators for the behaviour are personal, whether they are the result of relationships with the organisation or colleagues and supervisors, and how these motivators differ between different types of eCSR, different employees, and different organisations.

What challenges do employees face when engaging in eCSR? This question is the counterpart to the question of why employees engage in CSR behaviour; equally as important as understanding why employees do engage in CSR behaviour is understanding what makes it hard to engage. I seek to understand the nature of these challenges, such as whether they’re logistical, for example, high workload or unpredictable schedules, whether they’re related to organisational or team culture, or whether they result from misalignment between the organisation’s and the employee’s CSR values.

Although the interviews were conducted with the goal of answering the above questions, I did not have a clear idea of what the answers may be. Therefore, the interview schedule was semi-structured, allowing direction and flow of the interview to be determined by themes raised by the employee. In order to capture this, interview transcripts were coded according to themes raised by the participants, then grouped into similar categories, then put into a framework that answers the research questions, as presented here. Before presenting the qualitative results, it is important to understand the context of the two organisations, one a not-for-profit (NFP) and one a corporate organisation. The mission of the NFP organisation was centred around social responsibility, with a particular focus on social issues such as poverty, homelessness, financial hardship and mental health. The organisational structure was unique in that most of the operations were dependent on volunteers, so participants reported that the CSR context was shaped by all staff activities contributing to an overall socially responsible mission, and that the mission was primarily enacted by volunteers not employed by the organisation. This is reflected in the annual report of the organisation, which identifies employed staff as either providing direct service such as counselling and medical care, or operational support such as finance and human resources. To support the central operations, the organisation hosted an annual fundraiser that staff were encouraged to attend and raise money for, and, according to middle management, staff were encouraged but not expected or required to engage in volunteering outside of work with the organisation. Interestingly, although the social aspect of CSR was strongly evident, the organisation reported no environmental policies or procedures in the annual report.

The corporate organisation reported a more ‘traditional’ approach, stating in their annual report that they engage in CSR by focusing primarily on delivering value to stakeholders while being mindful of the environmental, social and economic impacts of its operations. However, the organisation had an excellent reputation amongst national volunteering organisations as an industry leader in the voluntary sphere of CSR. The major focus for staff
5.1 What is eCSR?

To investigate how employees themselves conceive of eCSR, participants were provided the definition of eCSR - behaviour engaged in at work with the intention of benefiting the environment or society - and asked to recount anything they’d done with that intention in the past twelve months. Analysis of participants’ primary responses revealed a stark contrast between the NFP and corporate sample. Eleven out of seventeen participants from the NFP sample responded that these types of behaviours were integral to their job, with an additional two respondents in the NFP sample making similar statements later in their interviews, such as “my whole role I suppose does that,” (NFP16), or “well working for

engagement was volunteering, with the employees having two paid days off available for volunteering at particular charities through the organisation’s programs. In addition, the organisation matched individual employee donations and allowed employees to apply for small (1000AUD) grants for community organisations that they wanted to support. Although the organisation’s parent company was involved in federally mandated environmental reporting, specifically National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting, it did not appear to be a major focus, with the annual report stating that the organisation is not subject to further legislated environmental regulation.

Sampling from both a corporate and NFP organisation is a conscious choice. Organisations can take several approaches to CSR: they can embed it into their core strategy and operations or treat it as an additional, peripheral activity (Aguinis and Glavas, 2013), they can be reactive, compliant or proactive (Wilson, 1975), resistant or aim to lead in CSR (McAdam, 1973), to name just a few. Further, most research that investigates employees in the CSR context has found that traditional employee attitudes and behaviours such as commitment and attraction are affected by the organisation’s CSR. Therefore, as CSR strategy can differ so greatly between organisations and CSR at the organisation-level has been found to affect other types of employee behaviour, it is important to explore how the organisation’s CSR context affects eCSR. The selection of two organisations with such different approaches to CSR is apt for beginning this exploration. In terms of participant sampling, employees from the not-for-profit organisation were approached via an organisation-wide email on behalf of the CEO, seeking their interest and asking them to contact me if they wished to participate. After the participants contacted me, we arranged a mutually agreeable time and I interviewed them at their workplace. The interviews were conducted at four different offices of the NFP organisation. The corporate organisation’s CSR team selected a large sample of their employees with a mix of those that had and had not participated in the organisation’s corporate volunteering program. The corporate organisation had agreed to 15 of their employees being interviewed, so the first 15 that responded to the organisation’s recruitment email were scheduled by the CSR team. The interviews took place at the organisation’s headquarters.
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[NFP X], that automatically means you’re working to help others in society,” (NFP1). NFP17 articulated that their choice of work was a socially responsible act: “the main thing that I do is choose the type of work that I do. So actually my career and what I’ve actively chosen is to work in the community sector”.

On the other hand, the majority (12 out of 15 participants) of the corporate sample referred to the organisation’s corporate volunteering program, with statements such as “...that’s a bit tricky ’cause I put my hand up [to be interviewed] because I haven’t done any volunteering over the past 12 months, so I don’t know if there’s anything I’ve done that has explicitly benefited the environment or society,” (CORP3), and “So we do occasionally have volunteering opportunities come up. So I did one recently where we got the opportunity for almost everyone in my broader division to do a volunteering day,” (CORP5), and “Well, probably would be the volunteering. So volunteering through the [organisation],” (CORP11).

Therefore, it seems that, generally, the NFP sample considers their job role CSR behaviour while CSR for corporate participants is additional (or peripheral) to their job role. This distinction between in-role or extra-role eCSR was particularly evident in comments that contrasted the participant’s type of eCSR engagement (in-role or extra-role) with the other: “So in my day job, I don’t - day-to-day, I don’t think there’s much that directly impacts that. But through volunteering at [CORPX] and I get involved with opportunities to volunteer for events or other community engagement stuff,” (CORP8) versus “Well there’s nothing in any policy of ours that says every staff member will have two days of community work. I suppose then one would argue that we are actually doing community work because you’re doing community work every day in coming to work, because ultimately that’s what your whole job’s based around,” (NFP14).

These comments emerged despite the two samples being unaware of each other or each others’ organisational CSR policy. Of the participants from the corporate organisation that did not immediately refer to volunteering, one mentioned recycling (CORP6), one answered ‘no’ (CORP9), and one discussed their role which was part of the organisation’s CSR function (CORP10). In the NFP sample, four participants (NFP 2, 3, 7 and 14) mentioned environmental initiatives such as paper reduction efforts or recycling programs and two (NFP 6 and 10) mentioned health and safety initiatives in the workplace. One potential reason that environmental efforts were salient in these participants is that they all encountered issues in engaging in these behaviours. For example, CORP6 questioned the authenticity of the organisation’s environmental initiatives, particularly whether the recycling was actually recycled: “We see the cleaners or some people have mentioned when they see the cleaners actually removed the bin bags they put it all together in the end...then people are like well, are we actually recycling and you see the lights on at night you know that only level ten is here, not all the other floors. Are we really being as green as what we’re portraying to
the community?” (CORP6). Further, she doubted the organisation’s willingness to answer these queries should she try and question the environmental procedures, stating “I wanted to ask but I was like, “Who do I ask?” And you kind of know the political response you would get. You wouldn’t actually get yeah there’s something wrong with the - you’d get kind of a media response.”

Similarly, NFP7 reported trying to reduce paper usage and felt unsupported due to a lack of policy and procedures, while NFP2 had been trying, through suggestions, for many years to get the organisation to implement an environmental policy to no avail. NFP3 and NFP14 experienced resistance at the colleague level, with NFP14 having to stop his recycling initiative due to colleagues complaining that it was attracting ants to the kitchen, and NFP3 having to repeatedly educate and correct her staff through the changes.

Figure 5.1 illustrates the open and axial codes categorised under the broad question of 'How do employees engage in eCSR?' The following sections will explore these codes in depth.

5.1.1 Corporate Volunteering

Given the prominence of corporate volunteering to employees, particularly those from the corporate organisation, it formed a major theme in the qualitative analysis of what CSR is to employees. Eleven out of fifteen employees reported participating in corporate volunteering in the previous year. One participant had only been with the organisation for four months and had a volunteering day planned the month following the interview (CORP4), two (CORP3 and 10) reported being too busy to engage, and one participant (CORP9) did not agree with the organisation’s CSR approach. Interestingly, several participants noted a spectrum of engagement in volunteering amongst their colleagues: “I think when it comes to people getting a day off work, they’re really keen. Trying to get people to volunteer otherwise, not so much,” (CORP5). “I think some people might see it as a good opportunity to take a day off...I think about 80, 90% of my team did the Give One, the major one. Because I think outside of that major one, it would - probably rare to find people that get involved in the smaller ones, but still some,” (CORP8), and “I would say that 80 percent is made up of those people who don’t really care one way or another, but will go along with it or people who are inspired by and proud of it, and then the 20 percent would be - I actually don’t feel that this matches my beliefs my values,” (CORP9).

This spectrum of engagement in corporate volunteering was observed within the sample. While most participants reported engaging in the organisation’s main volunteering event, called Give One, several participants engaged further. Though the focus of the organisation was employees participation in corporate volunteering once per year, the organisation allowed for two paid days off for volunteering, which several participants reported
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using. Most interviewees that participated in Give One reported that it was a repeated behaviour for them annually, recounting the different organisations at which they’d volunteered over the years. The exceptions were one participant that had been with the organisation for less than one year (and thus had only had one opportunity to participate) (CORP7) and one that had an unexpected schedule clash that prevented them from participating (CORP15).

Some participants sought additional opportunities by negotiating with their managers for further days or opting to participate in additional volunteering opportunities outside of work hours, such as CORP5 who said “...they had asked whether there were any staff who could go and help out at the service, I think, Kings Park, and so, I volunteered for that one...normally, I’m working for things like that and I’d never actually had a weekend of November 11th - had fallen on a weekend” and CORP11 “Again, so long as you go to the management with, “Right. So this is what we’re going to do. We’ve made arrangements. This person’s staying. This person’s going.” So as long as we kind of have those conversations and present that to management, they’re okay...It’s colleague driven, I would say. Not management driven,” (CORP11).

In addition, while many participants reported participating in the Give One event as a team, some participants’ work teams chose to forego team building activities such as team lunches or leisure activities in favour of an extra volunteering opportunity: “Well, it was actually our quarterly team event. So instead of going out for lunch or having a meal or something, it was decided that we would actually volunteer as a group to build team cohesiveness as well,” (CORP15) and “So we had a volunteering day not long ago; I organised my entire team to go volunteer as a group team-building thing,” (CORP6).

Finally, two participants reported using their annual leave or ‘flexi-days’ for volunteering opportunities, CORP12 who said “But sometimes I do like three or four [volunteering days]...I have a lot of annual leave anyway and that’s a worthy way of using your annual leave by volunteering, isn’t it?” and CORP15 who stated “Well, in my last team, I was volunteering on my flexi days. So I would take my normal day off that I’m entitled in a month if I needed to do things for the [charity] organisation”.

While the motivations for CSR behaviours will be explored further in the next section of this chapter, it is pertinent to explore whether certain characteristics are present in participants that report stronger engagement in corporate volunteering. Though these participants occupy a variety of roles in different departments within the organisation, only one of them (CORP12) is in a management role (i.e., has subordinates) and all of them have been with the organisation for three or more years. Length of service with the organisation is relevant as it takes time to understand the organisation’s CSR culture and get comfortable with engaging beyond the annual day ‘norm’. The non-management role is interesting;
while CORP1 and CORP8, who are in management roles, both participated in Give One, they did not report extensive engagement in corporate volunteering. However, they did report actively encouraging and facilitating their subordinates’ participation in volunteering, including ‘extra’ engagement. I considered whether it was the heavier workload associated with a managerial role that prevented ‘extra’ engagement in volunteering, but participants in management roles reported that the management role facilitated rather than hindered engagement by affording them flexibility and control over their schedule. Therefore, those in management roles may feel that they engage somewhat by proxy through their employees, mitigating their need to engage further personally, while those in non-management roles need to participate further in order to feel satisfied with their engagement in CSR.

Some participants from the NFP sample also reported participating in corporate volunteering, though it was quite different to the corporate sample. First, it was not well encouraged or facilitated by the organisation - it occurred outside of work hours and was not communicated widely or with the aim of attracting employee participation. This meant that only people who happened to hear about it and had flexibility in their commitments at home reported participating. Second, the volunteering events (a large scale, cross-organisational event and an organisation-branded annual fundraiser) were to raise money for the employing organisation. This seemed to appeal to those that participated, as they expressed knowing that it was for “the right reasons,” (NFP15), but may have deterred others from participating because they feel they’re already doing so much for the organisation within their role that the event needed to offer something additional to a good cause, such as an opportunity to learn more about the organisation’s mission (NFP7), or professional development (NFP4).

To summarise, employee volunteering presented as a common way for employees, particularly corporate employees to engage in eCSR. There was great variation between participants in terms of the frequency of their engagement and the degree of effort they went to in order to engage, with some engaging in the organisation’s annual volunteering day, some negotiating extra days with their manager and others taking their personal leave to engage. No definitive employee characteristic that determined the employee’s extent of engagement, though organisational tenure may have some explanatory power as longer tenure creates familiarity with the organisation’s CSR culture. These findings warrant further examination in the quantitative study to determine whether corporate volunteering is a widespread eCSR practice or a result of this organisation’s strong culture, and further explore the extent to which employees engage.

5.1.2 In-Role

In-role behaviour formed another prominent way that employees engaged in CSR behaviour. As outlined above, participants from the NFP organisation were much more likely to identify their job as socially responsible. For some, the social responsibility of their behaviour
was rooted in the choice to follow their particular career path, such as NFP17 who said “The main thing that I do is choose the type of work that I do...To be attracted to work with the most in need, the sort of crunchiest end of those services and NFP9: “I guess my overarch- ing thing would be that - so working with troubled young people is in hopes that therefore they can be better citizens and therefore contribute to society later in their own life, or in their adult life,” (NFP9). For some, the pathway to choosing a socially responsible career path began early:

“...it [the community sector] was an area that I enjoyed volunteering in and when I studied it I understood that I had an interest, but I had a key strength within working with young people at risk, and across the board, within identifying vulnerable adults at risk as well. And, I think overall I just have a passion to support others where I can,” (NFP15).

Other participants felt that identifying with the organisation’s mission and choosing to work for them entailed a socially responsible choice: “Well, I think in general, I suppose the ethos of [NFP X] would be around social responsibility, so - and the added value that people get...You’re doing something for a greater good,” (NFP12) and “Probably most of it, because in [NFP X], we’re looking after needy families,” (NFP8). For NFP1 the organisation’s values aligned with her own socially responsible values: “I needed an organisation that would fit with my values. So, it had to be a Christian organisation, or an organisation that’s working for vulnerable populations,” (NFP1). Further, most NFP participants expressed awareness of how the day-to-day activities of their role contributed to the socially responsible mission of the organisation:

“It’s [my job is] donation processing, I guess it’s a very important role, so my job is to not only enter donations on time, but also make sure that the donors are happy, in the sense they get their receipts out on time and when they call me with an inquiry, for me to treat them nicely and just to make sure that they’re happy because they’re very important to the organisation,” (NFP7).

“we also are there to support volunteers so that’s means educating them on social justice issues, getting them to engage with the mission of [NFP X] So it’s not just, oh I come in and I volunteer and that’s it; see you later. But really encourage them to think about how what they’re doing here at [NFP X], how that fits into society in general and how that can have ripple effects in their own lives and in the lives of other people,” (NFP4).
Another prominent way that NFP employees identified the social responsibility of their work was by the personal sacrifices, particularly with regard to pay, associated with their career choices. These sacrifices were usually balanced by a sense that the work was more personally fulfilling. NFP17 expressed this by saying “...by choosing that type of work I’m choosing to accept a career that gets me paid less, but has a lot more satisfaction, is part of actively trying to make society a better place”. Similar sentiments were expressed by NFP12: “...it’s not a well-paid industry, I suppose, the charitable sector, so I think part of what this [NFP X] brings is that added value in your day to day work...I think that generally, the people that work in this industry is doing it for - not for financial, they’re doing it for the benefit of society,” (NFP12), while NFP3 weighed up her options at a juncture in her career: “I could’ve gone to plenty of government roles; there was plenty of government hiring going on at the time and I thought “actually no, I want to go back to the not for profit”...It doesn’t pay as well but its sits better in the heart”.

The sentiments that NFP employees hold towards the social responsibility of their job contrast with those in the corporate sample, many of whom did not believe that their job enabled them to engage in acts of corporate social responsibility, making statements such as “In my role directly, I’d say not in the role that I perform,” (CORP15), “So in my day job, I don’t - day-to-day, I don’t think there’s much that directly impacts that,” (CORP8), and “I don’t know if there’s anything I’ve done that has explicitly benefited the environment or society...I don’t know if I would say that my job benefits the community,” (CORP3). However, many, including some that didn’t believe they engaged in CSR through their role, noted an indirect benefit for society through their work. The beneficiaries identified by some participants as the end users of their work: “So right now I work in a team. We develop the website. Ultimately, it’s the users - the society. Yeah. If you think those customer experience point of view, yeah, I can do something that benefits the society in that aspect,” (CORP14), “I feel helping people would be to understand my responsibility like if I’m doing a testing of any technical product...it should not cause any issues or any problems because he took our product or he advised someone for our product. I think I’m doing social service anyway really, really indirectly, not directly,” (CORP7). For others, such as CORP3, it was about how the organisation and thus her role fit into society: “I think indirectly, there’s a lot of work that I do that supports our society because we look after people’s money and we help them, and we help them make financial decisions and safe guard their cash and their assets and help them buy cars and homes and that type of thing”.

The exception with regard to the corporate sample not strongly identifying in-role CSR behaviour was CORP1, whose job role was in the CSR function of the organisation. A large part of her role was communicating CSR opportunities across the organisation. CORP3 also reported communicating CSR opportunities to the teams that she supported. Interestingly, neither CORP1 nor CORP3 had participated in corporate volunteering, and CORP1 cited the demands of her role as the main reason she had not participated in the opportunities that she communicated to her colleagues. Therefore, from our NFP sample, it appears that
when the socially responsible mission of the organisation is explicit and strong, employees identify how their role contributes to that mission, and consequently consider much of their role to inherently be CSR behaviour. On the other hand, when the ‘social’ mission of the organisation is not central, employees are less likely to identify behaviours within their role as socially responsible.

Some emerging evidence that CSR can be integrated into roles, regardless of the organisation’s mission is the theme of improving practice within the organisation. For some in the NFP sample, it was part of their job to find ways to increase the social benefit of the organisation while one person in the NFP sample had a paper reduction objective integrated into their tasks. The in-role nature of these tasks was indicated in statements such as “It’s part of my job to do that [make suggestions]. Yeah, because I’m operations manager, it’s part of my job to be constantly looking at ways to improve things,” (NFP17), “Part of my day-to-day job in one of the systems that we support is to look at reduction in the number of documents we print,” (CORP11) and “Yeah, we evaluate every service, every six months...If we see that one of the outcomes needs attention, we will develop an action plan to increase whatever it is, whatever the outcome is [for the clients]...So the next six months, we are looking at that outcome to see if we’ve made any changes, if we’ve made any improvements,” (NFP1). The evidence of these behaviours is important as it shows that CSR behaviour can be integrated into roles without being central the organisation’s strategy, meaning there is opportunity for small scale change.

While corporate volunteering was the predominant way in which corporate participants engaged in eCSR, in-role eCSR was the most common for the NFP sample. Some identified the way in which their role helped the organisation’s clientele as eCSR, while for others it was working for an organisation with a socially responsible mission, and for others it was the personal sacrifices involved in their choice to work in the NFP sector. This contrasted greatly with the corporate participants, many of whom explicitly stated that their role did not directly benefit the environment or society. Both samples featured some employees that had tasks that constituted eCSR integrated within their roles, which supports the notion that in-role behaviour should be considered in the conceptualisation of eCSR.

### 5.1.3 Affiliative/Promotive

While corporate volunteering and in-role behaviour were the most common ways that the corporate and NFP samples engaged in eCSR, respectively, there were some other organisationally-endorsed behaviours that participants reported. One such initiative was the community grants program in the corporate organisation. These small grants ($1000) are designed to support local communities and are given to community groups such as sporting teams, schools and community centres. Only a few (n = 3) participants mentioned the grants, and they had all applied or advised people to apply; CORP5 had recommended the program to
a friend outside of work, CORP14 had recommended it to community organisations they work with outside of work, and CORP12 had applied and received a grant for books in her daughter’s school library.

Fundraising was another activity that some participants report engagement in. The NFP organisation’s fundraising was mostly centralised into one annual event which raised funds for the organisation, while the corporate organisation had a variety of opportunities throughout the year to fund raise for the organisation’s charity partners. Interestingly, engagement in both samples was relatively low. While many mentioned the annual fundraiser, only four members of the NFP sample reported participating in it in the previous year, with the others citing time constraints as the major obstacle. For the corporate sample, five participants mentioned the fundraisers but only two had participated. It seemed as though personal connection to the cause in question was related to participating in fundraisers, with CORP15 having a health condition that she participated in fundraisers for, and CORP5 being quite touched and “getting a bit teary” at a charity fundraising event, motivating him to continue participating in the event in subsequent years.

Organisational committees were another relatively common way that employees engaged in eCSR. NFP3 was a member of the organisation’s environmental committee, CORP11 was a member of the Women in IT committee and the organisation’s charity foundation committee, and CORP10 was also a member of the charity foundation committee. All three were invited to their respective committees (i.e., the behaviour was not self-initiated), but reported active participation and enjoyment. Some participants also took the lead around corporate volunteering events and formed their own ‘organising’ (rather than organisational) committees. For example CORP12 took on a broader organising role: “I’m part of the working group as well when we are closer to that main [volunteering] event. So we do the planning. We do the communications and stuff” and CORP6 took to organising her work team specifically: “I sent out to my team, “Who’s keen to do this? Let’s do this one,...I don’t think there would’ve been as many people getting on board with it [if I hadn’t organised it]”.

One interesting behaviour that participants in both samples considered socially responsible was building relationships. In the NFP sample, relationship building was linked to enhancing the impact of their organisation through building connections with other NFPs whose activities complemented theirs, or improving staff morale (and therefore productivity). For example, referring to connecting with other organisations, NFP3 said “It’s about cementing those ties and they [other community organisations] quite often have fundraisers that I’ll go to and be part of” and NFP 17, with reference to internal relationship building said “you’ll stop and help someone if someone needs something its like “yes, I’ve always got time for you” and I think that adds value, for staff, to think that you’ve always got time for them...It certainly translates to staying longer”. Participants in the corporate
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Sample also mentioned building relationships in the context of CSR in that it "greases the wheels," (CORP1) and facilitated interdepartmental collaboration and improved productivity and performance, but how productivity constituted eCSR was unclear. However, some corporate participants had built relationships with an explicit socially responsible intention, such as forming a team to submit a proposal to undertake skilled volunteering with a charity (CORP5), or had seen the relationships formed through volunteering result in further activities in the workplace for charity (CORP1, 8 and 15).

In addition to corporate volunteering and in-role eCSR, several other affiliative/promotive eCSR behaviours were raised by participants in both samples. These involved fundraising initiatives, participating in committees, and building relationships with internal and external stakeholders. These behaviours help to inform the items I will use in the quantitative exploration of affiliative/promotive eCSR, specifically ensuring that I have items that pertain to participating in fundraisers, encouraging others to participate in organisational initiatives, and engaging in the organisation’s CSR policies via meetings such as committee meetings.

5.1.4 Challenging/Promotive and Pro-Environmental Behaviour

Although these two themes were prominent enough to form separate axial codes within the coding structure, I place them together in this section as many of the pro-environmental behaviours are also challenging/promotive behaviour. This is because of the lower emphasis on the environmental dimension of CSR in both the corporate and NFP organisation, meaning that pro-environmental behaviours undertaken by employees inherently 'challenge' the boundary of the organisation’s CSR strategy.

As mentioned above, some participants in the NFP organisation reported starting recycling programs in their respective offices. This included personally purchasing bins specifically for recycling (NFP3 and NFP11), collecting, rinsing and depositing aluminium cans to a recycling facility (NFP14), and transitioning the office to recycled paper sources (NFP2). Awareness of a disparity between what ‘should’ happen and what was actually happening within the organisation with regard to the environment seemed to motivate these actions: NFP3 was “shocked” that the organisation wasn’t recycling when “everybody does it at home” and believed it was within her scope as a manager to initiate, NFP14 was raised to be conscious of consumption and believed this environmental consciousness applied to his role as a “bean counter,” (chief financial officer), while NFP2 noted incongruence between an organisational mission that aims to improve society yet lacks environmental action.

Recycling facilities were provided at the corporate organisation, which many \( n = 9 \) reported using. It is important to note that this does not mean the other six participants did not use the recycling facilities, just that they did not mention it as a CSR behaviour they engaged in. Different levels of engagement were reported with regard to recycling.
While some just reported that they ‘obviously’ recycled (CORP10), two participants reported educating colleagues on which items go in which recycling bin, and one emphasised the effort she put into recycling, rinsing tins and jars once they were finished. One issue raised by many \( (n = 7) \) of the corporate sample was the belief that the recycling was not being recycled. This belief was widely held among the sample, spurred on by hearsay across the organisation, indicated with statements such as “someone noticed when they were here when they [the cleaners] were emptying the bins that [recycling and general waste] went it in the same bag,” (CORP13), “I know we had a conversation recently at work where people were accusing the cleaners of not actually treating the recycling as recycling. They were treating it as rubbish,” (CORP15), and “someone pointed out to me that because people put a mix of things in the two different bins, they don’t actually get recycled at the end of the day,” (CORP3).

Most participants stated that questions around whether the fate of the recycling once it left the bins did not affect their behaviour (i.e., they still recycled), but that it did affect their feelings about it and their trust in the organisation. CORP6 articulated this, questioning “Are we actually recycling and you see the lights on at night you know that only level ten is here, not all the other floors. Are we really being as green as what we’re portraying to the community?” Similar sentiments were echoed by CORP1: “We constantly talk about continuous improvements and being efficient and stuff and that just struck me as a, ‘What a waste.’ ”

In terms of environmental behaviour, on an individual level, many participants in both samples reported that little things like turning off lights and reducing personal printing were the “only thing they could do,” (NFP7). This is interesting in light of the low focus of both organisations on the environmental dimension of CSR, and the difficulties faced by employees in terms of getting follow through from the organisation on their larger environmental initiatives. Despite these obstacles, several employees reported trying to limit their personal environmental impact, though they expressed awareness of the limitations at the organisation-level by referring to these behaviours as ‘small’ or ‘silly’, with statements such as “just all those sorts of little everyday things that you do, like using the appropriate kinds of paper and those sorts of things,” (NFP2), “Small things, but every little bit helps and its just about trying to engage people in that process, turn lights off, not using as much waste...we can’t change the world but we can make small changes in our own world,” (NFP3), and “We do those small things that probably - I don’t know - I think most people would do,” (CORP10).

At the organisational level, it seemed that an ‘event’ in the organisation’s timeline precipitated environmental consciousness and action within the organisation. For the corporate organisation, this was moving to a new building. Participants identified several things about this new building changed the environmental context within the organisation: the
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Building was significantly more energy efficient and the organisation marketed this strongly to employees, workspaces became activity-based, meaning that people don’t have designated work spaces, and these workspaces no longer had rubbish bins at them, and a strong anti-printing message was sent through the organisation. Participants reported that these factors culminated in less printing and greater consciousness about rubbish:

“I think it’s really, because the bank has very much pushed the green rating of this building and explained why they’ve gone for the rating and explained why there’s no bin under your desk and why these kinds of things. I think it’s just slowly seeped through that people are just saying, ‘Wait, hang on. I don’t need to do that,’ ” (CORP11).

Within the NFP sample, the ‘event’ that allowed for environmental change was often a new person in the work environment. For example, NFP3 cited that, in addition to being in a management role, being new enabled her to challenge organisational cultural norms around printing and electricity consumption. Similarly, NFP1 stated that when she began at the organisation, a colleague asked her to be conservative in the use of plastic cups for the sake of the environment, and the fact she was new enabled her to raise the organisation’s lack of environmental facilities with the CEO.

Some participants (n = 4) reported cycling to work as a CSR behaviour they engaged in. The corporate organisation had facilities that supported this behaviour. In fact, one employee even cited the facilities as a factor for his retention within the organisation, saying “To be honest, any time I ever think of leaving - when the first thing it’s like, “Off with the bike... Well, will anybody else have it as good?” It’s - I don’t know if they realised it. I’m sure that’s not common thing, but for me, that’s a huge thing. The bike facilities are really important,” (CORP1).

A theme that several participants in the corporate sample raised was a surge of further CSR behaviours after the major volunteering day. CORP8 articulated this well, stating “...it’s an interesting one because throughout most of the year, we don’t have a lot of that stuff. But after volunteering day where a couple hundred people went out, there was these boxes just popped up everywhere, ’cause everyone’s like, ‘Oh, we can do this. We can kind of take it back [to work]’”. Interestingly, none of the interviewees reported instigating or participating in this behaviour, though they were not resistant to it. Rather, it was reported as an observation, for example: “There’s one at the moment where people are actually gathering donations for women in shelters and homeless women for essentials,” (CORP15).
Several employees made socially responsible suggestions, such as CORP7 who suggested a tree planting day to his supervisor after a software testing exercise that was using a large amount of paper, and CORP8 who suggested that the organisation could support a charity he volunteered for outside of work, and NFP10 who kept a notebook full of her ideas ready to put forward at the appropriate time. However, what was more interesting than instances of suggestion making was the larger group of participants that reported having suggestions that they had not made. In the corporate organisation, several of these suggestions were around addressing the recycling problem, such as CORP15 who suggested “well, perhaps if we put a great big recycling logo on the front, so that - and you comment when people go to put the tea bag in the recycling bin and little things like that that are ensuring that people are following on the practices that have been intended in the building.” (CORP15). Similarly, CORP3 said “I think they could probably make it a bit clearer, the labelling, and we don’t have a food scraps bin, which probably makes quite a big difference as well when you’ve got just three options, it’s a bit easier to split things up.” (CORP3).

When asked if they would feel comfortable making suggestions to the organisation, all of these participants said yes without hesitation. However, none of them had made the suggestions, instead opting for one-on-one behaviour to encourage individuals to use the recycling facilities correctly, such as CORP15: “you comment when people go to put the tea bag in the recycling bin and little things like that that are ensuring that people are following on the practices that have been intended in the building...To reinforce and quite often, you sort of say, ‘Oh. That’s recyclable. You’ve popped it in the rubbish.’ And often, they don’t know how to actually read to see if something’s recyclable or not. So take those little small opportunities and initiatives to do that” and, regarding suggesting that the organisation provide education to employees about recycling, CORP14 said “I have individually talked to individuals, but not in a major way. No, I haven’t done that”.

These participants did not articulate why they hadn’t made the suggestion, but it could be that they did not feel there was an appropriate channel through which to raise their suggestions. The members of the corporate sample that had raised a suggestion were very clear about where they raised their suggestions: CORP7 made the tree planting suggestion to his supervisor (because it was a suggestion specific to his team) and CORP8 raised the idea of supporting a different charity to the organisation’s community engagement team (who handle the sponsored charities). Therefore, the organisation’s lack of environmental policy and ‘environmental’ department could mean that employees are unsure where to direct their environmental suggestions, thus deterring them. Similarly, within the NFP sample, the few employees that did make pro-environmental suggestions made them directly to the CEO, presumably due to the lack of environmental department or policy. Approaching such high level superiors may be intimidating for some employees, and is often not feasible in larger organisations, thus many employee ideas may not be suggested to the organisation. Of course, in the corporate organisation, the disillusionment felt by the employees around the recycling may have also been an obstacle to these particular suggestions.
There were several other ideas mentioned across both samples, such as NFP12’s morale-boosting ideas for enhancing the organisation’s impact: “I’d love for all of the staff to go on a kid’s camp or go on a teen camp and do all of those things ‘cause I think that really helps people connect to the reason why we’re doing anything,” and NFP10’s suggestions of program expansion: “So we’ve got the homework centre, but even just having kind of like a kids’ group to maybe give parents a break one night a week or kind of like a service I thought that would be good,” (NFP10). Several participants identified paper-based processes that could be transitioned to digital (NFP13, NFP7, CORP1), different charity partners for the organisation to support or different ways for employees to support (CORP10, CORP3, CORP4), changes to processes to increase transparency and fairness (CORP6, CORP3, NFP7) or efficiency (NFP14, NFP6) to increased opportunities for skilled volunteering (CORP1, 2, 5, 12, 15).

In addition to the lack of appropriate channel, members of the NFP organisation also expressed awareness of the limitations of the organisation in terms of funding and other resources as part of the reason for not voicing suggestions, with statements such as “it’s really hard to implement [green policies] when you’ve got tight budgets, because it invariably costs more. And if everyone’s talking about the bottom line, that five bucks can actually be a difference,” (NFP3) and, with regard to the lack of environmental initiatives, “I would be more concerned about not wanting waste because we always run a tight ship financially, and money you waste is money you can’t spend on people,” (NFP17).

The corporate sample, on the other hand, seemed to believe that the organisation was quite set in its ways with regard to CSR, and that their suggestions were unlikely to be successful. This was indicated with statements such as “that’s just how things are done at CORPX,” (CORP2), or “I know the environment something that CORPX focuses on,” (CORP4). In the context of suggesting charity partners, CORP10 expressed scepticism about the possibility for change, saying “I actually think they’re coming up to review the partners. However, from where I see it, I find it really hard to see because some of those relationships are quite ingrained in the bank. I find that hard to see how they may change.”

Several examples of challenging/promotive eCSR were found through analysis of the interview transcripts. Interestingly, many of these acts were focused on the environmental dimension of CSR. Given both the NFP’s and corporate organisation’s relatively low performance on this dimension, this finding suggests that employees may engage in challenging/promotive eCSR in response to the organisation’s lack of action. As anticipated, many of the challenging/promotive eCSR centred around suggestion making, though there did appear to be a lack of clarity about where to direct suggestions and hesitation around making them at all. Some participants made suggestions to their supervisor, some directly to the CEO and others to the person whose role best fit with the idea in question. This will inform the items used to examine challenging/promotive eCSR, such that the items
will be focused on suggestion making and will ask employees the extent to which they make suggestions to their supervisor, upper management, as well as in general. Another notable finding is the corporate organisation’s volunteering initiative serving as an impetus for further CSR behaviours such as collecting donations for the organisation that they volunteered for. This suggests another way that challenging/promotive eCSR can be stimulated; environmentally-focused challenging/promotive eCSR was stimulated by awareness that was created by the organisation’s lack of action, while participating in corporate volunteering created awareness of particular causes that precipitated further action for those causes.

5.1.5 Challenging/Prohibitive

Participants were asked if they had witnessed anything unethical or illegal happening in the organisation, and asked what they did about it. Few \(n = 4\) participants had actually observed something blatantly unethical, one (CORP11) did not disclose what the event was but stated that she reported it directly to the organisation’s whistleblowing hotline. NFP17 became aware of a medical professional making deliberate errors with medications, reported it and the person in question was dismissed, and NFP6 observed that a subcontractor had not fulfilled the legally required safety measures on one of NFPX’s rental properties. CORP2 witnessed a colleague violating the company’s IT policy about confidential company data and reported it to the responsible department. Interestingly, several participants mentioned minor interpersonal things that make the workplace unpleasant, for example not saying good morning or taking bad moods out on colleagues, or behaviour that doesn’t represent the company well such as being loud at Friday night drinks as behaviours they observed and considered unethical or illegal. This indicates that, generally speaking, serious ethical and legal violations in the workplace occur quite rarely, and that there is significant variation in individuals’ conceptualisations of unethical behaviour.

The rest of the sample were asked hypothetically what they would do if they observed behaviour that was clearly unethical. The sample was quite split, with around half believing that they would address their concerns directly with the person involved, and the other half saying they would take it to a manager (such as their own manager or the offending co-worker’s manager) or report it through official channels. Those who stated that they’d address the individual tended to be male and/or in management positions. Further, female managers reported that they were more likely to take this route if they offending individual was under their supervision, expressed in statements such as “So if it was in my team, then I would be speaking to that person and calling them on that. If it was something that I observed or saw in another team, then I’d either talk to that person or talk to their line manager,” (CORP4) and “...if it’s someone that you can use your own power differential over then you can do that stuff, where if its someone who has similar power to you then the conversations are different, and if its someone who is above you, then its a very different thing and you need to find out how you’re going to do that,” (NFP3).
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Three males from the corporate sample reported that they would talk to the offending party first because they’ve been subject to people taking issues about them to their manager instead of speaking to them first. For example, CORP14 recalled “…the feeling that I get sometimes on feedback [I receive] is that these sort of discussions have happened without me being involved,” which was quite similar to the experience of CORP8: “…having been on the receiving end sometimes when someone else talks to your manager and they talk to you, I don’t try and believe that’s the best way to resolve conflicts,” (CORP8).

The participants that indicated that they would try and speak to the individual first generally began their answer with statements to the effect of ‘it depends who it is’ or ‘depends what it is’. In contrast, participants that indicated that they would report or had reported to superiors or official channel viewed the decision as very clear, with statements such as “My requirement was to report it, so I did,” (CORP2), “I’d call the whistle-blower line straight away. Wouldn’t be any issue with that,” (CORP15), “Escalate. Yeah. I wouldn’t have any concerns between that,” (CORP10), “I’m kind of more than happy to go against a colleague if - not if I believe, but in terms of the end goal being that the young person is safe,” (NFP9) and “I’d probably still be more inclined at this stage just to mention it to my manager because I’m just a staff member,” (NFP16).

The decision to report unethical or illegal behaviour to superiors is likely influenced by the junior or perceived junior status of the employees that believed they would do this. It may also be the case that these participants had specific, serious behaviours in mind when asked about illegal or unethical behaviour, while those who stated their action would depend on the nature of the behaviour or the person engaging in it could have a broader conceptualisation of this type of behaviour, with behaviours at the lower end of their personal scale not warranting reporting. This is supported by several participants mentioning low-harm behaviour such as being rude to colleagues as falling under the umbrella of unethical behaviour.

In sum, challenging/prohibitive eCSR was not widely observed by participants. Though it represents an extreme end of the CSR spectrum, the finding that 12% of participants had observed something objectively irresponsible and that such behaviour was conceivable to most participants, evidenced by their quite clear ideas of how they would respond to such behaviour, indicates that challenging/prohibitive has a place in the eCSR spectrum. There was variation in how participants believed they would respond to irresponsible behaviour, with around half believing they’d approach the individual directly and half that would escalate it via internal channels. Interestingly, no participants indicated an inclination towards or belief that they would have to report to outside authorities. This may provide insight into the way in which they conceive of challenging/prohibitive eCSR (i.e., that the acts of social irresponsibility that they could encounter were unlikely to be serious enough), or of their faith in the organisation’s ability to deal with social irresponsibility internally.
5.1.6 Convenience CSR

One category of behaviour that arose as an (albeit small) theme in both the NFP and corporate samples was ‘convenience CSR’ - CSR that did not involve much engagement on the part of the employee in terms of time, thought or energy. These included things like buying baked goods that were being sold at work for a charity, participating in charity morning tea fundraisers, or putting spare coins in donation tins. In the corporate sample, these behaviours were usually mentioned by participants that reported being too busy to participate in corporate volunteering, such as CORP10 who said “From a personal perspective, I probably, unfortunately, am limited to at work, buying the two-dollar cupcakes for various fundraisers that go on internally.”

In the NFP sample, convenience CSR was considered more of a prosocial act, a way of supporting colleagues and the causes that colleagues were passionate about, with statements such as “I attend the special morning teas. So for example, two weeks ago we had a special morning tea... Now I donated a bit of money, and was more than prepared to go along to that morning tea to support a cause here, and because I know that’s also good for staff relations,” (NFP16) and “Most people are participatory in those kinds of things, I think there’s a reasonable understanding of the social needs that go along with those things,” (NFP3).

As it’s a small theme it is difficult to draw any conclusions. However, it does seem like there is minimal resistance among employees to engaging in CSR behaviour if the barriers to entry are low. Further, the motivation for this particular type of behaviour may originate in a desire to support colleagues rather than broader social responsibility motivations.

5.1.7 Summary

This section has presented the findings of how employees engage in eCSR. The most common eCSR reported by corporate participants was corporate volunteering, while in-role eCSR was the most common for NFP participants. Other types of affiliative/promotive eCSR, such as sitting on CSR-related committees and relationship building were also reported by participants. Both the NFP and corporate organisations performed poorly on the environmental dimension of CSR, thus it was interesting to find that much of the challenging/promotive eCSR reported by employees was directed towards the environment. Employees expressed many ideas, both environmental and targeted towards improving the organisation’s mission, though there was some hesitation around whether and to whom to suggest these ideas. Few participants had encountered situations that warranted challenging/prohibitive eCSR, though most were very clear about what they would do if they were to encounter it. Finally, some participants mentioned participating in ‘easy’ acts of social responsibility which I termed convenience CSR, indicating that in the absence of obstacles
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The previous section raised some motivating factors that may explain why some participants did or did not engage in particular behaviours. As Figure 5.2 demonstrates, these have been classified into personal factors, job factors, organisational factors, and reward expectancy. This section will explore these axial codes and their respective open codes in detail.

5.2.1 Personal Values

Many participants cited their personal values as reasons for engaging in CSR behaviour. Many NFP participants cited influences in their upbringing that impacted their decision to work in the NFP sector. For example, the values and philosophies with which they were raised, whether they were religious: “...maybe it’s the Catholic upbringing, always looking out for your neighbour,” (NFP1) or other ideologies: “...my dad was a humanist so that kind of philosophy was underpinning all of my life,” (NFP11), or ‘just the way the family was’ (NFP4, 7, 11). Or the experiences and observations of their families, such as NFP5 who said:

“I guess a lot of it has to do with my background as well. In my own - I’ve seen things in my own family that if they have that extra support, things could be a totally different picture,” and NFP15 who stated “...my dad was a police officer, and he was a juvenile liaison officer so he worked directly with young people at risk and I observed the work that he did from a very early age,” (NFP15).

Some participants in the corporate sample also reported that their upbringing affected their interest in corporate volunteering. For some, it was the value of helping out that had been instilled in them, reflected in statements such as “I guess it’s all - it’s always part of way that I was brought up that you offer help where you can,” (CORP11) and “I’m born and brought up in India. It’s like a small town, where people help each of them so in on the typical town environment,” (CORP7). CORP12 cited her gratitude to Australia as an immigrant as a reason for wanting to give back, saying “I think having migrated from another country, I can - I feel blessed and I feel like I’m lucky to have now settled in Australia... so I kind of feel like I need to give back to the community,” (CORP12).
Figure 5.2: Coding structure of why employees engage in eCSR
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In line with the theme of family, the desire to set a good example for their own children also impacted the CSR behaviours of some participants in both the NFP and corporate samples. For example NFP17 reflected, saying “I get to go home and my kids say “how was your day?” and I get to tell them astounding things. I’m really proud of what I get to do. I think it sets a great example for them of you know, this is the type of thing you should do,” (NFP17), a sentiment shared by CORP12: “...sharing your time and your skills or your talents is really something that I would like to continue and I would like my child to learn from me in that way. So to lead by example, so that kind of motivates me,” (CORP12).

Participants in both samples mentioned that their individual environmentally-conscious behaviours had been instilled in them by families that emphasised not being wasteful: “we were brought up being frugal with our power and that sort of thing and then having your own home and that sort of thing, you try to keep your power and cost down as much as you can. So in an office environment, as much as I can, I sort of try to keep the utilities to a minimum,” (NFP11) and “That’s just the way, again, we’re kinda - was brought up with family and stuff like that, not leave out lights on, not being wasteful. Just simple things like that,” (CORP1).

Educational experience was a significant influence for many of the NFP sample in choosing their career, as well as their personal approach to it. This was articulated particularly clearly by NFP17:

“...it’s also about the original study that I did, I did youth work in the era when the course was run by some ideologues...all sorts of very challenging stuff and at the end of the course you basically had to sit and do an oral on why you’re doing the work you’re doing and what your philosophy is and how your values impact on it... So I drew a lot from that, that sort of informed how I do a lot of stuff,” (NFP17).

Identification with the cause that their CSR action was directed at was a strong reason for engagement in both samples. For the NFP sample, this was largely in the form of identification with the organisation’s mission. For some, such as NFP4, this was a determinant in choosing their organisation: “well it was important to find something meaningful. So for me it so happens that impacting on society and faith, they’re definitely the two really meaningful things to me and then they marry up really well in this organisation,” (NFP4). For others, it was something realised after they began working with their organisation, reflected in statements such as “you get the feedback of the people that have been touched by NFPX and they say what a great organisation it is, that makes me feel really, really good. And I’m very proud of the work here,” (NFP13) and “…if you work in an organisation where it
mean something to you, at the end of the day, it adds more value to your work life,” (NFP7). Accordingly, several NFP participants contrasted the lack of identification and meaning in their past work experience with the meaning they feel now, and how it affects their work decisions and behaviour, for example: “It goes against everything I believe in, you know believing that human beings are valuable inherently, because they’re human beings, they don’t need to have a dollar sign attached to them. So yeah, and I don’t think I could go back to the private sector,” (NFP3), “I worked in a bank for - in a major bank for 18 years, and then I - When their policies changed, that sort of thing, I resigned from that,” (NFP11), and “When I’ve worked for non-Christian organisations, it wasn’t me. I felt I was betraying who I was... when I’m working for an organisation that’s not aligned with my values, I don’t want to go to work,” (NFP1).

In the corporate sample, identification with the cause was a major drawcard for many participants when choosing to engage in corporate volunteering, such as CORP5 who said “I probably do consider what the organisation is and whether I know them and whether it’s something that - I mean there’s probably not too many charities that I would actually not support, but I certainly would choose who I support,” (CORP5) and “you read through it, the kind of options that this one really hits home for you, then definitely go with that one,” (CORP8). Accordingly, although time constraints were cited as the biggest reason for not volunteering, all except one of the corporate participants that had not participated in corporate volunteering stated that the charities the organisation supports did not resonate strongly with them, such as CORP10 who said “we all have had personal experiences that align us with certain not-for-profit organisations and the ones that are chosen here, I don’t have any personal alignment to,” (CORP10), and CORP4 who echoed similar points: “CORPX is different. It’s probably more community focused, family focused, whereas I am not so much in a community. So I don’t do so much - I haven’t got kids, so that whole arena is probably different to what I would choose to be involved in,” (CORP 4).

Connection with the cause was also important for NFP participants when deciding to participate in extra-role CSR, such as charity morning teas, illustrated in statements such as “If I felt like that was not the case and the fundraising was going somewhere perhaps that I didn’t feel that strongly about, my motivation would be lower,” (NFP9) and “I guess it’s just a personal thing, what I view as being relevant and whether it’s worthwhile and whether it’s - when I extend my time doing sort of thing,” (NFP11).

Interestingly, in both samples, exposure to different charities expanded employees’ interest in and openness to giving their support, for example NFP1 who said “Before NFPX, I didn’t think much about domestic and family violence issues...but ever since I started working here, you get exposed to counsellors talking about family and domestic violence, you get exposed to the victims, you see their children, and you hear their stories...” and CORP5 who said “...it kind of opens your mind a bit and then you kind of, you’re more willing to kind of - I don’t know. You hear someone’s story and you kinda want to get involved.”
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Strong personal ethics and a strong desire to help others drove participants in both samples towards CSR behaviours. While many clearly stated that both a driver and benefit of their CSR behaviour was helping others or “helping people less fortunate,” (CORP13), several participants had trouble articulating what it was specifically within their ethical code that drove them to eCSR, or why that ethical code existed, making statements like “I don’t actually say why I do it for the following reasons. It’s just something I always do,” (CORP11), “I think I’ve always been like this. Kind of even looking back to when I was young, I was always very empathetic towards people,” (NFP10) and “...once you’re born like me, you’re on a conveyor belt, and its hard to get off...I just try to help where I can,” (NFP16).

Finally, several participants reported that many of the eCSR behaviours they engaged in were ‘carried over’ from their personal life. This was particularly evident in both samples in the case of recycling, with many participants stating that they recycle at home ‘obviously’ (CORP10) or that “everybody does it at home” so “to transfer it into the workplace wasn’t that hard,” (NFP3). Some \((n = 5)\) participants in the NFP sample were involved with the organisation on a volunteer basis in their private lives prior to, and often continuing during, their employment at the organisation. Quite a number \((n = 8)\) of the corporate sample, including some \((n = 3)\) that did not engage in corporate volunteering, reported volunteering in their own time. The three that volunteered privately but not through work stated that the work opportunities did not fit with the causes they liked to support. Therefore, many personal factors, including behaviours in one’s private life, influence decisions to participate in eCSR.

These findings indicate that, despite being work behaviour, eCSR is heavily motivated by personal factors. Identification with the cause that their eCSR was directed towards was important for both samples. Due to the in-role nature of much of NFP employees’ eCSR, this identification was with the organisation’s mission while corporate participants evaluated whether the volunteering opportunities resonated with them when choosing, or choosing not to, engage in volunteering. Experiences during formative years such as the philosophical, religious and educational principles participants were raised with seemed to create a foundation that underpinned interest in and openness to eCSR. Participants found it difficult to articulate exactly how particular values factored into specific decisions, but it is clear that the values instilled in upbringing affected eCSR. As a result, I believe exploration of basic human values as antecedents for eCSR is an interesting avenue to explore in the quantitative analysis of this thesis.

5.2.2 Job Factors

While the personal factors listed above served mainly as motivators, several job factors were identified as facilitators for eCSR. As one would expect, having CSR explicitly in one’s job description, and in the organisational mission for the NFP sample, was cited as a reason...
for several of the in-role behaviours. Occupying a managerial position was also cited as a facilitator of some eCSR behaviours for participants in both samples. Those in the corporate sample reported that being in a managerial position gave them a level of autonomy that allowed them to participate in corporate volunteering. Participants in both samples reported that their management positions gave them the ability and, in some cases, a sense of obligation to encourage and support their subordinates’ engagement in eCSR, as well as the authority to implement new ideas, such as the introduction of pro-environmental initiatives mentioned earlier.

A great deal of the autonomy that managers in the corporate sample felt the position lent them was in terms of flexibility around scheduling, for example CORP6 said “I’m the project manager so I have the flexibility to be able to contribute where other teams probably wouldn’t.” A flexible schedule was also a facilitator for those that were not in management positions, with some noting that colleagues may not have that flexibility, or that they themselves had not had that flexibility in the past:

> “In where I work in IT project space, then it’s - yeah, the world doesn’t end if the team’s not there for a day. Would be very different in a processing or high-pressure area definitely.” (CORP8).

As expected, a less flexible schedule was a barrier to volunteering: “It is a bit difficult because we’re a second-level support team. So we have to have capacity. We have to have someone available at all times,” (CORP11).

Team factors also influenced participation in eCSR. The ‘double benefit’ of teambuilding as a result of eCSR was a prominent factor in the corporate sample’s engagement in volunteering, and the NFP sample’s engagement in extrarole CSR behaviour, including events like the charity morning teas. This was expressed in statements such as “I mean, you have bonding with your fellow - your colleagues as well, so that’s one [reason].” (CORP12) and “...for that particular one [morning tea], the woman who organised it was in my section, so it was important to give her support,” (NFP16). Having a willing and accommodating team was cited by many in the corporate sample as a facilitator to engagement in volunteering: “We’ve got a great bunch of very engaged colleagues, passionate about their work, passionate about other things,” (CORP11). In fact, CORP3 stated that her lack of engagement was partially because nobody in her team had organised it, saying “...our team hasn’t been proactive about it either, so there hasn’t been an easy opportunity for me to do it and I haven’t taken it up,” (CORP3).

Indeed, in the NFP sample, NFP6 found that because he operated as a contractor, he did not have a team and therefore couldn’t get involved with these types of activities:
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“they got their teams and their teams will organise their events or their...invariably, they’ll be doing their own thing and someone else will be doing their own thing and someone else will be doing their own thing. And I haven’t got a department as such...sometimes doesn’t sort of enable me to get involved in those activities because the team is doing that together,” (NFP6).

The meaning that CSR can provide to work was mentioned in the beginning of this chapter. This served as a major motivator for CSR in both samples; for the corporate sample, the volunteering opportunities provided meaning to their ordinary work. CORP1 contrasted volunteering with his everyday work particularly well:

“I don’t wake up, I guess, in the morning going, “Yes, I work for a bank. Am I contributing to society?” I don’t get that really. But - and again, that’s where the volunteering days help, that they, I guess, do make me feel a bit better, that - well, today I’ve actually, I’ve helped out in a very - and it - what feels to me much more kind of a way,” (CORP1).

While for the NFP sample, a lot of this meaning was inherent due to the socially responsible mission of the organisation. However, off-site CSR opportunities such as fundraisers and events served to further connect employees with the mission of their organisation. For example, NFP13 said “when you’re on the street with your collection tin and you had somebody come up, that actual act of putting money in and actually saying what wonderful work we do - it could be from some old-aged pensioner that probably can’t afford it...it’s that affirmation and that pat on the back,,” while NFP17 felt similarly, stating “It was really good to go to because it made me understand that actually I was part of [NFPX], not just part of [DepartmentX].”

Job factors affected engagement in eCSR, largely in terms of logistics. Role flexibility reduced barriers to volunteering in the corporate sample, while managerial position enabled independent eCSR actions and support for the eCSR of subordinates. Both having a supportive team and a desire to support one’s team served as motivation and as a driver for eCSR in both samples. The meaning created by eCSR, specifically by reinforcing NFP participants’ connection to the organisational mission and providing meaning to corporate participants’ every day work, also served as a motivator.
5.2.3 Organisational Factors

Several organisational factors facilitated employee participation in CSR activities. These were much more prominent in the corporate sample, and particularly in relation to corporate volunteering. Some of these factors provided access to CSR opportunities, such as communication and organisational policies and procedures that made it ‘easy’ to engage. This was evident in statements such as “...comes down to accessibility. A lot of people think they wanna do that [volunteer], but that’s just not something that they know where to go. So if it’s at work, they see it, then can just do it, it’s really easy,” (CORP8) and “So with the bank having the program, that’s actually kind of - it’s very easy to access and actually participate in,” (CORP1). In contrast, CORP3 cited a lack of easy opportunity as a reason for her not volunteering, saying “there hasn’t been an easy opportunity for me to do it and I haven’t taken it up,” (CORP3).

With regard to communication, some (n = 5) participants in the NFP sample mentioned receiving CSR-related emails, such as opportunities to donate to fundraisers, and one person mentioned a weekly ‘updates’ e-mail that listed all of the events happening in the organisation, including CSR opportunities. The relatively low number of NFP participants mentioning this indicates that there are factors other than organisational CSR communication that prevent engagement in extrarole CSR behaviour. NFP7 alluded to being organised and having a reasonable workload when she said “if you’re on top of your emails” you will know of the opportunities. The barriers to engagement will be explored more in the next section of this chapter.

Several participants in the corporate sample mentioned the organisation’s facilities, such as an energy-efficient building, activity-based workspaces and lack of personal rubbish bins as encouraging pro-environmental behaviour. For example, CORP1 said “We certainly don’t print stuff out from meetings or anything like that. It’s all about electronic. And then we have the facilities to display electronically, to read electronically,” while CORP11 reflected similarly, “I think the environment that we work in, this building, being very much about making you stop and think about, “Do I need to print the document?” I think it’s massively changed our behaviours,” (CORP11).

On the other hand the lack of environmental facilities and procedures was mentioned by NFP participants as a barrier to pro-environmental behaviour, meaning such behaviours were dependent on the proactivity of the individual, reflected in statements such as “People trying to make it happen from the bottom up...you can make little changes like recycled paper in the Albany office, but you can’t affect policy,” (NFP2).

A facilitator for both samples was strong CSR culture; the NFP organisation’s inherently socially responsible mission encouraged participation in additional CSR behaviour
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and adoption of socially conscious values: “what those people are doing that when they leave here on a daily basis, that they are giving people dignity, respect, empathy, all those kind of things and yeah, those values are crucial to how we go about our work” (NFP12). While the corporate organisation’s strong corporate volunteering focus seemed to create a norm of participation. This was evident in that most participants reported that ‘most’ (CORP14, 6, 7) or ‘80-90%’ (CORP8) of their team participated. Several (n = 6) participants reported that their managers were supportive or at least did not present any serious obstacles to participation. In addition, many participants felt that, because corporate volunteering is an organisational initiative, “no one can say no” to them engaging (CORP14). This is not to say that there weren’t barriers to participation, which will be discussed in the next section of the chapter, rather that these barriers could be navigated by the employee due to the organisation’s strong support and CSR culture.

Social exchange norms also appeared to be at play in the corporate sample, with several participants citing that gratitude for the opportunities and the notion that their participation was good for the organisation influenced their interest in corporate volunteering. For example, CORP11 said about volunteering, “I think it’s a good thing...for [me] personally and I think it’s also a good - it’s a tick for the bank as well ’cause it’s - they can, do all the nice community side of things, and say “look at us, we’re good”, ” (CORP11). Similarly, CORP5 said “It is good for society and it is good for employees and for the company to put their name on things as well, but I think all of that does tie together quite well,” and CORP14 said “it is our opportunity to go and give something to the society that they’re working. So, I don’t lose anything by doing that and I’m getting some morale, definitely.”

Participants from both samples expressed that their organisations were open to feedback and suggestions. Interestingly, what was more important than the implementation of the suggestion, was the feeling that they had been heard. In the corporate sample in particular, despite having many ideas and often voicing them, not one participant reported having a suggestion successfully implemented. However, all participants reported without hesitation that the organisation was open to their ideas and they felt comfortable making suggestions, making statements such as “I find [CORPX] a very trusting environment in that regards that if you do have any opinions, ideas, thoughts that, you know, you’re welcome to bring them to the table and encouraged to bring them to the table,” (CORP10) and “I had a hearing. I can see the fact that you made a decision to the best interest of the collective. Sometimes that doesn’t meet individuals’ requirements and on this occasion, I’m - if you’re thinking about 80-20 rule. In this occasion, I’m in the 20 percent. That’s okay,” (CORP9).

Several organisational factors affected engagement in eCSR. Corporate participants reported that strong organisational communication of CSR opportunities greatly facilitated participation, while NFP participants who, notably, reported substantially less engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR did not receive much CSR communication from the organisation. The organisation’s CSR culture also affected eCSR engagement by creating a standard
of participating in volunteering for the corporate organisation, and for inspiring strong adherence to organisational values for the NFP organisation.

5.2.4 Reward Expectancy

Several of the motivating factors that participants from both samples mentioned were related to rewards derived from engagement in the CSR behaviour. A strong theme in both samples was that CSR behaviour outside of the typical work environment, such as volunteering, served to improve relationships that ultimately makes their core work easier, for example “It improves the networks that the team has and the relationships that we’ve got with the wider society so that I can say that we can work more in collaboratively,” (NFP4), “you tend to form really good relationships...it’s kind of something and you bump into them or you have to work with them in the future and you’ve got that immediate connection to giving to something kind of greater,” (CORP8) and “…it’s just easier to interact with them and do business. It’s easier to get people to be interested in the same things or work in the same projects. And it just greases the wheel,” (CORP1).

A very superficial benefit that several (n = 6) participants in the corporate sample mentioned was that volunteering gives them a day off work. Another common theme was that volunteering offered variety; something different from their everyday work. This was expressed by CORP12, who said “I think apart from the fact that you get to go outside of the office, doing your usual routine job, facing the computer and things like that, you get to meet a lot of people,” (CORP12).

Finally, many participants mentioned the good feelings that they get from participating. For corporate sample participants, these good feelings were related to volunteering days: “It’s a good feeling, isn’t it? You go, you’ve helped, you had a fun day, you’ve taught,” (CORP1), “I always feel good. I always feel, come away - yeah, feeling good, feeling you’ve made a contribution,” (CORP11) and “It’s great! You really feel - especially this time, I really felt I did something really relevant to the people outside of the bank,” (CORP14). For the NFP sample, motivation came from the good feelings that came from working towards the organisation’s mission.

A strong theme that was prominent in both samples was that of contribution; participants enjoyed seeing the contribution their behaviours make, for example CORP12 said “…we actually cooked for the less fortunate people. So you can see right there and then how you impacted other people’s lives. So it’s really, really encouraging,” (CORP12). Similarly, NFP4 said “the thing that I like about [NFPX] is that you’re working in your local community and you can make a real long lasting difference. So it’s not I’m going overseas and I’m going to volunteer with cute little kids for two weeks and then that’s it,” (NFP4).
Indeed, two participants from the corporate sample (CORP 6 and 14) had had volunteering experiences where they felt underutilised and were thus disappointed with those experiences, though it did not discourage future participation. In addition, several \((n = 8)\) members of the NFP sample mentioned that the knowledge that they’re contributing positively to society keeps them in the not-for-profit sector.

The benefits that participants received from engaging in eCSR served to motivate behaviour. This does not mean that they engage for selfish reasons, rather that the experiences make them feel good and can have side benefits, which drives further engagement. The major side-benefit reported was the creation and strengthening of interpersonal relationships that the non-task context facilitated.

### 5.2.5 Summary

Several factors were found to affect engagement in eCSR. Personal factors, such as values instilled in upbringing and experiences during one’s formative years seemed to create openness to and drive towards eCSR. Connection to the cause served as a motivator for participants in two ways, by creating meaning in one’s work and a desire to help the cause in question. Job and organisational factors were mainly logistical facilitators, creating awareness of opportunities and removing the barriers to participation. Finally, the rewards experienced as a result of participating, such as positive affect and strengthened interpersonal relations also served as motivators.

### 5.3 Challenges to eCSR

Many participants also raised factors that presented barriers and challenges to their participation or willingness to engage in eCSR. As Figure 5.3 illustrates, these challenges were categorised under the axial codes of personal, job and organisational.
Figure 5.3: Coding structure of challenges to engagement in eCSR
5.3. Challenges to eCSR

5.3.1 Personal

While the ability to contribute motivated several participants to engage in CSR, being unsure of the impact that their behaviour would have, or whether it would make any impact at all created reservations for some participants. This was seen in CORP6 who did not raise her concerns about the organisation’s environmentally friendly facilities that appeared to be failing due to assumptions about receiving a “media response”. Instead, she “waited for somebody else to ask”. This sentiment was also present in both samples when participants were asked whether or not they had brought their ideas and suggestions to their organisation, with statements such as “I don’t see how that’s going to change” or “I don’t know that it will be taken on board,” (CORP10 and 6, NFP4) and “That’s just how things are done here,” (CORP4, NFP17, NFP3) being quite common.

Some of the challenges were around the CSR opportunities on offer. While time constraints were cited as the main barrier, all of the corporate sample participants that had not volunteered also mentioned that the causes did not align with what they would choose to support. In addition, though most corporate participants reported that they enjoyed the variety, compared with their work tasks that volunteering offered, some expressed a desire for opportunities that used their skills. This was reflected in statements such as “I would rather do something that adds more value and uses my skills...Those type of programs are really good because you do sign up for like a semester or a school term, so you do get to build that relationship and you get to see the change in the person,” (CORP3).

Interestingly, those that had enquired about skilled volunteering (n = 5) reported that their skills didn’t fit with the opportunities offered. These participants worked in various departments, such as IT, project management, and international banking, but they felt that the calls for skilled volunteering requested very specific skills that they didn’t have, or a broad but high level of expertise that meant they couldn’t fulfil all of the requirements.

Similarly, in the NFP sample, participants were more likely to participate in CSR that aligned with their area of interest. For example, NFP3 stated that she was more likely to support a cause other than her organisation if she worked with them throughout the course of her job, NFP17 assessed the ‘fit’ of the CSR opportunity with her work, and NFP10 was only interested in CSR opportunities that used and developed her work skills. Another significant barrier for the NFP sample was compassion fatigue - caring so much about their work and the organisation’s mission that taking on additional causes was simply too much sometimes. NFP3’s example illustrates this well:
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“we tried one year to have an Oxfam buy a pig thing and people are so compassion-fatigued that they actually wanted to have Secret Santa and focus on themselves and so you’re kind of coming up against that balance of people who are dealing with this stuff all day long, do they want to actually do some more within their workspace, and quite often they don’t,” (NFP3).

Some personal challenges to eCSR engagement were raised by participants. Interestingly, doubts about one’s ability to make a difference through their behaviour deterred participants from making suggestions or seeking clarification from the organisation about perceived organisational CSR failures. As anticipated, while connection with the cause served as a motivator for eCSR, a lack of connection to the cause negatively affected employees’ likelihood to engage.

5.3.2 Job

The main challenge, cited by both corporate and NFP participants, in engaging in eCSR is time. For example, with reference to engagement in volunteering, several corporate sample participants said there were no obstacles “unless there was a deadline,” (CORP2, 3, 4, 5), or that almost everyone, ‘except those that had a deadline coming up,’ (CORP1, 6, 8), participated. In terms of other CSR opportunities, particularly those that ate into hours outside of work, time constraints were significant for participants in both samples. For example, CORP4 said “I don’t have a whole lot of time during the week and at weekends, I’ve got personal commitments and responsibilities. So I haven’t got a lot of spare time,” which was echoed by NFP4, “If I feel like I might have been working a lot or I’ve been under a lot of pressure then I probably wouldn’t do anything extra,” (NFP4).

The participant’s team also factored in to CSR decisions. Fear of letting the team down was a barrier for some: “There’s a lot of time sensitive work and everyone in the team is so busy that I would feel that if I was to go and volunteer for a day, I would be putting my team under more unnecessary pressure,” (CORP10). These fears weren’t always unfounded; some participants had experienced resistance from within their teams. In the corporate sample, this was around volunteering, such as CORP11 who said “I’ve been in some teams where it can be a problem as well. So it’s very much, “Well, you had the day off, so I’m taking a day off,” and it’s, “No. I think you missed the point there,” that kind of thing,” (CORP11).

In the NFP sample, resistance was most often around implementing change. This was evidenced by statements such as “It’s usually individuals’ inability to change or they can’t see the benefits for themselves in it...do you really need to have every e-mail that you’ve sent today in hard file? So its about educating people around changing their practice. For
some it still didn’t work,” (NFP3), and “...where you’re trying to put that suggestion over, can be accepted negatively and not positively. In other words like, “We’ve been doing this like that for 15 years. Why do we need to change?” ” (NFP6).

Two job-related constraints to eCSR engagement were identified by participants, specifically time and resistance from colleagues. Participants’ lack of time was more of a logistical constraint for the corporate sample while it appeared to reduce NFP employees’ mental bandwidth for extra-role eCSR. With regard to resistance, participants from the corporate sample feared and, for some, experienced resistance from their team when engaging in volunteering, while the NFP sample experienced resistance from individuals when trying to change processes.

5.3.3 Organisation

Several organisational factors presented challenges to employee engagement in eCSR. Budget constraints were a major challenge for the NFP sample when looking to implement change, both in terms of implementing green initiatives, as mentioned by NFP3 and 17, as well as any other changes. For example, NFP6 articulated that “My job is primarily to provide guidance and focus for the managers on what they need to do to improve their service or to go forward in their business. So there may be barriers where funds are available to do that sometimes.”

Other organisational barriers included the lack of environmental policy which, though mentioned more in the NFP sample, was a challenge for participants in both samples. In line with the lack of policy, was the feeling that the organisation was not responsive to suggestions or lacked follow through with their CSR policy. The previous section of this chapter mentioned that employees in both samples would not be deterred from making suggestions because the organisation gave them fair consideration. However, none of the corporate sample and very few of the NFP sample had had any of their suggestions successfully implemented, and their frustration was evident in statements such as “I find that frustrating. I mean, certainly for the first two or three years I was making these suggestions and nothing happened,” (NFP2), “...it’s been like, well, there’s no point in me engaging in these issues...I’m just gonna do what I have to do rather than trying to take on the initiative of really making things better,” (NFP4), and “...it makes you say, “Oh why bother asking the question?”,” (CORP6).

Another challenge for several participants was disagreement with the organisation’s approach to CSR. Again, a lot of this disagreement was because of the organisation’s weak performance on the environmental dimension of CSR, however, some of it was around the organisation’s general approach. For example, CORP9 felt that the organisation was too
emphatic with its encouragement of volunteering, making him feel ‘shamed’ into participating and isolated if he didn’t. CORP4 felt that the organisation’s CSR approach was too broad, supporting “anything in the community” which led to lower brand recognition for their CSR activities and the feeling of being “spread thin” as an organisation. In contrast, several participants ($n = 5$) felt that the organisation’s support of particular charity partners limited their ability to engage with a cause that resonated with them.

Having an unsupportive manager also presented challenges to various types of eCSR engagement. In relation to volunteering, CORP6 and CORP11 observed the effect of unsupportive managers, recalling “...going up to different floors, “Are you guys volunteering today?” First thing in the morning, “No, we wouldn’t do that.” Or, “No, we can’t do that.” Or just no. It’s a bit sad,” (CORP6), and “From a higher level, that’s great. It doesn’t always transcend all the way down management level. So sometimes, it can be a little bit of a challenge;” (CORP11).

Several other participants mentioned times when their managers had thwarted their CSR efforts; CORP5 felt that his manager was so focused on sales targets that his report of a colleague violating company policy in quite a significant way did not receive adequate attention. NFP2 felt that his managers were constantly too busy for him to get in contact with them, NFP4 felt that her suggestions were not taken on board by her managers, and NFP7 felt that her manager was often too committed to the organisation’s current systems.

Another roadblock obstructing eCSR was bureaucracy. This presented in many forms, such as CORP6 not being allowed to water the office plants with the water left in her drink bottle, NFP17 being unable to do her job in a timely fashion because of the way the internal mailing process worked, CORP5’s belief that the way that jobs are structured in the organisation means his skillset doesn’t match opportunities for skilled volunteering, and NFP3 being the first person to occupy a management position in her department, placing the instigation of change entirely on her shoulders.

Several organisation-level challenges to eCSR were identified by participants in both samples. While funding was a barrier exclusive to the NFP sample, participants from both samples expressed difficulties arising from their respective organisations’ approach to CSR. Some of these difficulties related to the organisation’s lack of environmental policy prohibiting change in terms of implementing environmental suggestions, while some participants took issue with the way in which the organisation’s CSR strategy was implemented in general. In addition to lacking organisation-level support, a lack of managerial support was a significant barrier to participants in both samples. Finally, bureaucracy thwarted eCSR for many participants.
5.3.4 Summary

This section has outlined the challenges to eCSR identified by participants, which are categorised as personal, job and organisational. Personal barriers include a lack of connection to the cause and a lack of belief that their eCSR behaviour would have the effect they desire. Job factors include a lack of time and a lack of team support. Organisational factors mainly centred on a lack of environmental policy and a lack of support from management. The implications of these challenges, along with the facilitators to and types of eCSR behaviour will now be discussed.

5.4 Discussion

The first major qualitative finding is that employees do engage in a range of different CSR behaviours, and that these behaviours fit into a spectrum of in-role, affiliative/promotive, challenging/promotive and challenging/prohibitive as proposed in Chapter 3. As this section and Chapter 7 will outline, the means of and motivations for engagement in the various types of behaviours enhances our understanding of eCSR.

Another significant finding is that corporate and not-for-profit (NFP) employees conceptualise CSR and, accordingly, their CSR behaviour differently, and that this conceptualisation is shaped by the organisation’s CSR context. Specifically, NFP employees, whose organisation had CSR embedded into their mission and core activities, believed that CSR was embedded in their work tasks and job role (Aguinis and Glavas, 2013). On the other hand, the corporate sample, whose organisation approached CSR as a peripheral activity separate from their primary operations, also viewed their CSR behaviour as peripheral, or additional to, their core job (Aguinis and Glavas, 2013). The extent to which the organisational context shaped employees’ perceptions of their CSR behaviour. For example, most of the NFP participants were involved in operational, office-based roles, meaning that they were not involved in front line service delivery and did not see firsthand the organisation’s CSR through their job role, yet they articulated how their work contributed to the mission of the organisation. The NFP organisation had a very new CEO at the time, so the importance of the mission of the organisation may have been strongly communicated during the transition. However, I interviewed participants from three different sites, not just the central office and participants’ connection to the mission was present across all of them. The NFP organisation is quite prominent in the charity sector, often having television advertising campaigns and being well known in broader society, so the mission of the organisation may have been reinforced for participants outside of work.

Very few participants in the corporate organisation, on the other hand, identified behaviours within their role that could be considered socially responsible. In fact, the corporate organisation was so volunteering focused that many participants only remembered
other behaviours, such as applying for community grants, half way through their interviews, in the middle of answering a different question. It is noteworthy that the corporate organisation is a bank and some participants even mentioned the global financial crisis and the recovering reputations of financial institutions, so the notion that behaviours within their job itself could be socially responsible is unlikely to be entertained by participants (or their social circles).

Another interesting finding in both samples is the prevalence of pro-environmental behaviour. Both organisations performed weakly on the environmental dimension of CSR, so it is reasonable to posit that engagement in pro-environmental behaviour in these organisational contexts is a result of employees adhering to their own socially responsible and ethical values in order to compensate for the organisation’s inaction (Hemingway, 2005; Caldwell et al., 2005). This is supported by the frustration expressed by employees that the organisation lacks environmental policy and programs that they consider basic, such as recycling. This frustration seems particularly amplified because the employees state that it is behaviour that they carry out in their own homes, yet it is not happening at the organisation-level.

Therefore, the qualitative findings indicate that the organisational CSR context affects employee perceptions of and engagement in CSR in two ways. First, the employee’s conceptualisation of their individual socially responsible behaviour at work mirrors the organisation’s approach. This is a somewhat surprising finding as, being individual-level behaviour, I anticipated that it would be organisational factors that supported the individual rather than the organisation’s CSR approach itself that would affect eCSR to this extent. This could be explained by employees’ tendency to adopt the organisation’s CSR values over time (Smith, 2013), or that one’s individual values are often sacrificed in favour of the organisation’s in the work context (Silverman, 1970). However, the second way in which the organisation affects eCSR appears to be if the organisation’s approach violates or ignores the employee’s CSR values. Thus it seems that unless the employee has strong CSR values and these values are espoused by the organisation through its CSR, the employee’s CSR attitudes and behaviour will generally match that of the organisation.

However, different levels of CSR engagement are also observed within both samples, for example some corporate sample participants only participated in the organisation’s annual volunteering day, while others negotiated with their managers for extra days, made suggestions for charity partners, encouraged clients, family and friends to apply for community grants, or used their annual leave for further volunteering. Similarly, in the NFP sample, some engaged simply by doing their jobs, while others made suggestions for improvements and engaged in proactive individual-level socially responsible behaviour. For some participants, engagement in one type of CSR led to further interest and engagement. For example, volunteering for an organisation made some corporate sample participants aware of other behaviours they could undertake to support their charities, and working in
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the charity sector made some NFP sample participants aware of social problems that they did not have an active interest in previously. However, this was not the case for most; most participants reported that they, and the majority of their colleagues, engaged in what could be described as ‘baseline’ CSR - the major annual volunteering day for the corporate sample and in-role behaviour for the NFP sample. This suggests that, as anticipated, different motivational factors are at play.

A key finding is in relation to challenging/promotive eCSR. The growing body of literature on employees in the CSR context explores their reactions to the organisation’s CSR (Lee et al., 2013; Rupp et al., 2013) or engagement in a specific CSR initiative (Caligiuri, Mencin, and Jiang, 2013; Chen and Hung-Baesecke, 2014), and some even conceptualise typologies of employee attitudes towards CSR (Hemingway, 2005; Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008). However, little research has been done on the independent acts that employees engage in with a socially responsible intention, such as making CSR suggestions or modifying their work behaviour. These interviews found that many, if not most, employees have ideas that could help the organisation increase its CSR impact, such as adding a food scraps recycling bin, digitising and streamlining paper-based processes, and causes that the organisation could support. Most employees stated they had or would feel comfortable putting their suggestions forward, but none had had their suggestions implemented at an organisational level. Therefore, a major contribution of this thesis is identifying that these behaviours (or the ideas that prompt these behaviours) do exist, and that it does not appear that they are utilised by the organisation.

Finally with regard to eCSR behaviour, challenging/prohibitive eCSR is not particularly common because despite the significant attention that severe cases of corporate social irresponsibility such as Enron, Exxon, Lehman Brothers, Shell, and British Petroleum receive, these are quite rare cases. As a result, participants’ conceptualisation of challenging/prohibitive eCSR varied greatly, from data breaches and medication mismanagement, to being rude to colleagues or too loud at Friday night drinks. Accordingly, participants stated that their response would largely depend on the nature of the offence and their power in relation to the offender. These findings enable a more refined definition of challenging/prohibitive eCSR that is between environmental destruction or corporate espionage and antisocial behaviour at work. This will be elaborated on in the theoretical implications section.

In terms of motivation, eCSR was a source of meaning for participants in both the corporate and NFP samples. This meaning was central to NFP participants’ decision to enter and stay in a sector that both pays less and can be more emotionally taxing than the private sector. For some corporate participants, this meaning compensated for the lack of CSR in their core job roles and the organisation, and it contributed to overall satisfaction for all corporate participants. This provides some empirical support to theories about outcomes
of eCSR (Gond et al., 2007; Turban and Greening, 1996), and extends the growing body of empirical findings from employee CSR attitudes resulting from the organisation’s CSR, to employee CSR attitudes resulting from the employee’s CSR behaviour (Glavas and Piderit, 2009; Lin et al., 2010). Given the personal meaning that eCSR creates for employees, it is not surprising that a range of personal factors greatly influenced engagement in eCSR. Several of these factors were related to the development of personal values and identity, such as upbringing and educational experience, while others were a result of personal context, such as carrying behaviour from one’s personal life into the work context and identification with the cause in question.

Job and organisational factors also affected engagement in eCSR, such as managerial position, which provided some participants with the autonomy to engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR, some the power to instigate organisational change, and some the confidence to address ethical violations directly. Other factors included having a willing team and supportive manager, and organisational structures such as policies and procedures and clear communication of opportunities. Organisational and job factors appear to act as facilitators, while personal factors act as motivators. Extrinsic rewards also influenced the eCSR engagement of participants in both samples; the rewards resulting from engagement in eCSR, such as a day off work, variety, and feeling good about one’s contribution were all cited as factors in the decision to engage, or to continue engaging.

The interplay between these motivators, facilitators and extrinsic rewards appears to relate to the way in which an employee engages in eCSR. Facilitators and extrinsic rewards minimise the perceived obstacles to eCSR engagement, which tends to lead to participation in affiliative/promotive eCSR. That is, reducing the barriers to eCSR is more likely to influence participation in behaviour that is arranged by the organisation, rather than inspire employees to proactively engage in eCSR such as suggestion making. On the other hand, personal factors seem to foster intrinsic motivation and behaviour that the employee states they would engage in regardless of the organisational context, because they’re ingrained within the individual. For example, the employees whose upbringing instilled in them the value of minimising waste will likely look for ways to do this regardless of whether it was a focus of or beneficial to the organisation. This is illustrated in the data, as employees from both organisations cited this value and corresponding behaviour, despite the very different CSR contexts of their respective organisations and the lack of environmental focus for both of them.

That is not to say that barriers do not affect the behaviours that are motivated by personal factors. In fact, some of these barriers negatively affect engagement more for those motivated by personal factors. A key example is the non-volunteers of the corporate sample, whose lack of connection with the causes that the organisation supported contributed to them not participating, while others who were not as intrinsically motivated were happy to
go along because the organisation made it easy (reduced barriers). One barrier that seemed to affect participants more than they outright stated was the organisation not following through on its CSR or not being responsive to suggestions. While that had experienced this stated that it did not affect their willingness to make suggestions, their frustration was very clear. Future research should conduct further exploration of whether these barriers do impact behaviour in reality, and how that happens over time.

In sum, the qualitative interviews find that employees’ conceptualisation of their own CSR contributions is heavily shaped by the organisational context. However, as proposed in Chapter 3, employees do engage in a range of eCSR behaviours, such as the majority of NFP participants, who identified that doing their job was CSR, most corporate participants, who participated in the organisation’s volunteering program, participants from both samples that made suggestions or changed their individual behaviour, and some participants who had taken action against socially irresponsible behaviour. The factors that motivated these behaviours included personal, job and organisational factors. Overall, NFP participants were very intrinsically motivated and this motivation was largely derived from personal factors, such as upbringing and educational experience. Though some participants identified personal reasons for engagement, participation in affiliative/promotive eCSR, mostly focused on volunteering in this data, was consistently related to the organisational factors that made it easy to engage. Acts of challenging/promotive eCSR such as making suggestions were focused on areas in which the employee perceived the organisation’s CSR to be deficient, namely the environment in these samples. Further, having to repeatedly engage in this behaviour to compensate for the organisation’s poor performance was a source of frustration for many employees. These findings have many theoretical and practical implications which will be discussed in Chapter 7.

5.5 Summary

This section has presented a range of ways that employees engage in eCSR, reasons why, and challenges they face when engaging. As proposed in Chapter 3, these behaviours vary and can thus be conceptualised as a spectrum. A surprising finding is that, despite being work behaviour, many personal factors substantially contribute to an employee’s likelihood to engage in eCSR. That is not to negate the effect of job and organisational factors; several factors such as the organisation’s policy and CSR communication were identified as factors that affect engagement in eCSR. The implications of these findings for the proposed theoretical framework and micro-level CSR will be discussed in Chapter 7 in greater depth and in conjunction with the findings of the quantitative exploration that will be presented next.
Chapter 6

Quantitative Results

This chapter presents the results of quantitative analysis of the relationships between several antecedents and the proposed employee CSR behaviours (eCSR). It is important to note that this analysis is exploratory; the main contribution of this thesis is to put forward a theory of eCSR and examine its nature qualitatively. Extant theoretical typologies that consider employees as actors in the CSR process typically consider employee attitudes to CSR, such as whether they are open to it, tolerant of it, or resistant to it (Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008; Hemingway, 2005; Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen, 2015). Accordingly, the proposition of a spectrum of eCSR requires the significant qualitative examination in Chapter 5 to ensure that there is indeed a range of eCSR, and thus will require further quantitative examination in the future in order to validate the eCSR scales and their antecedents.

The quantitative analysis presented here involves principal component analysis of the items used to measure two of the proposed types of eCSR, namely affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive. Challenging/prohibitive behaviour is examined with a single item that assesses the employee’s likelihood of reporting socially irresponsible behaviour to external parties. Confirmatory factor analysis of the affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive behaviour scales is also conducted. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis of the antecedents is conducted to ensure that the model uses the optimal number of factors. Then, hierarchical multiple regression is used to test the relationships between the antecedents proposed in Chapter 3 and affiliative/promotive, challenging/promotive and challenging/prohibitive eCSR. Finally, in response to the qualitative results indicating that personal values play a significant role in predicting employee engagement in eCSR, the relationship between employee values and affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR is examined.

6.1 Principal Component Analysis

To examine the underlying factor structure of the proposed eCSR spectrum, principal component analysis was conducted on the 22 survey items examining affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR. These items were developed through theoretical conceptualisation in conjunction with the qualitative results (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 5. Analysis n
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of 160 is ‘fair’ for this analysis (Comrey and Lee, 1992). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .853, above the recommended minimum of .6, and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant, indicating that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix.

Initial examination of the scree plot indicated that the majority of the variance was explained by three factors, therefore principal component analysis was run to extract three components. These three factors explained 22.6%, 18.4% and 9.1% of variance respectively, and the remaining components had eigenvalues below 1, reaffirming their relatively low explanatory power. Varimax rotation, an orthogonal rotation which aims to maximise the variance of each of the factors, was used as I believe that affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR are separate (uncorrelated) behaviour types, as well as to facilitate simple interpretation of the factors (Kim and Mueller, 1978).

The five items that loaded heavily on the third factor, AP4, AP6, CP2, CP7 and CP12, were excluded from the affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR scales. Four out of five of these items were pro-environmental behaviours that the employee could engage in regardless of the organisation’s support. However, attempts to develop a scale for these items failed to result in acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .514$), therefore the items that loaded on the third factor were discarded. Without these items, the scales for affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR formed strong reliabilities ($\alpha = .86$ and .91, respectively).

6.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

I conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) on both the independent variables and the dependent variables using Mplus version 7.4 (Muthen and Muthen, 1998-2015). The CFA serves different purposes for the independent and dependent variables; items for the independent variables are derived largely from established scales, however the constructs may be highly correlated, therefore the CFA is to check whether these constructs should indeed be considered separately. On the other hand, items for the dependent variables’ scales were developed for this study and are thus not validated. Further, principle component analysis has reduced the number of factors and the CFA is to ensure that these factor loadings are correct and the items best fit their respective scales. Accordingly, separate series of CFA are conducted for the dependent and independent variables.

The proposed two-factor model of affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR yielded a borderline acceptable fit to the data $\chi^2(118) = 394.204, p = .001$, comparative fit index (CFI) = .735, standardised root mean square residual (SRMR) = .103, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .122. However, simplification of the model to a single factor for the Harman test (Harman, 1967) produced an inferior fit to the data, $\Delta \chi^2(1) = 147.111, p = .001$, CFI = .595, SRMR = .13, RMSEA = .150. Fitting to a three-factor model
### Table 6.1: Principle component analysis of eCSR scales

| CP1: I have made suggestions for how the organisation could better help the community. | Component 1 | Component 2 | Component 3 |
| CP3: I have put forward ideas for the organisation to be more environmentally friendly. | .536 | .483 | -.121 |
| CP4: I have made suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my supervisor. | .792 | -.03 | .117 |
| CP5: I have suggested different charity partners to my organisation. | .819 | .139 | -.037 |
| CP6: I tell my supervisor about ideas I have that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste. | .654 | .195 | .090 |
| CP8: I have told upper management about my ideas that the organisation could use to help the community. | .774 | .203 | -.172 |
| CP9: I have made suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts through organisational surveys/suggestion boxes. | .691 | .056 | -.086 |
| CP10: I have raised suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my colleagues. | .741 | .186 | -.068 |
| CP11: I tell my upper management about ideas I have that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste. | .758 | .045 | -.089 |
| AP1: I encourage my co-workers to participate in charity events run by the organisation. | .155 | .693 | .237 |
| AP2: I tell my friends and family about good things the organisation does for society. | .062 | .713 | .142 |
| AP3: I give feedback about positive things the organisation does for society to my supervisor. | .337 | .659 | .122 |
| AP5: I let senior members of the organisation know when I am proud of the organisation’s CSR initiatives. | .300 | .644 | .171 |
| AP7: I voluntarily represent my organisation at charity events (e.g., wear t-shirts with the organisation’s logo). | .105 | .644 | .039 |
| AP8: I make sure I read memos and e-mails about the organisation’s CSR policy. | -.013 | .686 | .200 |
| AP9: I attend non-mandatory meetings about the organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility activities. | .174 | .585 | -.029 |
| AP10: I donate to causes that the organisation promotes e.g., food drives, Christmas appeals. | -.045 | .588 | .162 |
| AP4: I use recycling bins at work. | -.220 | .182 | .513 |
| AP6: I encourage my colleagues to be environmentally conscious at work (e.g., use recycling bins, don’t print unnecessarily). | .396 | .003 | .681 |
| CP2: I don’t print unless it is necessary. | -.142 | .034 | .665 |
| CP7: I do little things e.g., turn off my computer when I leave for the day; that help the environment. | -.026 | .186 | .581 |
| CP12: I have raised suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my colleagues. | -.035 | .155 | .466 |
also failed to produce a superior model $\Delta \chi^2(0) = 53.294$, $p = .001$, CFI = .684, SRMR = .127, RMSEA = .133. Therefore, for the exploratory purposes of this chapter, a two-factor model is accepted, though results will be interpreted with appropriate caution.

### Table 6.2: Confirmatory factor analysis of eCSR scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed 2-factor model</td>
<td>394.204**</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-factor model (AP7,9,10 included in CP)</td>
<td>447.498***</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53.294***</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor model (Harman Test)</td>
<td>541.315***</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>147.111***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

The proposed nine-factor model of perceived organisational support (POS), perceived supervisory support (PSS), authentic organisational communication, employee commitment, employee autonomy, organisational readiness for change, self-efficacy, organisational trust and organisational justice yielded a substandard fit to the data $\chi^2(712) = 3964.763$, $p = .001$, CFI = .756, SRMR = .09, RMSEA = .084. Simplification of the model to an eight-factor model, combining organisational trust and justice, two variables that are highly correlated in the literature (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen, 2002) produced a significantly superior fit to the data, $\Delta \chi^2(68) = -2466.255$, $p = .001$, CFI = .753, SRMR = .095, RMSEA = .084.

Further simplification to a seven-factor model, while better than the proposed nine-factor model $\Delta \chi^2(61) = -2418.331$, $p = .001$, CFI = .740, SRMR = .096, RMSEA = .085, did not yield a better fit to the data than the eight-factor model. Similar results were found for the Harman test (Harman, 1967) $\Delta \chi^2(40) = 1879.209$, $p = .001$, CFI = .578, SRMR = .100, RMSEA = .107. Therefore, an eight factor model, while not a good fit, is the best fit for the data. Accordingly, the results of the exploratory analysis of challenging/prohibitive eCSR will not interpret trust and justice as separate constructs.

### Table 6.3: Confirmatory factor analysis of predictor variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed 9-factor model</td>
<td>3964.763***</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-factor model - trust and justice combined</td>
<td>1498.508***</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>-2466.255***</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-factor model - trust and justice combined; POS and PSS combined</td>
<td>1546.432***</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>-2418.331***</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor model (Harman Test)</td>
<td>2085.554***</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>-1879.209***</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001
6.3 Affiliative/Promotive eCSR

This section quantitatively explores affiliative/promotive eCSR, employee engagement in socially responsible behaviour that is endorsed by the organisation. The qualitative results indicated that corporate volunteering was a common method of engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR. This was echoed in the quantitative sample, with 81.7% of respondents indicating that they had participated in an activity organised by their organisation in the prior twelve months. In terms of frequency, 38.1% of participants reported that they had participated once in the past year, while 28.9% reported engaging 2-3 times. Frequency was similar for workplace giving, with 29.4% of participants stating that they had engaged once in the past year and 25.4% 2-3 times, though a larger percentage (33.3%) reported that they had not engaged at all. Finally, 35.1% of participants had participated in workplace fundraising once in the prior year, and 32.4% had engaged 2-3 times. These results indicate that affiliative/promotive eCSR is a common way employees engage in socially responsible behaviour at work.

6.3.1 Antecedents of Affiliative/Promotive eCSR

The first set of analyses examine the predictors of affiliative/promotive eCSR. Chapter 3 proposed that there will be a positive relationship between perceived organisational support (POS), perceived supervisor support (PSS), authentic organisational communication, and affiliative/promotive eCSR. In addition, I proposed that these relationships would be moderated by employee commitment. I controlled for gender and participants having a job role in the CSR function, as the qualitative results indicated that occupying such a role may negatively affect engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. In the first step, the control variables were included. These accounted for a small but significant amount of variance in affiliative/promotive eCSR ($F(2,156) = 12.081, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .134, (Role in CSR $\beta = .259, p < .001$; Gender $\beta = .308, p < .001$). It is interesting to note that the relationship between having a role in the CSR function and affiliative/promotive eCSR is positive, contrary to what was indicated in the qualitative results.

Next, POS, PSS, authentic organisational communication and employee commitment were included into the model. This model accounted for a higher and more significant amount of variance in affiliative/promotive eCSR ($F(4,152) = 28.766, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .507. POS was significantly and positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR ($\beta = .137, p < .05$), PSS was negatively but non-significantly related ($\beta = -.144, ns$), and authentic organisational communication was significantly and positively related ($\beta = .564, p < .001$). Finally, employee commitment was positively and significantly related ($\beta = .137, p < .05$).

In the third step, the interaction terms were included in the model. The interaction terms did not account for a large or significant amount of the variance in affiliative/promotive
eCSR \((F(3,149) = .315, \text{ ns})\) with an \(R^2\) of .302, (POS and commitment \(\beta = .009, \text{ ns}\); PSS and commitment \(\beta = -.023, \text{ ns}\); communication and commitment \(\beta = -.047, \text{ ns}\)). Therefore, female gender and one’s role being in the CSR function of the organisation are both positively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR. In addition, the results show some support for perceived organisational support and strong support for authentic organisational communication as predictors of affiliative/promotive eCSR, but no support for perceived supervisor support as a predictor. Finally, while employee commitment was significantly related to affiliative/promotive eCSR, but the interaction terms did not, thus the moderation hypothesis is not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4: Antecedents of affiliative/promotive eCSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable: Affiliative/promotive eCSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in CSR function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organisational support (POS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisor support (PSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic organisational communication (COM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS x employee commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS x employee commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM x employee commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta \text{ in } R^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(* p < .05. \quad ** p < .01. \quad *** p < .001\)

Given the slightly suboptimal reliability for employee commitment \((\alpha = .666)\), I conducted additional regression analyses with affective commitment (a subscale of employee commitment), which had an acceptable reliability \((\alpha = .777)\), in place of employee commitment. Similar to the prior analyses, the first model showed that gender and role in the CSR function of the organisation accounted for a significant amount of variance in affiliative/promotive eCSR \((F(2,151) = 11.529, p < .001, R^2 = .132)\, (Role in CSR \(\beta = .261, p < .001\); Gender \(\beta = .313, p < .001)\). The second model introduced POS, PSS, authentic organisational communication and affective commitment \((F(4,147) = 28.726, p < .001, R^2 = .513)\). As in the above model, POS accounted for a significant amount of variance \((\beta = .189, p < .05)\), as did authentic organisational communication \((\beta = .548, p < .001)\), while supervisory support did not \((\beta = -.118, \text{ ns})\). While employee commitment was significantly related to affiliative/promotive eCSR in the above model, the same relationship was not found for affective commitment \((\beta = .042, \text{ ns})\).

The third model introduced the interaction terms. In this model POS remained significant \((\beta = .211, p < .05)\), as did authentic organisational communication \((\beta = .537, p <
.001), and PSS and affective commitment remained insignificant (PSS $\beta = -.130$, ns; Affective commitment $\beta = .048$, ns). As with the prior model, none of the interaction terms were significant (POS and affective commitment $\beta = .070$, ns; PSS and affective commitment $\beta = .000$, ns; communication and affective commitment $\beta = -.059$, ns).

Therefore, substituting overall employee commitment with affective employee commitment did not substantially change the results. The only point of difference was, when affective commitment was used, the support for POS as a predictor of affiliative/promotive eCSR.

Table 6.5: Antecedents of affiliative/promotive eCSR (with affective commitment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable: Affiliative/promotive eCSR</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in CSR function</td>
<td>.261***</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.225***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.313***</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>.154*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organisational support (POS)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.211*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisor support (PSS)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic organisational communication (COM)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.548***</td>
<td>.537***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective employee commitment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS x affective employee commitment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS x affective employee commitment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM x affective employee commitment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ in $R^2$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ change</td>
<td>11.529***</td>
<td>28.726***</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>(2,151)</td>
<td>(4,147)</td>
<td>(3,144)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

6.4 Challenging/Promotive

This section presents analyses of the proposed antecedents of challenging/promotive eCSR, eCSR that is engaged in independently of the organisation’s CSR actions and strategy. I proposed that autonomy, organisational readiness for change and employee autonomy would be positively related to challenging/promotive eCSR, and these relationships will be moderated by the employee’s self-efficacy. In addition, Chapter 3 proposed that the antecedents build on each other; the organisation-level antecedents represent support factors for each behaviour and the individual-level factors represent a spectrum of employee resilience. Accordingly, this section presents hierarchical linear regression of the antecedents proposed to predict affiliative/promotive eCSR (perceived organisational support (POS), perceived supervisory support (PSS) and authentic organisational communication and employee commitment) in addition to the antecedents specific to challenging/promotive eCSR.
Chapter 6. Quantitative Results

The first model introduced the control variables of role in CSR function and gender. This model accounted for a significant amount of variance in challenging/promotive eCSR ($F(2,198) = 12.799, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .114, though this variance was accounted for by role in CSR function ($\beta = .317, p < .001$) rather than gender ($\beta = -.071, \text{ns}$). The qualitative results indicated that while participants of both genders had CSR-related ideas and suggestions, males were slightly more likely to make them than females. While these results indicate that males are more likely to engage in challenging/promotive eCSR, they are not significantly more likely.

Next, the antecedents, namely POS, PSS, authentic organisational communication, employee commitment, autonomy, organisational readiness for change and self-efficacy, were introduced. This model did not account for significantly more variance than the prior model ($F(7,191) = 1.878, \text{ns}$) with an $R^2$ of .172. The third model introduces the interaction terms and, once again, the results are non-significant ($F(2,189) = 2.377, \text{ns}$) with an $R^2$ of .192.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role in CSR function</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organisational support (POS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisor support (PSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic organisational communication (COM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational readiness for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy x self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational readiness for change x self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ in $R^2$</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ change</td>
<td>12.799***</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>2.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>(2,198)</td>
<td>(7,191)</td>
<td>(2,189)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Antecedents of challenging/promotive eCSR

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001

6.5 Employee Values as Predictors of eCSR

The qualitative results indicated that personal values underpinned many employees’ decision-making processes related to eCSR. Therefore, this section presents exploratory analyses of the role of Schwartz et al.’s (2001) basic human values in predicting affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR.

The first analyses hold affiliative/promotive eCSR as the dependent variable. As per the rest of the analyses in this chapter, the first model introduces the control variables of role
in CSR function and gender. This model accounts for a significant amount of variance in affiliative/promotive eCSR ($F(2,123) = 8.609, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .123, (Role in CSR $\beta = .261, p < .01$; Gender $\beta = .183, p < .001$). The second model introduces the ten basic human values. This model does not account for a significantly greater amount of variance than the first model ($F(9,114) = 1.045, \text{ns}$) with an $R^2$ of .190. Interestingly, the value of benevolence was significantly related to affiliative/promotive eCSR ($\beta = .183, p < .05$).

![Table 6.7: Employee values as antecedents of affiliative/promotive eCSR](image)

Next, the role of values on challenging/promotive eCSR is explored. The first model introduces the control variables of role in CSR function and gender. This model accounts for a significant amount of variance in challenging/promotive eCSR ($F(2,122) = 8.898, p < .001$) with an $R^2$ of .127, though once again this variance was accounted for by role in CSR function ($\beta = .329, p < .001$) rather than gender ($\beta = -.079, \text{ns}$). The second model introduces the basic values. This model does not account for a significantly greater amount of variance in challenging/promotive eCSR ($F(9,113) = 1.156, \text{ns}$) with an $R^2$ of .201.

In sum, these analyses fail to provide support for basic human values predicting engagement in eCSR.

### 6.6 Challenging/Prohibitive

This section presents analyses of challenging/prohibitive eCSR, behaviour that an employee engages in to halt socially irresponsible behaviour enacted by or within the organisation.
Chapter 6. Quantitative Results

### Table 6.8: Employee values as antecedents of challenging/promotive eCSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role in CSR function</td>
<td>.329***</td>
<td>.325***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement - my own success</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security - safety, harmony and stability of society, relationships and self</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction - my independent thoughts and actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation - excitement, novelty and challenge in life</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition - respect of the customs and ideas of my personal context (organisation, beliefs and values, colleagues)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence - preservation and enhancement of the welfare of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power - social status and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism - understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for all</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism - my own enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity - maintenance of social norms</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ change</td>
<td>8.898***</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>(2,122)</td>
<td>(9,113)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

As challenging/prohibitive eCSR is quite theoretically different to affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR, the analysis presented in this thesis is exploratory in nature. Accordingly, I explored the direct effects of organisational justice and organisational trust on one specific type of challenging/prohibitive behaviour: reporting to outside authorities. In addition, as only 13.9% of respondents reported that they had encountered illegal or unethical behaviour occurring within the organisation, and only half of those took any action against it, the analysis is conducted using responses from respondents who believe they would have reported to outside authorities if they were to encounter unethical or illegal behaviour.

I proposed that organisational justice and organisational trust would positively be related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR, moderated by an employee’s level of conformity. As this is an exploratory analysis, only the direct effects of organisational justice and organisational trust are considered. Chapter 3 conceptualised the organisation-level antecedents of the different types of eCSR as a spectrum of support factors, and that challenging/prohibitive eCSR was more likely to occur in the absence of these support factors. Therefore, the antecedents of affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR are included in the analysis, with the expectation that these antecedents will be negatively related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR.

The control variables of role in CSR function and gender are introduced in the first model. These variables account for a significant amount of variance in challenging/prohibitive eCSR.
eCSR ($F(2,165) = 3.151, p < .05$) with an $R^2$ of .037. Role in CSR function was positive and significant ($\beta = .177, p < .05$), while gender was negatively related and insignificant ($\beta = -.049, \text{ns}$), indicated that males are slightly but not significantly more likely than females to report socially irresponsible behaviour to outside authorities. The second model introduces the antecedents. This model does not account for a significantly greater amount of variance than the first model ($F(9,156) = .610, \text{ns}$). As anticipated, some of the organisational support factors were negatively related to challenging/prohibitive eCSR, such as perceived supervisory support ($\beta = -.196$) and autonomy ($\beta = -.127$), however, none were significant.

### Table 6.9: Antecedents of challenging/prohibitive eCSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role in CSR function</td>
<td>.177†</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organisational support (POS)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisor support (PSS)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic organisational communication (COM)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee commitment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational readiness for change</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational trust</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational justice</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ in $R^2$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ change</td>
<td>3.151†</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>(2,165)</td>
<td>(9,156)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

### 6.7 Discussion

The quantitative component of this thesis is very much exploratory and results will be interpreted with that in mind. With regard to affiliative/promotive eCSR, some support was found for gender as a predictor, specifically that female respondents were more likely to score highly on the affiliative/promotive scale. A stronger relationship was found for role in CSR function predicting affiliative/promotive eCSR. Though this relationship contradicts the findings of the qualitative results which indicated that role in CSR function was negatively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR, the finding that it is positively related is more in line with expectations. Operating in the CSR function of the organisation is likely to increase awareness of the organisation’s CSR initiatives, and it is not unreasonable to expect that an employee working in the CSR function has greater interest in CSR than the average employee, which would increase the likelihood of engagement, as indicated.

Some support was found for perceived organisational support as a predictor of affiliative/promotive eCSR, though the significance of the relationship did not hold when the
interaction terms were introduced to the model. Strong support was found for authentic organisational communication. This supports the findings of the qualitative results and some results in the literature that the organisation’s communication creates greater awareness of and engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR opportunities (Chong, 2009). Generalising from these results must be mindful of the scale; the scale for authentic organizational communication was created for this study and, while forming acceptable reliability, is not validated. However, preliminary promise regarding organisational communication as an antecedent of employee engagement in organisationally-endorsed CSR initiatives is shown.

Employee commitment was significantly related to affiliative/promotive eCSR in both model two and three. Employee commitment is a well-explored outcome of organisational CSR (Glavas and Kelley, 2014; Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007; Mueller et al., 2012), therefore it is interesting to note that this commitment may predict employee engagement in CSR. Future examination of the role of employee commitment in CSR should consider the direction of the relationship, for example, whether organisational commitment resulting from organisational CSR leads to employee engagement in CSR and whether employee commitment as a result of other organisational factors also predicts eCSR engagement. However, the moderation relationships proposed in Chapter 3 did not hold, indicating that employee commitment is an independent predictor of affiliative/promotive eCSR rather than an enhancing factor.

Though insignificant, the negative relationship between supervisory support and affiliative/promotive eCSR could be explained by the employee choosing to engage in behaviors directly targeted the supervisor, such as prosocial organizational behavior or organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000), rather than affiliative/promotive eCSR. As affiliative/promotive eCSR delivers benefit to the organization more than the supervisor, an employee seeking to reciprocate PSS may choose to engage in behavior directly targeted at the supervisor, at the opportunity cost of affiliative/promotive eCSR.

Repeating the analysis with affective commitment in place of general employee commitment did not net particularly different results. Specifically, the only real difference is that perceived organisational support remained significant in both models two and three. This is somewhat interesting as explorations of employee commitment in CSR have focused on affective commitment. For example Brammer, Millington, and Rayton (2007) and Mueller et al. (2012) found that employee perceptions of CSR positively affected their affective commitment. Again, the quantitative analysis presented here is very exploratory, however, it is plausible that organisational commitment as a predictor of eCSR is underpinned by different mechanisms than organisational commitment as an outcome of organisational CSR. As mentioned above, future examination should consider the directions of the relationships.

In terms of challenging/promotive and challenging/prohibitive eCSR, none of the relationships proposed in Chapter 3 held. As a result, the proposition that the organisational
antecedents are a continuum of support factors that build upon each other is not supported. Instead it seems, as supported by the qualitative results, that more complex mechanisms are at play relating to organisational context, personal context and values, and the type of eCSR. Chapter 7 will discuss in further detail.

Finally, exploration of basic values as antecedents of affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR also failed to produce many significant results. Benevolence was positively, significantly related to affiliative/promotive eCSR, but not challenging/promotive eCSR. Despite the lack of statistical significance, it is interesting to note the negative relationships between some of the values. For example, self-direction, a desire for power, and hedonism, values one would reasonably expect to be negatively related to behaviour intended to benefit external parties, are all quite negatively related to affiliative/promotive eCSR. Similarly, a desire for security and hedonism were negatively but insignificantly related to challenging/promotive eCSR. As these relationships were insignificant, very little confidence can be placed in them, but when paired with the substantial role that qualitative participants stated that their values played in determining their eCSR, it is difficult to completely dismiss the role of values. An important avenue for future study will be exploring and refining the types of values that are significant to eCSR so that quantitative analysis can reliably examine the relationships.

6.8 Summary

This chapter has presented a quantitatively exploration of the relationships between the antecedents of eCSR proposed in Chapter 3, as well as some themes identified in the qualitative chapter, namely the prevalence of corporate volunteering and the role of values in predicting eCSR engagement. Results suggest support for organisational factors, namely perceived organisational support, authentic organisational communication and employee commitment predicting affiliative/promotive eCSR, but no support for any of the other proposed antecedents for their respective types of eCSR. The implications of these findings, in conjunction with the qualitative findings, for the theoretical model proposed in this thesis and for micro-level CSR research are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 7

Discussion

This thesis has put forward and empirically explored a theoretical framework of eCSR, that is, behaviours employees engage in with the intention of benefiting the environment or society. The following chapter discusses these findings and their implications for the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter 3, as well as CSR theory and practice.

7.1 Discussion of Findings

This section will discuss the overall findings of this thesis in relation to the behaviours that employees engage in and their reasons for engagement, and the implications of these findings for the proposed theoretical framework.

7.1.1 Employee CSR Behaviour

This research represents one of the first empirical and exploratory explorations of how employees engage in CSR behaviour themselves, as opposed to their attitudes and reactions towards organisational CSR (Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015; Gond et al., 2017). I find several behaviours that employees engage in, such as corporate volunteering, in-role behaviour, suggestion-making and implementation of ideas, which are extensively discussed in Chapter 5. These behaviours require different levels of effort from the employee, for example, engaging in in-role behaviour, while meaningful for the employee, does not require as much effort as conceptualising and implementing a socially responsible idea. As such, this section will focus on the way in which these different behaviours are engaged and the role of organisational and individual context in determining how employees engage in CSR.

The finding that employees employ embedded and peripheral CSR strategies in a similar way that organisations do has substantial implications for the way in which they engage in eCSR (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012). This is evidenced in the different types of eCSR engagement between corporate and not-for-profit (NFP) participants in the qualitative sample; corporate participants engaged primarily through the organisation’s CSR programs (affiliative/promotive eCSR) while NFP participants primarily engaged through in-role eCSR.
Further emphasising the effect of organisational context on eCSR engagement, most acts of challenging/promotive eCSR reported in both the corporate and NFP samples were directed at the environment, while the organisations’ efforts were directed towards the social dimension of CSR.

The role of organisational context has been explored in micro-CSR literature examining employee reactions to CSR. For example, Collier and Esteban (2007) found that employees were more likely to react positively (in the form of increased organisational commitment) to their organisation’s CSR if the CSR strategy fit with the organisation’s values. Similarly, McShane and Cunningham (2012) find that employees determine the authenticity of organisational CSR by analysing how well the organisation’s CSR image fits with their perception of its true image, and that authentic CSR can lead to positive employee outcomes such as organisational identification. On the other hand, if the employee does not view the organisation’s CSR is genuine or worthwhile, they are unlikely to respond in any positive way to it (McShane and Cunningham, 2012; Laufer, 2003; Frankental, 2001). In terms of participation, Bingham et al. (2013) propose that employees are more likely to participate in organisation-sponsored CSR if they feel their organisation is genuinely committed to the cause. Thus, it makes sense in light of the literature that the results of the present study point towards the type of eCSR and the target of eCSR being influenced by the organisational context. These findings build on the existing literature by indicating that the organisational context not only influences how employees react to CSR, but also how they engage in it.

Another interesting finding is the role that job context plays, specifically that affiliative/promotive eCSR can be used to compensate for the employee’s perceived lack of social responsibility within their role. The role of job context has received some exploration in the literature; Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen (2015) put forward that employee attitudes to CSR depend on the employee’s balance of their developmental (job), ideological and economic needs, while Glavas (2016[b]) found that CSR and particularly in-role CSR, allowed employees to embody more of their whole selves at work and thus resulted in greater employee (general) engagement. In the present study, corporate participants did not feel that they had many opportunities to engage in CSR within their role, therefore corporate volunteering, a type of affiliative/promotive eCSR, was the most common method of engagement in this sample and several participants felt that the volunteering compensated for their lack of in-role eCSR. Non-profit participants, on the other hand, felt that their job itself was a form of eCSR and, in addition to being presented with less opportunities to engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR, considered the fit of the opportunities with their role and the organisation’s mission moreso when making their decision to engage. Therefore, it appears that job context affects engagement in CSR in that employees are more likely to pursue CSR acts that enable them to fulfil their personal needs at work.

Building upon the notion of employees engaging in CSR in order to fulfil their needs is the finding that, though the most common way for employees to engage in CSR were acts
that aligned with the organisation’s CSR strategy (volunteering for the corporate sample and in-role behaviour for the NFP sample), independent eCSR was directed towards areas where the employee perceived deficiencies in the organisation’s CSR efforts. Specifically, participants from both samples engaged in primarily environmentally-directed challenging/promotive eCSR and expressed frustration with their organisation’s lack of environmental action. This adds credence to the various proposed spectrums of employee attitudes to CSR, such as Hemingway’s (2005) assertion that employees can be active or frustrated social entrepreneurs, depending on the level of support felt in the organisational culture.

The finding that these frustrations may result in eCSR is a significant one with promising implications for fostering employee innovation, though it leads to questions for future research such the effect of employee frustrations on other outcomes such as commitment, satisfaction and performance.

Despite there being quite a substantial body of literature on social irresponsibility, incidents of challenging/prohibitive behaviour were quite rare in both the quantitative and qualitative results. In the qualitative sample, participants reported engaging in challenging/prohibitive behaviour mostly against actions by colleagues that affected intra-organisational stakeholders, rather than organisational actions that had larger impacts on society or the environment. This reflects what CSR means to employees; while organisation-level CSR affects a broad range of stakeholders, employees appear to be concerned with a much narrower range of stakeholders. This is illustrated in research that examines the role of social exchange mechanisms in determining employee reactions to CSR, finding that employees’ reactions are affected more by organisation/employee exchange relationships than the organisation’s relationships with other stakeholders (El Akremi et al., 2015; Gond et al., 2017). This is also reflected in the growing body of literature that uses justice as a framework for explaining employee reactions to CSR which suggests that employees reactions to CSR reflect their observations of justice in the organisation (Rupp et al., 2006; Rupp et al., 2013).

In sum, there are many different ways in which employees engage in CSR, and these different behaviours fit into a spectrum of effort required of employees in order to engage in them, as suggested by the theoretical framework put forward in Chapter 3. Another key finding is the role of job and organisational context in determining which behaviours an employee engages in. Specifically, the findings suggest that employees engage in CSR behaviour in order to satisfy their personal needs, specifically needs related to social responsibility. Employees that were unable to fulfil their socially responsible needs through their role were significantly more likely to engage in the affiliative/promotive activities the organisation offered, while participants that were able to fulfil their socially responsible needs through their role evaluated additional CSR opportunities with regard to the needs participating would fulfil, such as the building of interpersonal relationships or career development. These findings regarding the way in which employees engage in CSR indicate some compatibility between frameworks of employee responses to CSR and the proposed
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framework of eCSR. These will be discussed further in the Implications for the Theoretical Framework section, below.

7.1.2 Antecedents of Employee CSR Behaviour

Several antecedents of eCSR were identified in the qualitative results and some were tested in the quantitative section. A very prominent finding in the qualitative results was the role of personal values. To elaborate, participants indicated that their socially responsible values were instilled quite early in life, through their education, family and religious contexts. In turn, these values naturally affected which CSR causes resonated with them, thus affecting whether or not they chose to engage in eCSR. These values were articulated as very important to the participants, however, they varied in terms of their source (religion, personal experience, family experience) and were not universal or particularly concrete. For example, no participant stated that the value of benevolence or the value of charity was important to them, rather values were described more in terms of their significance to the individual. This may explain why the quantitative examination of the effect of Schwartz et al. (2001) basic human values on affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR did not net any significant results.

Some individual values and traits, such as narcissism (Petrenko et al., 2016) and hubris (Tang et al., 2015) have been proposed to drive the CSR engagement of executives, but prevent engagement of lower-level employees (Garavan et al., 2010). Identity, and particularly organisational identification, on the other hand, are well-explored as reactions and mechanisms for explaining employee reactions to CSR (De Roeck and Delobbe, 2012; Jones, 2010; Kim et al., 2010; Farooq et al., 2014). However, identification has primarily been examined as a result of the self-esteem employees draw from working for an organisation that is prestigious in terms of CSR (Gond et al., 2017). As an exception, Grant (2012) proposes that employee need for external recognition drives employee participation in volunteering as it allows for the development of a volunteer identity which can compensate for poor social enrichment within one’s role.

Further to this line of argument, Davies and Crane (2010) found that it was not simply holding values that predicted employees’ ‘buy in’ with regard to CSR, but the fit of the organisation’s values with theirs. This adds to the arguments presented in the previous section that organisational and job context affect employee engagement in eCSR; it is not simply having particular values or working for a particular organisation, it is how these factors interact with one’s context. Therefore, the present results contribute to the literature examining the role of identity in micro-level CSR research as they indicate that it is not just the fit between organisational and social identity broadly that affects engagement in CSR, but a more complex interaction between the CSR opportunity, the employee’s social identity, and their job and organisational context.
Support was found in both the qualitative and quantitative results for some organisational antecedents of eCSR. As anticipated, perceived organisational support predicted engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR. However, despite some participants in the qualitative sample mentioning that supportive supervisors facilitated their engagement, perceived supervisory support did not predict affiliative/promotive or challenging/promotive eCSR in the quantitative analysis. This is somewhat surprising in light of recent literature that emphasises the role of leadership in predicting employee attitudes towards CSR and employee engagement in green behaviour (Graves, Sarkis, and Zhu, 2013; Groves and LaRocca, 2011; Kim et al., 2014; Mallory and Rupp, 2014). It may be that, as Chen and Hung-Baesecke (2014) found, CSR-specific leader behaviours such as leading by example and advocacy are more likely to motivate eCSR engagement and general supervisory support, while a facilitator for eCSR by reducing barriers to participation, is more likely to be reciprocated in prosocial or employee performance behaviour (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Strong results were found in the quantitative analysis for authentic organisational communication as a predictor of affiliative/promotive eCSR. The importance of CSR communication is established in the literature (Chong, 2009), however, in light of the qualitative results, it appears that it facilitates eCSR of already willing employees rather than creating motivation. Similarly, while employee commitment is a prominent outcome of organisational CSR (Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007; Mueller et al., 2012; Glavas and Kelley, 2014), and support was found in the quantitative results for commitment as a predictor of affiliative/promotive eCSR, commitment to the organisation is unlikely to induce an employee to engage in eCSR that does not fulfil other needs at work.

In sum, the results of the qualitative and quantitative analysis point towards a prominent relationship between person-centric factors and motivation and engagement in eCSR. While organisational factors certainly facilitate eCSR engagement, they are not enough to create motivation alone. Rather, it seems that employees evaluate CSR opportunities based on the needs they fulfil, with each individual’s needs depending on their personal values, job context, and organisational context. Further, organisational factors seem to mainly predict engagement in affiliative/promotive eCSR. It is important to note that none of the organisational or individual factors proposed in Chapter 3 to predict challenging/promotive and challenging/prohibitive eCSR were supported in the quantitative results. Though one must be mindful of the exploratory nature of the quantitative analysis and thus the inherent limitations of this analysis, the prominence of other factors combined with the lack of support highlight some critical improvements that can be made to the theoretical framework of eCSR. Accordingly, the implications of these findings for the theoretical framework will now be discussed.

7.1.3 Implications for the Theoretical Framework

Chapter 3 put forward two main theoretical assertions; first, that employees can engage in a range of CSR behaviours, and these behaviours fall on a spectrum of effort the employee has
to exert to engage in them and the potential resistance they may face from the organisation and, second, that these behaviours are predicted by organisational support factors, moderated by individual-level employee factors. General support is found for the first theoretical proposition (a spectrum of eCSR), and mixed support is found for the model of antecedents. The implications of these findings for the theoretical frameworks will now be discussed.

As mentioned, the proposition that employees engage in a range of eCSR, and that these behaviours can be categorised into a spectrum based upon the level they require and resistance they encounter is supported. In-role eCSR was not explored in the quantitative aspect of this thesis, however, given the growing prominence of employees in CSR (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Gond et al., 2017) and the fact that other conceptualisations of employee CSR attitudes and behaviours often take an in-role perspective (Ones and Dilchert, 2012), I believe it is a valuable component of the spectrum. The qualitative findings offer some opportunities to refine the boundaries of in-role eCSR. As clear affiliative/promotive CSR initiatives such as corporate volunteering and workplace giving were prominent in both the qualitative and quantitative results, some behaviours I conceptualised as affiliative/promotive eCSR, in reality fit better with in-role eCSR. For example, many participants in both the NFP and corporate samples mentioned sitting on CSR-related committees which I conceptualised as affiliative/promotive eCSR. However, the participants, while acknowledging it as CSR behaviour, indicated that it was something they engaged in through their role and considered it quite differently to participating in things like the volunteering days.

Accordingly, the link between affiliative/promotive eCSR and organisational context is clarified. Specifically, how employees engage in affiliative/promotive eCSR depends on the opportunities that employees are given by the organisation. While some employees will seek out or engage more deeply opportunities that the organisation offers (Hemingway, 2005; Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008; Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015), as seen with corporate participants’ different levels of volunteering engagement, for example; most employees will engage with the opportunities that the organisation emphasises. Therefore, a useful way to empirically examine affiliative/promotive eCSR in the future may be to first get participants to the organisation’s CSR activities, then ask them to assess their levels of engagement, such as frequency of participation. These lists of CSR activities can then be compared with organisational CSR information (i.e., what the organisation actually offers) as well as across participants.

Challenging/promotive eCSR, as theorised, primarily involved implementing small ideas and making socially responsible suggestions to the organisation. Interestingly, the small, mainly environment-focused actions such as recycling and encouraging others to recycle did not form an acceptable scale with the suggestion-focused items. Future research should undertake further empirical testing of the challenging/promotive eCSR scale to determine how these behaviours fit together. For example, perhaps challenging/promotive eCSR needs
to be divided into green behaviours (Norton et al., 2015) and CSR suggestion making. However, the organisational context, namely low environmental performance, seems to drive employees to engage in these types of behaviours, thus organisational context will need to be factored into future empirical examination.

Despite the relative prominence in the literature on major organisational acts of corporate social irresponsibility (Hemingway, 2005), very few participants had actually observed this kind of behaviour, and the few that reported engaging in challenging/prohibitive eCSR did so against comparatively minor behaviour, such as breaches of company policy, and these acts were mostly committed by colleagues. This may reflect a number of things, for example, it could merely be contextual; as employees interact more with their colleagues than with the organisation as an entity, they are more likely to encounter socially irresponsible behaviour from colleagues than the organisation. However, it may also reflect how employees conceive of CSR. Employees have been shown to have quite a narrow view of social exchange mechanisms in relation to CSR (El Akremi et al., 2015) in that they typically consider dyadic relationships when evaluating CSR, such as that between the employee and employer or employee and colleagues, thereby excluding external stakeholders that are affected by CSR (Gond et al., 2017). This is also found in examinations of justice and CSR, where employees determine an organisation’s level of justice based upon how the organisation treats them (Rupp et al., 2013). Therefore, it appears that micro-level social irresponsibilities (those of colleagues) are more likely to come to the attention of employees and elicit challenging/prohibitive eCSR. This is an important refinement of the conceptualisation of challenging/prohibitive eCSR, as there is little point having a behaviour in the spectrum that is unlikely to ever be encountered by employees.

With regard to the factors that drive these different types of eCSR, I proposed that the theoretical framework was underpinned by intrinsic motivation. This appears to be true in reality, and the results shed some light onto the mechanisms behind this intrinsic motivation. Firstly, I find that rather than a continuum of support factors as I proposed in Chapter 3, the organisational factors that affect eCSR appear to be largely contextual. Specifically, the qualitative results indicate that employees engage in the acts of affiliative/promotive eCSR that are most promoted by the organisation, and that challenging/promotive eCSR is often targeted towards areas in which the organisation’s CSR strategy is deficient. This is not to say that organisational support factors do not play a role in eCSR, rather that instead of eliciting participation from all employees, they serve as facilitators for already willing employees. For example, having a supportive supervisor makes it easier to engage in eCSR if the employee wants to engage, but does not create an interest or desire to engage.

In addition to the organisational context, the job context is similarly important. Where employees perceived deficiencies in their ability to be socially responsible through their work, they ‘compensated’ with eCSR. Conversely, those that did have a strong sense that
their work was socially responsible were less likely to engage in additional eCSR. This builds upon recent research that posits the desire for meaning is a powerful driver for eCSR (Grant, 2012; Glavas, 2016[b]). The present findings suggest that organisational and job context affect the way and extent to which employees engage in eCSR, such that the employee will engage in CSR to compensate for perceived incongruence between the desired and actual socially responsible activities of their organisation and their role.

Another key finding is that despite eCSR being work-based behaviour, the individual antecedents that drive it are not, as I proposed, work-related. This is interesting in light of the ample research that finds that organisational CSR has positive effects on employee outcomes such as commitment and organisational identification (Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007; Collier and Esteban, 2007; Farooq et al., 2014; De Roeck and Maon, 2016). Therefore, a significant contribution of this research is that the factors that result from organisational CSR do not necessarily predict employee engagement in CSR. Instead, it seems that the individual drivers of eCSR are related to personal values which are central to the employee’s identity, as indicated by the early influences of these values mentioned by participants. These values affect the causes that resonate with the employee and the ‘level’ of social responsibility they require in their organisation and role.

In sum, while organisational support factors and work-related individual factors may facilitate engagement in eCSR by reducing barriers, and can elicit a certain degree of participation, they are unlikely to foster motivation towards eCSR. Instead, it appears that the personal values that affect an employee’s socially responsible orientation - the degree to which they expect and require socially responsible action from their job and organisation - determine whether the employee perceives a deficiency in their organisational or job context that requires them to engage in socially responsible behaviour to ensure that their eCSR fits with their socially responsible values (Grant, 2012). The nature of the interactions between these factors will need to be further explored to confidently put forward a model of specific antecedents and moderation and mediation mechanisms.

### 7.2 Theoretical Implications

In addition to the implications of the findings for the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter 3, mentioned above, these findings have implications for the broader study of micro-level CSR. First, the evidence of a range of different ways that employees engage with and in CSR adds to the growing body of literature that asserts that employees are integral to CSR Rupp et al., 2013; Slack, Corlett, and Morris, 2015. Further, while there has been a significant surge in micro-level CSR research, it has often focused on employee reactions to CSR or engagement in specific types of behaviour. Exploring the range of CSR behaviours employees engage in and investigating the factors that drive employee engagement in the different types of eCSR works towards understanding the difference between
these antecedents and the mechanisms behind employee reactions to organisational CSR, and the interplay between these factors (Gond et al., 2017). In this regard, the findings of this thesis suggest that many of the factors that drive employee engagement in eCSR are different to those that drive employee reactions to CSR.

This has significant implications for future research as it highlights that employees have two roles in relation to CSR: as stakeholders that can be beneficiaries of CSR and deliver benefits (such as employee commitment (Brammer, Millington, and Rayton, 2007; Collier and Esteban, 2007), organisational identification (Farooq et al., 2014; De Roeck and Maon, 2016) and performance (Delmas and Pekovic, 2013)) to the organisation as a result of its CSR, and as stakeholders that enact the organisation’s CSR strategy and actively engage in socially responsible behaviour at work. These two roles are driven by different mechanisms. Therefore, research that examines employees in the CSR context will need to distinguish between the ‘roles’ that employees play to ensure that the two are not conflated.

The results of this research indicate an interactive process between personal, job and organisational factors that drive eCSR. The nature of this interaction will need to be considered carefully. For example, in the extant micro-CSR literature, organisational identification is found to be both an outcome of organisational CSR in and of itself, as well as a mediator of CSR and other employee outcomes (De Roeck and Maon, 2016; Farooq, Rupp, and Farooq, 2016; De Roeck et al., 2014). Similarly, the nature of the relationships between the personal, job and organisational factors that are related to the different types of eCSR will need to be established. For example, do personal values drive the employee to feel a lack of fit between the social responsibility of their job and organisation and their social responsibility desires which leads them to engage in eCSR, or does the lack of fit lead the employee to consult their values to determine how they should address the incongruence, or is it a mix of both depending on the organisational or job context. In line with the assertion of Gond et al. (2017), the boundary conditions of these factors (when and how they affect eCSR) need to be established.

### 7.3 Practical Implications

Given that the roles employees play in relation to CSR is integral to the organisation’s CSR success (Rupp et al., 2006), this research has significant practical implications. First, it sheds light on the array of behaviours that employees engage in that organisations can capitalise on, from small, everyday behaviours such as extending effort to fully utilise the recycling facilities, actively participating and encouraging others to participate in organisational initiatives, to starting entire fundraisers themselves. It also indicates that different factors facilitate different types of eCSR engagement. Specifically, employee engagement in organisational CSR initiatives (affiliative/promotive eCSR) is driven largely by the ease of access...
to participation opportunities. Therefore, if an organisation wants high participation in their particular CSR initiatives, indications are that they should invest their time into clear communication of CSR opportunities and clear articulation of organisational support factors to facilitate and reduce barriers to participation. For example, many participants in the qualitative noticed variation in supervisory support in terms of volunteering; in order to reduce this perceived barrier, the organisation could implement a policy that prevents the supervisor from stopping their employees for engaging, or the organisation could provide supervisors with a clear process or training to ensure that their subordinates feel able to engage.

Challenging/promotive eCSR, however, is often driven by a perceived mismatch between the organisation’s CSR and the employee’s preferred level of CSR. However, it is important to note that frustration can arise in the employee at having to compensate for the organisation’s poor CSR. Therefore, if an organisation wants broader engagement and potentially greater employee outcomes from CSR, they should understand employees’ social responsibility orientations and work to increase fit between CSR opportunities at work and said social responsibility orientations. This will reduce frustrations and facilitate greater eCSR overall. Organisational support factors can be channelled to this end; while it is not feasible for an organisation to shape its CSR strategy around the needs of individual employees, leaders can work to gain an understanding of their subordinates CSR needs and create opportunities and encourage engagement in behaviours that meet these needs.

Finally, while challenging/prohibitive eCSR was explored in a very limited way, it appears that clear internal processes and comfort using these processes is key to resolving any perceived social irresponsibility with minimal damage to the organisation. Therefore, the organisation should ideally have channels that the employee can access with ease and anonymity and the appropriate use of these channels should be regularly communicated, such as through annual competency updates or organisational policy updates.

7.4 Summary

This chapter has discussed the findings of the qualitative and quantitative results in light of the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter 3 and the micro-CSR literature. It is found that employees do, as proposed, engage in a range of CSR behaviours that require varying levels of effort from the employee. Suggestions for refining of the conceptualisations of the different types of behaviours as a result of the findings are put forward. The antecedents of the different types of eCSR differ from the proposed spectrum of organisational support factors and individual-level moderators in that these factors are facilitators more than motivators. Instead, the results point to an interaction between personal, job and organisational factors. Specifically, that eCSR is engaged in when there is a misfit between the employee’s
socially responsible orientation and the CSR opportunities they get through their job, and the organisation’s CSR activities.
Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1 Contribution of the Present Study

This thesis has argued that employee engagement in CSR behaviour is so significantly different to other types of employee behaviour that it should be considered a separate construct. This construct, named employee CSR (eCSR), is defined as employee behaviour, engaged in at work, with the intention of benefiting the environment or society. The basis of the difference between other employee behaviours and eCSR was the socially responsible intention of the behaviour, the external target of the behaviour, and the low chance of positive feedback or reciprocation resulting from the behaviour. Four different categories of eCSR were proposed, in line with the categorisation of extra-role behaviour by Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks (1995). In-role eCSR is socially responsible behaviour that is explicitly expected and mandated by the organisation, such as through one’s job description or particular tasks; affiliative/promotive eCSR is engaging in non-mandatory CSR behaviour that is arranged by the organisation, such as corporate volunteering or joining organisational environmental committees. Challenging/promotive eCSR involves independent, socially responsible acts that are conceptualised and instigated by the employee but are still complementary to the organisation’s CSR approach. Finally, challenging/prohibitive eCSR is employee action against social irresponsibility occurring in the organisational context. This type of behaviour is typically damaging to both the organisation and the employee.

Accordingly, Chapter 3 put forward a framework of different organisation-level antecedents and individual-level moderators. As there is so little knowledge about employee CSR behaviour (rather than attitudes towards or reactions to the organisation’s CSR), this framework was built upon existing employee behaviour literature and theoretical conceptualisation of eCSR, which was explored relative to other types of employee behaviour as well as organisation-level CSR. Therefore, a primary goal of this thesis was to ground the theoretical conceptualisation of eCSR in reality, using qualitative interviews to establish what eCSR is to employees and why they engage in it. Then, quantitative methods were used to test some of the proposed relationships between the proposed antecedents, moderators, and eCSR behaviours, informed by the qualitative results.
Chapter 8. Conclusion

The qualitative results found that, in line with the conceptualisation in Chapter 3, employees do engage in a range of eCSR behaviours that increase in terms of the amount of effort the employee has to exert in order to engage. The qualitative results also found a number of personal, organisational and job factors that affected engagement in eCSR. However, quantitative examination found limited support for the organisational antecedents and individual moderators of eCSR proposed in Chapter 3. Consideration of the qualitative and quantitative results, along with the recent surge of micro-level research indicates that instead of a continuum of organisational support factors, it is an interaction between employees’ socially responsible orientation and the extent to which their job and organisation satisfies their socially responsible needs that drive the type and extent of eCSR. This does not completely dismiss the role of organisational support factors; instead, the findings indicate that organisational support factors facilitate engagement in eCSR rather than motivate it.

Therefore, this thesis makes several contributions. First, it identifies and categorises the range of behaviours that employees engage in with a socially responsible intention. Second, it empirically explored a theoretical model of organisation-level antecedents and individual-level moderators. The results of this exploration indicated that, while organisational factors and work-related individual factors may facilitate engagement in eCSR, the interaction between an employee’s personal values, job context and organisational context determine motivation to engage. Specifically, employees will target their eCSR where they perceive a deficiency in their job or organisation’s social responsibility. This implications of these findings also significantly contribute to micro-CSR literature as they provide early evidence that the factors that affect employee reactions to CSR are different to those that determine employee engagement in eCSR.

8.2 Limitations

As this is one of the first empirical explorations of eCSR and the first examination of the theoretical framework put forward in 3, there are some significant limitations to the present study. Methodologically, the quantitative results are based on a cross-sectional, self-report survey, increasing the risk of self-report bias (Donaldson and Grant-Vallone, 2002). In addition, while validated scales were used to measure established constructs, this was the first empirical test of the scales used to measure the different CSR behaviours. Exploratory factor analysis and internal reliability analysis indicates that affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR are distinct constructs and the items used to measure them fit quite well, however, goodness of fit indices were well below minimum cut-offs. As a result, revision and further validation of the behaviour scales will be required in future work to ensure that the scales, and therefore the findings, are generalisable (DeVellis, 2003). In addition, consideration of the qualitative and quantitative results suggests some adjustments for the way in which the behaviours are conceptualised. While this emphasises the importance
of inductive study when introducing a construct, it does limit the generalisability of the present results.

Several steps were taken to mitigate the potential shortcomings of the quantitative methods, such as using an online platform to administer the survey to reduce the influence of the researcher over the participants answers (Knowles and Nathan, 1997). Items pertaining to different scales were mixed with each other to reduce response biases (Furnham, 1986) and finally, the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods, in addition to suiting the purpose of the thesis, reduces mono-method bias which is common in organisational research (Spector, 2006).

This thesis has focused heavily on affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR. While this has, to a large extent, been guided by the data and particularly the qualitative results, in-role and challenging/prohibitive eCSR have received comparatively less attention. In addition, extensive examination of employee-level outcomes of eCSR were not within the scope of this thesis. Future research will need to further examine the full spectrum of eCSR, as well as the relationships between the different eCSR behaviours and employee outcomes.

8.3 Future Research

The current state of research on micro-level CSR, and particularly the role of employees, represents only the beginning of this important field of research. With regard to this specific thesis, future work will revise the theoretical framework in response to the empirical findings as suggested in the discussion in Chapter 7, validate scales for affiliative/promotive and challenging/promotive eCSR behaviour and develop scales for in-role and challenging/prohibitive eCSR. Further, future research should take a 360-degree approach, utilising the perspective of employees, their supervisors and colleagues to develop a more rigorous, generalisable model of eCSR. The collection of longitudinal data and utilisation of more robust quantitative methods such as structural equation modelling would also facilitate this goal.

The findings of this research with regard to the antecedents of eCSR also provide some direction for future research. Specifically, future research should determine which employee values affect employee engagement in eCSR, as well as how these values interact with organisational and job context. As Gond et al. (2017) emphasise, the conditions under which antecedents affect eCSR is a crucial point for future research.

Finally, now that it is established that employees are actively engaged in the CSR process, future research should explore the outcomes of eCSR. This includes organisation-level
outcomes both inside and outside of the CSR domain, such as whether organisations with high employee CSR engagement have stronger corporate reputation and better CSR outcomes, or whether they perform better on traditional organisational success metrics such as financial performance. It also includes employee-level outcomes, such as satisfaction, commitment, productivity, performance, creativity, and proactivity.
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Appendix A

Interview Schedule

We are looking to explore behaviours that employees engage in at work with the intention of helping the environment and/or broader society. Can you think back, say over the last 12 months about things that you’ve done at work that you hope benefited the environment or broader society?

Prompts: these behaviours can range hugely, from things you have to do as part of your job, non-compulsory things that the organisation wants you to do that you’ve chosen to do, or things that the company doesn’t even know about.

So tell me about [behaviour].

- Is it something you do regularly? Is it compulsory?
- What leads you to do it? Does anything get in your way?
- How does it make you feel when you engage in this behaviour?

[Repeat for all mentioned behaviours].

[[If the above approach is unsuccessful and/or there is not enough information from the participant, then the more structured schedule below can be engaged]].

Tell me about the last time something you did within your specific job role helped improve the environment.

- What was it?
- How - what did you do exactly? What was in your way, what helped you etc.
- Why did you do it?
- What opportunities are you given within your job to help the environment?
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- What about the community, does your job offer you opportunities to help the community?

Tell me about initiatives to help society that the organisation encourages employees to engage in.
- What are they? What do they involve?
- How are you encouraged to participate?
- Which ones do you participate in? Why/why not?
- How do you feel when you participate?

Tell me about things you do at work to help society and/or the environment, that you don’t have to do/aren’t actively encouraged to do (example prompts: maybe you’ve changed the way you do a part of your job so you produce less waste, maybe you turn off the electronics in your office if you know you’re going to be away from your desk for a while, perhaps you’ve made suggestions to your supervisor about more efficient ways of doing things?).
- How do you go about doing these things? Do people around you know that you do them? Does your supervisor?
- Do you encourage others to do similar things?
- How does doing these things make you feel? Are there benefits or consequences for you in engaging in these behaviours?

Can you tell me about a time when you have had to take action about damaging behaviour occurring within the organisation (prompt: this can be reporting colleagues that aren’t doing their job properly, resulting in damage to the environment, or it can be something the organisation is/was doing).
- What action did you take? Why?
- What happened as a result?
- How did you feel about it?

Demographics.
- Age:
- Gender:
- How long have you been in your current position?
- How long have you been with the organisation?
- What previous jobs and organisations/industries have you worked in?
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**eCSR Scale Items**

**Affiliative/Promotive:**

- I encourage my co-workers to participate in charity events run by the organisation
- I tell my friends and family about good things the organisation does for society
- I give feedback about positive things the organisation does for society to my supervisor
- I let senior members of the organisation know when I am proud of the organisation’s CSR initiatives
- I voluntarily represent my organisation at charity events (e.g., wear t-shirts with the organisation’s logo)
- I make sure I read memos and e-mails about the organisation’s CSR policy
- I attend non-mandatory meetings about the organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility activities
- I donate to causes that the organisation promotes e.g., food drives, Christmas appeals

**Excluded items:**

- I use recycling bins at work
- I encourage my colleagues to be environmentally conscious at work (e.g., use recycling bins, don’t print unnecessarily.)

**Challenging/Promotive:**

- I have made suggestions for how the organisation could better help the community
- I have put forward ideas for the organisation to be more environmentally friendly
- I have made suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my supervisor
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- I have suggested different charity partners to my organisation

- I tell my supervisor about ideas I have that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste

- I have told upper management about my ideas that the organisation could use to help the community

- I have raised suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my colleagues

Excluded items:

- I don't print unless it is necessary

- I do little things e.g., turn off my computer when I leave for the day; that help the environment

- I try to use environmentally friendly transport options to get to work
Appendix C

Survey Instrument

C.1 Introduction

Thank you for participating in the employee CSR survey!

My name is Ami Seivwright and I'm currently completing my Ph.D thesis at the University of Western Australia. The thesis explores the concept of employee corporate social responsibility (CSR) - behaviours employees engage in at work that are intended to benefit broader society and/or the environment.

You face no risks to your health, safety or employment by participating in this survey. Your answers will remain completely anonymous and participation is entirely voluntary. You may decline to answer questions you are not comfortable answering and you can withdraw from the study at any time without consequence or explanation, and your data will be discarded if you choose to withdraw. All survey results will be aggregated to ensure that no individual can be identified. Data will be stored offline on one computer, and will only be accessed by the investigator (Ami). The data will be removed from the online host immediately after download by the researchers, and after analysis has been completed, the data will be removed from the one computer it is stored on in accordance with the practices in the Australian Government Information Security Manual (ISM)

Please feel free to email me (ami.seivwright@research.uwa.edu.au) with any questions you may have about this study and/or your participation in it. Alternatively, you can contact my thesis supervisor Professor Paul Flatau at paul.flatau@uwa.edu.au.

Please press the ">>" button if you are happy to proceed.
C.2 In-role

Is your current job role within the corporate social responsibility function of the organisation e.g., community engagement, corporate partnerships, social outreach, sustainability reporting, ethical governance, social impact assessment etc.

- Yes
- No
C.3 Affiliative-promotive

Have you participated in an activity organised by your organisation to help benefit the environment or society?

Examples include:
- **Corporate volunteering**: volunteering in the community through the organisation. Can also be known as employee volunteering or employer supported volunteering.
- **Workplace giving**: donating through work to charity. Often these donations come out of your pre-tax pay and are limited to the organisation’s charity partners.
- **Workplace fundraising**: raising money or donating non-perishables for charity at work through things like morning teas, bake sales, putting spare change in collection tins, donating tinned food to Christmas appeals.
- **Employee match schemes**: when your employer matches your personal donations to charity.

○ Yes
○ No

How frequently do you participate in these types of events?

○ Less than once per year
○ Once per year
○ Twice per year
○ 3-5 times per year
○ More than 5 times per year

Over the last **12 months**, how many times have you participated in the following activities through work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-3 times</th>
<th>4-5 times</th>
<th>More than 5 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee match schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next questions pertain to corporate volunteering specifically. To confirm, have you participated in some form of corporate volunteering in the last 12 months?

- Yes
- No

Approximately how much of your time on average does each engagement in corporate volunteering take?

- An hour or less
- 2-4 hours
- 5-8 hours
- A full day
- More than one full day

Please rank the following factors from (1) most important to (10) least important as motivators for you to participate in corporate volunteering. Drag the items to change their order.

- **Achievement** - my own success
- **Security** - safety, harmony and stability of society, relationships and self
- **Self-direction** - my independent thoughts and actions
- **Stimulation** - excitement, novelty and challenge in life
- **Tradition** - respect of the customs and ideas of my personal context (organisation, beliefs and values, colleagues)
- **Benevolence** - preservation and enhancement of the welfare of others
- **Power** - social status and prestige
- **Universalism** - understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for all
- **Hedonism** - my own enjoyment
- **Conformity** - maintenance of social norms
How many hours in the last **12 months** would you estimate you spend on **all CSR initiatives** such as corporate volunteering, workplace giving, workplace fundraising etc.?

- Less than one hour
- 1-5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 11-20 hours
- 21-50 hours
- More than 50 hours

Are you currently engaged in one or more of these activities (e.g., an ongoing volunteering or fundraising commitment)?

- Yes
- No

How long have you been engaged in this current activity?

- Less than a year
- 1 year
- 2 years
- 3-5 years
- More than 5 years
The following questions ask you about your experiences with activities that benefit the environment or society that your organisation has endorsed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager supports me participating in these activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my co-workers to participate in charity events run by the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell my friends and family about good things the organisation does for society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give feedback about positive things the organisation does for society to my supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive e-mails about causes the organisation is supporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use recycling bins at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let senior members of the organisation know when I am proud of the organisation's CSR initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my colleagues to be environmentally conscious at work (e.g., use recycling bins, don't print unnecessarily.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I voluntarily represent my organisation at charity events (e.g., wear t-shirts with the organisation's logo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see posters or other promotional materials about my organisation's CSR initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive rewards at work if I participate in organisation-sponsored charity causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make sure I read memos and e-mails about the organisation's CSR policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend non-mandatory meetings about the organisation’s Corporate Social Responsibility activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor rewards me for staying up to date with the organisation’s CSR policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation hides the benefits it receives from my efforts towards CSR initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I donate to causes that the organisation promotes e.g., food drives, Christmas appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The causes that the organisation supports align with my values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be more likely to participate in volunteering days if my colleagues were attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages me to participate in things at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has environmentally-friendly facilities (e.g., recycling bins, sensor lights etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is transparent about why it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions ask about your feelings about your experiences with activities that benefit the environment or society that your organisation has endorsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see that I make a difference by participating in these events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy participating in volunteering days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These activities strengthen my sense of belonging to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have fun participating in these events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to support the organisation’s efforts to benefit society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel energised about work after participating in one of these events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my contribution is valuable when participating in these activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my work improves after an event like a volunteering day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering through work makes me want to volunteer in my own time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support more causes personally since getting involved with the organisation's causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues have engaged in further helping after a volunteering event e.g., starting a Foodbank collection after sorting boxes at Foodbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish these events used my skills more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are general questions about your experiences within the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation considers my goals and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a flexible work schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation is genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor considers my goals and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I wanted to leave my organisation now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation deserves my loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation shows very little concern for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation cares about my opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organisation now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel emotionally attached to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions ask about your experiences of the initiatives the organisation has in place to benefit the environment or society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation provides opportunities to benefit the society (e.g., volunteer days, charity morning teas etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my team participate in these opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am too busy to participate in these activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has environmental facilities (e.g., recycling bins, sensor lights etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to give back to my community in my own time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that my organisation gives back to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The causes the organisation supports align with my values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pressured by the organisation to participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager encourages me to participate in these activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to donate to charity personally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is transparent about why it wants employees to participate in CSR initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get e-mails about causes the organisation is supporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to participate in these types of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues pressure me to participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation hides the benefits it receives from employee efforts towards CSR initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are general questions about your experiences within the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation considers my goals and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a flexible work schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation is genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor considers my goals and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I wanted to leave my organisation now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation deserves my loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation shows very little concern for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation cares about my opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organisation now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel emotionally attached to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are about things that you do at work at your own discretion (i.e., not through organisational initiatives or because you have to), with the intention of benefiting the environment or society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have made suggestions for how the organisation could better help the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t print unless it is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer running my ideas by my colleagues before taking them higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are charity partners that I would like my organisation to support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have put forward ideas for the organisation to be more environmentally friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel most comfortable making anonymous suggestions to the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have suggested different charity partners to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is the first person I go to when I have any ideas for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of having my ideas for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tell my supervisor about ideas I have that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do little things e.g., turn off my computer when I leave for the day, that help the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told upper management about my ideas that the organisation could use to help the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts through organisational surveys/suggestion boxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have raised suggestions for improving the organisation’s CSR efforts to my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have told upper management about my ideas that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages suggestions that I have for the organisation’s CSR agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea of helping the organisation further their CSR efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer sharing my ideas that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste anonymously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to use environmentally friendly transport options to get to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor makes me feel confident making suggestions to improve the organisation’s CSR policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer sharing my ideas that the organisation could use to help the environment e.g., reduce pollution, reduce waste anonymously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions ask about general experiences of your job and organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have control over how I do my job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to access the resources I need to perform my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get to decide when I complete my tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can bring about change within my organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very proud of my job skills and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communicate change well in this organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can control the physical conditions at my workplace (e.g., lighting, temperature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at coming up with solutions to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have influence over policies and procedures that relate to my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt my ability to do my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some tasks required by my job that I cannot do well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change is adopted well in this organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an expert at my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people in my line of work could do this job better than I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems like changes are pushed through the organisation that management doesn't even want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation adapts well to it's environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.5 Challenging-prohibitive

Have you ever encountered illegal or unethical behaviour occurring within the organisation?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Did you take action against the illegal or unethical behaviour you encountered?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
The following questions are about you and what you did and felt in that situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I spoke to an outside authority about the behaviour I observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt encouraged by the organisation to report internally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spoke to my supervisor about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was important to me that I try to stop unethical behaviour at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to speak to the individual(s) involved first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I considered a lot of different options before taking action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt confident that the organisation would support my in reporting wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career with the organisation suffered as a result of reporting wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a clear protocol to follow when I encountered the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told my friends and family about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt supported by my supervisor in reporting the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the outcome of my report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting wrongdoing was a difficult decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation had channels (e.g., anonymous phone line or e-mail) I could use to report my concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing involved only one person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encountered backlash from my colleagues for reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was legally obligated to report the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was directed at me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew I was legally protected when I reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was invited to participate in the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was reported to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encountered direct evidence of the wrongdoing (e.g., I saw it with my own eyes, or I saw official documents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was perpetuated by someone ranking below me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was perpetuated by my immediate supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was perpetuated by higher level employees than me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wrongdoing was perpetuated by someone at the same level as me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is good for the organisation if employees
The following questions are about what you would do and feel if you needed to report illegal or unethical behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would try to talk to the individual(s) involved first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There would be procedures in place within the organisation for me to report wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be supported by my supervisor if I reported wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career with the organisation would suffer if I reported wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be ostracised by my colleagues if I reported organisational wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be a difficult decision for me to report wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation encourages internal reporting of ethical concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation would support me reporting wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell my friends and family if I encountered unethical behaviour at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to stop unethical behaviour at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would report if I could remain anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would speak to outside authorities about organisational wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would encounter backlash from colleagues if I reported wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good for the organisation if employees report wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I approve of employees reporting illegal activities occurring within the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would report if I was legally obligated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I approve of employees reporting wasteful activities within the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be less inclined to report if there was more than one person engaged in the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be unlikely to report non-serious wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would report if I was legally protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting would not lead to correction of the wrongdoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would need strong evidence to want to report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are about procedures within your organisation, as well as your personal processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation considers my viewpoint when I present it</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to take the path of least resistance at work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can usually trust my supervisor to do what is good for me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to act on my gut feelings about things</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has procedures that allow for requests for additional information or clarification about decisions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't usually bother to analyse and explain people's behaviour.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it is important to analyse and understand our own thinking processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management can be trusted to make decisions that are also good for me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has procedures that ensure that decisions made are consistent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think very little about the ways that people influence each other.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has procedures that ensure that all sides affected by a decision are represented</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong moral compass</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To understand a person's behaviour, I have found it is important to know how that person's beliefs, attitudes and character traits fit together</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation fairly rewards people for their effort</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust management to treat me fairly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot about the influence that society has on my behaviour and personality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to view situations from all angles before taking action</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions seek your opinions about yourself, your job, your workplace and the organisation you work for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with my current working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care about the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my organisation tries to be environmentally friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care about my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my objectives at work is to make a positive difference in other people’s lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my organisation does good things for the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job provides me with steady employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to volunteer outside of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I chose my field of work because I believe it positively contributes to society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make plans and stick to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me to make a positive difference in people’s lives through my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get to occasionally try different things at my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my organisation damages the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job makes good use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I donate to charity outside of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do just enough work to get by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I chose to work in this industry because I believe it positively contributes to society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my organisation is bad for the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation should be responsible for outcomes in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get involved in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my organisation should do more to give back to society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't do anything that goes against my conscience in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer outside of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community would be negatively affected if the organisation decided to abandon it's corporate social responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to get down to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.7 Demographic Questions

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

What state do you reside in?
- New South Wales
- Victoria
- Queensland
- Tasmania
- Northern Territory
- South Australia
- Western Australia

In which country were you born?

Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin? If both, select both 'Yes, Aboriginal' and 'Yes, Torres Strait Islander'
- Yes, Aboriginal
- Yes, Torres Strait Islander
- No

Which age group do you fall into?
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-45
- 46-55
- 55+
How long have you been with your current organisation?
- Less than one year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16+ years

How would you rank your seniority within the organisation?
- Entry-level employee
- Mid-level employee
- Management
- Upper Management
- Executive

Are you a full-time or part-time employee?
Note: Full time employees are those that are work more than 35 hours per week
- Full-time
- Part-time

What category best describes your occupation?
- Manager
- Professional
- Technician or Trade Worker
- Community or Personal Service Worker
- Clerical or Administrative Worker
- Sales Worker
- Machinery Operator or Driver
- Labourer
Do you work for a Not for Profit organisation?

- Yes
- No

What sector do you work in?

- Public sector - Commonwealth government
- Public sector - State government
- Public sector - local government
- Private sector (including all non-government, corporate, business and not-for-profit)

What subcategory best describes the purpose of your organisation?

- Advancing Health
- Advancing Education
- Advancing Social or Public Welfare
- Advancing Religion
- Advancing Culture
- Promoting reconciliation, mutual respect and tolerance between groups of individuals that are in Australia
- Promoting or Protecting Human Rights
- Advancing the security or safety of Australia or the Australian public
- Preventing or relieving the suffering of animals
- Advancing the natural environment
- Advancing public debate
What industry do you work in?

- Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing
- Mining
- Manufacturing
- Electricity, Gas, Water and Waste Services
- Construction
- Wholesale Trade
- Retail Trade
- Accommodation and Food Services
- Transport, Postal and Warehousing
- Information Media and Telecommunications
- Financial and Insurance Services
- Property and Business Services
- Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Services
- Administrative and Support Services
- Public Administration and Safety
- Education and Training
- Health Care and Social Assistance
- Arts and Recreation Services
- Other services
Please enter your first name and last initial e.g., "John S". This is only to link your supervisor's response to yours, it will be deleted as soon as the responses are matched and will not be used to identify you in any way.
Thank you so much for taking the time to complete this survey. If you would like us to donate $1 to a charity on your behalf, please fill out your name, e-mail and preferred charity. This section will be kept completely separate from your answers to the survey. If you would prefer not to donate, just press the ">>" button.

Name
E-mail
Preferred Charity
EMPLOYEE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PROJECT

Dear [NAME],

We at the UWA Centre for Social Impact are undertaking a project examining the role of employees in corporate social responsibility (CSR). We are seeking organisations to engage in this project, and [ORGANISATION] has come to our attention through the Australian Centre for CSR’s State of CSR annual review as being at the forefront of CSR activity. A particular area of interest that has arisen from the research, that Newmont also demonstrates active involvement in, is employee volunteering, and the behavioural and attitudinal changes that follow volunteering. After extensive interviews with employees in both the not for profit and corporate sectors, we are now running a survey for employees and managers to further explore employee CSR behaviour.

We believe that this project would deliver significant value to [ORGANISATION], as understanding the role that employees play in CSR is vital to developing organisational CSR strategy that is effective in both maximising social impact and strengthening organisations’ capabilities and employee relations.

Attached is a general overview of the project. Please don’t hesitate to contact us with any questions. I look forward to hearing from you!

Kind Regards,

Professor Paul Flatau
Director, UWA Centre for Social Impact

EQUIS

[Additional contact information]
Appendix E

Survey Information Sheet

RESEARCH STUDY: EMPLOYEE VOLUNTEERING & CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Ami Seivwright, Ph.D Candidate (UWA)

Background and Justification for the Research:
Significant organisational resources are spent on CSR initiatives that require employee engagement in order to reap optimal benefit, yet we know very little about how employees want to engage in CSR behaviours at work, their existing behaviours and interests, and the factors that motivate them to perform these behaviours. Similarly, we know that many employees volunteer their time and money through work-sponsored initiatives, but we don’t know beyond anecdotal evidence the impact this has on employee or organisational performance. Understanding both the antecedents and impacts of employee CSR behaviour will enable the organisation to efficiently and effectively develop strategy, ensure uptake of strategy throughout the organisation, and allow for comprehensive evaluation of the strategy.

Research Design:
We are conducting a 180-degree survey, collecting data from employees and their supervisors to identify the factors that influence and the outcomes that result from employee CSR behaviour that are statistically significant over a broader sample. Obtaining the supervisor’s perspective will help to mitigate the biases associated with employees answering questions about their own behaviour.

The survey is conducted online and should take a maximum of 30 minutes.

What Benefit will this Bring the Organisation?
The results from this study will identify employee CSR behaviour and its antecedents, which will assist the organisation in developing and selecting initiatives to dedicate resources to, as well as enhancing the internal marketing efforts required to recruit employees to said initiatives. This will ensure that organisational efforts with regards to CSR utilise the organisation’s internal capabilities and have the greatest possible benefit to society, the organisation, and its employees.

The organisation will have access to the de-identified data collected from its employees, and a comprehensive summary of the findings.

What risk will the Organisation Incure?
There is no risk to the organisation. Participating organisations will not be named in any documents, including the thesis itself, instead only being identified by industry and rough size. Data collected from employees will be anonymised and results will not be attributable to any particular individual. I require no financial contribution from the organisation, just a small amount of employee time. Approval to conduct this study has been provided by the University of Western Australia Human Research Ethics Office (Reference: RA/4/1/6152).

Contact Details:
Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or issues, I am very excited about this project and confident that it can provide benefits for both the organisation, academic literature, and of course, my dissertation.

Sincerely yours,

Ami Seivwright
Appendix F

Descriptive Statistics and Zero-Order Correlations
Table F.1: Antecedents of employee CSR: Correlations and descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived organisational support</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.595</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived supervisor support</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Authentic organisational communi-</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.7220</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employee commitment</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affective employee commitment</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.388</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee autonomy</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self efficacy</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Challenging/promotive eCSR</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Challenging/prohibitive eCSR</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)*
Appendix G

Regression Diagnostics

Ordinary least squares regression requires normally distributed data and independent (non-correlated) predictor variables (Field, 2009). I first examined the correlation table (Appendix F) and noted that only organisational trust and organisational justice were correlated above .8. This was suggested by the confirmatory factor analysis in Chapter 6, and results using these predictors are accordingly interpreted with caution.

The Durbin-Watson test was used to determine whether residual terms are uncorrelated. A value near 2 on the Durbin-Watson test is indicative that variables are not autocorrelated, though more precise lower and upper limits can be obtained using the values in the tables of Savin and White (1977) that correspond with the sample size and number of predictors for each regression model. The lower and upper limits for the Durbin-Watson test, at 5% significance for affiliative/promotive eCSR (n = 179 and Predictors = 7) were 1.637 and 1.832, respectively. The Durbin-Watson test statistic for these two models is slightly higher than ideal at 1.878 for the first model and 1.929 for the model with affective commitment in place of general employee commitment. The lower and upper limits for challenging/promotive (N=214 and Predictors=9) and challenging/prohibitive (n = 174 and Predictors = 9) were 1.675-1.863. Again the Durbin-Watson test is slightly higher than ideal, but not surpassing the key value of 4 (Savin and White, 1977).

Multicollinearity was assessed using the average variance inflation factor (VIF) and average tolerance level. No VIF value should exceed ten and the average value should not exceed one, while tolerance should be above .2 (Field, 2009). No individual VIF value exceeded the critical ten value, though the averages are slightly higher than one, and all tolerance levels were greater than .2.
### Table G.1: Multicollinearity and independence of residuals tests for regression models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Durbin-Watson test statistics</th>
<th>Average tolerance level</th>
<th>Average VIF value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative/promotive</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative/promotive (affective commitment)</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative/promotive (employee values)</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging/promotive</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging/promotive (employee values)</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging/prohibitive</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>