The impact of ethical leadership and stakeholder orientation on employee CSR participation

Annu Mathew and Rohit Punnoose
Doctoral scholars, XLRI, Jamshedpur, India

Abstract

Corporate social responsibility programmes have become the norm today, with most large companies creating separate teams and making significant investments specifically for this purpose. Companies can strategize, allocate funds, and make detailed plans, but it would all be fruitless if employees - one of the critical stakeholders - did not contribute to these activities. After all, the onus of CSR does not lie solely on the leadership, rather employees need to be equally invested in becoming part of the organizational culture. The objective of this study is to devise a framework showing the drivers of employee participation in CSR activities, drawing on the three constructs of ethical leadership, stakeholder orientation, and employee identification.

Keywords: Employee CSR Participation, Organizational Identification, Ethical Leadership, Stakeholder Orientation, Social Responsibility

Introduction

Many companies act on the premise that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not merely "the right thing to do" but also "the smart thing to do" (Chong, 2009), especially given the array

of stakeholder benefits (Graafland & Van de Ven, 2006; Dawkins & Lewis, 2003; Benabou & Tirole, 2006). An organization's success in implementing its CSR strategy is contingent upon its staff's commitment, contribution, and efforts (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). There is a need for more studies in this area, since there is minimal literature studying the antecedents to employees' socially responsible behaviour, including participation in the firm's CSR efforts.

Corporate Social Responsibility has been defined as "the management's obligation to set policies, make decisions and follow courses of action beyond the requirements of the law that are desirable in terms of the values and objectives of society" (Mosley, Pietri, & Megginson, 1996, p. 141). Davis and Blomstrom (1966) conceptualized CSR as 'the managerial obligation to take action to protect and improve both the welfare of society as a whole and the interest of organizations'. According to Barnett (2007, p. 801), CSR is "a discretionary allocation of corporate resources towards improving social welfare that serves as a means of enhancing relationships with key stakeholders".

Van Marrewijk (2003, p. 8) describes CSR as "voluntary company activities that demonstrate the inclusion of social and environmental concerns in business operations and interactions with stakeholders". The stakeholder perspective was introduced as a framework to explain and defend social responsibility and ethics to include entities beyond shareholders or owners; and the stakeholder framework recognizes the intrinsic value of all stakeholders from an ethical perspective (Ferrell & Ferrell, 2008). It is difficult for businesses to prosper if their sole concern is to make money without consideration for other values (Spector, 2008); and the core

theme of CSR is to deal, interact, and relate with stakeholders ethically (Hopkins, 2003). Thus, for running socially responsible businesses, stakeholder orientation becomes a critical element.

Employees are essential stakeholders in an organization's CSR efforts (Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera, & Williams, 2006; Klaus, 2005). They share unique relationships with their organizations and are in a unique position to ascertain whether their organization's CSR programme is authentic, unlike external stakeholders (McShane & Cunningham, 2012). Authenticity enhances employees' perceived value to the organization and shares a deeper commitment with the organization (Liedtka, 2008). Employees identify more strongly with the organizations they work with, when they have positive perceptions of their organizations' CSR efforts (Glavas & Godwin, 2012).

The research question we ask here is "What factors drive employee participation in organizational CSR activities". This study proposes that employees make different judgments about their employing organizations' CSR efforts by 1) understanding the role of leadership in CSR activities; 2) how CSR activities align with the orientation towards its stakeholders, and 3) how the identity of the employees relates to the organization and its CSR focus. All these perceptions indicate the level of fulfilment of employees' psychological needs and affect their subsequent attitudes (and behaviours) towards participation in CSR activities.

We look at the dimensions that lead to the success of a good CSR programme by identifying and responding to a gap in the literature by focusing on leadership, stakeholders, and organizational identity and their relationship with employee participation in CSR. This paper has two main sections: the first of these is the review of academic literature on social responsibility

of business, leadership and its role in CSR, stakeholder orientation of the organization, organizational identity, and employee CSR participation. The second consists of the propositions developed based on the literature review.

Literature Review

What constitutes a successful CSR Programme?

According to Elkington (1997), a company's contribution to the welfare of society does not consist only of economic value creation, but concerns value creation in three spheres referred to as the Triple-P bottom-line: **Profit**: the economic dimension**, People**: the social dimension and **Planet**: the ecological dimension. Collier and Esteban (2007) stress the importance of the principle of 'tone from the top' – the extent to which CSR is perceived to be championed by management, by corporate leaders, and by those with the responsibility of embedding its principles and practice in hearts and minds, in decision-making structures, and the culture and climate of the organization.

 Collier and Esteban (2007) further argue that employees' response to CSR programmes depends on how employees relate with the organization, the extent to which they derive elements of their own identity from being members of that organization, and the degree to which they can commit to the organization's values and goals: these constitute a significant influence on their willingness to participate in social responsibility programmes.

Corporate volunteering is a key CSR activity involving human resources where employees give time, knowledge, or skill as part of the community service, outreach, or social responsibility activities often sponsored by the company without any additional compensation or direct

personal remuneration (Bussell & Forbes, 2008; Wilson, 2000). Employee CSR participation in the form of Corporate Volunteering contributes to effectively carrying out volunteering programmes and helps influence their work attitudes. Employees participate in CSR activities based on their human values, beliefs, human capital, social resources, age, gender, context, and nature of volunteering work etc. (Wilson, 2000).

From an organizational perspective, CSR initiatives can help an organization define its stance on society's ethical and moral values, and further propel employees' Organizational Identification (OI) (De Roeck & Delobbe, 2012). Thus, employees who participate in corporate volunteering and CSR activities assess the organization's intention and prefer to participate when these intentions align with their personal values and motives for volunteering (Houle, Sagarin, & Kaplan, 2005). The outcomes expected from employee CSR participation are much beyond volunteering and have a positive impact on an organization's performance, its image in the society, employees' commitment and identification. It is, therefore, vital for employees to stay aligned with the CSR initiatives of their organization and actively engage in these initiatives to make them successful.

Social Responsibility of Business and Stakeholder Orientation

It is believed that the hallmark of a profession is a sense of duty (Valackiene & Miceviciene, 2011). To reiterate, CSR leads to a more ethical approach towards stakeholders (Hopkins, 2003) without harming or hurting any one of them (Sethi, 1979; Carroll, 1979). The word 'stakeholder' first appeared in management literature in an international memorandum at

the Stanford Research Institute (Freeman, 1984), who classified stakeholders into two major groups, Primary and Secondary. Primary or internal stakeholders are those related to the primary firm functions (Frederick, Post, & Davis, 1992), and are essential for the organization's survival, e.g., shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, etc. (Clarkson, 1995). In comparison, secondary stakeholders or external stakeholders are concerned with the secondary (support) firm functions (Frederick et al., 1992). Therefore, the stakeholders in this study are primary stakeholders, namely investors, shareholders, customers, suppliers, and the community, per the European model of stakeholders (Zink, 2005).

Stakeholder orientation is widely accepted as a construct to understand how an organization should relate to entities affected by or that have an interest in some aspect of an organization's products, operations, market, industry, or outcomes (Maignan & Ferrell, 2004). Based on current thinking, the degree to which an organization understands, addresses, and integrates stakeholder concerns into strategic planning and operations is referred to as stakeholder orientation (Maignan & Ferrell, 2004).

A firm's survival and success depend on its managers' ability to create sufficient wealth and satisfaction for its primary stakeholders (Clarkson, 1995). To act socially responsibly means, in most cases, is not only fulfilling legal expectations but also going beyond mere compliance and investing more into human capital, the environment, and relations with stakeholders. Companies well known for championing social responsibility and sustainability have also improved their competitiveness and financial results. Acting responsibly towards all relevant

stakeholders may be broadly summarized as a company's ethical behaviour towards society (Zink, 2005). As per Calabrese, Costa, Menichini, Rosati, and Sanfelice (2013), CSR studies underline that the competitiveness of organizations may depend on a structured and rewarding relationship with their stakeholders.

Conceptual Framework and Propositions

Some of the obstacles to CSR are found to be a) an ad hoc approach towards CSR by the top management, b) lack of consensus on priorities within the firm, and c) problems related to measurement and evaluation of CSR activities. There are also issues related to employee perceptions of authenticity of CSR (McShane & Cunningham, 2012) and what drives employee participation.

As preparation for the study, we conducted exploratory discussions with six HR professionals from multinationals in India responsible for driving CSR activities. These professionals were part of our alumni groups as well as our social networks. These discussions intended to understand the details of CSR initiatives and identify the factors that led to the success of these programmes. While there were several exciting dimensions of a successful programme, what stood out was how corporate employees responded to these socially responsible initiatives. We found that some employees were extremely interested in the CSR initiatives of the organization; they were responsible and committed to participating in CSR initiatives, whereas many were not interested in these initiatives and neither did they take part in volunteering nor collaborate with leaders. We assume that the non-participation of employees could be because these programmes may not align with the individual's ideas, motives, or values,

or they may be opposed to such giving behaviours. Also, we found that solid CSR practices and strong organizational values were not great motivators of employee participation. Employees who participated in CSR initiatives might have had their own preferences on where and how to utilize their time or money, and this might not have been in line with what the organization charted out as CSR initiatives. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors that drive CSR participation among employees in an organization that has an active CSR programme.

Employee participation in CSR programmes can take different forms like volunteering or contributing in terms of money, time, and ideas; supporting and responding to organizational initiatives, etc. From the exploratory discussions with the CSR programme managers, we identified some common organizational CSR initiatives where employees have opportunities to participate. These are 1) *employee payroll giving*; 2) *donations, and 3) time volunteering.* For instance, payroll giving is a contribution from monthly salaries; donations are responding to calls for supporting people affected by natural disasters like floods/hurricanes/tsunamis etc., time volunteering includes participating in blood donation camps or supporting people impacted by natural disasters or spending time in old-age homes or hospitals. In the current COVID-19 scenario, several employees have formed voluntary groups in partnership with organizations to extend support to impacted employees and families. In addition, there has been virtual volunteering where employees supported their colleagues in mobilizing hospital/ICU beds, oxygen cylinders, etc.

In the context of employee participation and corporate social responsibility, studies in the past have considered factors like pro-social behaviours (Tao, Song, Ferguson, & Kochhar, 2018), organizational citizenship behaviour (Shen & Benson, 2014), ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino,

& Harrison, 2005; Groves & LaRocca, 2011), organizational identification (Mael & Ashforth 1992), stakeholder orientation (Glavas & Kelley, 2014) etc.

Employee Participation in CSR

Bhattacharya, Sen and Korschum (2008) argued that CSR programmes are most effective when employees are the "actual enactors," while the company is the "enabler" (p. 44). Employees participate in CSR activities when these programmes are aligned with the corporate culture (Lee, Park & Lee, 2013), are co-created by employees (Dobson, 2011), and are based on individual needs and interests (Mirvis, 2012). Further, CSR participation creates a positive perceived organization commitment (Haski-Lenethal, 2013). Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2014) suggest that employees participate in corporate volunteering by assessing the organization's intentions behind carrying out those volunteering activities. Regarding the outcomes of employee participation in CSR, Mamantov (2009) suggest that employee participation in CSR results in the enhancement of employee morale, identification with the organization (Kim, Lee, Lee, & King, 2010), commitment and emotional attachment to the organization (Chong, 2009), and subsequent motivation and further involvement in CSR activities (Sekar & Dyaram, 2017). Sekar and Dyaram (2017) break down employee participation in CSR activities into three categories, activity level, organizational level and personal level. In this paper, we focus on organizational level factors as drivers of employee CSR participation.

Ethical Leadership

Organizational leaders play the most significant role as non-institutional drivers to promote CSR and leadership behaviours strongly reinforce and inspire employee attitudes towards CSR and its successful practice (Angus-Leppan, Metcalf & Benn, 2010). Ethics in leadership has become a focal topic in popular media and scholarly outlets (Ciulla, 2004; Trevino, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006). Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005) define ethical leadership as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making" (p. 120). Ethical leadership as a construct is in its nascent stage. Ethical leaders are fair and principled leaders who support their subordinates (Brown & Trevino, 2006a), so it can be inferred that the followers of such leaders will feel more strongly committed to their organizations/leaders. Corporate social responsibility in business is driven more by the personal beliefs and values of the people running the business (Tandon, Mishra & Singh, 2011). It is the leaders of an organization who are responsible for initiating and sustaining corporate culture which encourages employees to behave ethically (Painter-Morland, 2008). According to the stakeholder theory (Donaldson & Preston 1995; Freeman, 1984; Freeman, 2010), ethical leaders are responsible for the employees and their interests and other stakeholder groups (e.g., clients, shareholders and suppliers).

Another essential element in ethical leadership is the ethical values of the leader. Ethical values of the leader impact follower beliefs and it has been empirically proven that leaders with deontological ethical values and leaders with teleological ethical values influence follower attitudes toward CSR (Groves & LaRocca, 2011). To be viewed as an ethical leader, one must

develop a reputation as both a 'moral person' and a 'moral manager'. Ethical leaders are known to possess traits like honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness and being a moral person depends on traits, behaviours and decision-making process (Brown & Trevino, 2006a). Thus, ethical leaders 'walk the talk' and enable their followers to think and act socially responsibly, leading to CSR participation. Groves and LaRocca (2011) found that the ethical values of the leaders and their behaviours create an ethical environment in the organization that is favourable for CSR activities and inspire employee attitudes towards CSR. Based on this, we propose that:

P1. *Ethical leadership will drive employee CSR participation*

Organizational Identification

Organizational Identification (OI) refers to a cognitive linking between the definition of the organization and the definition of the self (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994) or "a perceived oneness with an organization and the experience of the organization's successes and failures as one's own" (Mael & Ashforth, 1992, p. 103). Ashforth, Harrison and Corley (2008) offer four reasons why organizational identification is essential. Firstly, it is vital to the concepts of self-identity: it is one way people define themselves, make sense of their place in the world, and appropriately navigate their worlds. Secondly, there is an essential human need to identify with and feel part of a larger group, including their workplace, to fulfil their needs and enhance themselves. Thirdly, OI is associated with several critical organizational outcomes, including employee satisfaction, performance, and retention. Fourthly, OI also impacts organizational behaviours, including leadership, perceptions of justice, and the meaning of work. Finally,

identification is a property of individuals and is defined as the extent to which members of an organization incorporate fundamental organizational identities onto their identity (Dutton et al., 1994).

A growing body of evidence indicates that corporate social responsibility significantly affects employees within the company. A study conducted by Glavas and Piderity (2009) revealed that employees were more engaged, creatively involved, and had higher-quality relationships when they worked for socially responsible organizations. Numerous other scholars have proposed a positive effect on employees when they work for companies engaged in CSR efforts (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001; Albinger & Freeman, 2000; McGuire, Sundgren, & Schneeweis, 1988; Peterson, 2004;). OI is recognized as a strong driver of employees' favorable workplace outcomes (Riketta, 2005). The concept of organizational identity also refers to how organizations represent themselves to internal and external audiences (Olins, 1978, 1989; Hatch & Schultz, 1997). In this study, we define organizational identification as the set of meanings by which an organization allows itself to be known and through which it will enable people to describe, remember and relate to it (Melewar, 2003).

Thus, when employees can connect the work they are doing with the social responsibility activities of the organization, they tend to identify with the meanings that the organization allows to be known and are able to relate to it. The fact that their contributions are meaningful may enhance their participation in CSR. The social identity theory posits that it is beneficial for individuals to associate themselves with organizations with positive reputations because their

association with such organizations strengthens their 'self-concept' (Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007). Hence we propose that:

P2. *Employees' organization identification influences their CSR participation*

Ethical Leadership and Stakeholder Orientation

Ethical leaders care about various stakeholders such as customers, suppliers, shareholders, society, the natural environment and others (Frisch & Huppenbauer, 2014; Trevino et al. 2006). Ethical leaders abide by high ethical standards and encourage others within their organizations to do the same (Brown & Trevino, 2006b). Some examples of ethical leadership in business include treating employees fairly, offering competitive pricing to customers, being transparent in organizational processes, communicating openly and clearly to all stakeholders, paying suppliers on time, being involved in charitable activities, and demonstrating pro-social values and behaviours in all societal responsibilities and commitments. Ethical leadership is more time-consuming than other leadership styles because apart from economic and technical aspects, ethical leaders must also focus on social and ecological issues. Instead of maximizing their income, ethical leaders are said to invest in existing staff, quality of products, eco-friendly infrastructure, and charity projects (Frisch & Huppenbauer, 2014). Therefore, strong ethical leaders are likely to be more effective than weak ethical leaders at maintaining the trust of crucial stakeholders vital for realizing long-term, strategic organizational objectives (Brown & Trevino, 2006a; Hansen, Dunford, Boss, Boss, & Angermeier, 2011). Based on the linkages between ethical leadership and stakeholder orientation, we propose that:

P3. In socially responsible organizations, ethical leadership influences stakeholder orientation

Employee participation in CSR activities is said to be high when they perceive their organization to favour corporate volunteering programmes through effective planning, consistent communication and interaction with key stakeholders, alignment of culture with volunteering activities, effective programme management and measurement of initiatives' success and acceptance (Sekar & Dyaram, 2013). Grant (2007) argues that relational job designs in CSR initiatives provide opportunities to interact and positively affect key stakeholders and other potential beneficiaries, which might enhance employee motivation to make a prosocial difference. Thus, CSR activities of organizations that are related to the welfare of stakeholders influence employees to participate in the CSR initiatives; hence we propose:

P4. In socially responsible organizations, stakeholder orientation drives employee CSR participation

Stakeholder orientation as a mediator between Ethical Leadership and Employee CSR Participation

Ethical leadership (EL) is "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relations, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005, p. 120). Wu, Kwan, Yim, Chiu, & He (2015) studied the connections between

EL and CSR. They found that CEO EL has a positive impact on CSR based on the organizational ethical culture. Choi, Ullah, & Kwak (2015) suggested the connection between EL and CSR with the mediating and moderating role of ethical work climate. Thus, from a similar point of view, we argue that CSR activities are perceived to be successful in organizations with ethical leadership if the key stakeholders' interests and welfare are considered the most critical priority. This perception will drive employees to participate in CSR activities. Based on this, we propose that:

P5. Stakeholder orientation of the organization mediates the impact of ethical leadership on employee CSR participation

Ethical Leadership, Employee CSR Participation and Organizational Identification

Organizational identification is viewed as the degree to which organizational members define themselves in relation to organizational membership (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). It is a 'self-defining concept' that reflects the level of perceived overlap between an individual's self and an organization's values, interests, and norms (Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2004). Thus, the more an individual identifies with an organization, the more likely it is for them to champion the different organizational activities and initiatives. Prior research in OI has shown that ethical leadership encourages positive employee behaviours by promoting organizational identification (Kalshoven, Van Dijk, & Boon, 2016; Walumbwa et al., 2011). Tyler (1997) argues that the leader behaviours that are seen as more trusting should promote and raise identification with the workgroup or organization, because such interpersonal treatment conveys to individuals

that they are valued and respected. In addition to behaviours, character traits of leaders such as openness and trustworthiness, among others, are positively related to organizational identification (De Cremer, Brebels, & Sedikides, 2008; Smith, Thomas, & Tyler, 2006). Based on this, we propose that:

P6. Ethical leadership in organizations influences its employees organizational identification

Since OI is an overlap between an individual's self and their organization, employees with high organizational identification are likely to be intrinsically motivated to contribute to the organization's success and are less likely to need any additional motivation from leaders to undertake socially responsible behaviours (Bottomley, Mostafa, Gould-Williams, & Leon-Cazares, 2016; Van Dick et al., 2004). On the other hand, employees with low organizational identification are "psychologically disengaged" from the organization and lack the motivation to engage in extra-role behaviours (Martin & Epitropaki, 2001, p. 258). Employees with high organizational identification thus get influenced by the behaviours of ethical leaders, which in turn drives them to participate in CSR activities. Rodrigo and Arenas (2008) investigated qualitatively how employees' relationship with their organization evolved from their organization's CSR initiatives. According to this study, employees' perceptions of their organization's social role and image led many of them who formerly felt that their organization was just a place to work, to view their employer as an institution that shares their social views and values. The study also suggests that CSR initiatives increase the sense of importance committed employees attach to the work performed, enabling them to identify with the

organization. As Pratt (1998) suggests, employees of organizations associated with a specific vision or social cause may exhibit increased organizational identification because they feel more connected to the organization than typical affiliation would predict. Employees identify more positively with those companies in which they perceive virtues and strengths to be inherently good (Dutton et al., 1994), and which they view to be socially responsible (Turban & Greening, 1997).

Glavas and Godwin (2012) argue that association with companies with a perceived external image of being socially responsible could be seen as prestigious for employees and help fulfil their need for meaning and self-esteem; thus, positively affecting their organizational identification. There is empirical support for the positive impact of ethical leadership on organizational identification (Walumbwa et al., 2011), and employees identify with the organization when it responds to social causes effectively. This makes employees more committed to the organization's CSR activities, which further drives their participation. Therefore, employee participation in CSR is an outcome of how they perceive their organization's image in responding to social causes. Therefore, based on the linkages between ethical leadership, employees OI, and employee CSR participation, we propose that:

P7. Organizational identification mediates the impact of ethical leadership on employees CSR participation

Figure 1: Conceptual Model for Employee CSR Participation

Source: Authors' own

Discussion

Our conceptual study on the antecedents of employee CSR participation proposes the relationship between ethical leadership, stakeholder orientation, and employee organizational identification. It has been suggested that CSR in business is essentially driven by the personal beliefs and values of the people running the firm (Jenkins, 2004; Perrini, Russo, & Tencati, 2007). Hence, strong, ethical leaders can positively influence employees and enhance the perceived social responsibility of the business towards its stakeholders. The conceptual model in the study supports the assertion that organizations that have a robust ethical leadership see a positive impact on employee CSR participation.

Stakeholder orientation is critical for any organization, and organizations that value stakeholders are interested in providing the best stakeholder outcomes. Employees tend to appreciate the stakeholder orientation of such organizations; this leads to a positive influence on

their perception of the organization's CSR programmes, which further enhances their CSR participation. Ethical leadership also provides transparency in communication that is characterized by honesty, fairness, and care (Brown & Trevino, 2006a). Transparency and fairness become critical not only for employees but also for the other stakeholders, therefore, stakeholder orientation mediates the CSR participation of employees if there is ethical leadership. Employees are essentially the face of their organization. They are expected to act as the primary ambassadors for the organization's CSR programme (Collier & Esteban, 2007); therefore, organizations need to understand how employees perceive their CSR programmes and ultimately participate in them. This is crucial given that employees play a critical role in shaping an organization's relationship with its external stakeholders (e.g., customers, suppliers, investors) (Berry, 1983) and, by extension, how they identify with the organization. Hence, there is a strong basis to believe that employees rely on different cues from ethical leadership to frame their own perceptions on CSR initiatives, thus leading to organizational identification. This study posits that when there is ethical leadership in an organization, employees identify with the organization and its initiatives towards the society. This has a direct impact on the employee CSR participation.

Employees who have a higher sense of organizational identification tend to enjoy increased engagement with their work because they view this engagement to be mutually beneficial for them and the organization (He & Brown, 2013). Employees can experience profound changes in their identities by participating in CSR initiatives. It can be concluded that

when employees identify with their organization as being socially responsible, their participation in CSR programmes increases because of their belief that this is a mutually beneficial exercise.

Employees tend to perceive that ethical leaders are essential for the success of any organizational initiatives that require employee participation. Followers, therefore, emulate ethical leaders' actions because such leaders are attractive and credible models of normatively appropriate behaviour (Brown & Trevino, 2006a). Employees who identify with their organizations emulate the leadership values of integrity, honesty, fairness, and this positively impacts their approach towards the organization's CSR practices and participation.

Employee participation in CSR programmes is vital, because without their wholehearted support and cooperation, it is difficult to sustain these initiatives in the long run. Hence, the leadership needs to understand the pulse of the employees while defining or developing CSR strategies for the organization. This study reveals that employees believe that the leadership is responsible for higher social responsibility of their organization. Where there is a strong sense of social responsibility, employees tend to identify with their organizations, which, in turn, leads to enhanced CSR participation.

To sum up we find that socially responsible behaviours in organizations such as ethical leadership, stakeholder orientation, and organizational identification influence employee participation in CSR activities. For employers, this study provides inputs on critical elements that employees consider while considering participation in CSR programmes. In the long run, this

can be a measure to help organizations in aligning employee CSR goals with the organizational CSR goals while planning such programmes.

For employees, this study provides inputs on some of the critical factors for consideration while participating in CSR programmes. While there are several types of leadership, the linkage between ethical leadership and social responsibility and its impact on employee CSR participation seems to be crucial in today's corporate environment where leaders' ethics and organizations' approach to ethics are key in engaging employees. In addition, the modern-day workforce lays emphasis on deriving meaning from work, and hence, identification with the organization and its initiatives are crucial for employee engagement and commitment.

Limitations and Future Research

This study considers CSR participation from an individual perspective, however, the intention towards engaging employees in the CSR planning process and allowing them to participate is purely dependent on the organization. Employees' tendency to participate in any organizational initiatives is individual-specific, and hence there is a question of generalizability.

Based on the literature review, we have chosen four constructs, ethical leadership, stakeholder orientation, employee organizational identification, and employee CSR participation to develop a model for creating successful CSR programmes in an organization. Future researchers could look at other constructs like authentic leadership, workplace spirituality, employee pro-social values, etc., as antecedents to employee CSR participation.

Other outcome variables that can be studied in this context are stakeholder retention (Wang & Juslin, 2013), organizational justice (Greenberg, 1990), sustainability (Montiel, 2008), talent attraction (Bhattacharya, Sen & Korschun, 2008), socially responsible HR initiatives (Cohen, 2017), etc. Additional mediators can also be explored for connecting ethical leadership, stakeholder orientation, and organizational identification. In this study, we chose social responsibility and employee participation. We have considered an organization's responsibility towards stakeholders but not its responsibility towards the environment. This is a topic that has great potential for research in today's context and can be explored by future researchers.

Unethical leadership (Eisenbeiß & Brodbeck, 2014) is another area that can be researched in the context of CSR programmes because of the scandals and misappropriation of CSR funds by leaders.

References

Aiman-Smith, L., Bauer, T. N., & Cable, D. M. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy-capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2), 219-237.

Albinger, H. S., & Freeman, S. J. (2000). Corporate social performance and attractiveness as an employer to different job seeking populations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 28(3), 243-253.

Angus-Leppan, T., Metcalf, L. & Benn, S. (2010). Leadership Styles and CSR Practice: An Examination of Sensemaking, Institutional Drivers and CSR Leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 93, 189–213. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0221-y

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325-374.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review,* 14(1), 20-39.

Barnett, M. L. (2007). Stakeholders influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 794.

Bottomley, P., Mostafa, A. M. S., Gould-Williams, J. S., & León-Cázares, F. (2016). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviours: The contingent role of public service motivation. *British Journal of Management*, 27(2), 390-405.

Benabou, R. & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and Pro-social Behavior. *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1652–7.

Berry, L. L. (1983). Relationship marketing. In L. L. Berry et al. (Eds.). Emerging perspectives in relationship marketing. *Chicago: American Marketing Association,* (pp. 25–34).

Bhattacharya, C. B., Sen, S., & Korschun, D. (2008). Using corporate social responsibility to win the war for talent. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *49*(2), 37-44

Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10), 1701-1719.

Brown, M.E. & Treviño, L. K (2006a). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 17 (2006) 595–616

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006b). Role modeling and ethical leadership. Paper presented at the *2006 Academy of Management Annual Meeting*. Atlanta, GA.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117−134.

Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2008). How UK universities engage with their local communities: A study of employer supported volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing,* 13(4), 363-378.

Carroll, A.B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 497-505.

Calabrese, A., Costa, R., Menichini, T., Rosati, F., & Sanfelice, G. (2013). Turning corporate social responsibility‑driven opportunities in competitive advantages: A two‑dimensional model. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 20(1), 50-58.

Collier, J., & Esteban, R (2007). Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment. *Business Ethics: A European Review*. Vol. 16, No. 1.

Choi, S. B., Ullah, S. M., & Kwak, W. J. (2015). Ethical leadership and followers' attitudes toward corporate social responsibility: The role of perceived ethical work climate. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 43(3), 353-365.

Chong, M. (2009). Employee participation in CSR and corporate identity: Insights from a disaster-response programme in the Asia-Pacific. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(2), 106-119.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Ethics, the heart of leadership (2nd Ed.). *Westport*, CT: Praeger.

Clarkson, M.B.E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 92-117.

Cohen, E. (2017). CSR for HR: A necessary partnership for advancing responsible business practices. *Routledge.*

Davis, K., & Blomstrom, R. L. (1966). Business and its environment. *McGraw-Hill.*

Dawkins, J., & Lewis, S. (2003). CSR in stakeholder expectations: And their implication for company strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(2-3), 185-193.

De Cremer, D., Brebels, L., & Sedikides, C. (2008). Being uncertain about what? Procedural fairness effects as a function of general uncertainty and belongingness uncertainty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1520-1525.

Dobson, S. (2011). CSR program helps boost engagement. *Canadian HR Reporter, 24(22),* 13-14.

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

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 239-263.

Eisenbeiß, S. A., & Brodbeck, F. (2014). Ethical and unethical leadership: A cross-cultural and cross-sectoral analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *122*(2), 343-359.

Elkington, J. (1997). Cannibals with forks: the triple bottom line of twenty-first century business. *Capstone.*

Ferrell, O. C., & Ferrell, L. (2008). A macromarketing ethics framework: stakeholder orientation and distributive justice. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28(1), 24-32.

Frederick, W.C., Post, J.E. & Davis, K. (1992), Business and Society: Corporate Strategy, Public Policy, *Ethics*, 7th ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. *Pitman Publishing*, Boston, MA.

Freeman, R. E. (2010). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. *Cambridge University Press.*

Frisch, C. & Huppenbauer, M. (2014). New Insights into Ethical Leadership: A Qualitative Investigation of the Experiences of Executive Ethical Leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics* 123:23–43.

Gatignon-Turnau, A. L., & Mignonac, K. (2015). (Mis) Using employee volunteering for public relations: Implications for corporate volunteers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(1), 7-18

Glavas, A. & Kelley, K. (2014), "The Effects of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Attitudes", *Business Ethics Quarterly* 24:2 pp. 165–202

Glavas, A. & Godwin, L.N. (2012), "Is the perception of 'goodness' good enough? Exploring the relationship between perceived corporate social responsibility and employee organizational identification", *Journal of Business Ethics,* 114:15-27.

Glavas, A. & Piderit, S.K. (2009), "How does doing good matter?", *JCC Winter* 36 2009.

Graafland, J., & Van de Ven, B. (2006). Strategic and moral motivation for corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (22), 111-123.

Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393–417

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.

Groves, K. S. & LaRocca, M. A. (2011). An Empirical Study of Leader Ethical Values, Transformational and Transactional Leadership, and Follower Attitudes Toward Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 103:511–528.

Hansen, S. D., Dunford, B. B., Boss, W., Boss A., & Angermeier, I. (2011). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the benefits of employee trust: A cross-discipline perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(1), 29–45.

Haski-Leventhal, D. (2013). Employee engagement in CSR: The case of payroll giving in Australia. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 20(2), 113-128.

Hatch, M. J. & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31, 356 – 365.

He, H., & Brown, A. D. (2013). Organizational identity and organizational identification: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(1), 3-35.

Hopkins, M. (2003). The Planetary Bargain: Corporate Social Responsibility Matters. *Earthscan*, London.

Houle, B. J., Sagarin, B. J., & Kaplan, M. F. (2005). A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(4), 337–344. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2704_6

Jenkins, H. (2004). A Critique of Conventional CSR Theory: An SME Perspective. *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 35-57.

Kalshoven, K., van Dijk, H., & Boon, C. (2016). Why and when does ethical leadership evoke unethical follower behavior? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(2), 500–515. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-10-2014-0314

Kim, H., Lee, M., Lee, H. & Kim, N. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee–Company Identification. *Journal of Business Ethics* (2010) 95:557–569.

Klaus J. Z. (2005). Stakeholder Orientation and Corporate Social Responsibility as a Precondition for Sustainability. *Total Quality Management* Vol. 16, No. 8–9, 1041–1052

Lee, E. M., Park, S. Y., & Lee, H. J. (2013). Employee perception of CSR activities: Its antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1716-1724.

Liedtka, J. (2008). Strategy making and the search for authenticity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80(2), 237-248.*

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 103-123.

Maignan, I. & Ferrell, O.C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (1): 3–19.

Mamantov, C. (2009). The engine behind employee communication SUCCESS. *Communication World*, 26(5), 33-35.

Martin, R., & Epitropaki, O. (2001). Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories (ILTs), transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations,* 4(3), 247-262.

McGuire, J. B., Sundgren, A. & Schneeweis, T. (1988). Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Financial Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(4), 854–872.

McShane, L., & Cunningham, P. (2012). To thine own self be true? Employees' judgments of the authenticity of their organization's corporate social responsibility program. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(1), 81-100.

Mirvis, P. (2012). Employee engagement and CSR: Transactional, relational, and developmental approaches. *California Management Review,* 54(4), 93-117.

Melewar, T. C. (2003). Determinants of the corporate identity construct: a review of the literature. *Journal of Marketing Communications,* 9(4), 195–220. doi:10.1080/1352726032000119161

Montiel, I. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability: Separate pasts, common futures. *Organization & Environment*, *21*(3), 245-269.

Morsing, M., & Schultz, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility communication: stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(4), 323-338.

Mosley, D., Pietri, P.H. & Megginson, L.C. (1996). Management: leadership in action. New York: *Harper Collins*.

Olins, W. (1978). The corporate personality: An inquiry into the nature of corporate identity. *Design Council, Thames & Hudson*, London.

Olins, W. (1989). Corporate Identity. *Harvard Business School Press*, Boston.

Painter-Morland, M. (2008). Systemic Leadership and the Emergence of Ethical Responsiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82:509–524.

Perrini F., Russo A. & Tencati A. (2007). CSR Strategies of SMEs and Large Firms. Evidence from Italy", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 285-300.

Peterson, D. K. (2004). Benefits of participation in corporate volunteer programs: Employees' perceptions. *Personnel Review*, 33(6), 615–627

Pratt, M. G. (1998). Central questions in organizational identification. *Identity in organizations*, 24(3), 171-207.

Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 358-384.

Rodrigo, P. & Arenas, D. (2008). Do Employees Care About CSR Programmes? A Typology of Employees. *Journal of Business Ethics* (2008) 83:265–283.

Roeck de K., & Delobbe N. (2012), Do environmental CSR initiatives serve organizations' legitimacy in the oil industry? Exploring employees' reactions through organizational identification theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110: 397-412.

Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R. V. & Williams C. A. (2006), Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (June, 2006), pp. 537-543.

Sekar, S., & Dyaram, L. (2017). What drives employees to participate in corporate volunteering programs? *Social Responsibility Journal*.

Sethi, S.P. (1979). A conceptual framework for environmental analysis of social issues and evaluation of business response pattern. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 63-74.

Shen, J., & Benson, J. (2016). When CSR is a social norm: How socially responsible human resource management affects employee work behavior. *Journal of Management*, 42(6), 1723-1746.

Smith, H. J., Thomas, T. R., & Tyler, T. R. (2006). Concrete Construction Employees: When Does Procedural Fairness Shape Self‑Evaluations? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(3), 644-663.

Spector, B. (2008). Business Responsibilities in a Divided World: The Cold War roots of the corporate social responsibility movement. *Enterprise & Society*, 314-336.

Tandon, A. K., Mishra, S. K., & Singh, E. (2011). What discriminates the prospective manager's attitude towards corporate social responsibility? An insight from psychological variables. *IUP Journal of Corporate Governance*, 10(3), 52.

Tao, W., Song, B., Ferguson, M. A., & Kochhar, S. (2018). Employees' prosocial behavioral intentions through empowerment in CSR decision-making. *Public Relations Review*, 44(5),667-680.

Trevino, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 951-990.

Tyler, T. R. (1997). The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities. *Personality and social psychology review*, 1(4), 323-345.

Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 658–672. https://doi.org/10.2307/257057

Valackiene, A., & Miceviciene, D. (2011). Methodological framework analyzing a social phenomenon: stakeholder orientation implementing balanced corporate social responsibility. *Engineering Economics*, *22*(3), 300-308.

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Stellmacher, J., & Christ, O. (2004). The utility of a broader conceptualization of organizational identification: Which aspects really matter? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 171-191.

van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 95–105.

Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., & Christensen, A. L. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader–member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 115(2), 204-213.

Wang, L., & Juslin, H. (2013). Corporate social responsibility in the Chinese forest industry: Understanding multiple stakeholder perceptions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *20*(3), 129-145.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 215-240.

Wu, L. Z., Kwan, H. K., Yim, F. H. K., Chiu, R. K., & He, X. (2015). CEO ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(4), 819-831.

Zink, K.J. (2005). Stakeholder orientation and corporate social responsibility as a precondition for sustainability. *Total Quality Management*, Vol. 16, No 8-9, 1041-1052, Oct-Nov 2005.

Authors*

Annu Mathew

Annu completed her bachelors' degree in commerce and master's in business administration. She is a doctoral candidate pursuing her Fellow Programme in Management in Human Resources at Xavier School of Management, XLRI Jamshedpur. Her research interests are Individual Careers, Sustainable Careers, Career Management and Development, Recruitment and Job Search, and Gender and Diversity in Organizations.

Rohit Punnoose

Rohit completed his bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from Delhi College of Engineering and a master's in business administration from XLRI. Jamshedpur. He is a doctoral candidate pursuing his Fellow Programme in Management in Graph Theory and Network Analysis from XLRI, Jamshedpur.