EXTENDING CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY RESEARCH TO THE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOMAINS: A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

FREDERICK P. MORGESON
Michigan State University

HERMAN AGUINIS
Indiana University

DAVID A. WALDMAN
Arizona State University

DONALD S. SIEGEL
State University of New York

Although issues of corporate social responsibility (CSR) have become an important topic of research, there have been few studies on this topic conducted in the fields of human resource (HR) management and organizational behavior (OB). To address this gap, we edited a special issue of *Personnel Psychology* that explicitly focuses attention on CSR in the HR/OB domains. In this introductory editorial, we synthesize and extend the four articles published in the special issue. We also address issues relating to the conceptualization and measurement of CSR, the application of microlevel theories to CSR, and the practical and methodological implications of research in this domain. Finally, we provide suggestions for future research linking CSR with some of the most frequently studied topics in HR/OB. We propose that a focus on HR/OB will improve our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of CSR and also benefit HR/OB in terms of bridging the science–practice and micro–macro gaps.

This special issue of *Personnel Psychology* is motivated by ongoing interest among organizational scholars and practitioners in corporate social responsibility (henceforth, CSR) and sustainability. Given that the vast majority of scholarly research on CSR and sustainability has focused on the macrolevel of analysis (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Devinney, 2009;

Siegel, 2009), we envisioned this special issue as addressing questions more directly related to the fields of human resource (HR) management and organizational behavior (OB).

Due to the rise in consumer, investor, supplier, and worker demands for CSR, organization decision makers are asking important questions about how to manage these activities and how to allocate resources to them. Thus, there is strong organizational and community demand for research on CSR-related topics such as environmental responsibility, sustainability, and stakeholder management, including HR/OB issues. In addition, practitioners seek knowledge that can be used to formulate and implement effective CSR-related policies. For example, executives are increasingly concerned with how to incorporate or align CSR with HR practices and employee initiatives.

Despite the increasing attention given to CSR among academics and practitioners, critical issues regarding conceptual frameworks and empirical methods are still evolving. As noted by Aguinis and Glavas (2012), scientific fields addressing macrolevel issues, such as economics, initially developed without giving a prominent role to their microfoundations (Foss, 2011; Mollick, 2012). CSR research is rooted in several macrolevel disciplines such as strategy (Siegel & Vitaliano, 2007), finance (Edmans, 2012), and corporate governance (Brammer & Pavelin, 2013). Thus, it is not surprising that the main focus of CSR research has been at the institutional level (i.e., addressing regulatory elements such as laws and standards, as well as normative and cultural-cognitive elements that are shaped by society, consumers, and stakeholders external to the firm; Scott, 1995) and, more recently, at the organizational level of analysis (Lee, 2008), with several studies addressing the relationship between CSR and firm financial performance.

To achieve a more comprehensive understanding of CSR, researchers must incorporate HR/OB theories and empirical methods, what Aguinis and Glavas (2012) termed *microfoundations of CSR*. As such, our vision in this special issue is to consider multiple levels, potentially including individual, team, organization, and industry levels in order to incorporate HR and OB constructs and processes. As described later, to a large degree, the articles in this special issue succeeded at bringing together both micro- and macro-level processes that are relevant to CSR and its implementation.

There appears to be considerable interest in studying CSR in the HR/OB domains. We received 52 submissions and, ultimately, accepted the four articles that appear in this issue (Caligiuri, Mencin, & Jiang, 2013; Gully, Phillips, Castellano, Han, & Kim, 2013; Ormiston & Wong, 2013; Rupp, Shao, Thornton, & Skarlicki, 2013). This approximately 8% acceptance rate is comparable to the 8–10% acceptance rate of "regular"

submissions to the journal. These manuscripts were assigned to one of the four editors of this special issue (the authors of this editorial) and subject to "blind" review by two experts on the various topics, which is the same process that is used for regular submissions to the journal.

In the remainder of this editorial, we summarize the articles (see also Table 1) in the special issue and identify several themes in order to integrate and extend work in this area. Our goal is to take stock of the empirical findings across the set of articles and then look to the future of HR/OB research on CSR. To accomplish this objective, we consider: (1) how CSR has been conceptualized and measured; (2) the application of microlevel theories to CSR implementation and employee-based outcomes; (3) implications for practice and policy; and (4) methodological implications. We conclude with a consideration of specific suggestions to help guide future research on this important topic.

CSR Conceptualization and Measurement

CSR has been defined in several ways. The following definition from Waldman, Siegel, and Javidan (2006, p. 1703) is representative: "actions on the part of the firm that appear to advance, or acquiesce in the promotion of some social good, beyond the immediate interests of the firm and its shareholders and beyond that which is required by law." However, there are other definitions, such as the one advanced by Aguinis (2011, p. 855) and adopted by others (e.g., Rupp, 2011), which defines CSR as, "context-specific organizational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders' expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance." In operationalizing such actions, researchers have largely pursued what could be termed an "objective" approach. That is, they objectively assess the actions on the part of the firm that reflect corporate social performance (henceforth, CSP; e.g., Doh & Stumpf, 2005; Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003).

To accomplish this goal, a number of researchers have relied on the ratings of analysts at the firm of Kinder, Lydenberg, and Domini (KLD). Specifically, KLD data provide ratings of CSP for investors who wish to "screen" investment portfolios to exclude companies that might violate their socially based beliefs or principles. For example, a union pension fund may wish to exclude investments in companies that are anti-union. Technically, most of the KLD data are not "objective" per se because they rely on perceptions and interpretations on the part of KLD analysts. However, they could be considered to be more objectively based, as compared to ratings of CSR/CSP from employees who are internal to a firm, because the KLD analysts are removed from particular firms and rely on

TABLE 1
Brief Summaries of Articles Included in Special Issue

Theoretical Frameworks	Methods and Samples	Main Research Questions	Main Findings and Implications
Rupp, Shao, Thornton, & Skarlicki (2013)			
• Multimotive framework	Study 1: Scenario-based experiment with students in the final stages of MBA program.	How do potential and current employees react to CSR in terms of job pursuit intentions and citizenship behavior?	• Applicants are more likely to pursue a job at a firm they perceive as being socially responsible.
• Organizational justice	Study 2: Survey including full-time employees who were attending part-time MBA classes.	How do moral identity and the experience of distributive justice moderate these effects?	• Employee's citizenship behaviors are positively associated with their perceptions of their employer's corporate social responsibility.
• Deontic justice			• The positive effects of applicant (employee) perceptions of a firm's corporate social responsibility depends on how fairly they expect to be treated (how fairly they have been treated) by the organization, as well as their moral identity.
Caligiuri, Mencin, & Jiang (2013)			
• Engagement	Data collected over three time periods from employee volunteers who are nationals of 26 countries and work at a large European-based *Fortune 500* pharmaceutical company, matched with surveys distributed to their managers and nongovernmental organization (NGO) managers.	Do corporate volunteerism programs produce lasting benefits for employees, NGOs, and the employees' business units after employees complete their volunteer assignments?	• Corporate volunteer programs can be a "win–win–win," creating value for multiple organizational stakeholders including NGOs, employees, and business units.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Theoretical Frameworks	Methods and Samples	Main Research Questions	Main Findings and Implications
● Social learning		What are the conditions that maximize the value of such programs for each of these three stakeholder groups?	● To increase organizational stakeholder value, corporate volunteers should perceive their volunteer work as meaningful for the NGO, a professional developmental experience, and supported by the NGO leaders and staff.
			● Employees that work on volunteer assignments in other countries can help develop their professional capabilities.
			● Employee engagement can be created and sustained through well-designed corporate volunteerism assignments.
Gully, Phillips, Castellano, Han, & Kim (2013)			
● Signaling	Field experiment involving job seekers registered on an Internet-based consolidator of job advertisements.	How do prospective employees (job seekers) react to information about a firm's CSR?	● Communicating social and environmental responsibility values significantly alters the mix of people attracted to and willing to pursue jobs with an organization.
● Person–organization fit		What are the factors that mediate and moderate this relationship?	● Recruitment messages supporting social and environmental values are most attractive to people who have a strong desire to have a significant impact through their work.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Theoretical Frameworks	Methods and Samples	Main Research Questions	Main Findings and Implications
• Attraction–selection–attrition			• The effect of social and environmental messages on job pursuit intentions seems to operate through perceived fit and attraction. • Firms that highly value corporate social and environmental responsibility should make a strong effort to include these values in their recruitment messages if they want to attract people who fit their culture and value system. • The wording of job advertisements influences the types of people likely to respond to them.
Ormiston and Wong (2013)			
• Strategic leadership	Mixed-method study involving organization-level ratings of analysts at the firm of Kinder, Lydenberg, and Domini (KLD) for CSR and corporate social irresponsibility (CSiR); judges' ratings (i.e., Q-sort methodology) of CEOs' moral identity; archival organization-level data from COMPUSTAT; archival industry-level data from Dun and Bradstreet's *Industry Norms and Key Business Ratios*; and archival individual-level data for CEOs from Dun and Bradstreet's *Book of Corporate Managements*. Organizations were *Fortune 500* organizations.	Why, how, and when do organizations move from CSR to CSiR?	• Firms that engage in corporate social responsibility are subsequently more likely to engage in corporate social irresponsibility.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Theoretical Frameworks	Methods and Samples	Main Research Questions	Main Findings and Implications
• Moral licensing			• CEOs who present themselves as moral individuals are more likely to be associated with this positive relationship between corporate social responsibility and subsequent corporate social irresponsibility than are CEOs who do not present themselves as moral individuals.
• Moral identity			• Boards of directors should carefully monitor firms after successful implementation of corporate social responsibility initiatives.
• Boards of directors should carefully monitor leaders who emphasize their morality, as these leaders may be more likely to engage in this behavior (i.e., bad behavior) than are those who do not emphasize their morality.

systematically collected data across a large number of organizations (Sharfman, 1996).

In their study, Rupp et al. (2013) used a subjectively based measure of employee perceptions, specifically a measure of perceived corporate citizenship that was originally advanced by Maignan and Ferrell (2000). Rupp et al. (2013, p. 897) stressed the psychological aspects of CSR and its interpretation, as illustrated by their statement that "how employees perceive the CSR of their employer has more direct and stronger implications for employees' subsequent reactions than actual firm behaviors of which employees may or may not be aware." In other articles in this special issue, psychological theory is also applied to CSR and its implementation effectiveness, although the existence of CSR (or aspects of CSR) is assumed to be a given. Such is the case in the work of Caligiuri et al. (2013), in which corporate volunteerism is assessed using a more objective approach. Ormiston and Wong (2013) also relied on objective measurement, specifically using the KLD ratings described earlier. In addition, as shown by Rupp et al. and Gully et al. (2013), it is also possible to manipulate CSR experimentally by presenting alternative scenarios to research participants.

In sum, this special issue demonstrates how a variety of measurement approaches can be utilized to assess CSR and its effects. They range from subjective to more objective indices, as well as experimentally induced procedures. Of course, there is no inherently "right" way to measure CSR, as measurement choices are driven largely by the research questions that are being explored.

Application of Microlevel Theories to CSR

As mentioned earlier, the focus of most of the extant research on CSR has been at the macrolevel, especially given growing academic interest in "strategic" CSR. This macrolevel emphasis has been promulgated by numerous attempts to link social responsibility to firm performance (e.g., McWilliams & Siegel, 2000; Waddock & Graves, 1997). It is important to note that the key datasets that have been used to construct measures of social responsibility in most empirical studies, such as the KLD social performance ratings and *Fortune* reputation surveys (Hannon & Milkovich, 1996), are collected at the firm level. Thus, it is not surprising that existing research has invoked theory that is predominantly oriented toward firm or even institution-level phenomena. For example, McWilliams and Siegel (2001) outlined a theory of the firm perspective of CSR, which asserts that managers engage in CSR only if it advances the financial interests of their organizations. Such thinking is consistent with agency theory, which

suggests that managerial behavior should be rewarded (or punished) in such a way as to ensure that the actions of managers will be in line with interests of owners or shareholders (Husted & Salazar, 2006; Jensen, 2001). In the realm of CSR, this would mean that, as McWilliams and Siegel (2001) have argued, there should be a clear link between the CSR policies that are instituted by management and financial outcomes for the firm. Furthermore, the morality of CSR pertains to whether managers are indeed serving the interests of owners/shareholders, as opposed to only serving their own selfish interests.

Beyond such transaction-based theorizing, stakeholder theories assert that firms and policymakers should balance the needs of the multiple stakeholder entities or constituent groups that have an interest in the activities and outcomes of a firm (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Margolis & Walsh, 2003). Among others, these entities and groups can include employees, customers, suppliers, environmentalists, the community as a whole, and owners/shareholders. Indeed, among the above, the only true "stakeholder" group or entity per se would be owners/shareholders (Waldman & Siegel, 2008). Moreover, transaction-based, strategic approaches to CSR, on the part of top-level managers, can be conceptualized as constituting "responsible" leadership (Waldman & Siegel, 2008). On the other hand, a stakeholder theory perspective on the morality of CSR implies that managers should recognize and serve the interests of a broader set of constituent groups (Aguinis, 2011; Jones, Felps, & Bigley, 2007).

This special issue brings additional theorizing into play, especially at the microlevel of analysis. As suggested by Aguinis and Glavas (in press, 2012), the use of theories that are targeted at more microlevels can help us to ascertain the underlying psychological processes (i.e., mediators), as well as contingencies (i.e., moderators) of CSR and its outcomes. The special issue articles successfully apply various microlevel theories to the CSR domain.

Rupp et al. (2013) illustrates how adopting a multimotive framework and deontic justice theoretical perspective, or how individuals may react to (in)justice committed toward others, can help us understand how perceptions of CSR are translated into favorable employee outcomes. These authors also point toward individual differences in terms of moral identity as a potentially moderating factor in the relationship between perceptions of CSR and employee outcomes. Thus, Rupp et al.'s article suggests the usefulness of expanding theoretical frameworks both outward (i.e., third-party perceptions) as well as inward (i.e., individual differences).

Caligiuri et al. (2013) is one of the first studies on the impact of corporate volunteerism programs on employees. This important aspect of social responsibility deals with direct employee involvement in

community improvement efforts. Although many companies have adopted such programs, there is little direct evidence on the outcomes of such efforts, especially advantages that might accrue to firms, employees, and other stakeholders. The authors utilize engagement and social learning theories to help us understand how these initiatives lead to more favorable outcomes for employees, their units, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Thus, Caligiuri et al.'s article highlights the usefulness of using theoretical frameworks that cross organizational boundaries and include both internal and external stakeholders.

Gully et al. (2013) apply signaling, person–organization fit, and attraction–selection–attrition theories. Along with a focus on a key individual difference variable (i.e., individuals' desire for significant impact through work), the authors use these theories to form a better understanding of job pursuit intentions when participants are provided information about a firm's CSR. Thus, Gully et al. offer a demonstration of how to integrate several HR/OB theories to better understand the impact of CSR policies and practices.

Finally, Ormiston and Wong (2013) draw on moral licensing and strategic leadership theories to describe how organizations can move from CSR to corporate social irresponsibility (CSiR) through the acquisition of moral credits. They go on to suggest that moral identity symbolization on the part of CEOs can moderate the relationship between CSR and CSiR. In this instance, psychologically based theory focusing on identity is used to enable a better understanding of how firm-level CSR might predict firm-level CSiR. Ormiston and Wong's article demonstrates the usefulness of expanding CSR theoretical frameworks to include the "dark side" of CSR (i.e., corporate social *irresponsibility*).

Taken together, these four articles demonstrate the usefulness of applying micro-oriented theories when studying CSR. They also show that a CSR lens can lead to innovative and fruitful expansions of HR/OB theories. We will return to this point later when we offer suggestions regarding future research.

Implications for Practice and Policy

The findings reported in this special issue have important implications for practice. For example, Rupp et al. demonstrate the importance of understanding the manner in which people perceive the CSR policies and practices of their firms. The authors also show how those perceptions interact with justice and moral identity and how understanding this process can help managers improve important individual-level outcomes, such as applicant job pursuit intentions and organizational citizenship behavior.

Results from Rupp et al. can be used to enhance a firm's ability to attract job applicants and enhance their employees' performance via employees' engagement in extra-role behaviors.

An understanding of job pursuit is further examined by Gully et al. In that article, the authors show that information on a firm's values about environmental and social responsibility mediates the relationship between recruiting messages and applicant job pursuit intentions. Moreover, the effect was stronger for job seekers with a stronger desire to have a significant impact through their work (DSIW). In addition, the moderating effect of DSIW on the relationship between recruitment messages and job pursuit intentions was fully mediated by person–organization fit perceptions and organizational attraction. In short, Gully et al.'s study provides important insights regarding when and why information on CSR is likely to affect job seekers' attitudes and behaviors, and these insights can be used to design more effective recruitment programs.

In addition, a number of CSR-related policies are inherently based on the actions of individuals. This is shown by Caligiuri et al., who determined that corporate volunteerism constitutes an action involving a firm's human resources for the purpose of serving some social good or purpose. In their paper, we can see precisely how such programs can be optimized to provide the best possible outcomes. Overall, volunteerism assignments that include meaningful projects, social support within NGOs, and opportunities for skill development are associated with benefits to multiple stakeholders. However, this study also suggests that different factors maximize benefits for different stakeholders. For example, if the goal is to maximize employee engagement, it is important that employees receive social support and meaningful projects, and the NGOs have the resources necessary to sustain the project. If the priority is to implement programs that have a positive sustainable impact on NGOs, the employee volunteers should use a wide range of professional skills. However, if the goal is to maximize capability development, then it is useful for employees to be on an international assignment.

Finally, the article by Ormiston and Wong (2013) suggests that firms that engage in prior socially responsible behavior are more likely to engage in socially irresponsible behavior. Moreover, CEO moral identity symbolization moderates the relationship between prior CSR and CSiR, such that the relationship is stronger for CEOs who are higher on moral identity symbolization. Because leaders who attempt to put forth a moral image are more likely to engage in moral licensing behavior, an important implication for practice is that firms should implement governance structures that hold leaders accountable not only for stakeholder management but also for stakeholder mismanagement.

Future Research Directions: Methodological and Content Issues

In this section, we offer a discussion of directions for future research, organized by methodological and content issues.

Methodological Issues

Levels of analysis.   As is evident from reading the articles published in this special issue, the study of CSR can potentially be framed as a multilevel phenomenon. Specifically, it could be argued that CSR policies and practices reside at the firm level of analysis. However, it can also be asserted that perceptions of employees about these policies and practices may reside at the individual or group levels of analysis. Outcomes of CSR reside at the individual and team (e.g., an individual's job pursuit intentions), firm (e.g., firm performance), and higher (e.g., societal-level outcomes) levels. Accordingly, we believe that in many cases, future research aimed at making important contributions to CSR theory and applications could adopt a multilevel measurement, design, and analysis perspective.

From a conceptual standpoint, an explicit consideration of multilevel issues will require posing a priori hypotheses regarding relationships among variables. Specifically, such research can include three types of relationships (Aguinis, Gottfredson, & Culpepper, in press). First, there are lower-level, direct effects, such as a hypothesized relationship between individual values about CSR and individual perceptions of a firm's CSR initiatives. Second, there are cross-level direct effects such as a hypothesized relationship between a firm's CSR policies and an individual's job satisfaction. Third, there are cross-level interaction effects, such as a hypothesized moderating effect of a firm's CSR policies on the relationship between individual values about CSR and individual perceptions of a firm's CSR initiatives.

In proposing multilevel research approaches, it is imperative to carefully consider levels of analysis issues, especially with regard to the measurement of CSR. As shown in this special issue, CSR measurement can span both subjective and objective approaches and can include experimental manipulations as well as longitudinal designs. We see at least a few key issues here. First, because CSR can be viewed as a psychological or perceptual phenomenon, questions arise as to what the appropriate level of analysis is. Conceptually, it is imperative that researchers make compelling arguments regarding an appropriate level of analysis. Of course, such arguments will depend upon the exact dimensions or aspects of CSR (or other variables) that are being considered. In terms of measurement

considerations, if researchers adopt a multilevel perspective, it is necessary to use appropriate tools to capture constructs at different levels of analysis and anticipate the methodological appropriateness of aggregating scores to higher levels. The strategic HR management literature suggests that individual perceptions are a key intermediate mechanism linking HR policies and employee subsequent attitudes and behavior (e.g., Chuang & Liao, 2010). In other words, as noted by Rupp et al. (2013), the way in which "employees perceive the CSR of their employer may actually have more direct and stronger implications for employees' subsequent reactions than actual firm behaviors of which employees may or may not be aware" (p. 897). However, employees may not perceive the same HR policies in the same way (e.g., Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2008). Consequently, an important consideration in future research is the need to offer conceptual and empirical evidence regarding the appropriateness of aggregating individual-level CSR perceptions and attitudes to higher levels (e.g., team, functional unit, organization).

In Rupp et al., the individual level was emphasized. But might it also be conceptually and methodologically appropriate to aggregate such perceptions to a team or organizational level? For example, is such aggregation most appropriate when CSR is operationalized in terms of such phenomena as philanthropy or volunteerism (e.g., Caligiuri et al.), both of which can be assessed more objectively at the unit or organizational levels?

The above discussion would suggest that operationalizations of CSR can be all encompassing, or alternatively, investigators might disaggregate aspects of CSR in their research. KLD measurement represents an example of a more broad-brush approach to CSR measurement, in that a wide range of stakeholder-based actions on the part of the firm are taken into account. At the same time, researchers have demonstrated that it is both feasible and desirable to analyze separate components of the KLD data (e.g., Waldman et al., 2006).

In addition, it should be apparent from Ormiston and Wong that a longitudinal approach might help us better understand how a positive aspect of CSR at one point in time could actually be associated with aspects of social irresponsibility at a later date. For example, Enron initially gained a reputation for corporate philanthropy and being a good citizen of its broader community. However, in the end, it turned out to be highly irresponsible in terms of its blatant disregard for key stakeholders (e.g., employees, customers, and shareholders).

It is also important to note that in the context of conducting multilevel research, there may be limitations with existing firm-level measures of CSR, such as KLD. Several studies have challenged the construct validity of the KLD data, especially as it relates to the measurement of

environmental performance/social responsibility, a key dimension of CSR (e.g., Chatterji & Levine, 2006; Chatterji, Levine, & Toffel, 2009). Walls, Phan, and Berrone (2011) constructed a new measure of environmental strategy/performance, based on the natural resource-based view of the firm (Hart, 1995), as well as content analysis of company reports and secondary data, suggesting that their new measure had advantages over existing measures.

This is a good example of how researchers can construct better measures of CSR; a technique that could be applied to other dimensions of CSR (e.g., employee relations). From a research design standpoint, it will be necessary to plan such studies with sufficient statistical power, given that tests of hypotheses involving cross-level interactions are affected by sample size at all levels of analysis (Mathieu, Aguinis, Culpepper, & Chen, 2012).

Emerging research approaches.   As noted earlier, the articles in the special issue vary in terms of research approaches, including the use of surveys, experimental designs, longitudinal data collection efforts, and archival/secondary data sources. All of these research approaches are well established in the HR/OB and broader management literatures. There are, however, some new and emerging research methods, particularly around the use of neuroscience methods, which are highly relevant to CSR (Balthazard, Waldman, Thatcher, & Hannah, 2012; Waldman, Balthazard, & Peterson, 2011). As argued by Senior, Lee, and Butler (2011), neuroscience methodologies can be used to broaden our understanding of organizational phenomena and their measurement.

For example, Waldman et al. (2013) asked teams of MBA students to analyze a CSR-based case dealing with a dilemma encountered by the Levi Strauss firm, which involved the use of child labor by one of its suppliers in Asia. While dealing with the case, all students were assessed in real time in terms of quantitative electroencephalogram (qEEG) activity. Their results indicated that when emergent leaders (as assessed through peer ratings following the team process) spoke, fellow team members became more engaged neurologically in the process, as compared to when nonleaders spoke. Although engagement has been assessed psychometrically (e.g., Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010), typically such measurement cannot be done unobtrusively or in real time during an actual team process. Neuroscience methods could also be used to examine related issues, such as how the introduction of CSR-based content in an otherwise more "business-like" discussion might influence team emergent states and processes. Waldman et al. (2006) presented an example of how the introduction of CSR issues in a top management team process could potentially help to get the team more engaged in problem-solving activities.

Content Issues

This special issue represents an attempt to incorporate more microlevel perspectives into the analysis of CSR. To a large extent, we see progress in this current collection of studies, although we acknowledge that research of this nature is still in its early stages. Indeed, CSR may provide the type of broader contextual lens that might move our understanding of work and organizational phenomena forward (Morgeson, Dierdorff, & Hmurovic, 2010). A number of specific research questions could be addressed using such a lens. How can CSR inform us as to the nature of effective leadership and characteristics of top executives (e.g., see Pless, Maak, & Waldman, 2012)? How might selection, appraisal, reward, and training processes be designed to take into account, or align with, CSR? Aside from the employee-based outcomes addressed in this special issue (e.g., organizational citizenship behavior), does CSR implementation have effects on absenteeism, turnover, innovation or creativity, and so forth? Another critical issue is how CSR affects employee productivity. It would also be useful to explore the relationship between organizational culture/climate and CSR.

To understand these relationships, we should also consider that Ones and Dilchert (2012) distinguished social responsibility from environmental sustainability. Ones and Dilchert (2012) and Aguinis and Glavas (2013) suggested that HR/OB issues relevant to the former may not necessarily overlap with those pertaining to the latter. Anderson, Costa, and Salgado (2012) further argued that efforts to achieve social responsibility relevant to employees might be labeled as "psychological sustainability in the workplace." Moreover, they suggested that such internal psychological sustainability might be a precursor or stepping stone to help a firm pursue goals of environmental sustainability. It might also be useful to link these new micro-based perspectives on CSR to the burgeoning literature on strategic HR management (Marler, 2012).

Aguinis and Glavas (2012) offered a way to structure future research on CSR consisting of understanding predictors, mediators, moderators, and outcomes. Building upon the suggestions by Aguinis and Glavas (2012), we offer additional guidance for research involving CSR and HR/OB. One way to do this involves grouping research questions about CSR around some of the most frequently investigated topics in HR/OB. In Table 2, we draw from Cascio and Aguinis' (2008) list of the most frequently studied research domains, which included predictors of performance, work motivation and attitudes, performance measurement/work outcomes, leader influences, and psychometric/methodological issues. Table 2 includes a selected set of questions about CSR and HR/OB that are linked to each of these research domains. Some of these questions have been addressed, at

TABLE 2

*Summary of Suggested Future Research Questions Linking Frequently Studied
HR/OB Research Domains to Corporate Social Responsibility*

Predictors of Performance
- What are features of successful selection systems that will result in the effective adoption or implementation of CSR?
- What are some constructs and measures that may predict an employee's future involvement with a firm's CSR initiatives?
- What is the impact on a firm's CSR effectiveness of using virtues and character strengths as part of the employee selection process?

Work Motivation and Attitudes
- How are ethical decision-making processes related to CSR endeavors, and are there different, cognitively based interpretations of such processes?
- What is the relationship between organizational culture/climate and CSR?
- Can CSR have an effect on employee identity?
- Is there a relationship between diversity and CSR?
- How do CSR policies or practices relate to employee work attitudes or morale?
- How do CSR policies and practices affect individual attitudes that, in turn, may affect emergent states and processes in teams?
- What causal attributions do organizational members make regarding their firm's CSR policies and practices, and what are the consequences of these attributions?
- What are the factors that affect individuals' perceptions of CSR policies and practices?
- What is the effect of CSR policies and practices on employee motivation and vice versa?
- What is the role of context (e.g., reward systems, team-level factors, industry-level factors, society-level factors) on employee attitudes regarding CSR?

Performance Measurement and Work Outcomes
- How does CSR affect employee-based indicators of effectiveness, such as absenteeism or turnover rates?
- How is CSR related to employee performance, including productivity, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior?
- How is CSR related to employee voice behavior?
- How are incentive and reward systems related to employees' CSR performance?

Leader Influences
- How is CSR related to effective leadership and the characteristics of top executives?
- What is the role of attitudes, values, and personality traits of members of the top management in setting a firm's CSR policies and practices?
- What is the relationship between responsible leadership and CSR, and are there different conceptualizations of the nature of responsible leadership?
- When and why do leader influences result in corporate social irresponsibility (i.e., the "dark side" of CSR)?

Psychometric and Methodological Issues
- If CSR can be viewed as a psychological or perceptual phenomenon, what is the appropriate level of analysis for measuring CSR?
- Should certain dimensions or aspects of CSR be conceived at the individual level of analysis while others are conceptualized at higher levels?
- Under what conditions can individual-level scores of CSR perceptions be aggregated to higher levels of analysis (e.g., team, firm, and even society)?

TABLE 2 (continued)

- Under what conditions should measures of CSR be narrow or broad?
- Are perceptions of CSR stable over time? Under what conditions is it more appropriate to measure CSR over time?
- What is the relationship between measures of CSR and measures of corporate environmental sustainability? Should these measures be considered as indicators of a single multidimensional construct?
- What are the contributions that multilevel theory, design, measurement, and analysis can make to substantive CSR issues?
- What is the contribution that neuroscience methods can make to substantive CSR issues?

Note. Research domains are those identified as the five most popular ones by Cascio and Aguinis (2008) based on 5,780 articles published in *Journal of Applied Psychology* and *Personnel Psychology* between 1963 and 2007.

least in part, by the articles published in this special issue. Yet, many of these questions have not yet been addressed. We hope that the information in this table will be useful for all those interested in conducting research on CSR, particularly involving linkages between CSR and HR/OB domains. By addressing these questions, we will see further contributions to CSR, as well as expansions of HR/OB theories.

Conclusion

The articles presented in this special issue, along with our own analysis, demonstrate that HR/OB has much to contribute to CSR research and practice. Adopting an HR/OB lens is critically important in terms of understanding the microfoundations of CSR—a notorious "black box" in CSR. As recently noted by Devinney (2013, p. 84), "microfoundations can be a key platform in moving the management field forward. It opens up the possibilities of bridging the macro–micro divide that pervades management research by serving as a conceptual forum to debate whether it is possible for us [to] come up with a more unified and parsimonious characterization of our field."

In addition, we also believe that research on CSR can help HR/OB bridge the much lamented science–practice and micro–macro gaps. CSR is of great importance to organizations and society. Accordingly, CSR research is likely to be received with attention by the media and society in general—thereby elevating the status and visibility of HR/OB research. Regarding the micro–macro gap, CSR research, by virtue of its largely multilevel nature, will encourage HR/OB researchers to consider the role of context more explicitly (Morgeson et al., 2010). Therefore, CSR-targeted research will allow HR/OB researchers to think more

broadly about individuals as embedded within firms, as well as firms embedded within societal and cultural contexts, thereby helping narrow the micro–macro gap in HR/OB and the field of management in general.

In conclusion, this special issue suggests that we have just begun to scratch the surface in terms of answering questions about linkages between CSR and HR/OB. However, we hope this special issue will serve as a catalyst for future work. There is great potential for HR/OB research to make important contributions to our understanding of CSR and also for such research to yield important benefits for HR/OB research and practice. We look forward to continued work in this domain.

REFERENCES

Aguinis H. (2011). Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In Zedeck S (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 855–879). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Aguinis H, Glavas A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 932–968.

Aguinis H, Glavas A. (2013). What corporate environmental sustainability can do for industrial-organizational psychology. In Huffman AH, Klein SR (Eds.), *Green organizations: Driving change with I-O psychology* (pp. 379–392). New York, NY: Routledge.

Aguinis H, Glavas A. (in press). Embedded versus peripheral corporate social responsibility: Psychological foundations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*.

Aguinis H, Gottfredson RK, Culpepper SA. (in press). Best-practice recommendations for estimating cross-level interaction effects using multilevel modeling. *Journal of Management*.

Anderson N, Costa AC, Salgado JF. (2012). Sustainability and industrial, work, and organizational psychology: Globalization, contribution, and psychological sustainability. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *5*, 487–490.

Balthazard P, Waldman DA, Thatcher RW, Hannah ST. (2012). Differentiating transformational and non-transformational leaders on the basis of neurological imaging. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 244–258.

Brammer SJ, Pavelin S. (2013). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility. In Wright M, Siegel DS, Keasey K, Filatotchev I (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of corporate governance* (pp. 719–743). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Caligiuri P, Mencin A, Jiang K. (2013). Win–win–win: The influence of company-sponsored volunteerism programs on employees, NGOs, and business units. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *66*, 825–860.

Cascio WF, Aguinis H. (2008). Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 1062–1081.

Chatterji AK, Levine D. (2006). Breaking down the wall of codes: Evaluating non-financial performance measurement. *California Management Review*, *48*(2), 29–51.

Chatterji AK, Levine D, Toffel MW. (2009). How well do social ratings actually measure corporate social responsibility? *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, *18*, 125–169.

Chuang C, Liao H. (2010). Strategic human resource management in service context: Taking care of business by taking care of employees and customers. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *63*, 153–196.

Devinney TM. (2009). Is the socially responsible corporation a myth? The good, the bad, and the ugly of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *23*, 44–56.

Devinney TM. (2013). Is microfoundational thinking critical to management thought and practice? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *27*, 81–84.

Doh JP, Stumpf SA. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook on responsible leadership and governance in global business*. Cheltenham/Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

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

Edmans A. (2012). The link between job satisfaction and firm value, with implications for of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*, 1–19.

Foss NJ. (2011). Why micro-foundations for resource-based theory are needed and what they may look like. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1413–1428.

Gully SM, Phillips JM, Castellano WG, Han K, Kim A. (2013). A mediated moderation model of recruiting socially and environmentally responsible job applicants. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *66*, 935–973.

Hannon J, Milkovich G. (1996). The effect of human resource reputation signals on share price: An event study. *Human Resource Management*, *35*, 405–424.

Hart SL. (1995). A natural resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 986–1014.

Husted B, Salazar J de J. (2006). Taking Friedman seriously: Maximizing profit and social performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*, 75–91.

Jensen MC. (2001). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *European Financial Management*, *7*, 297–317.

Jones TM, Felps W, Bigley GA. (2007). Ethical theory and stakeholder-related decisions: The role of stakeholder culture. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 137–155.

Lee M. (2008). A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead. *International Journal of Management Review*, *10*, 53–73.

Maignan I, Ferrell OC. (2000). Measuring corporate citizenship in two countries: The case of the United States and France. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *23*, 283–297.

Margolis JD, Walsh JP. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 268–305.

Marler J. (2012). Strategic human resource management in context: A historical and global perspective. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*, 6–11.

Mathieu JE, Aguinis H, Culpepper SA, Chen G. (2012). Understanding and estimating the power to detect cross-level interaction effects in multilevel modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*, 951–966.

McWilliams A, Siegel D. (2000). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Correlation or misspecification? *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*, 603–609.

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

Mollick E. (2012). People and process, suits, and innovators: The role of individuals in firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *33*, 1001–1015.

Morgeson FP, Dierdorff EC, Hmurovic JL. (2010). Work design *in situ*: Understanding the role of occupational and organizational context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 351–360.

Nishii LH, Lepak DP, Schneider B. (2008). Employee attribution of the "why" of HR practices: Their effects on employee attitudes and behaviors, and customer satisfaction. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *61*, 503–545.

Ones DS, Dilchert S. (2012). Environmental sustainability at work: A call to action. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *5*, 444–466.

Orlitzky M, Schmidt FL, Rynes S. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, *24*, 403–411.

Ormiston ME, Wong EM. (2013). License to ill: The effects of corporate social responsibility and CEO moral identity on corporate social irresponsibility. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *66*, 861–893.

Pless NM, Maak T, Waldman DA. (2012). Different approaches toward doing the right thing: Mapping the responsibility orientations of leaders. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*, 51–65.

Rich BL, Lepine JA, Crawford ER. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*, 617–635.

Rupp DE. (2011). An employee-centered model of organizational justice and social responsibility. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *1*, 72–94.

Rupp DE, Shao R, Thornton MA, Skarlicki DP. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, *66*, 895–933.

Scott RW. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Senior C, Lee N, Butler M. (2011). Organizational cognitive neuroscience. *Organization Science*, *22*, 804–815.

Sharfman M. (1996). The construct validity of the Kinder, Lydenberg and Domini social performance ratings data. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *15*, 287–296.

Siegel DS. (2009). Green management matters only if it yields more green: An economic/strategic perspective. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *23*, 5–16.

Siegel DS, Vitaliano D. (2007). An empirical analysis of the strategic use of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, *16*, 773–792.

Waddock S, Graves S. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*, 303–319.

Waldman DA, Balthazard PA, Peterson S. (2011). The neuroscience of leadership: Can we revolutionize the way that leaders are identified and developed? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *25*, 60–74.

Waldman DA, Siegel D. (2008). Defining the socially responsible leader. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 117–131.

Waldman DA, Siegel D, Javidan M. (2006). Components of transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*, 1703–1725.

Waldman DA, Wang D, Stikic M, Berka C, Balthazard PA, Richardson T, Pless NM, Maak T. (2013). Emergent leadership and team engagement: An application of neuroscience technology and methods. *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*.

Walls JL, Phan PH, Berrone P. (2011). Measuring environmental strategy: Construct development, reliability and validity. *Business & Society*, *50*, 71–115.