ABSTRACT

Although the importance of engaging employees in corporate philanthropy has received a growing attention, less research has examined how employee behaviors were related to corporate philanthropy. To fill this research gap, we argue that there is a positive relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy by comparing targets of OCB, including OCB-O and OCB-I, to types of philanthropy, including business-related philanthropy (BRP) and nonbusiness-related philanthropy (NRP). Besides, we argue that impression management (IM) influences employee engagement in philanthropy within OCB, and that perceived organizational support (POS) moderates the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy. This study concludes with discussion and limitations.
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INTRODUCTION

The importance of corporate philanthropy continues to be a topic of intense interesting among both scholars and practitioners. Proponents argue that engaging in corporate philanthropy enhances the firm’s reputation, thereby improving performance among key stakeholders (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990; Williams & Barrett, 2000; Godfrey, 2005; Wang & Qian, 2011). Therefore, engaging in corporate philanthropy should be an important goal of the firm (Porter & Kramer, 2002). On the other hand, opponents argue that a firm exists due to generate economic returns, not to solve societal problems; therefore, it needs to spend money on better products and services (Devinney, 2009; Vaaland, Heide, & Grønhaug, 2008). However, many firms engage in corporate philanthropy to fulfill humanitarian needs, to develop a positive image, and reinforce its relationships with customers. Currently, it has been suggested that corporate philanthropy may also provide avenues for employees to be personally involved in a company’s commitment to social responsibility. Although there has been a growing interest in the relationship between employee behaviors and corporate philanthropy, less research has focused on how employee behaviors are related to corporate philanthropy.

It has been found that employees involved in philanthropic initiatives showed a statistically significant increase in their sense of identification with their respective firms (Bartel, 2001); as a result, this improvement in employee attitudes towards their companies, in turn,
could influence an improvement in job performance. Lim’s (2010) study shows that employees who have a favorable impression of corporate philanthropy are four times more likely to be truly loyal employees and five times more likely to remain with their employer than those who do not. In addition, involving employees with philanthropy could enhance employee morale and their social relationship with the business, eventually contributing to increased employee retention, motivation and recruitment (Brammer, Millington, & Pavelin, 2006). Notably, since employees are also seen as the most important stakeholder group toward whom corporations have to exercise their social responsibility activities, including corporate philanthropy (Bozhurt & Bal, 2012), it has been suggested that firms can promote a strong organizational culture by engaging employees in philanthropy at either a policy making level or through participation in giving. For example, greater breadth and depth of employee involvement practices, such as corporate philanthropy, are associated with higher levels of organizational commitment which leads to a strong organizational culture (Cox, Zagelmeyer, & Marchington, 2006). Therefore, firms tend to provide with organizational support through which employees get involved through philanthropic activities, such as employee giving and volunteering.

Two most common employee behaviors toward corporate philanthropy are prosocial and altruism (Penner, Dovidio, Pilavin, & Schroeder, 2005; Martin, 1994). The former refers to social behavior that benefits other people or society as a whole (McDougall, 2013) and the latter refers to individual willingness to reduce his own consumption for benefit of others (Foster, Wenseleers, & Ratnieks, 2006; Becker, 1976; Martin, 1994). Notably, it has been suggested that altruistic motivations would be driven by agreeableness and conscientiousness both of which are antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). By definition, agreeableness refers to compassion, mercy, sympathy, generosity, philanthropy, and trust (Jabari, Boroujerdi, Ghaeini, Naghshbandi, & Karimi, 2013). Conscientiousness refers to discretionary behavior beyond the minimum role requirements expected by an organization (Organ, 1988). According to 2014 Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Newsroom, conscientious nursing students continuously have devoted their time and energy to giving back to future generations of nursing students. In addition, OCB could entail involvement in philanthropy which in turn contributes to legitimation of individuals who occupy positions of formal authority at the head of a social organization (Dinello, 1998). For example, managers incorporate their own attitudes and conscientiousness which affect corporate giving behavior (Campbell, Gulas, & Gruca, 1999).

Social identity theory indicates that employees are predisposed to reinforce their self-esteem and bolster their self-images by identifying themselves with groups and organizations recognized for their social engagement and responsibility (Hakimy Abdullah, Rashid, & Ramli, 2012). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) also indicates that individuals can learn appropriate behaviors through a role-modeling process, by observing the behaviors of others. In other words, employees can increase their moral identity through observing and mimicking others’ prosocial behaviors, such as charitable giving (Aquino, & Reed, 2002). Notably, employees’ motive to prosocial behavior often reflects a combination of image-management and altruism (Leary, & Kowalski, 1990). For example, impression management (IM) would increase these individual desires for social activities, such as philanthropy (Krämer & Winter, 2008). Any individual and/or organization need to establish and maintain impressions that are congruent with the perceptions they want to convey to their publics (Goffman, 1959). Therefore, to manage their own impression, employees tend to combine with a concern for managing their organization’s socially favorable image stemming from corporate philanthropy.

Although employee behaviors toward corporate philanthropy might be interpreted as a personal, volunteer behavior (Penner et al., 2005; Foster et al., 2006; Jabari et al., 2013) that is discretionary action, such as OCB, less research has examined the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy. To fill this research gap, we intend to compare different targets of OCB to different types of corporate philanthropy. Williams and Anderson (1991) suggest that
OCB can be categorized as OCB-I and OCB-O. The former refers to behavior toward individuals, interpersonal-focused behavior with altruism and agreeableness. The latter refers to behaviors directed toward organization, organization-focused behavior with civic virtue and conscientiousness. In addition, corporate philanthropy can be categorized as the altruistic model (Sharfman, 1994; Useem, 1984) and the profit maximization model (Galaskiewicz, 1985). The former refers to nonbusiness-related philanthropy (NRP) which allows individual managers to pursue charitable for the singular goal of helping others; therefore, it links to employees' moral based on altruism (Lantos, 2002). The latter refers to business-related philanthropy (BRP) which focuses on corporate objective of helping the firm; therefore, it links to a corporate objective (Ricks, 2002). We anticipate that this comparison can help build a theoretical background for the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy. To do so, we intend to answer three research questions. First, what is the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy? Second, what is the role of organizational support – perceived organizational support (POS) – on the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy? Third, how does IM influence employee engagement in philanthropy within OCB? This study contributes to a new attempt which investigates the relationship different targets of OCB and different types of philanthropy so that organizations can motivate their employee philanthropic behaviors through OCB. This study continues with discussion, and concludes with limitations and directions for future study.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Corporate philanthropy & corporate social responsibility (CSR)

Carroll (1979) argues that philanthropy represents a discretionary manifestation of CSR that differ in kind from the obligation with economic, legal, or moral dimensions of CSR. As a discretionary action beyond what is expected by a firm, philanthropy can, under certain conditions, generate approbation and imputations of exemplary values or characteristics to the firm from its various publics as opposed to merely good, behavior that CSR represents throughout explicit economic, legal, and ethical obligation (Wood & Logsdon, 2002; Godfrey, 2005). Corporate philanthropy refers to "gifts, such as time, volunteering, monetary contributions given by corporations to social and charitable causes" (Choi & Wang, 2007:349). CSR refers to "economically sustainable business activities that go beyond legal requirements to protect the well-being of employees, communities, and the environment" (Heslin & Ochoa, 2008:126).

The similarity between corporate philanthropy and CSR is "taking care of society." The difference is that the formal seems narrowly based on helping others by charitable giving, time, and volunteering, but the latter is broadly based on other issues that affect the environment, consumers, human right for the good of the world. With these two concepts, it might be anticipated that firms may not need to engage in corporate philanthropy because it is a discretionary (voluntary) action. However, they do so because corporate philanthropy positively influences firm reputation.

Although it has been widely argued that corporate philanthropy is mainly determined by organization leaders, such as CEO and board of directors, some researchers (e.g., Cox et al., 2006) argue that firms tend to encourage employees to engage in philanthropic activities at either a policy making level (e.g., where firms need to volunteer or donate) or through participation in giving (e.g., how much or to what degree firms invest in philanthropy). Therefore, it is an important to examine in terms of OCB what specific employee behaviors influence corporate philanthropy and how employees are motivated to engage in corporate philanthropy. To answer these questions, we suggest the research model and six prepositions in Figure 1.
Impression management (IM)

It has been argued that a primary human motive, both inside and outside of organizations, is to be viewed by others in a favorable light and to avoid being viewed negatively (Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995). In other words, people tend to be viewed as looking good and/or doing well. IM can fulfill this human motive. IM refers to the process by which individual employees may use to influence others’ attributions for their behaviors and thus, the impression that others form of them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Jones & Pittman, 1982). For example, when employees have strong IM motives, they are careful to avoid creating a negative image in the eyes of others (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Jones & Pittman, 1982). Researchers suggest that IM includes sets of behaviors that individuals performs to enhance their image (Gardner & Martinko, 1988; Jones & Pittman, 1982). They define that the common process of IM for individuals would be: 1) Identifying what makes you another person, 2) Managing appearance (trying to fit it), 3) Making your actions seems appealing or understandable, and 4) Imposing identities on other people.

The relationship between IM and OCB has been well developed in studies of organizational behavior (Bolino, 1999; Wayne & Green, 1993). The common theme is that IM motives encourage employees to express their prosocial motives in forms of citizenship behaviors, such as helping others (OCB-I), courtesy, and responsibility (OCB-O). For example, employees with strong prosocial and IM motives are likely to gravitate toward citizenship behaviors that simultaneously “do good” and “look good”— actions that are beneficial to others (OCB-I) and organization itself (OCB-O) (Grant, 2008; Sheldon, Arndt, & Houser-Marko, 2003). Despite of fact that there might be conceptual similarities between OCB and IM (Bolino, 1999), a
recent study by Bowler and Brass' (2006) suggests that IM can motivate OCB, especially when citizenship is targeted at employees with influential friends in the organization. In addition, OCB is spurred by strategic reasons, as permanent employees seek to improve their future prospects in organizations; thus, it is part of employees’ attempts to influence the images others have of them, increase evaluation ratings, and enhance promotion opportunities (Lamertz, 2005; Bowler & Brass, 2006). From these observations, we propose the following propositions.

Proposition 1. There is a positive relationship between impression management and OCB-O.

Proposition 2. There is a positive relationship between impression management and OCB-I.

Employee philanthropic behaviors & OCB

It has been suggested that firms that encourage employee philanthropic activities are more desirable to potential employees, and report turnover cost (Turban & Greening, 1997). In addition, it has been argued that employees are "motivated to enhance or change public perception of their employer or company (Peloza & Hassay, 2006: 367)." One of the important public perceptions that employees like to see is how their firm responds to social need (i.e., philanthropy). Therefore, how employee behaviors are related to philanthropy has received an important attention.

It has been suggested that socially favorable activities, such as employee volunteering and philanthropy, are motivated by two causes, such as altruistic (helping others) and egoistic (helping themselves). For example, employees may be motivated to help the charitable organization, and value-based motive, such as concern for others, would predict the length of philanthropic activities (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998). Employees also could make philanthropic decisions at workplace for altruistic reasons (Muller, Pfarrer, & Little, 2014). Therefore, moral obligation is often found to be a predictor of employee philanthropic activities. On the other hand, employees may be motivated to develop relationship with others, a way to gain some practical experience by engaging in philanthropy (Peloza, Hudson, & Hassay, 2009). The common egoistic motive for engaging in philanthropy could be social reasons. For instance, philanthropy in the workplace may offer ability for employees to interact with supervisors and employers (Wilson, 2000); therefore it helps provide them with an opportunity to practice image management.

Successful organizations need employees who will do more than their usual job duties and provide performance that is beyond expectation. Therefore, OCB has been particularly emphasized because it represents actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements (Ahmadi, 2010). In addition, OCB reflects positive work behaviors (e.g., altruistic and conscientious actions) which are made by employees themselves on behalf of either employers or other employees (Peloza & Hassay, 2006). Particularly, employee philanthropic behaviors could be unique phenomenon because the efforts of the employee have benefits that extent beyond the firm to charitable organization and to its beneficiaries.

Different targets of OCB, including OCB-O and OCB-I, have generally been explored in studies of organizational behavior (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Importantly, it is anticipated that each type that originates from different antecedents, such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, can encourage employees to engage in philanthropy. OCB-I (behaviors directed toward individuals) would be driven by agreeableness which refers to kind, sympathetic, cooperative, warm, and considerable (Thompson, 2008; Williams & Anderson, 1991) and these behavioral characteristics could motivate employee engagement in philanthropy. For example, people with higher score in agreeableness are naturally sympathetic philanthropist and altruistic people (Kalantari-Khandan, Ghaemi, & Dortaj, 2012). Since
agreeableness represents social criteria as a basis for behaviors that are right, good, and just for society, it can be anticipated that OCB-I driven by agreeableness would more likely influence employees’ moral of helping others, in fact influencing social values.

Unlike OCB-I, OCB-O (behavior directly toward organizations) would be driven by conscientiousness which refers to being thorough, careful, and responsible so it benefits the larger organizations, not other people in some way (Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009). For instance, it has been suggested that a degree of conscientiousness that individuals possess would closely be related to their duties of charity as benevolence (Feinberg & Narveson, 1970). In addition, since OCB-O focuses on employees’ responsible behaviors toward organizations, employees and managers tend to incorporate their own attitudes and conscientiousness so as to optimize the effect of their charitable decision to meet organizational objectives (Campbell et al., 1999).

Different types of corporate philanthropy

Whether corporate philanthropy can be driven by either nonmaterial and benevolent motivations or organizational goal to improve public image has had a considerable discussion among scholars and practitioners (Useem, 1984; Neiheisel, 1994; Sánchez, 2000). Corporate philanthropy can have meet altruistic, harmonized, and agreeable purposes (e.g., for others, including community and society in general). Meanwhile, it can have profit-focused and responsible ones (e.g., for themselves, including organizations in specific). Therefore, it is worth exploring two types of corporate philanthropy so that we can build the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy.

Just as OCB can be differentiated based on targets, such as individuals who are agreeable and caring for others and organization which expects employees to have responsible behavior for organization itself, so corporate philanthropy has different purposes, such as goals of helping others and enlightening corporates themselves. Broadly three different causes, such as communal obligation, goodwill building, and strategic giving, have been explained to corporate philanthropy for the following. “First, communal obligation refers to support of civic, welfare, and educational organizations, motivated by the company’s desire to be a good citizen. Second, goodwill building refers to contributions to support causes favored by employees, customers, or community leaders, often necessitated by the desire to improve the company’s relationships. Third, strategic giving refers to philanthropy focused on enhancing competitive context” (Porter & Kramer, 2002:13).

The first purpose may not be related to business and/or organizational objectives, such as focusing on any kind of business activities related to profit. On the other hand, the second and third purpose is more likely related to business benefits so as to help connect their charitable contributions to organizational objectives. These three purposes can be represented in two types of corporate philanthropy: business-related philanthropy (BRP) and nonbusiness-related philanthropy (NRP). BRP called strategic philanthropy and/or profit maximized philanthropy (Drucker, 1984) refers to “an activity that involves choosing how to voluntarily allocate resources to charitable or social service activities to reach marketing and other business related objectives (Ricks, 2002:117). Therefore, BRP explicitly links its philanthropic strategy to business benefits.

Since OCB-O expects employees to have conscientious behaviors beyond what is required in their job, when deciding and engaging in philanthropic activities, it is anticipated that employees more likely care about to what degree philanthropy can influence organization itself, not other people in some way. In addition, it is anticipated that with OCB-O, employees and managers tend to incorporate their own attitudes and conscientiousness to their charitable decision to maximize the effect of philanthropy, in fact fulfilling organizational objectives (Campbell et al., 1999). From these observations, we propose the following preposition.
Proposition 3. There is a positive relationship between OCB-O and BRP.

Unlike BRP, NRP called altruistic model of philanthropy (Sharfman, 1994; Useem, 1984) refers to one where the activities have nothing to do with advancing the mission or corporate objectives (Porter & Kramer, 2002). The example would be engaging in non-business charitable activities without concern for reward (Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Lantos, 2002). The motivation behind NRP is altruism and social agreeableness rather than responsibility for organization itself. For example, charitable contributions are not related to the business objectives; therefore, it only generates social benefits (Porter & Kramer, 2002). In addition, NRP tends to have a singular goal of helping others so that philanthropy would be considered independent from the operational pressures of generating profit (e.g., meeting organizational goal and objectives).

Since OCB-I includes agreeableness behaviors which reflect social criteria (Thompson, 2008; Williams & Anderson, 1991) and OCB-I would influence employees’ moral of helping others, it is anticipated that employees more likely care about to what degree philanthropy can influence others rather than organization itself. In addition, it is suggested that agreeableness would closely be related to altruistic philanthropy rather than strategic and/or profit maximized philanthropy (Bekkers, 2004). From these observations, we propose the following preposition.

Proposition 4. There is a positive relationship between OCB-I and NRP.

Perceived organizational support

It has been argued that some organizations are perceived as being concerned with the welfare of their employees and social value and that this environment could be thought of as one characterized by organizational support (Shore & Shore, 1995; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). On the basis of the organization’s personification, employees tend to view their organization favorable or unfavorable treatment as an indication that the organization would favor or disfavor them (Rhoades, & Eisenberger, 2002). For example, supportive organizations are seen as taking pride in their employees, compensating them fairly, and look after their needs (Randall et al., 1999). Under this environment, employees attempt to raise their investments in the form of more helpful citizenship behaviors particularly when they receive high degree of perceived organizational support (POS).

POS refers to the degree to which employees believe that their organization values employees’ contributions, cares about employees’ well-being, and fulfills socioemotional needs (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Several scholars argue that there is a favorable association between POS and factors of organizational effectiveness for the following. “High levels of POS are associated with a host of positive work outcomes, including increased affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990) and job involvement (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), reduced absenteeism, turnover intentions (Hutchison et al., 1986), strain (Stamper & Johlke, 2003), and employee engagement (Saks, 2006), which subsequently predicted job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intent and citizenship” (Byrne & Hoch, 2008: 55).

POS can increase employees’ emotional bond and commitment to the organization (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Lynch, 1998), in fact encouraging philanthropic behaviors among employees. Therefore, POS might influence individual-level helping behavior (Vandenberghhe, Bentein, Michon, Chebat, Tremblay, & Fils, 2007). For example, organization’s sponsorship of employee engagement in philanthropy would function as an important indicator when employees receive POS as the core identity of the firm. In addition, it has been suggested that POS would be closely related to conscientiousness and social value and environment (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Furthermore, it is anticipated that firms offer organizational support which helps employees get more involved in philanthropic activities, such as employee giving and volunteering, because employees are also seen as the most important stakeholder group
who cares about social responsibility activities, including corporate philanthropy (Bozhurt & Bal, 2012). From these observations, we propose the following prepositions.

Proposition 5. POS positively moderates the relationship between OCB-O and BRP.

Proposition 6. POS positively moderates the relationship between OCB-I and NRP.

**DISCUSSION**

Employee engagement in philanthropy no longer is a new trend in the modern organizational environment. For a firm’s perspective, this trend could offer a business opportunity because it can be argued that the more employees concern philanthropy, the higher employee royalty a firm could receive. To build a theoretical foundation on this trend, the study have provided with a proposed model that can integrate and extend theories of social identity, social learning, and IM. We argued that IM would increase employee behaviors for philanthropy throughout OCB, and socially favorable employee behaviors would increase as POS increases. In addition, we argued that different antecedents of OCB could make employees involve in specific types of philanthropy. For example, agreeableness (OCB-I) would more likely lead to NRP (e.g., pure altruistic model of philanthropy); on the other hand, conscientiousness (OCB-O) would more likely lead to BRP (e.g., business profit based philanthropy).

The most important lesson of the study is that employee behaviors within OCB may not only lead employees to engage in philanthropy but also determine types of philanthropy. For a personality perspective, employee dispositions, such as agreeable or conscientious, would function as behavioral motives that could lead employees to determine types of philanthropy. Therefore, we argue that OCB can function as a determinant which offers a reason for employee engagement in philanthropy. In addition, it is recommended that firms support employee engagement in philanthropy by enhancing OCB in that they can receive the positive benefits to organizations. Another lesson is that POS can be an important factor to determine to what degree employees are willing to spend time and energy to engaging in philanthropy. Since giving employees the opportunity to engage in philanthropy for their communities could help to instill a sense of pride in employees as well as organization, it is recommended that firms put more an effort into enhancing employees’ emotional bond to the organization, the welfare of their employees, and social value throughout POS.

This study suffers from limitations that need to be addressed in future work. First, although this study helped offer theoretical evidence on the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy, this might be considered as less convincing without having empirical investigation. For example, an empirical examination of two distinguished concepts, such as BRP and NRP, might be a determinant which explains to what degree these concepts could reflect employee philanthropic behaviors. In addition, the study assumed that two targets of OCB, such as OCB-I (agreeableness) and OCB-O (conscientiousness), were considered as different dimensional structures of the citizenship behavior (Williams & Anderson, 1991). However, when regarding OCB as motives for employee engagement in philanthropy, there might have some overlaps as employees might have both altruistic motive and egoistic motive to engaging in philanthropy. These issues should be addressed for future study.

**CONCLUSION**

To offer a theoretical foundation on a growing trend of employee engagement in philanthropy, we investigated the relationship between OCB and corporate philanthropy. We argued that IM would increase employees’ desires for philanthropy throughout OCB, and socially favorable employee behaviors would increase as POS increase. Especially, we argued that different targets of OCB, such as OCB-I and OCB-O, would motivate employees to engage in different
types of philanthropy, such as BRP and NRP. We hope that this study would function as a tipping point that more employees as well as firms are interested in engaging in philanthropy.
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