Corporate Volunteering: Delivering Business Objectives through a Values Focused Mission

VOLUNTEERING TOGETHER TO ENABLE CHANGE AND CREATE A BETTER WORLD CONTEXT PAPER

Author:

Dr. Lonneke Roza, Assistant Professor, Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands

OCTOBER 2020

Volunteering Together to Enable Change and Create a Better World.

The COVID-19 pandemic has emphasised how volunteers as agents of change provide the practical action that builds hope and resilience, improves lives and strengthens communities. The pandemic has resulted in the postponement of the October 2020 IAVE World Volunteer Conference hosted by the Emirates Foundation in Abu Dhabi until the autumn of 2021. However, the conference theme chosen for 2020 of 'volunteering together to enable change and create a better world' has never been more relevant or more real.

As part of the preparations for the conference the Emirates Foundation had agreed to support the writing of seven context papers on the conference sub themes. This project has continued in order to provide for greater consideration of the issues, particularly with relevance to volunteering and COVID-19, and to enable wider dissemination of knowledge that will add value to those supporting and developing volunteering around the world.

The context papers seek to bring forward current thinking and any relevant research, highlighting case studies to demonstrate impact. The papers will be published and available between July and December 2020. In addition, an incredibly special series of online Forums is being organized to enable the sharing of knowledge and discussion of the issues. The papers and the Forums provide information and insight on the following key topics:

- ▸ Volunteerism and Community Resilience – Locally Owned Solutions Delivering Impact
- ▸ Future Leadership – the Role of Youth Volunteers
- ▸ Tolerance and Inclusion – Volunteering Enabling Community Cohesion and Embracing Diversity
- ▸ Volunteering and the Digital World – Extending the Power of Volunteering through New Technologies
- ▸ Corporate Volunteering – Delivering Business Objectives through a Values Focused Mission
- ▸ Measurement and Impact – Providing the Evidence that Volunteering is Good for Society and Good for You
- ▸ Volunteering 2030 – New Paradigms

Introduction

In 2019, 181 chief executive officers of the world's largest companies stated that the purpose of a corporation is not only to serve shareholders, but to create value for all stakeholders (Business Roundtable, 2019). Shortly thereafter, 34 multinational companies based in Europe launched the Business for Inclusive Growth (B4IG) coalition (OECD, 2019). In 2020, two historic moments further increased the urgency of revisiting the role and accountability of businesses to various stakeholders: the global outbreak of Covid-19 and the protests against racism and discrimination around the globe. These developments could potentially lead to the adoption of new standards concerning the involvement of stakeholders in businesses (Sundheim and Starr, 2020). This paper discusses the role of corporate volunteering within the context of these developments.

In both theory and practice, the inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders in a company's priorities is often associated with corporate social responsibility (CSR, or more broadly sustainability). Although some companies allocate these responsibilities to a particular department, CSR is, by definition, a way of doing business. As described by Aaronson (2003), CSR involves *"business decision-making* linked to ethical values, compliance with legal requirements, and respect for people, communities, and the environment around the world"* (p. 310; italics added). In other words, companies that incorporate CSR fully into their business decision-making have a values focused mission to contribute to all of their stakeholders.

Employees, jobseekers, and customers all across the globe[1] **are becoming more values driven.** Jobseekers are increasingly considering the social and environmental responsibility of potential employers when applying for jobs (see e.g. Dogl and Holtbrugge, 2014; Hinson, et al., 2018; Klimkiewicz and Oltra, 2017; Waples and Brachle, 2019). Moreover, commitment to CSR and corporate volunteering has been shown to enhance employee pride and loyalty, while increasing the likelihood that employees will speak favorably about their employers and exhibit more organizational citizenship behaviour (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Glavas and Willness, 2020; Jones, 2010).

Customers also respond positively to CSR (for a meta-study based on 60 articles, see Aljarah et al., 2018). According to a study spanning eight global markets,[2] **an average of 83% of consumers feel that a company should not earn a profit unless it also delivers a positive impact**. Moreover, 76% of the consumers in that study reported that they had taken action against a brand in response to actions with which they disagreed (e.g., no longer buying the brand or switching to a competitor; Zeno Group, 2020). It is important to note that the ways in which stakeholders respond to CSR and corporate volunteering is subject to contextual factors, including corporate or national culture (e.g., for China: Wang and Juslin, 2009), generation (Zeno Group, 2020), and religion (Zsolnai, 2007).

The developments outlined above highlight the importance of alignment between values and actions of companies and employees, their customers, and the broader society (e.g., Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017). **Corporate volunteering plays an important role** in this regard, **as it enables alignment through stakeholder interactions based on common values and beliefs**.

---

[1] Findings are consistent across Europe, Africa, United States; India, China, South America.

[2] United States, Canada, United Kingdom, France, China, India, Singapore, Malaysia

The overall objective of this paper is to provide a context for examining when and how corporate volunteering within large companies may or may not support a values focused mission to make a contribution to all stakeholders. It addresses what does and does not constitute a values focused mission, in addition to exploring the role of corporate volunteering within this context. It identifies the need for further stakeholder involvement in corporate volunteering and discusses how a corporate volunteering climate can enhance delivering on a values focused mission. The paper concludes by reflecting on key points and offering suggestions for future research.

A values focused mission: More than good intentions?

A values focused mission includes a long-term perspective on the role that the company would like to play in society, based on its unique values and actions (Aaronson, 2003; Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017). Values are stable, evaluative beliefs that guide preferences and behavior (Schwartz, 1992). They help individuals, groups, and organizations to define what is good and bad, what is right and wrong. As such, they form the foundation for a unique organizational moral identity and behavior.

The motivations that companies have for pursuing a values focused mission vary across organizations, contexts, cultures, and even stakeholders (Ellen et al., 2006). These motivations can be divided into four broad (albeit not mutually exclusive) categories.

> ▶ First, **egoistic** motivations focus more on exploiting particular causes in order to serve self-interest rather than on promoting these causes for their own sake. For example, a company might seek to form a partnership with a community organization or prestigious cause that they know will improve their image, regardless of whether such a partnership would actually help the cause.

> ▶ Second, **strategic** motivations aim to increase sales or mitigate risks/harm while also contributing to society. Briefly stated, a strategically motivated company pursues a deliberate goal of creating value for both the company and society - a process that is often referred to as creating shared value (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

> ▶ Third, **stakeholder-driven** motivations lead a company to engage in society in response to stakeholder pressure. For example, the outbreak of Covid-19 has led many companies to support local (or otherwise specific) causes in response to direct solicitations from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), governments, employees, local business units, and customers.

> ▶ Finally, **values driven** motivations lead a company to engage in society, based on the belief that it is the right thing to do (Ellen et al., 2006).

Regardless of a company's motivations, and regardless of whether stakeholders perceive these motivations as genuine, the fact that they appear in the company's mission implies that the company is taking action.

It is nevertheless questionable whether a company will actually move beyond its good intentions. As noted in recent studies, companies that had pledged to increase their contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) made hardly any changes in their core business activities (Kramer, et al., 2019). Many even failed to make any changes in their CSR activities (Dowd, 2018). **The recent Covid-19 pandemic is putting the commitment to increase stakeholder involvement to the test.** As noted by Martin Whittaker, the CEO of Just Capital: "In a riskier world, some people are...not going to think long-term" (Georgescu, 2020), and this is likely to jeopardize value-driven efforts to include stakeholders.

Following the outbreak, some organizations increased their contributions to society through their community and corporate volunteering programs (see Text Box 1). In contrast, others took measures that have proven harmful to local communities. For example, many retailers immediately cancelled all of their orders, leaving factories and local communities in despair (Business and Human Rights, 2020).

Box 1	The response of the Philips Foundation and Philips India following the Covid-19 outbreak in India

Philips is a leading health-technology company. Since the company was established in 1891, its operations have expanded to more than 100 countries. Philips strives to improve health and enable better outcomes across the health continuum, from healthy living and prevention to diagnosis, treatment, and home care. In keeping with the corporate purpose, the Philips Foundation and local community programs focus on reducing healthcare inequalities by providing access to quality healthcare for disadvantaged communities.

On March 25, 2020, a nationwide lock-down was imposed in India, the second-most populated country in the world, in order to contain the spread of Covid-19. As a result, many people became stranded in the cities, leaving them without income or food. The Philips Foundation and Philips India acted to support the testing of suspected coronavirus cases, in addition to supporting treatment and ensuring the safety of healthcare workers. Through its employee-giving program, the Foundation's support was extended to several non-profit organizations in order to help the most vulnerable groups of the population, including children living on the streets, elderly people, migrant workers, and their families. Basic survival and healthcare necessities were provided, and awareness sessions on the prevention of Covid-19 were organized in a variety of locations.

As described above and discussed in the following section, the overall setting in which corporate volunteering takes place constitutes an important context to consider when exploring the role of corporate volunteering in following through on a values focused mission.

The role of corporate volunteering in a values focused mission

Corporate volunteering allows companies to signal and operationalize their contributions to society. Particularly in Europe and North America, multinational companies are increasingly aligning their corporate volunteering efforts to their own objectives (including with regard to sustainability), brand purposes, and strategies, as well as to specific SDGs and/or issues relating to the industry (for a broader narrative on this, see Heitmann et al., 2020). Such choices pertaining to corporate volunteering are driven primarily by top-down policy (Van der Voort et al., 2009), which tends to emphasize a strong "fit" between the company and its non-profit partners (Sen and Bhattacharaya, 2001).

Companies opting for policy-driven corporate volunteering often prefer activities that are easy to communicate to the public at large (e.g., "days of service") and that are sufficiently standardized that they can be easily scaled up to allow participation by large groups of employees (Raffaelli and Glynn, 2014). For example, many companies engage employees in national or company-specific days of service. Policy-driven corporate volunteer programs also often involve employees in skill-based volunteering, with the goal of contributing through what the company does best. For example, the EY company developed the EY Vantage program, which places the skills of some of their employees (including high-level experts) at the disposal of non-profit organizations (NPOs) and social enterprises.

Even though many multinational companies opt for policy-driven programs, this approach does not guarantee that the company will actually achieve its values focused mission. One reason is that the type of support that the company wishes to contribute is not necessarily aligned to the needs existing within the local community. In addition, by addressing only aspects that are directly relevant to the company, a program could potentially restrict the breadth of community needs or jeopardize the support of community groups that are not related to the interests of the company (Van der Voort et al., 2009). The outbreak of Covid-19 made this limitation particularly apparent, as the immediate needs of the community were not always reflected in the policies or core focal areas of corporate volunteering programs. Finally, a strict focus on particular themes and/or corporate benefits might lead some employees to opt out of a program, as it signals a lack of altruism and, possibly, conflicts with their personal values (Van der Voort et al., 2009; Roza, 2016; Van Schie et al., 2018).

A community or grassroots approach is one alternative to policy-driven corporate volunteering. In such an approach, employees take the lead in community involvement, while the company facilitates their efforts by providing the flexibility to design some or all aspects of their community involvement: when, where, for whom, and with whom (Van der Voort et al., 2009). For example, Toyota supports volunteer activities that employees undertake on their own initiative to address various local problems. This approach is based on the company's fundamental value of operating with close ties to the community. The company regards employees as community representatives who know what their communities need.

This approach ensures that the choice of which causes could best be supported is more closely aligned to the preferences of individual employees (or groups of employees), with the primary fit being between individual preferences, interests, values and a particular social cause. As a facilitator, however, the

company continues to play an important role. For example, a company could match the time or money donated by employees with monetary contributions, or it could recognize volunteer efforts.

Whatever the approach is, recent research suggests that building a positive climate for corporate volunteering within companies is key (Zhang et al., 2020; Rodell et al., 2017). A corporate volunteer climate consists of "employees' shared perception about the extent of employee volunteering through their corporate volunteering programs" (Rodell et al ., 2017, p. 1665). This does not necessarily mean that all employees participate in corporate volunteering; it does give a sense of 'this [volunteering] is simply something that we do here at the organization'.

When building a corporate volunteer climate, an important aspect is the alignment of the values and actions of the employer and those of the employees. Alignment is a complex balance that results from continuous interactions between a company and its employees (Haski-Leventhal, et al., 2017). Corporate volunteering can play an important role in achieving such a balance and may result in positive workplace outcomes, such as loyalty, pride and organizational citizenship behavior (Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017). It can signal the value that a company attaches to its contributions to society, and it can influence the behavior of employees (Du et al., 2010; Gulati and Sytch, 2007). As studies have demonstrated, **corporate volunteer programs can attract people who do not volunteer anywhere else, and these programs can even have a positive influence on prosocial behavior outside the workplace** (Krasnopolskaya, et al., 2017; Rodell et al., 2016; Roza, 2016). See **Text Box 2** for a values-based interaction process between employers and employees.

Box 2 | Corporate volunteering as values exchange between employers and employees

Accenture—a global consultancy firm—promotes their values focused mission through community involvement and volunteering at the onboarding stage of new hires. In this process, they help employees to define their personal values and guiding principles, and ask them to follow up on these values by taking part in a community activity. If new employees have difficulty in defining such activities, the Accenture team helps them to find appropriate organizations and volunteer assignments. This allows the company to socialize its new employee to its values while learning the values of employees and promoting concrete community action.

Nevertheless, we should not forget that non-alignment between employers and employees can be harmful. For example, non-alignment could potentially result in indifference ("I don't care"), resentment ("I don't like this"), and/or disengagement ("I don't feel at home here") toward the company. This can ultimately lead to detachment, absenteeism, and intention to leave (see Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Paradigm shifts

The societal trends outlined above, **greater urgency of stakeholder involvement aimed at the realization of values focused missions, the rise of value-driven employees and customers, and the increasing need for congruence between companies and their stakeholders in the realization of a values focused mission, are increasing the complexity of stakeholder management in corporate volunteering.** This section focuses on two shifts that could promote the inclusion of more stakeholders in corporate volunteering and ultimately the values focused mission.

Including a variety of community stakeholders and perspectives

In many cases, what corporate volunteering can (or cannot) do for the community is oversimplified. By definition, **the focus of corporate volunteering is not purely internal (on the interests of the company and its employees), but also extends to the interests of external community stakeholders,** including the broader community, nonprofit organizations, and their beneficiaries (Rodell et al., 2016). Many studies emphasize win-win (company-community) or win-win-win (company-employee-community) situations, however, this essentially regards the community as a singular, unitary stakeholder. Just as it is important to disentangle companies and their employees within the context of corporate volunteering, the community should be addressed in terms of a variety of stakeholders, including the community as a whole, non-profit organizations, non-profit employees, and specific target groups or causes (Roza et al., 2017; Samuel et al., 2016). Perhaps even customers of the company can be regarded as community stakeholders.

In addition to the tendency toward oversimplification of 'the community stakeholder', many corporate volunteering reports and studies focus primarily on the positive aspects and effects of corporate volunteering for the company (for an academic review, see Rodell et al., 2016). This disregards any potential negative consequences or dark sides of corporate volunteering, such as perceived work-overload and work-family conflict (Zhang et al., 2020) and negatively influencing job performance (Hu et al., 2016). For example, in the initial stage of the COVID-19 outbreak, many employees of taxi companies in Wuhan voluntarily joined the volunteering team to take medical workers home. However, these employees then had to be isolated from their families and could not take care of their children (Zhang et al., 2020).

Similar to building the business case for companies, for non-profit organizations the 'non-profit' case is often used. Indeed, corporate volunteering can serve as a starting point for building a deeper relationship with the company, which can subsequently generate additional benefits (e.g., financial resources, human resources, and access to networks). Such programs can also signal the legitimacy and credibility of the non-profit organization among corporate (or other) stakeholders (Roza et al., 2017; Shachar et al., 2018). Furthermore, it can support the daily routines of non-profit employees and help them to deliver more or even better services to their beneficiaries (Roza et al., 2017; Samuel et al., 2013).

Emphasizing the "non-profit case" for corporate volunteering also risks oversimplifying the potential contributions of corporate volunteering, while ignoring its potential to harm non-profit organizations, their employees, and beneficiaries (Roza, et al., 2017; Samuel et al., 2016). **The literature has tended to ignore the challenges that corporate volunteering can pose for non-profit organizations, including potential reputational risks, employee dissatisfaction, and the need to accommodate corporate employees who lack sufficient skills or experience to provide the right services to the non-profit organization**. Corporate volunteering can also have harmful effects on beneficiaries. For example, the quality and suitability of corporate volunteering projects are often subjugated to the company's preferences with regard to the duration of the involvement of its employees or to the type of volunteer tasks that corporate volunteers can or cannot fulfill (Roza, et al., 2017; Roza et al., 2018). Even if employees have advanced technical skills, they may not have the soft skills needed for translating their business expertise to the non-profit context (Samuel et al., 2016). As noted in research, "Sometimes, if an outsider [corporate volunteer] comes in for a short-term project, it can be perceived as disruptive, create harmful power dynamics or erode dignity" (Roza et al., 2018, p. 19).

The inclusion of the perspectives of all stakeholders may generate tension among the interests of the company, employees, and community stakeholders, thereby complicating the design of impactful programs. For example, while a company may want to include as many employees as possible (i.e., based on a business case), this perspective ("the more the merrier") might not be shared by the non-profit organization, its employees, and beneficiaries. In addition, offering time off for volunteering can be quite costly, and some companies prefer to offer short-term volunteer opportunities for their employees. It can be difficult to organize impactful short-term volunteer assignments and longer-term assignments are more likely to have a meaningful impact on particular target groups (Roza, et al., 2018). The involvement of community stakeholders in the decision-making process concerning corporate volunteering could have far-reaching consequences, as illustrated in **Text Box 3**.

The potential consequences of stakeholder involvement that are outlined above point toward a more fundamental critique on corporate volunteering, CSR, business involvement in social issues, and philanthropy in general. One criticism in this regard is that those who are attempting to do good by giving back are actually upholding the very system that generates major social issues (e.g., inequality, climate change, and poverty). True changes in the system could even be contrary to the interests of a company, as they could result in the loss of wealth and power (Giridharadas, 2019). **Despite the theoretical importance of including stakeholders in order to achieve a values focused mission, in practice their inclusion can have far-reaching consequences.**

When the interests of community stakeholders are placed at the center of corporate volunteering

LLOYDS BANK FOUNDATION

C&A Foundation

Some companies or corporate foundations are very much aware of the negative consequences and/or trade-offs involved in corporate volunteering. By incorporating the voices of the community into their design, **Lloyds Bank Foundation** has developed a strict policy of selecting and training corporate volunteers very carefully before bringing them into the community organizations that they support. The number of corporate volunteers in their program is therefore limited, as not everyone is suitable for providing support to vulnerable groups affected by complex issues (e.g., domestic violence, mental illness, or exploitation). For example, the company does not organize annual volunteer days for their employees, as experience has taught them that such initiatives are not in the best interest of the organizations they support.

Another example is provided by the **C&A Foundation** (now the Laudes Foundation), which discontinued a part of their corporate volunteer program in Brazil after the program was found to be over-ambitious and the results for community organisations and children were limited.

Including stakeholders by developing inclusive leadership

Another way of realizing the inclusion of stakeholders in corporate volunteering involves shifting the perspective on corporate volunteering away from helping others to enhancing individual understanding of how to relate to social issues and causes, and toward the creation of positive outcomes for society at large beyond the direct delivery of services. Such a shift is needed, **as companies increasingly need to transform themselves into more inclusive and sustainable organizations to foster organizational longevity**.

The transition toward inclusivity and sustainability calls for leaders with "the ability to build sustainable relationships in a responsible and empathetic way…" (Maak and Pless, 2006; p. 33). As indicated by recent research on social neuroscience, empathy allows for more informed decision-making within contexts of complexity. It is also a skill that is characteristic of ethical managers, a prerequisite for moral engagement, and a shield against cold, impersonal, and dehumanized business. Moreover, empathy is an essential aspect of efficient organizations (Martineau, et al., 2020). The development of empathic leaders does not take place along one-dimensional, linear career paths. Instead, it evolves as individuals process the contradictions, dilemmas, and crises that they encounter, consciously coping with them and incorporating them into their identities (Mezirow, 2009).

Corporate volunteering can create an immersive learning environment that is capable of fostering the type of learning needed to develop empathic leaders (Bartsch, 2012). Corporate volunteering is conventionally referred to in terms of "helping" or "giving," thereby implying that one party is a beneficiary, with the other party being a "superior," who will provide help, financial assistance, or support. Discussions of corporate volunteering also tend to emphasize "making a difference" by making changes to the world beyond the self, without questioning the perceptions that individuals have on the world, such as reflecting on individual behavior (Ford, 2015; Bartsch, 2012). Including stakeholder perceptions in processes of making business decisions - as a key element of a values focused mission - requires that discussion of corporate volunteering draws on a discourse of mutual learning and development, featuring greater equality in interaction between the various stakeholders involved. Such discussions should subsequently focus on changes occurring within both the individual who is helping and the individual who is being helped.

Corporate volunteering brings employees into contexts in which they have the potential to expand their awareness (e.g., by gaining insight into the living conditions of people in more difficult circumstances or being confronted with issues that are new to them). Such experiences can serve as a catalyst for critical reflection on individual assumptions, potentially leading employees to validate contested beliefs through discourse, critically assessing the insights gained, and then acting on them (Christie, et al., 2015). This represents a deep layer of learning that is needed by leaders (both current and future). For example, when volunteering in geriatric facilities, volunteers are confronted with the consequences of aging and fragility. This could potentially help then to learn how to tolerate slowness and how to deal with illogical behavior, in addition to gaining an appreciation for nonverbal communication. Ideally, such experiences should help employees to recognize situations in the workplace where these insights and skills could be useful, possibly leading them to make more empathetic decisions (Bartsch, 2012). By these volunteer experiences, employees build empathy and emotional intelligence, and companies can develop inclusive work environments in which a balance between having shared organizational values and honoring individual uniqueness is being sought (Gardenswartz et al., 2010).

Conclusion

This context paper situates corporate volunteering within a broader quest on the part of large companies around the globe to realize value-focused missions. **From the stakeholder perspective, the realization of a values focused mission requires involving and bringing together a broader range of stakeholders, aligning their interests, and integrating them into business-related decision-making**. Corporate volunteering, in various ways, can play an important role. First, companies can include more stakeholders in the actual design and implementation of corporate volunteering programs and activities. This requires differentiating the community into multiple stakeholders and sharing key lessons concerning what does and does not work in corporate volunteering or addresses the less positive aspects of corporate volunteering; a discussion that is often ignored. Moreover, on the individual level, corporate volunteering can function as an immersive learning experience, in which employees at all levels of the organization can develop inclusive leadership skills (e.g., emotional intelligence and empathy). Corporate volunteering could thus help them to develop crucial skills that are needed in order to include various stakeholders in the process of making business decisions.

The inclusion of stakeholders further increases the complexity of managing corporate volunteering. Important questions concern how it can be made manageable and what is needed in order to do so. This paper briefly addresses various approaches to corporate volunteering programs and stresses the importance of creating a corporate volunteer climate in which corporate volunteering is part of the organizational culture. Here also, there are more questions that currently answers. For instance, what is the role of national or organizational culture, organizational history (or legacy) and governance in building a corporate volunteer climate? How do you deal with this is in a multi-national organization working in offices around the world? And, how does this climate evolve with regard to diversity and inclusion?

Another element that might help with the increase complexity of managing corporate volunteering, and thus requires further exploration, is the use of technology (Baldwin, 2020). For example, technology can enable remote volunteering, which is particularly relevant during the Covid-19 pandemic. Online platforms can easily assemble and display a great variety of volunteer opportunities, ranging from local to international, while providing an administrative framework for tracking participation and impact (RW Institute, 2019). It is nevertheless important to consider the potential disadvantages of using technology as well. Relevant questions could concern whether the technology-enabled volunteer experiences are capable of building the deep relationships that are characteristic of in person volunteering. It is also important to investigate ways of ensuring that technology will not impede ethical decision-making, in addition to examining whether it might level or amplify existing power imbalances between involved stakeholders.

The advancement of corporate volunteering will require embracing critical perspectives, in addition to identifying the benefits. An evenhanded perspective on what corporate volunteering brings to each stakeholder is needed. This can subsequently help to advance thinking with regard to how corporate volunteering can make a positive contribution to society, while helping the company to realize its values focused mission.

References

Aaronson, S. (2003). Corporate Responsibility in the global village: The British role model and the American laggard. *Business and Society Review*, *108*(3), 309–338.

Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What We Know and Don't Know About Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Management*, *38*(4), 932–968.

Aljarah, A., Emeagwali, L., Ibrahim, B., & Ababneh, B. (2018). Does corporate social responsibility really increase customer relationship quality? A meta-analytic review. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *16*(1), 28–49.

Baldwin, G. (2020, March 17). *How New Technologies and Alliances Are Transforming Corporate Volunteering (SSIR)*. Stanford Social Innovation Review.

Bartsch, G. (2012). Emotional learning: managerial development by corporate volunteering. *Journal of Management Development*, *31*(3), 253–262.

Business & Human Rights Resource Centre. (2020). *Major apparel brands delay & cancel orders in response to pandemic, risking livelihoods of millions of garment workers in their supply chains*. Business & Human Rights Resource Centre.

Business Roundtable (2019). Business Roundtable Redefines the Purpose of a Corporation to Promote 'An Economy That Serves All Americans'.

Christie, M., Carey, M., Robertson, A., & Grainger, P. (2015). Putting transformative learning theory into practice. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, *55*(1), 10–30.

Dögl, C., & Holtbrügge, D. (2014). Corporate environmental responsibility, employer reputation and employee commitment: an empirical study in developed and emerging economies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *25*(12), 1739–1762.

Dowd, L. (2018, May 16). *Risk of "SDG wash" as 56% of companies fail to measure contribution*. Ethical Corporation.

Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing Business Returns to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Role of CSR Communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *12*(1), 8–19.

Ford, S. (2015, May 27). *Time to Rethink Your Approach to Employee Giving*. America's Charities.

Ellen, P.S., Webb, D.J. & Mohr, L.A. (2006). Building corporate associations: Consumer attributions for corporate socially responsible programs. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *34*, 147–157.

Gardenswartz, L., Cherbosque, J., & Rowe, A. (2010). Emotional intelligence and diversity: A model for differences in the workplace. Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture, 1(1), 74-84.

Georgescu, P. (2020, March 11). The First Big Test for Stakeholder Capitalism. *Forbes*.

Giridharadas, A. (2019). *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World* (Reprint ed.). Vintage.

Glavas, A. & Willness, C. (2020). Employee (Dis) Engagement in Corporate Social Responsibility. In: Haski-Leventhal, D., Roza, L., & Brammer, S. (eds.). *Employee Engagement in Corporate Social Responsibility*. SAGE Publications.

Gulati, R., & Sytch, M. (2007). Dependence Asymmetry and Joint Dependence in Interorganizational Relationships: Effects of Embeddedness on a Manufacturer's Performance in Procurement Relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*(1), 32–69.

Haski-Leventhal, D., Roza, L., & Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2017). Congruence in corporate social responsibility: Connecting the identity and behavior of employers and employees. *Journal of Business Ethics, 143*(1), 35-51.

Heitmann, K., Roza, L., Boiardi, P., & Serneels, S. (2020). The Rise of the Corporate Social Investor. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Hinson, E., Agbleze, S., & Kuada, J. (2018). Corporate Social Responsibility and Employer Attractiveness: Perspectives of Students on the African continent. *African Journal of Business Ethics, 12*(2), 1–17.

Hu, J., Jiang, K., Mo, S., Chen, H., & Shi, J. (2016). The motivational antecedents and performance consequences of corporate volunteering: When do employees volunteer and when does volunteering help versus harm work performance? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 137*, 99–111.

Jones, D. A. (2010). Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a volunteerism programme. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*(4), 857–878.

Klimkiewicz, K., & Oltra, V. (2017). Does CSR Enhance Employer Attractiveness? The Role of Millennial Job Seekers' Attitudes. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 24*(5), 449–463.

Kramer, M. R., Agarwal, R., & Srinivas, A. (2019, June 12). Business as Usual Will Not Save the Planet. *Harvard Business Review*.

Krasnopolskaya, I., Roza, L. & Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2016). The Relationship Between Corporate Volunteering and Employee Civic Engagement Outside the Workplace in Russia. *Voluntas 27*, 640–672.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281–342.

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible Leadership in a Stakeholder Society – A Relational Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 66*(1), 99–115.

Martineau, J.T., Decety, J., Racine, E. (2020). The Social Neuroscience of Empathy and Its Implications for Business Ethics. In: Martineau, J., Racine, E. (eds). *Organizational Neuroethics. Advances in Neuroethics*. Springer.

Mezirow, J., & Taylor, E. W. (2009). *Transformative Learning in Practice*. In: Mezirow, J.,Wiley, and E.W. Taylor. (eds). Wiley.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2019). *Top global firms commit to tackling inequality by joining Business for Inclusive Growth coalition* - OECD.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review, 89*(1/2), 62–77.

Raffaelli, R., & Glynn, M. A. (2014). Turnkey or tailored? Relational pluralism, institutional complexity, and the organizational adoption of more or less customized practices. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(2), 541-56

Rodell, J. B., Breitsohl, H., Schröder, M., & Keating, D. J. (2016). Employee volunteering: A review and framework for future research. *Journal of Management, 42*(1),55–84

Rodell, J. B., J. E. Booth, J. W. Lynch and K. P. Zipay (2017). 'Corporate volunteering climate: mobilizing employee passion for societal causes and inspiring future charitable action. *Academy of management Journal, 60*(5), 1662-1681.

Roza, L. (2016). *Employee Engagement in Corporate Social Responsibility*. PhD Series of Erasmus Research Institute in Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Roza, L., Heitmann, K., Serneels, S., & Boiardi, P. (2018). Toolkit 2: Social Impact through Employee Engagement. Creating Impact-Driven Engagement Activities. European Venture Philanthropy Association.

Roza, L., Shachar, I., Meijs, L. C. P. M., & Hustinx, L. (2017). The nonprofit case for corporate volunteering: a multi-level perspective. *The Service Industries Journal, 37*(11–12), 746–765.

RW Institute (2019). Corporate Volunteering: Giving and Grants Technology Review. A global comparison and analysis. RW Institute.

Samuel, O., Roza, L., & Meijs, L. (2016). Exploring partnerships from the perspective of HSO beneficiaries: The case of corporate volunteering. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 40*(3), 220-237.

Samuel, O., Wolf, P., & Schilling, A. (2013). Corporate volunteering: Benefits and challenges for nonprofits. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 24*(2), 163-179.

Schwartz, S.H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25, 1-65.

Sen, S. & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(2), 225-243.

Shachar, I. Y., Hustinx, L., Roza, L., & Meijs, L. C. P. M. (2018). A new spirit across sectors: Constructing a common justification for corporate volunteering. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology, 5*(1–2), 90–115.

Sundheim, D., Starr, K. (2020, January 22). Making Stakeholder Capitalism a Reality. *Harvard Business Review*.

Van Der Voort, J. M., Glac, K., & Meijs, L. C. (2009). "Managing" corporate community involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90*(3), 311–329.

Van Schie, S., Gautier, A., Pache, A.-C., & Güntert, S. T. (2018). What Keeps Corporate Volunteers Engaged: Extending the Volunteer Work Design Model with Self-determination Theory Insights. *Journal of Business Ethics, 160*(3), 693–712.

Wang, L., Juslin, H. (2009). The Impact of Chinese Culture on Corporate Social Responsibility: The Harmony Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*, 433–451 (2009).

Waples, C. J., & Brachle, B. J. (2019). Recruiting millennials: Exploring the impact of CSR involvement and pay signaling on organizational attractiveness. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27*(2), 870–880.

Zhang, Z., Wang, J., & Jia, M. (2020). Integrating the Bright and Dark Sides of Corporate Volunteering Climate: Is Corporate Volunteering Climate a Burden or Boost to Employees? *British Journal of Management*. Online first, 1-18.

Zeno Group (2020). 2020 Zeno Strength of Purpose Study. Zeno.

Zsolnai, L., 2007. Business, ethics and spirituality: Europe–Asia views. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 16* (1), 87–92.

About Emirates Foundation

Emirates Foundation is an independent national organization set up by the Abu Dhabi Government to facilitate public-private funded initiatives for the empowerment of youth across the UAE, putting them at the forefront of economic, social and human capital development. Emirates Foundation's works to have empowered and engaged youth contributing towards shaping the future of the UAE. The organization works in partnership with the private and public sectors to encourage social responsibility and enhance youth capacities through programs that meet their needs towards achieving sustainable community development.

The Emirates Foundation has 3 key priorities:

- ▶ To develop youth competencies through empowerment and raising awareness
- ▶ To encourage social responsibility within the private and public sectors
- ▶ To provide all administrative services according to standards of quality, effectiveness, transparency and innovation.

To learn more about Emirates Foundation, Please visit their website at www.emiratesfoundation.ae/ef

About IAVE

International Association for Volunteer Effort

The International Association for Volunteer Effort (IAVE) exists to promote, strengthen and celebrate volunteering in all of the myriad ways it happens throughout the world. With members in 70+ countries, IAVE is the connective tissue of a global network of leaders of volunteering, NGOs, businesses, governments and acadmic institutions that share a belief in the power of volunteers to make a significant strategic contribution to resolving the world's most pressing problems.

IAVE has four core functions:

▶ **Convening.** IAVE brings together leaders from across the field through a series of virtual and in-person events, such as the biennial World Volunteer Conference and regional conferences.

▶ **Advocacy.** IAVE serves as a global voice for volunteering, working closely with the United Nations, international NGOs and global companies to call attention to the strategic importance of volunteering as a way to solve problems and improve the quality of life for all.

▶ **Knowledge development.** IAVE is a recognized knowledge leader for the global volunteer community, conducting research and providing in-depth reports on current trends and challenges.

▶ **Network Development.** IAVE brings together key constituencies to share with and learn from one another – the Global Corporate Volunteer Council and the Global Network of Volunteering Leadership.

To learn more about IAVE, Please visit their website at www.iave.org

About the Author

Dr. Lonneke Roza

For over 10 years, Dr. Lonneke Roza has focused on impact first and impact only initiatives associated with companies to create positive social change, with a particular interest in corporate volunteering. Currently, Lonneke works as an Assistant Professor Erasmus University Rotterdam and as a strategy consultant for companies to design and implement their corporate citizenship. She publishes her work in both academic and practitioners' journals such as Journal of Business Ethics and Stanford Social Innovation Review, and she has published multiple books with Springer and Sage. She closely collaborates with platforms such as European Venture Philanthropy Association (Belgium) and RW Institute (United States).

Acknowledgements

About the Sub-theme

Corporate Volunteering – Delivering Business Objectives through a Values Focused Mission

Today's business leaders see their organizations and their employees as together having a stake in the wellbeing of their communities. The focus is changing from what corporations can do for you to what they can do with you. Corporate volunteering plays a big part in this shared sense of social purpose that gives the win-win-win effect, good for business, good for employees and good for wider society.

VOLUNTEERING TOGETHER TO ENABLE CHANGE AND CREATE A BETTER WORLD