

# LSE Research Online

**Jessica B Rodell, Jonathan E. Booth, John Lynch and  
Kate Zipay**

## **Corporate volunteering climate: mobilizing employee passion for societal causes and inspiring future charitable action**

**Article (Accepted version)  
(Refereed)**

**Original citation:**

Rodell, Jessica B., Booth, Jonathan E., Lynch, John W. and Zipay, Kate P. (2017) *Corporate volunteering climate: mobilizing employee passion for societal causes and inspiring future charitable action*. *Academy of Management Journal* . ISSN 0001-4273

DOI: [10.5465/amj.2015.0726](https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0726)

© 2017 Academy of Management Journal

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/69524/>

Available in LSE Research Online: February 2017

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# Corporate Volunteering Climate: Mobilizing Employee Passion for Societal Causes and Inspiring Future Charitable Action

**Jessica B. Rodell**  
University of Georgia  
jrodell@uga.edu

**Jonathan E. Booth**  
London School of Economics and Political Science  
j.booth@lse.ac.uk

**John W. Lynch**  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
jwlynch@uic.edu

**Kate P. Zipay**  
University of Georgia  
kzipay@uga.edu

## CORPORATE VOLUNTEERING CLIMATE: MOBILIZING EMPLOYEE PASSION FOR SOCIETAL CAUSES AND INSPIRING FUTURE CHARITABLE ACTION

As a society, we grapple with a host of national and global social issues — ranging from hunger and poverty to education to financial stability. Today’s corporations are playing an increasing role in efforts to address such concerns, predominantly through corporate volunteering. Yet, because research on corporate volunteering has been primarily focused on the individual volunteer experience, we still know relatively little about how corporate volunteering can help address grand challenges. In this study, we introduce the concept of *corporate volunteering climate* in order to examine the broader, more system-level functioning of corporate volunteering in workplaces. Drawing on the sensemaking process, we theorize about how a corporate volunteering climate develops — to what extent is it driven by company-level policies versus employee convictions for a cause? We also explore the potential influence of corporate volunteering climate for volunteers and non-volunteers, both in terms of the workplace (through employee affective commitment) and in terms of the broader community (through employee intentions to volunteer, both in corporate opportunities and on personal time). The results of a study conducted with United Way Worldwide suggest that corporate volunteering climate not only arises through either employees’ belief in the cause or corporate policies, but also that these forces act as substitutes for one another. Moreover, by fostering a sense of collective pride among employees, this climate is related to affective commitment, as well as both corporate and personal volunteering intentions.

Volunteers play a critical, though often unnoticed, role in a functioning society. Even when envisioned at a small scale, within one particular community, volunteers carry a heavy load — they serve as fire fighters, deliver meals to homeless youth or homebound seniors, provide health care services for the homeless and poor, make neighborhoods and parks clean and safe, care for animals in need, build schools and advance education, and the list could go on (Idealist.org, 2008). At a grander level, volunteers can even help to create stable political environments, organize and mobilize basic services — such as sustainable food and water distribution from natural resources, and promote the ideals of civic participation and active citizenship (Institute for Social Research and Community Development, 2008; Points of Light Institute, 2011). Worldwide, it is estimated that approximately 140 million people across 37 countries volunteer every year (Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies, 2011). As noted by the Points of Light Institute (2011):

1  
2  
3           *“If those 140 million volunteers comprised the population of a country, it*  
4           *would be the 9<sup>th</sup> largest country in the world. Those 140 million volunteers*  
5           *represent the equivalent of 20.8 million full-time equivalent jobs. It’s*  
6           *estimated that volunteers contribute around \$400 billion to the global*  
7           *economy annually.”*

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15           Volunteers may very well be the most important resource that society has and, as such,  
16  
17 represent the world’s best option to affect real change and address important societal challenges  
18 across the globe. To provide a modern example, Google’s ReCAPTCHA program provides  
19 people, worldwide, with an opportunity to create long-term sustainable value. Although captchas  
20 (the online form that asks users to input a distorted sequence of characters) were designed to  
21 verify that someone is human and not a computer program, they are also a global volunteering  
22 initiative that helps to digitize and preserve books, an endeavor that provides infinite education  
23 benefits globally. Combined, each day, people type approximately 200 million captchas, which  
24 translates into around 100 million digitized words a day (the equivalent of about 2.5 million  
25 books a year). Looking at a few more traditional examples, volunteers have helped build homes  
26 for 6.8 million people through Habitat for Humanity since the company’s foundation, they are  
27 currently promoting independence and health for nearly 2.4 million seniors in the U.S. through  
28 Meals on Wheels, and they supported UNICEF in supplying 25.5 million people with safe  
29 drinking water in 2015.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48           Despite the vital role that volunteers play in society, indications suggest that volunteering  
49 rates are trending down slowly each year (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). If this trend were to  
50 continue, it could represent its own challenge on top of the vast number of social issues that the  
51 non-profit organizations face themselves. One area where this is not the case – and volunteerism  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is actually on the rise – is in the corporate world. Today’s business environment encourages  
4  
5 organizations to be not only fiscally responsible, but also socially responsible – to exhibit  
6  
7 compassion and concern for people outside the boundaries of their organization (Aguilera, Rupp,  
8  
9 Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007; Muller, Pfarrer, & Little, 2014). An increasingly prevalent method  
10  
11 of achieving this goal is the implementation of *corporate volunteering programs* – formal and  
12  
13 informal practices and policies created by organizations to coordinate and encourage employees  
14  
15 to donate their time to an external volunteer group (Grant, 2012; Henning & Jones, 2013; Rodell,  
16  
17 2013). Estimates suggest that at least 60% of companies in the United States have formal  
18  
19 volunteering programs, and approximately 90% of companies have taken informal steps to  
20  
21 encourage and support employee volunteering in some fashion (Basil, Runte, Basil, & Usher,  
22  
23 2011; CECP, 2011, 2014; Points of Light Foundation, 2006). Indeed, corporate volunteering  
24  
25 programs have been described as “one of the fastest-growing areas of voluntary activity” of our  
26  
27 time (Bussell & Forbes, 2008: 364).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Volunteering initiatives within corporations can be likened to a form of social movement  
35  
36 — a collective effort aimed at addressing a broader social need (Muller et al., 2014; Toch, 1965;  
37  
38 Simon, Loewy, Sturmer, Weber, Freytag, Habig, Kampmeier, & Spahlinger, 1998). Given the  
39  
40 extensive workforce that can be generated by the ubiquitous nature of corporate volunteering  
41  
42 programs, corporations collectively have the potential to exert significant impact on national and  
43  
44 global societal issues. For example, Morgan Stanley — recognized by VolunteerMatch as one of  
45  
46 the top corporate volunteering programs — strives to ensure that young people have access to  
47  
48 quality healthcare and education (VolunteerMatch, 2013). Likewise, Darden Restaurants focuses  
49  
50 on the battle against hunger in every community that they serve (The Darden Foundation).  
51  
52  
53 Health, education, and poverty are grand challenges, of course, and represent only a portion of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the grand challenges facing society. Still, companies like these invest in these endeavors with the  
4 hope of making a difference. In order to achieve such a lofty goal, corporate leaders would  
5  
6 benefit from a clearer understanding of how volunteering functions within their organizations.  
7  
8  
9

10 Although scholarly research on employee volunteering has recently begun to flourish  
11 (e.g., Brockner, Senior, & Welch, 2014; Grant, 2012; Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2014; Rodell,  
12 2013), the majority of this research speaks to individual employee experiences with volunteering.  
13 For example, research has addressed an individual's predispositions and motivations to volunteer  
14 (e.g., Brockner et al., 2014; Rodell, 2013), as well as the personal and work-related outcomes of  
15 their volunteering (e.g., Booth, Park, & Glomb, 2009; Jones, 2010; Mojza, Sonnentag, &  
16 Bornemann, 2011). However, there remains little information and guidance regarding the  
17 system-level functioning of corporate volunteering. Although we recognize that we cannot  
18 provide a completely comprehensive picture of the entire corporate volunteering system in one  
19 study, our goal in this manuscript is to elevate the existing conversation regarding volunteering  
20 by initiating a discussion of the company-wide considerations and implications for corporate  
21 volunteering (both within and beyond the company's borders). In particular, we seek to address  
22 two research questions:  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 First, what are the conditions that foster an environment of corporate volunteering?  
41

42 As part of their corporate volunteering programs, companies have begun to provide a variety of  
43 resources to support employee volunteering, such as time off work, transportation, and material  
44 goods (Basil, Runte, Easwaramoorthy, & Barr, 2009; Booth et al., 2009; MacPhail & Bowles,  
45 2009). Yet there is little data regarding the utility of these efforts. Is this the best way to mobilize  
46 a volunteering movement within an organization? Without hard evidence, it is possible that the  
47 rapid adoption of these programs is merely the result of mimetic adoption (DiMaggio & Powell,  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1983) without much consideration of the best process. Recent theorizing regarding corporate  
4 philanthropy alternatively suggests that such movements may also arise from employee interest  
5 and concerns (Muller et al., 2014; Madden, Duchon, Madden, & Plowman, 2012). Thus, are  
6 volunteering movements better motivated by grassroots employee beliefs? A clearer  
7 understanding of how a corporate volunteering environment emerges may help companies  
8 determine where to invest their energy in order to create long-term sustainable programs.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Second, what are the ultimate implications of an environment of corporate volunteering  
19 within and outside of the organization? Research to date has provided evidence that individual  
20 volunteers benefit in terms of well-being (Mojza et al., 2011), as well as improved job attitudes  
21 and behaviors (e.g., Booth et al., 2009; Jones, 2010; Rodell, 2013). However, because these  
22 findings pertain solely to volunteers, this research provides only a partial picture. What — if any  
23 — are the implications of a volunteering movement for employees who choose *not* to participate  
24 in corporate volunteering? Moreover, does this type of movement have the ability for social  
25 change beyond the boundaries of the organization — that is, can it affect employee actions not  
26 only in the work domain, but also in the non-work domain through their personal lives?  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 To address these research questions, we draw from the climate literature and introduce  
40 the concept of *corporate volunteering climate* — a shared perception regarding the extent to  
41 which employees volunteer through their corporate volunteering programs. This climate reflects  
42 the sense that volunteering behavior is “something people do here” on behalf of the employees.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ultimately influences employees' attitudes and intentions, both within the workplace (in terms of  
4 affective commitment) and beyond (in terms of volunteering intentions through corporate efforts  
5 and in their personal lives). Importantly, we propose that a corporate volunteering climate has the  
6 potential to influence *all* employees, *regardless* of whether they participate in corporate  
7 volunteering or not. We theorize that, by fostering a sense of pride within the organization, this  
8 climate has the potential to impact both volunteers and non-volunteers alike. Existing scholarly  
9 conversations about volunteering have not theorized about such "crossover" effects. If found,  
10 these effects would significantly broaden the importance and reach of corporate volunteering  
11 programs.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 -----  
26 Insert Figure 1 about here  
27  
28 -----  
29

30 This research advances our understanding of volunteering in the corporate world in at  
31 least two ways. First, by conceptualizing corporate volunteering at the unit level, we extend our  
32 understanding of this construct and offer new information about how corporate volunteering  
33 functions in the workplace. In particular, by taking this approach, we provide evidence that the  
34 effects of corporate volunteering may not simply live in the act of volunteering — that  
35 employees may not necessarily need to volunteer themselves in order to get a sense of that value  
36 system at the company and for it to impact their attitudes and behaviors. Second, by including a  
37 non-work behavior — employees' personal volunteering intentions — we are able to  
38 demonstrate that the role of corporate volunteering may extend beyond the four walls of their  
39 employer. Together these advancements in the literature highlight the possibility that corporate  
40 volunteering may have the potential to contribute to broader social change in society.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 **CORPORATE VOLUNTEERING CLIMATE**  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
As described above, corporate volunteering climate refers to employees' shared perception about the extent of employee volunteering through their corporate volunteering programs. Using Chan's (1998) terminology for multilevel models, corporate volunteering climate represents a referent-shift consensus model because it is conceptually and empirically based on an aggregate of individual assessments of group experiences. Although corporate volunteering climate is derived from individual ratings regarding corporate volunteering ("Through the corporate volunteering program, employees at my company give their time to help a volunteer group"), these perceptions are conceptually distinct from an individual's ratings of their own corporate volunteering behavior ("Through the corporate volunteering program, I give my time to help a volunteer group"). Indeed, an individual employee does not need to volunteer in order to perceive the climate of corporate volunteering. In the sections below, we will theorize about how corporate volunteering climate emerges, as well as the broader implications of this climate for employees (volunteers and non-volunteers), both in the work and non-work domains.

### 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 **Emergence of a Corporate Volunteering Climate**

Climate emerges from the interactions among employees (Schneider & Reichers, 1983). It is the result of a sensemaking process where, essentially, employees look to their environment for social cues and information, and then interpret and organize those stimuli into some meaningful structure (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Zalesny & Ford, 1990; Weick, 1995). Schneider's theorizing on climate emergence goes into more detail, suggesting that employees experience or witness events (and actions), which they interpret through their own individual lens, and make sense of through repeated conversation and interaction with colleagues (Schneider & Reichers, 1983).

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Information about volunteering in the workplace can come from two sources – either

1  
2  
3 directly from the company or through the individual experiences of employees. Indeed, a  
4  
5 combination of anecdotal evidence on corporate volunteering and theorizing on related topics  
6  
7 (e.g., philanthropy and compassion) points to two possible processes through which corporate  
8  
9 volunteering climate may form: company-driven practices regarding corporate volunteering and  
10  
11 employee attitudes regarding volunteering (e.g., Booth et al., 2009; Cavallaro, 2006; Gatignon-  
12  
13 Turnau & Mignonac, 2015; Grant, 2012; Muller et al., 2014). This distinction echoes multilevel  
14  
15 theorizing that the emergence of group level phenomena can be either top-down – driven by  
16  
17 higher-level contextual influences within a system – or bottom-up – where lower-level,  
18  
19 individual properties converge or spread among employees to create a collective phenomena  
20  
21 (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Although we focus on just two possible processes, existing research  
22  
23 on volunteering points to the particular prevalence and importance of these two factors –  
24  
25 company policies and employees’ belief in the volunteering cause (e.g., Basil et al., 2009;  
26  
27 Cavallaro, 2006; Geroy, Wright, & Jacoby, 2000; MacPhail & Bowles, 2009).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Company-level influence through policies and procedures on volunteering is reflected in  
35  
36 an organization’s corporate volunteering program. Indeed, these programs consist of procedures  
37  
38 and policies set at a higher, organizational level, designed to influence behavior at a lower,  
39  
40 individual level. As described by Muller et al. (2014), this company-driven model represents the  
41  
42 “prevailing paradigm” in corporations regarding philanthropic decisions — where executives  
43  
44 unilaterally make decisions about the likelihood, scale, and form of community involvement on  
45  
46 behalf of their employees.  
47  
48  
49

50 Reliance on this approach is particularly evident in regard to corporate volunteering. A  
51  
52 significant number of empirical studies have focused on the various policies and procedures that  
53  
54 companies employ in order to encourage corporate volunteering (Basil et al., 2009; Booth et al.,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2009; Cavallaro, 2006; Gatignon-Turnau & Mignonac, 2015). Some of the most common of  
4  
5 these practices include: time benefits — such as time-off for volunteering or adjusting schedules  
6  
7 to accommodate volunteering, financial support — such as donations of goods (e.g., prizes, gift  
8  
9 certificates, t-shirts) and paying entry fees, and logistical support — such as the use of company  
10  
11 facilities, equipment, and transportation. We use the term *company-provided resources* to refer  
12  
13 to the collection of resources and benefits that companies offer employees as part of their  
14  
15 corporate volunteering programs (see also Booth et al., 2009).  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 According to climate scholars, company-level practices and policies such as these  
21  
22 provide the primary foundation for climate to emerge (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2011). In  
23  
24 essence, these resources can be viewed as artifacts of the company's underlying culture — a  
25  
26 manifest way of signaling latent company values to its employees (Schein, 1990, 2010). Even if  
27  
28 employees do not participate in the corporate volunteering program, the existence of such  
29  
30 policies and procedures serves as a salient reminder that corporate volunteering is something that  
31  
32 the organization values and encourages. Thus, the greater a company invests in resources for  
33  
34 corporate volunteering, the more likely it is that employees will perceive a corporate  
35  
36 volunteering climate.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 *Hypothesis 1: Company-provided resources will be positively related to a corporate*  
42  
43 *volunteering climate.*  
44  
45

46 Alternatively, theorizing on organizational philanthropy and compassion has recently  
47  
48 adopted an emergent, employee-driven focus (e.g., Madden et al., 2012; Muller et al., 2014). In  
49  
50 his recent theorizing on corporate volunteering, Grant (2012) also speculated that it is “typically  
51  
52 led by the bottom-up grassroots efforts of employees” (p. 590). This employee-driven process  
53  
54 centers on the information that employees gather based on what their peers are doing, what their  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 peers are saying, and the emotions that their peers convey. Through repeated interaction and  
4  
5 communication, employees are continually transferring this information amongst themselves,  
6  
7 resulting in individual perceptions and opinions converging on an organizational phenomenon  
8  
9 (Hardin & Higgins, 1995).  
10  
11

12  
13 Much of the social information conveyed about corporate volunteering lives in the  
14  
15 attitudes that employees project about their involvement in the activity. Although volunteers may  
16  
17 hold a variety of attitudes and motives for their volunteering, evidence suggests that a sense that  
18  
19 it is important and meaningful is a predominant force for employees (Geroy et al., 2000). In  
20  
21 some of the initial investigations of the functions served by volunteering, Clary and colleagues  
22  
23 (1998) introduced the concept of value fulfillment – that volunteering was a way to act on what a  
24  
25 person values and an outlet to do something they perceive as worthwhile. Subsequent research  
26  
27 on corporate volunteering suggests that this sentiment holds particular importance for employed  
28  
29 individuals (Geroy et al., 2000; Pajo & Lee, 2011; Peloza & Hassay, 2006). Of all of the  
30  
31 commonly listed reasons for volunteering, employees appear overwhelming concerned with the  
32  
33 extent to which it is meaningful, important, and helps a worthwhile cause (Geroy et al., 2000;  
34  
35 Pajo & Lee, 2011; Peloza & Hassay, 2006). Accordingly, in this study, we examine employees'  
36  
37 *belief in the cause*, which reflects their desire to help a worthy organization achieve its goals.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Employees may communicate their belief in the volunteering cause both explicitly and  
45  
46 implicitly (Barsade, 2002; Kelly & Barsade, 2001). For example, an employee passionate about a  
47  
48 particular volunteering cause may explicitly share stories with coworkers about his or her  
49  
50 personal volunteering experiences. In addition, employees may implicitly share their interest for  
51  
52 a volunteering cause with coworkers by wearing their corporate volunteering t-shirt or displaying  
53  
54 pictures from a recent volunteering event on their desk.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Moreover, research has also shown that the more intensely an individual member of a group feels about something, the more intensely they convey that information to others and the more likely it is that collective perceptions emerge (Barsade, 2002). Thus, the more an employee cares about and believes in a particular volunteering cause, the more likely this information is to spread and allow a collective perception of corporate volunteering to emerge. Importantly, following this line of theorizing, employees need not volunteer themselves to be aware of the climate for corporate volunteering. By experiencing the attitude from others second-hand – either explicitly or implicitly – they too can gain a sense of the collective norms and values regarding volunteering in their workplace.

*Hypothesis 2: Employee belief in the cause will be positively related to a corporate volunteering climate.*

### **Workplace Implications of a Corporate Volunteering Climate**

Similar to other forms of work climate, corporate volunteering climate has the potential to exert meaningful influence on employee attitudes and behaviors (for a review, see Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). Uniquely, however, corporate volunteering climate may serve as a conduit through which the concept of volunteering may affect not only those employees who participate in the company program (which we refer to as *volunteers*) but also those who do not participate in the company program (which we refer to as *non-volunteers*). In particular, we anticipate that corporate volunteering climate will influence employee affective commitment by creating a positive tone in the environment.

Shared perceptions and experiences – such as climate – foster shared emotions among colleagues (Rime, 2007). Volunteering is a particularly emotion-laden activity. Individual volunteers tend to comment on how it makes them “feel good” (United Health Group, 2013).

1  
2  
3 One commonly noted reaction to volunteering is a sense of pride – a feeling of pleasure and self-  
4 respect (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Tyler & Blader, 2001). For example, based on recent survey of  
5  
6 volunteers, the Human Services Council reported that over 90% of people felt that volunteering  
7  
8 provided them with a sense that they accomplished something and made a positive difference in  
9  
10 the world (Holroyd, 2011). This reaction holds true for employees volunteering through their  
11  
12 company’s endeavors as well (Caudron, 1994; Grant, Dutton, & Rosso, 2008; Jones, 2010). For  
13  
14 example, Jones and colleagues found that employee opinions about corporate volunteering were  
15  
16 linked to a sense of organizational pride (Jones, 2010) and that job seekers anticipated a sense of  
17  
18 pride from being affiliated with a company known for community involvement (Jones et al.,  
19  
20 2014).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27           There are also indications that volunteering can provide people with a sense of  
28  
29 enthusiasm – that volunteering encourages them to look forward to each day (Holroyd, 2011) –  
30  
31 and that it can promote awareness and perspective taking about one’s own life circumstances  
32  
33 compared to others (Clary, 1999; Clary et al., 1998; Bartel, 2001), which can lay the foundation  
34  
35 for inspiration (Thrash et al., 2010). Although these emotions – pride, enthusiasm, and  
36  
37 inspiration – have some distinctions, they are all similarly positioned near 30 degrees on the  
38  
39 affect circumplex (Remington, Fabrigar, & Visser, 2000; Yik et al., 2011). This position, referred  
40  
41 to as “activated pleasure,” reflects a highly pleasant state with a slight level of activation (Yik  
42  
43 Russell, & Steiger, 2011). Yik et al. (2011) characterize this state as one where people feel  
44  
45 enthusiastic and positive about what they are doing, as well as inspired by and proud of the  
46  
47 activity. Despite slight differences in these discrete emotions, it appears that people are likely to  
48  
49 experience this general form of positive emotion in reaction to volunteering.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55           Emotions, such as these, are shared with others in the workplace – explicitly and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 implicitly – enabling them to manifest at a higher level (Barsade, 2002; George, 1990; Rime,  
4  
5  
6 2007). Explicitly, employees are likely to directly communicate their emotions to colleagues  
7  
8 through their repeated interactions (Kelly & Barsade, 2001). Implicitly, emotions also spread at a  
9  
10 less conscious level, based on automatic processing (Barsade, 2002). For example, feelings can  
11  
12 be communicated through non-verbal signals, such as facial expressions, body language, and  
13  
14 tone. The act of sharing an emotion – either explicitly or implicitly – increases that feeling in  
15  
16 both the agent and the target (Rime, 2007). As a result, the emotion spreads across individuals  
17  
18 and creates a particular emotional climate. Likewise, according to intergroup emotions theory,  
19  
20 people experience group-level emotions when they belong to and identify with a particular  
21  
22 group, such as their workplace (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Smith et al., 2007). Thus, we  
23  
24 expect that the particular positive sentiment associated with corporate volunteering at the  
25  
26 individual level – that of pride, enthusiasm, and inspiration – will be shared among colleagues  
27  
28 and converge at the group level as well. We use the term *collective pride* to capture this shared  
29  
30 affective experience among employees.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Research in this area suggests that a sense of collective pride should influence  
38  
39 employees' attachment attitudes (Grant et al., 2008; Jones, 2010). Employees who feel a sense of  
40  
41 pride rooted in their group membership are likely to identify with their company (Ashforth &  
42  
43 Mael, 1989). These individuals have an emotional desire to remain with that group in order to  
44  
45 continue to reap the feelings of pleasure and self-respect (for example, pride and/or inspiration)  
46  
47 that they associate with it (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tyler & Blader, 2001). As a result, these  
48  
49 employees are likely to experience stronger *affective commitment* — an emotional attachment to  
50  
51 and identification with their organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Empirical evidence supports  
52  
53 this connection in regard to corporate volunteering. For example, Jones (2010) found that  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 employees who viewed corporate volunteering more positively reported more pride in their  
4 company and, ultimately, higher intentions to remain in the organization. In addition, Grant et al.  
5  
6 (2008) discussed the key role that pride played in fostering affective commitment in reaction to  
7  
8 company giving programs. Thus, we expect that, by fostering a sense of collective pride,  
9  
10 companies with a higher volunteering climate will exhibit higher levels of employee affective  
11  
12 commitment.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 *Hypothesis 3a: Corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect*  
19  
20 *relationship with affective commitment through collective pride.*  
21

22  
23 Because the emotional process that we are describing occurs at the unit level, *both*  
24  
25 volunteers *and* non-volunteers are likely to go through the same process. Non-volunteers may  
26  
27 feel the emotions – either directly as result of knowledge of the corporate volunteering climate or  
28  
29 indirectly by catching the emotions of volunteers – contributing to the group’s collective pride.  
30  
31 Indeed, research has shown that people can feel emotions on behalf of a group even if they are  
32  
33 not personally affected by it (Smith et al., 2007). Thus, it is likely that non-volunteers are equally  
34  
35 capable of internalizing this group state.  
36  
37

38  
39 As a result of recognizing and internalizing this group state (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978;  
40  
41 Weick, 1995), non-volunteers may exhibit increased affective commitment to a similar degree as  
42  
43 volunteers. Although the majority of research on corporate volunteering has focused on the  
44  
45 subset of employees who volunteer, there are some indications that non-volunteers have similar  
46  
47 patterns of workplace attitudes. For example, although Jones (2010) did not explicitly distinguish  
48  
49 between volunteers and non-volunteers, he found that positive views of corporate volunteering  
50  
51 and pride were related to commitment intentions across all employees. Likewise, deGilder,  
52  
53 Schuyt, and Breedijk (2005) noted how non-volunteers at a company with a strong volunteering  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 presence exhibited similar levels of commitment as volunteers. Thus, we expect that the  
4 relationship hypothesized above will hold for all employees within the company, regardless of  
5 whether they participate in corporate volunteering (volunteers) or not (non-volunteers).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 *Hypothesis 3b: The indirect relationship between corporate volunteering climate and*  
11 *affective commitment will exist for both volunteers and non-volunteers within the*  
12 *corporate volunteering program.*  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 **Societal Implications of a Corporate Volunteering Climate**

18  
19 Moving beyond workplace implications, we are also interested in whether corporate  
20 volunteering climate may motivate employees' future volunteering behaviors – both with their  
21 employer and on their own time, as well as for volunteers and non-volunteers. If so, the ultimate  
22 impact of corporate volunteering climate may go beyond the four walls of the company and help  
23 contribute to broader societal issues. To quote Steve Jobs (2005), cultivating a corporate  
24 volunteering climate may then be able to help companies put “a ding in the Universe.”  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 As discussed in the previous section, corporate volunteering climate should foster an  
35 environment where employees are proud of their affiliation with a group that is willing to help  
36 others. Internalizing such emotion can influence individual employee action (Schneider &  
37 Reichers, 1983; Smith et al., 2007; Swann & Read, 1981). In particular, research on group  
38 identification suggests that people are likely to behave in consistent ways that reinforce positive  
39 images of themselves (Swann & Read, 1981). A sense of inspiration and pride tends to evoke an  
40 approach motivation – where people are compelled to express or imitate the act that sparked that  
41 sentiment (Thrash et al., 2010). Moreover, research on group emotions suggests that people are  
42 likely to associate themselves with the underlying identity of a particular group-level emotion, in  
43 this case the volunteering climate that fostered pride, and act accordingly (Mackie et al., 2000;  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Smith et al., 2007). Thus, we expect that employees at companies with higher levels of corporate  
4  
5 volunteering climate are likely to want to engage in additional actions that will help others. Most  
6  
7 directly relevant in this context is employee intentions to help others through involvement in  
8  
9 their company's volunteering efforts. We use the term *corporate volunteering intentions* to refer  
10  
11 to employees' intentions to volunteer through their company's volunteering program in the  
12  
13 future.  
14  
15

16  
17 As was the case with affective commitment, we expect that the impact of corporate  
18  
19 volunteering climate on volunteering intentions will exist equally in the group of volunteers and  
20  
21 non-volunteers within an organization. Because all employees are exposed to and internalize the  
22  
23 sense of collective pride, volunteers and non-volunteers alike are capable of exhibiting these  
24  
25 behavioral intentions affiliated with corporate volunteering climate.  
26  
27

28  
29 *Hypothesis 4a: Corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect*  
30  
31 *relationship with corporate volunteering intentions through collective pride.*  
32  
33

34  
35 *Hypothesis 4b: The indirect relationship between corporate volunteering climate and*  
36  
37 *corporate volunteering intentions will exist for both volunteers and non-volunteers within*  
38  
39 *the corporate volunteering program.*  
40

41 In addition, drawing on the work-non-work literature, we suspect that this internalized  
42  
43 sense of pride will transfer home with employees and influence their actions beyond the  
44  
45 workplace boundaries. In particular, the concept of a spillover effect is particularly relevant to  
46  
47 this possibility (for a review see Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). A spillover perspective suggests  
48  
49 that employees can carry thoughts and emotions with them from one life domain (e.g., the  
50  
51 workplace) into another life domain (e.g., home). The spillover of moods and emotions is highly  
52  
53 likely and unintentional – employees may not intend to carry their feelings home with them from  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 work, but they do it anyway without realizing it (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).  
4

5  
6 This theorizing suggests that the internalized emotion garnered by a corporate  
7  
8 volunteering climate – a sense of pride and inspiration – is likely to transfer home with  
9  
10 employees when they leave the workplace. Similar to the implications for corporate volunteering  
11  
12 intentions, we then expect that employees should be more likely to seek out opportunities to  
13  
14 engage in volunteering in the non-work domain (Smith et al., 2007; Swann & Read, 1981). We  
15  
16 use the term *personal volunteering intentions* to refer to employees' intentions to volunteer on  
17  
18 their own time (outside of the corporate volunteering structure). Moreover, as with the theorizing  
19  
20 above, we expect to see a similar pattern of relationships for volunteers and non-volunteers  
21  
22 because they equally share in the general sense of inspiration at their company.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *Hypothesis 5a: Corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect*  
28  
29 *relationship with personal volunteering intentions through collective pride.*  
30

31  
32 *Hypothesis 5b: The indirect relationship between corporate volunteering climate and*  
33  
34 *personal volunteering intentions will exist for both volunteers and non-volunteers within*  
35  
36 *the corporate volunteering program.*  
37

## 38 39 **METHOD**

### 40 41 **Sample and Data Collection**

42  
43 Companies and participants were recruited through their affiliation with United Way  
44  
45 Worldwide. United Way Worldwide is a global organization with a mission to “improve lives by  
46  
47 mobilizing the caring power of communities around the world” (United Way Worldwide). The  
48  
49 participating companies collaborate with United Way Worldwide as part of their corporate  
50  
51 volunteering programs. Each of the recruited companies has their own form of a corporate  
52  
53 volunteering program, which vary widely in structure. Through their corporate volunteer  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 program, employees volunteered for organizations such as Meals on Wheels, the Humane  
4  
5 Society, Boys and Girls Club, the American Cancer Society, March of Dimes, and Habitat for  
6  
7 Humanity – as well as other volunteer activities, such as one-time events (e.g., Relay for Life,  
8  
9 United Way’s Day of Caring, and Race for the Cure). Each United Way Worldwide affiliate  
10  
11 designates an employee – a United Way liaison – to manage its corporate volunteering program.  
12  
13  
14

15 Through collaboration with the United Way, we were put in contact with each company’s  
16  
17 volunteering liaison – the employee who oversees their corporate volunteering program and  
18  
19 coordinates their efforts with their local United Way office. At the start of our study, the liaison  
20  
21 from each participating company completed a survey about the structure of their corporate  
22  
23 volunteering program — specifically about company-provided resources. Of the 108 companies  
24  
25 that we contacted, we received completed surveys from 58 company liaisons, resulting in a  
26  
27 response rate of 54%. After adjusting for incomplete surveys and liaison surveys without any  
28  
29 matched employee surveys, our final sample included surveys from 50 different companies.  
30  
31  
32 These companies represented a range of industries – 20% utilities, 22% retail, 30% financial,  
33  
34 14% education and health, and 14% other. On average, the liaisons were 42.18 years old ( $SD =$   
35  
36 9.38) and had company tenure of 12.10 years ( $SD = 8.15$ ). Of the 50 liaisons in our final sample,  
37  
38 78% identified as female and 73% were Caucasian.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 In addition to completing the survey about company-provided resources, each liaison was  
44  
45 asked to identify approximately 10 employees to participate in our study — including a mix of  
46  
47 employees who volunteered through the corporate volunteering program and employees who did  
48  
49 not volunteer through the program. As a result, we contacted 520 potential participants, of which  
50  
51 445 completed Time 1 surveys, resulting in a response rate of 86%. At the end of the first survey,  
52  
53 we asked participants if they would be interested in completing a second survey, of which 319  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 participants agreed. Approximately four weeks later, we emailed these individuals the Time 2  
4 survey. We received 255 completed responses, resulting in a response rate of 80%. After  
5 removing incomplete responses, our final sample included 229 participants — 160 of whom  
6 indicated that they had volunteered through their corporate volunteer program and 69 of whom  
7 indicated that they did not. On average, we had complete data from six employees ( $SD = 2.29$ ) in  
8 each company, which represented approximately 35% ( $SD = 6.9\%$ ) of the total company  
9 population. These participants were, on average, 42.88 years old ( $SD = 10.51$ ) and had company  
10 tenure of 11.62 years ( $SD = 9.97$ ). Of the 229 participants in our final sample, 65% identified as  
11 female and 82% were Caucasian.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 At Time 1, employees completed a survey including measures of their belief in the  
25 corporate volunteering cause, as well as their perceptions of corporate volunteering climate and  
26 basic individual differences and demographic information. The Time 2 survey included measures  
27 of employees' perceptions of collective pride and prosocial climate, as well as individual  
28 outcomes of affective commitment, and corporate and personal volunteering intentions.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Measures**

37 Unless otherwise noted, all measures used a five-point Likert scale from 1 =  
38 *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Company provided resources.** Company liaisons assessed company-provided resources  
44 for volunteering using a nine-item measure developed by Booth et al. (2009). Following the  
45 prompt of "Our company's volunteer program includes," example items included, "Approval to  
46 take time off to spend some time volunteering," "Approval of use of facilities or equipment for  
47 employee volunteer activities," and "Donation of prizes, gift certificates, food, etc." ( $\alpha = .73$ ).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 **Employee belief in the cause.** We developed four items to assess the extent to which  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 employees who volunteered did so because they cared about the volunteering cause. Following  
4 the prompt of “I volunteer...” the items read as follows: “Because I believe in the ‘cause’ of the  
5 volunteer organization,” “To help the volunteer organization meet its goals,” “To improve the  
6 chances that the volunteer organization will achieve their mission”, and “Because I support the  
7 mission of the volunteer organization” ( $\alpha = .82$ ). These rating were only provided by the subset  
8 of employee volunteers in our sample. Using an additive composition model (Chan, 1998), the  
9 level of belief in the cause within each company was operationalized as the average of these  
10 ratings. Initial evidence points to the validity of this measure – both convergent ( $r = .40$  with  
11 prosocial identity and  $.34$  with empathy) and discriminant (non-significant relationships with  
12 other motives, such as socialization  $-.02$ , gaining skills  $.12$ , impression management  $-.08$ ).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **Corporate volunteering climate.** To measure corporate volunteering climate, we  
28 adapted Rodell’s (2013) five-item volunteering measure. Corporate volunteering climate reflects  
29 a referent-shift composition model, which measures employees’ shared belief regarding  
30 employees’ engagement in the corporate volunteering program. As such, we adapted items to  
31 reference “employees at my company” rather than “I”. Following the prompt of “Through the  
32 company’s volunteering program...,” example items included “Employees at my company give  
33 their time to help a volunteer group” and “Employees at my company employ their talent to aid a  
34 volunteer group” ( $\alpha = .97$ ). Employees responded to these items with a frequency scale ranging  
35 from 1 = *Almost Never* to 5 = *Very Often*. Initial evidence for the validity of this concept can be  
36 drawn from prior research on volunteering using this scale – for example, it has correlated  
37 strongly ( $r = .64$ ) with other measures of volunteering (Gillath, Shaver, Mikulincer, Nitzberg,  
38 Erez, & Ijzendoorn, 2005 and a direct measure of volunteering; see Rodell, 2013) – and from an  
39 expected pattern of relationships with data in the current study (e.g.,  $r = .34$  with prosocial  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 climate and .19 with company positive tone).  
4

5  
6 The referent-shift nature of corporate volunteering climate is supported by an  
7  
8 examination of within-group agreement of individual ratings of this scale (Chan, 1998). Thus, we  
9  
10 calculated  $r_{wg}$  and ICC scores for each company to establish the appropriateness of aggregating  
11  
12 employee responses from the individual level to the company level (James, Demaree, & Wolf,  
13  
14 1984). Although the ICC scores were rather low – ICC(1) .05 and ICC(2) .16 – the average  $r_{wg}$   
15  
16 score across companies was .83. The low ICC scores were not entirely surprising, given that our  
17  
18 recruitment process encouraged within-company variance in volunteering (both volunteers and  
19  
20 non-volunteers participated) and suppressed between-company variance by surveying companies  
21  
22 with an existing relationship with a worldwide volunteering organization (United Way).  
23  
24

25  
26 However, the  $r_{wg}$  provided support for aggregation and we calculated the average value of  
27  
28 employee responses within each company to create corporate volunteering climate. In order to  
29  
30 capture and examine the within-company variation, we also calculated the standard deviation of  
31  
32 these ratings and controlled for this variation when testing our hypotheses.  
33  
34

35  
36 **Collective pride.** We measured collective pride using a referent-shift adaptation of three  
37  
38 items from the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994). These three items correspond with a  
39  
40 particular quadrant of the affect circumplex at the 30 degree angle called “activated pleasure” –  
41  
42 which reflects emotions that primarily denote a high state of pleasantness with a secondary  
43  
44 implication of arousal (Yik, Russell, & Steiger, 2011). In particular, participants rated the extent  
45  
46 to which “employees in my company tend to feel...”: “proud,” “enthusiastic,” and “inspired” on  
47  
48 a scale ranging from 1 = *Very Slightly/Not At All* to 5 = *Extremely* ( $\alpha = .88$ ). The average  $r_{wg}$   
49  
50 score across companies was .74 and ICC(1) and ICC(2) were .14 and .39, respectively.  
51  
52

53  
54  
55 **Affective commitment.** We measured affective commitment using Meyer and Allen’s  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (1997) six-item scale. Example items include “I feel like ‘part of the family’ at my company”  
4  
5 and “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my company” ( $\alpha = .92$ ).  
6  
7

8       **Corporate volunteering intentions.** We measured corporate volunteering intentions  
9  
10 using an adapted version of Rodell’s (2013) five-item measure of employee volunteering. In  
11 particular, we adapted the prompt to capture the future orientation of this variable, which stated  
12 “Next year, through my company’s volunteering programs, I intend to...” Example items  
13 included “Give my time to help a volunteer group” and “Engage in activities to support a  
14 volunteer group” ( $\alpha = .96$ ).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22       **Personal volunteering intentions.** Similarly, personal volunteering intentions was  
23 assessed with adapted version of Rodell’s (2013) five-item measure of employee volunteering.  
24 Following the prompt, “Next year, outside of my company’s volunteering programs, I intend  
25 to...” example items included “Give my time to help a volunteer group” and “Engage in  
26 activities to support a volunteer group” ( $\alpha = .97$ ).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34       **Control variables.** We included several control variables designed to speak to alternative  
35 explanations for the relationships predicted in our model. Primarily, we wanted to account for the  
36 known relationship between prosocial nature and volunteering (Penner, 2002; Rodell, 2013;  
37 Wilson, 2000) – both at the individual and company level. To account for an individual’s  
38 prosocial nature, we controlled for employee’s prosocial identity – the extent to which a person  
39 sees themselves as caring and kind (Grant et al., 2008;  $\alpha = .79$ ). We also controlled for employee  
40 perceptions of prosocial climate – using a referent-shift adaptation of Grant et al.’s (2008) scale  
41 ( $\alpha = .91$ ; average  $r_{wg} = .91$ ; ICC(1) = .15; ICC(2) = .41). Those three items were: “I see this  
42 company as caring,” “I think that this company is generous,” and “I see this company as being  
43 genuinely concerned about its employees.” Including prosocial climate ensures that volunteering  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 climate has a unique role beyond a general sense that employees at a company are “good” and  
4 “kind.” In addition, this form of climate accounts for a potential cognitive evaluation (in contrast  
5  
6 to the emotional explanation that we modeled) that may explain the impact of a corporate  
7  
8  
9  
10 volunteering climate on employee attitudes.

## 11 12 **RESULTS**

13  
14  
15 We tested our model using multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) in MPlus  
16  
17 (Muthén & Muthén, 2010), which adopts a FIML (full information maximum likelihood)  
18  
19 approach. MSEM is able to capture the nested nature of the data, thus addressing potential issues  
20  
21 with non-independence inherent in multilevel data (Bliese, 2000). In particular, we used the  
22  
23 “cluster” option within this program based on company level identifiers. Given our smaller  
24  
25 sample size at the organizational level, we used single indicators to model these latent variables  
26  
27 (factor loadings provided in parentheses): company-provided resources (.86), employee belief in  
28  
29 the cause (.92), corporate volunteering climate (.98), collective pride (.93), and prosocial climate  
30  
31 (.96) with the error variances for these latent products set to  $(1-\alpha) \times \text{variance}$  (Kline, 2005).  
32  
33 Individual-level variables were modeled as fully latent variables (average factor loadings  
34  
35 provided in parentheses): affective commitment (.81), corporate (.93) and personal (.91)  
36  
37  
38 volunteering intentions, and prosocial identity (.78).

39  
40  
41  
42  
43 The measurement model provided good fit to the data ( $\chi^2 [281] = 571.06$ , CFI = .92,  
44  
45 RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .03). We then added paths to reflect the conceptual model presented in  
46  
47 Figure 1, which also suggested good fit to the data ( $\chi^2 [305] = 557.02$ , CFI = .93, RMSEA = .06,  
48  
49 SRMR = .05). The descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations for our variables are shown in  
50  
51 Table 1, and a summary of the standardized MSEM results are in Figure 2. All path coefficients  
52  
53 and p-values are presented below or in the relevant tables and figures. Given sample size loses with  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 aggregate data, we report both  $p < .05$  and  $p < .10$  alpha levels. As noted in the figure, we  
4  
5 controlled for several potential alternative explanations in the analyses. Any significant  
6  
7 relationships in that regard are discussed below in our test of hypotheses.  
8  
9

10  
11 -----  
12 Insert Table 1 and Figure 2 about here  
13  
14 -----  
15

16 Hypothesis 1 predicts that company-provided benefits will be positively related to  
17  
18 volunteering climate. Hypothesis 2 predicts that employee belief in the cause will be positively  
19  
20 related to volunteering climate. As shown in Figure 2, both hypotheses were supported – the path  
21  
22 coefficient from company-provided benefits to volunteering climate was significant at ( $\beta = .29$ ,  
23  
24  $p = .06$ ) as was the path coefficient from employee belief in the cause to volunteering climate ( $\beta =$   
25  
26  $.37$ ,  $p = .00$ ;  $R^2$  for corporate volunteering climate was  $.34$ ,  $p = .01$ ).  
27  
28  
29

30 Hypothesis 3 focuses on the workplace implications of corporate volunteering climate.  
31  
32 Hypothesis 3a predicts that corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect  
33  
34 relationship with affective commitment through collective pride. The relevant path coefficients  
35  
36 for this indirect effect can be found in Figure 2 ( $\beta = .27$ ,  $p = .04$ , and  $\beta = .32$ ,  $p = .00$ , respectively).  
37  
38 The indirect relationship of corporate volunteering climate with affective commitment ( $\beta = .09$ ,  
39  
40  $p = .08$ ) was significant, supporting Hypothesis 3a (and  $R^2$  for affective commitment was  $.14$ ,  
41  
42  $p = .00$ ).  
43  
44  
45

46 Hypothesis 3b predicts that the indirect relationship of corporate volunteering climate  
47  
48 with affective commitment will be significant for both volunteers and non-volunteers. Following  
49  
50 Mathieu, Tannenbaum, and Salas' (1992) recommendations for modeling moderators in  
51  
52 structural equation modeling, the relevant product terms – calculated from the mean-centered  
53  
54 scale score for the independent variable and the moderator (Cortina, Chen, & Dunlap, 2001) –  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were used as single indicators of the latent interaction variables. The coefficient alphas for the  
4 interaction terms were calculated with the formula:  $((r_{xx} * r_{zz}) + r_{xz}^2) / (1 + r_{xz}^2)$ , where X was the  
5 independent variable, Z was the moderator, and  $r_{xz}$  was the correlation between those latent  
6 variables (Cortina et al., 2001). We relied on Edwards and Lambert's (2007) approach for  
7 second-stage moderated mediation using bias-corrected bootstrapping to test these moderated  
8 indirect effects. As expected, in regard to Hypothesis 3b, we saw that the indirect relationship  
9 between corporate volunteering climate and affective commitment was not moderated by  
10 corporate volunteer participation. Moreover, as shown in Table 2, the indirect relationship  
11 between corporate volunteering climate and affective commitment was significant for both non-  
12 volunteers (.15) and volunteers (.18) and a test of the difference between those estimates was  
13 non-significant.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Hypotheses 4 and 5 focus on the societal implications of corporate volunteering climate.  
30 Hypothesis 4a predicts that corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect  
31 relationship with corporate volunteering intentions through collective pride. Although the  
32 relevant path coefficients ( $\beta = .27, p = .04$ , and  $\beta = .15, p = .02$ , respectively) were significant, this  
33 indirect relationship ( $\beta = .04, p = .14$ ) was not significant ( $R^2$  for corporate volunteering intentions  
34 was .26,  $p = .00$ ). In addition, in regard to Hypothesis 4b, we found that employees' current  
35 corporate volunteering participation significantly moderated this relationship ( $\beta = -.12, p = .04$ ).  
36 As presented in Table 2 and Figure 3, the indirect relationship between corporate volunteering  
37 climate and corporate volunteering intentions was significant for non-volunteers (.08) and not  
38 significant for volunteers (-.05). Moreover, the difference between these two estimates was  
39 significant (-.13). In terms of the control variables, employee prosocial identity ( $\beta = .26, p = .00$ )  
40 was significantly related to corporate volunteering intentions.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

-----  
Insert Table 2 and Figure 3 about here  
-----

Hypothesis 5a predicts that corporate volunteering climate will exhibit a positive indirect relationship with personal volunteering intentions through collective pride. Based on the relevant path coefficients ( $\beta = .27, p = .04$ , and  $\beta = .29, p = .00$ , respectively), this indirect relationship ( $\beta = .08, p = .08$ ) was significant ( $R^2$  for personal volunteering intentions was  $.23, p = .00$ ). As expected, in regard to Hypothesis 5b, the indirect relationship between corporate volunteering climate and personal volunteering intentions was not different for volunteers and non-volunteers. As shown in Table 2, although the relationship was significant for non-volunteers ( $.16$ ) but not significant for volunteers ( $.09$ ), a test of the difference between those estimates was non-significant. Regarding the control variables, prosocial identity ( $\beta = .22, p = .00$ ) and prosocial climate ( $\beta = -.14, p = .06$ ) were both significantly related to personal volunteering intentions.

### **Interaction of company-driven and employee-driven processes**

Theorizing on climate emergence would suggest that there might be integrative effects of various sources of information (Schneider & Reichers, 1983). People gather information from their surroundings – company policies and procedures, as well as peer attitudes, emotions, and behaviors – then integrate this information and interpret it through their own personal lenses. This logic suggests that company provided resources and employee belief in the cause may not only have direct implications for corporate volunteering climate, but also may interact in some fashion to influence that climate.

We did not formally hypothesize this interaction because theoretical arguments can be made for contradictory patterns for this relationship (see Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Howell, Dorfman, & Kerr, 1986). On one hand, company-provided resources

1  
2  
3 and employee beliefs may act in a complementary fashion – where they serve to reinforce each  
4 other and ultimately enhance or magnify the level of corporate volunteering climate. Following  
5 this line of theorizing, it is possible that company-provided resources allow for the mobilization  
6 of employee beliefs into the kinds of activities and interactions that can give rise to climate. On  
7 the other hand, these forces may act as substitutes that compensate one another. In the absence of  
8 company-provided resources for employees, it may be possible for other more easily accessible  
9 factors – such as employee beliefs in a volunteering cause – to act as a substitute and exert a  
10 significant influence on corporate volunteering climate (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Howell et  
11 al., 1986).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 As shown in Figure 2, there was, indeed, a significant interaction between company-  
25 provided resources and employee belief in a cause ( $\beta = -.29$ ,  $p=.02$ ). The plot of this relationship  
26 (see Figure 4) supports the idea that these two forces act as substitutes for one another – in the  
27 absence of company-provided resources, employee belief has a significant relationship with  
28 corporate volunteering climate, and vice-versa.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 -----  
38 Insert Figure 4 about here  
39 -----  
40  
41

## 42 DISCUSSION

43  
44 As a society, we grapple with a host of national and global social issues, ranging from  
45 hunger and poverty to education to financial stability. Focusing on hunger in particular, recent  
46 reports suggest that one out of every nine individuals around the world – approximately 805  
47 million people – face chronic hunger (World Hunger Education Service, 2015). Over the past  
48 few decades, the role of corporations in the fight against such issues has been steadily increasing.  
49 For example, Panera Bread runs *Panera Cares Community Cafes* – non-profit locations that will  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 feed anyone whether they can pay or not (Panera Cares). Likewise, Darden Restaurants run a  
4  
5 program called *Darden Harvest* where they rescue food from landfills and get it to those in need.  
6  
7 Through this program, Darden Restaurants has donated more than 100 million meals – as they  
8  
9 put it, “enough to feed every person in Manhattan three meals a day for three weeks” (The  
10  
11 Darden Foundation).  
12  
13

14  
15 Given the large-scale efforts of companies like these and others, there is the potential for  
16  
17 the corporate world to exert significant social change. This potential raises the questions: How  
18  
19 can these efforts be fostered within organizations? What are the organizational implications of  
20  
21 them? And, can the environment of corporate volunteering inspire employees to tackle grand  
22  
23 challenges in their own personal lives? With these questions in mind, the goals of this study were  
24  
25 twofold: First, to examine the conditions that foster a corporate volunteering climate within an  
26  
27 organization, and second, to examine the impact of this climate on employee actions – both  
28  
29 within and outside of the companies’ boundaries.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 By examining these questions, we were able to gain insight into how the corporate world  
35  
36 may be able to uniquely and positively impact grand societal challenges. One of the most  
37  
38 relevant take-aways in this regard is that corporate volunteering climate may improve  
39  
40 volunteering rates. Specifically, we saw that employees in companies with higher volunteering  
41  
42 climates had higher intentions to volunteer, both in the corporate program and on their own  
43  
44 personal time, compared to companies with lower volunteering climates. Importantly, corporate  
45  
46 volunteering climate did not only wind up impacting the subset of employees who already  
47  
48 volunteer, but it also increased volunteer intentions among non-volunteers. Given the increasing  
49  
50 adoption of and participation in corporate volunteering programs, the impact of this relationship  
51  
52 could be tremendous. As noted at the onset of this paper, volunteers represent a significant (and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 free!) resource that can be used to address societal issues. Over the past 13 years, the  
4  
5 volunteering work by Americans alone is estimated as a \$2.1 trillion value – efforts that have  
6  
7 helped the 670,000 homeless, 48 million hungry, and 46.2 million living in poverty, among  
8  
9 others, in that country alone (Corporation for National & Community Service, 2014; Volunteers  
10  
11 of America, 2016). Moreover, volunteers are twice as likely to donate money to such causes,  
12  
13 compared to non-volunteers (Corporation for National & Community Service, 2014). If  
14  
15 corporate volunteering climates can help increase volunteering rates, they may also indirectly  
16  
17 increase income to these important causes.  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 In addition, the corporate world may just be uniquely suited to tackle these types of  
23  
24 challenges. Not only is it the fastest growing sector of volunteerism (Bussell & Forbes, 2008),  
25  
26 but also the skills necessary in the business world may be precisely what non-profit organizations  
27  
28 need in order to increase their impact. Most volunteer organizations suffer from lack of business  
29  
30 acumen – in particular, they struggle with management of human resources, such as their  
31  
32 volunteer workforce (Connors, 2012; McKee & McKee, 2012). In her introduction to a recent  
33  
34 volunteer management handbook, Connors wrote, “many volunteer resource programs remain  
35  
36 underappreciated and under developed regarding their strategic potential to the organization’s  
37  
38 ability to fulfill its public service mission” and “managers need more training in such  
39  
40 management areas as strategic planning and implementation” (2012: p. XV). Corporate  
41  
42 involvement may inherently bring theoretical and practical knowledge to non-profit  
43  
44 organizations enabling them to, ultimately, address the societal challenges more efficiently.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Given the amount of good that corporate volunteering climate may help accomplish,  
51  
52 companies are likely to want to know how to cultivate this type of environment. The results of  
53  
54 this study suggest that the development of corporate volunteering climate is the result of both a  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 bottom-up process – stemming from the passion that employees have for the volunteering cause  
4  
5 – and a top-down process – driven by company policies and practices pertaining to corporate  
6  
7 volunteering. Moreover, these processes appear to be able to compensate for one another. In the  
8  
9 absence (or low levels) of one driving force, the other is capable of driving the corporate  
10  
11 volunteering climate. This finding seems to suggest that either approach is an effective  
12  
13 mechanism for forming and sustaining a volunteering climate.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Taken together, these results provide insight on how corporate volunteering could be  
19  
20 used to address the grand challenges that face society today. In instances where companies do  
21  
22 not have a significant employee volunteering presence, management may want to consider  
23  
24 creating and implementing a formal program to support and encourage the behavior. Given the  
25  
26 important role played by employees' belief in the cause, organizations with an existing volunteer  
27  
28 force may instead want to focus on the types of challenges employees are most passionate about.  
29  
30 The evidence here suggests that allowing employees to continue with their grass-roots interests  
31  
32 will organically foster a corporate volunteering climate. As a climate for corporate volunteering  
33  
34 emerges, it then becomes more salient to employees – both participants and non-participants –  
35  
36 that volunteering is something that employees “do” at a given organization. That climate can  
37  
38 then inspire employees to grapple with grand challenges on their own personal time – perhaps  
39  
40 the same issues the corporate programs are addressing or still new issues not considered by the  
41  
42 company.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Implications for Organizational Theory**

49

50  
51 The current study advances the nature of the conversation among volunteering scholars in  
52  
53 a few significant ways. First, this is the first study to conceptualize corporate volunteering as a  
54  
55 group-level perception. As such, we are able to empirically examine the role of corporate  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 volunteering programs in creating an environment for corporate volunteering. This framework  
4 also enables us to expand the current discussion about volunteering to include employees who  
5 choose not to participate in corporate volunteering programs (i.e. non-volunteers). As the results  
6 demonstrated, this was indeed the case in our sample — corporate volunteering climate  
7 influenced non-volunteers' affective commitment to their employer, as well as their intentions to  
8 volunteer both through the company's efforts and in their personal lives.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Second, although a handful of scholars have discussed the impact of personal  
19 volunteering on one's work domain experiences (Mojza & Sonnentag, 2010; Mojza et al., 2011),  
20 there has not yet been much discussion of the impact of corporate volunteering on employees'  
21 home behavior – particularly in terms of their personal volunteering behaviors. In this  
22 manuscript we make the conceptual distinction between corporate volunteering and personal  
23 volunteering – although both are instances of employees volunteering, one is part of company  
24 initiative in the work domain (corporate volunteering) and the other is part of employees'  
25 personal lives in the non-work domain (personal volunteering). This distinction allows us to see  
26 a type of transferring of attitudes and behaviors from the work domain to non-work domain and,  
27 more broadly, provides hints of the larger social impact of corporate volunteering climates.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 **Limitations and Future Research**

42  
43 There were several limitations within this study that should be noted, a few of which  
44 point to potential areas for future research. First, we relied on various self-reports of  
45 phenomenon – a practice that may inject common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, &  
46 Podsakoff, 2003). That said, we took steps to avoid common method concerns whenever  
47 possible. For example, data collection of the focal antecedents – believe in the cause and  
48 corporate volunteering climate – was separated in time from the outcomes – affective  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 commitment and volunteering intentions (Doty & Glick, 1998). In addition, corporate  
4  
5 volunteering climate and the mediating mechanism (collective pride) were modeled as group-  
6  
7 level perceptions, and interacted with an individual-level volunteering variable – reducing  
8  
9 concerns about correlation inflation (Lai, Li, & Leung, 2013 Podsakoff, et al., 2003). In cases of  
10  
11 cross-level main effects, where common method bias is thought to be a larger concern, the  
12  
13 results presented hold up to their suggested higher standard of  $p < .01$  (Lai et al., 2013).  
14  
15

16  
17 A second issue pertains to the representativeness of the respondents in our data. Although  
18  
19 we were able to assess employees in a broad range of companies – 50 organizations across  
20  
21 various industries – the number of respondents in each organization was rather low ( $M = 6$ ,  $SD =$   
22  
23 2.29). Although this type of sampling is consistent with recent climate research (e.g., Collins &  
24  
25 Smith, 2006; Schminke, Ambrose, & Neubaum, 2005), it still may present a validity concern –  
26  
27 primarily that we cannot be certain that the climate perceptions by our participants are fully  
28  
29 representative of their broader organization. Relatedly, the nature of our data collection approach  
30  
31 presents two unique concerns regarding aggregating company-level perceptions. First, we  
32  
33 collected data from both volunteers and non-volunteers within each company, which inherently  
34  
35 increases within-company variance in perceptions. Second, companies were recruited to  
36  
37 participate based on their existing partnership with the United Way Worldwide, which implies at  
38  
39 least some degree of volunteering presence and likely limits the between-company variance in  
40  
41 volunteering climates. As a result of these procedures, our sample may suffer from selection  
42  
43 bias. In an ideal situation, and as research on specific types of climate progresses, we would like  
44  
45 to collect data from a broader set of companies – including those with strong volunteering  
46  
47 programs as well as those without existing volunteering programs – as well as a more  
48  
49 representative sample of employees within each organization.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Third, we relied on one particular employee attitude about corporate volunteering – belief in the cause – as an indicator of the bottom-up process for climate emergence. Although this individual factor was supported in our data, there may be other individual factors to consider in this process. For example, employees have also been shown to be motivated to participate in corporate volunteering because it represents an opportunity for socializing with coworkers and for building work-related skills (Geroy et al., 2000). Future research may consider how some of these other individual motives factor into corporate volunteering climate.

Fourth, there are two related assumptions in our model regarding volunteering intentions. To start, we are assuming that volunteering intentions reflect subsequent behaviors. Although there is precedence to expect a significant relationship between intentions and behaviors (e.g., Ajzen, 1991; Webb & Sheeran, 2006), the two are not interchangeable and not all intentions will be successfully realized. Moreover, there is an assumption that this volunteering ultimately benefits the intended targets and exerts impact on societal issues. Although we do not have data from the direct beneficiaries, there is evidence to suggest these effects from other sources. For example, the 2013 Societal Impact of Volunteerism study by the Points of Light Institute demonstrated that volunteering makes a significant contribution to the global economy, makes communities stronger and safer, and enhances connections between business sectors. Combining data from the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Independent Sector provides quantitative data that, in 2014, 62.8 million volunteers in America volunteered 7.9 billion hours, which constitutes 184 billion dollars of services contributed.

The nature (and limitations) of our study point to several directions for future research as well. To offer one example, future research on corporate volunteering climate may benefit from including perceptions of others' motivations for volunteering. Although, in our sample, we saw

1  
2  
3 that employee belief in the cause translated into corporate volunteering climate, non-volunteer  
4 reactions to that attitude might depend on the perceived sincerity. Such opinions may also  
5  
6 influence the impact of volunteering climate on employees. Indeed, Rodell and Lynch (2016)  
7  
8 recently demonstrated that colleague perceptions of motives factored into whether acts of  
9  
10 volunteering were credited or stigmatized and, ultimately, how colleagues reacted to those  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 volunteers.

16  
17 To offer another example, the role of company-provided resources was not significant as  
18  
19 we expected. Given the size of the path coefficient, it is possible that this result reflects a lack of  
20  
21 power at the company level (N=50) in our sample. It is also possible that employee reception to  
22  
23 company-provided resources may depend on other factors, such as how the information is  
24  
25 communicated or the attributions that employees assign for the company's involvement.  
26  
27

28  
29 Although not yet empirically examined in-depth, researchers have reported that companies take a  
30  
31 range of approaches regarding how to communicate information about corporate volunteering to  
32  
33 their employees (e.g., Basil et al., 2009). In addition, Gatignon-Turnau & Mignonac (2015)  
34  
35 provide some evidence that public relations attributions for corporate volunteering programs  
36  
37 harm employee reactions. Understanding these types of nuances regarding corporate  
38  
39 volunteering programs would provide better guidance to companies on where to focus their  
40  
41 efforts and investments in order to create the most successful environment possible.  
42  
43  
44

## 45 46 **Conclusion**

47  
48 Given the increasing position of corporations to address social issues through corporate  
49  
50 volunteering, it is important to understand the system-level role that these efforts play within  
51  
52 those organizations. By introducing the concept of corporate volunteering climate, this study  
53  
54 takes one of the first steps in that direction. Our results indicate that corporate volunteering  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 climate may be fostered through either an employee-driven process – emerging from employee  
4 belief in the volunteering cause – or through a company-driven process, based on resources that  
5  
6 companies provide for corporate volunteering. In addition, our results suggest that corporate  
7  
8 volunteering climate has positive implications for employee attitudes regarding their employee  
9  
10 (in terms of affective commitment), as well as intentions for social action through both corporate  
11  
12 and personal volunteering intentions. The seeming ability of corporate volunteering climate to  
13  
14 cross life boundaries (from work to non-work) hints at the vast level of social change that may be  
15  
16 sparked by such endeavors. Moreover, our results generally suggest that this pattern of attitudes  
17  
18 and intentions is consistent among employees, regardless of whether they are volunteers or non-  
19  
20 volunteers.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

#### 29 REFERENCES

- 30 Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*  
31 *Processes*, 50: 179-211.
- 32 Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. 2007. Putting the S back in  
33 corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations.  
34 *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 836–863.
- 35 Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. 1989. Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of*  
36 *Management Review*, 14: 20–39.
- 37 Barsade, S. G. 2002. The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior.  
38 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 644–675.
- 39 Bartel, C. A. 2001. Social comparisons in boundary-spanning work: Effects of community  
40 outreach on members' organizational identity and identification. *Administrative Science*  
41 *Quarterly*, 46: 379-413.
- 42 Basil, D., Runte, M., Basil, M., & Usher, J. 2011. Company support for employee volunteerism:  
43 Does size matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 64: 61–66.
- 44 Basil, D., Runte, M., Easwaramoorthy, M., & Barr, C. 2009. Company support for employee  
45 volunteering: A national survey of companies in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85:  
46 387–398.
- 47 Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal  
48 attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117: 497-529.
- 49 Bliese, P. D. 2000. Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for  
50 data aggregation and analysis. In K. J. Klein & S. W. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel*  
51 *theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco: Jossey.
- 52 Booth, J. E., Park, W. K., & Glomb, T. M. 2009. Employer-supported volunteering benefits: Gift  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 exchange among employers, employees, and volunteer organizations. *Human Resource*  
4 *Management*, 48: 227–249.
- 5 Brockner, J., Senior, D., & Welch, W. 2014. Corporate volunteerism, the experience of self-  
6 integrity, and organizational commitment: Evidence from the field. *Social Justice*  
7 *Research*, 27: 1–23.
- 8  
9 Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015. Vounteering in the United States – 2015.  
10 <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm>
- 11 Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. 2008. How UK universities engage with their local communities: A  
12 study of employer supported volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and*  
13 *Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 13: 363–378.
- 14  
15 Caudron, S. 1994. Volunteer efforts offer low-cost training options. *Personnel Journal*, 73: 38-43.
- 16 Cavallaro, L. 2006. Corporate volunteering survey: The extent and nature of corporate  
17 volunteering programs in Australia. *Australian Journal on Volunteering*, 11: 65–69.
- 18 CECP, 2011. *Giving in numbers, 2011 Edition*. In association with The Conference Board.  
19 <http://cecp.co/measurement/benchmarking-reports/giving-in-numbers/2011-edition>.
- 20 CECP, 2014. *Giving in numbers, 2014 Edition*. In association with The Conference Board.  
21 <http://cecp.co/research/benchmarking-reports/giving-in-numbers.html>.
- 22  
23 Corporation for National & Community Service. 2014. Volunteer and civic life in America.  
24 <https://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/national>.
- 25  
26 Chan, D. 1998. Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different  
27 levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83:  
28 234–246.
- 29  
30 Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. G. 2006. Knowledge exchange and combination: The role of human  
31 resource practices in the performance of high-technology firms. *Academy of Management*  
32 *Journal*, 49: 544–560.
- 33 Connors, T. D. (Ed.) 2012. *Volunteer management handbook: Leadership strategies for*  
34 *success* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- 35 Cortina, J. M., Chen, G., & Dunlap, W. P. 2001. Testing interaction effects in LISREL:  
36 Examination and illustration of available procedures. *Organizational Research Methods*,  
37 4: 324–360.
- 38  
39 deGilder, D., Schuyt, T. N. M., & Breedijk, M. 2005. Effects of an employee volunteering on the  
40 work force: The ABN-AMRO Case. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61: 143-152.
- 41 DiMaggio, P. J., Powell, W. W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and  
42 collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147–  
43 160.
- 44  
45 Doty, D. H., & Glick, W. H. 1998. Common method bias: Does common method variance really  
46 bias results? *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 374–406.
- 47 Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. 2007. Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: A  
48 general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 12:  
49 1-22.
- 50  
51 Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. 2000. Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the  
52 relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25:  
53 178–199.
- 54  
55 Gatignon-Turnau, A-L., & Mignonac, K. 2015. (Mis)Using employee volunteering for public  
56 relations: Implications for corporate volunteers’ organizational commitment. *Journal of*  
57 *Business Research*, 68: 7–18.
- 58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 George, J. M. 1990. Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,  
4 75: 107–116.
- 5 Geroy, G. D., Wright, P. C., & Jacoby, L. 2000. Toward a conceptual framework of employee  
6 volunteerism: An aid for the human resource manager. *Management Decision*, 38: 280–  
7 286.
- 8 Grant, A. M. 2012. Giving time, time after time: Work design and sustained employee  
9 participation in corporate volunteering. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 589–615.
- 10 Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. D. 2008. Giving commitment: Employee support  
11 programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
12 898–918.
- 13 Hardin, C. & Higgins, E. T. 1995. Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective  
14 objective. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and*  
15 *cognition: Foundations of social behavior*: 828–842. New York: Guilford.
- 16 Henning, J. B., & Jones, D. A. 2013. Volunteer programs in the corporate world. In J. B. Olson-  
17 Buchanan, L. L. Koppes Bryan, & L. F. Thompson (Eds.), *Using industrial-*  
18 *organizational psychology for the greater good: helping those who help others* (SIOP  
19 Organizational Frontiers Series): 110–147. New York: Routledge.
- 20 Holroyd, M. 2011. Volunteering benefits emotional health. The Columbian.  
21 <http://www.columbian.com/news/2011/dec/26/volunteering-benefits-emotional-health/>.  
22 Posted December 25, 2011.
- 23 Howell, J. P., Dorfman, P. W., & Kerr, S. 1986. Moderator variables in leadership research.  
24 *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 88-102.
- 25 Idealist.org. 2008. *Why is volunteering important?* <http://www.idealists.org/info/Volunteer/Why>  
26 Institute for Social Research and Community Development. 2008. *National Survey on*  
27 *Volunteerism in Kenya – Perspectives, Structures & Systems*.
- 28 James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. 1984. Estimating within-group interrater reliability  
29 with and with-out response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69: 85–98.
- 30 Johns Hopkins University Center for Civil Society Studies. 2011. *ILO Manual on the*  
31 *Measurement of Volunteer Work*.
- 32 Jones, D. A. 2010. Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational  
33 identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a  
34 volunteerism programme. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83:  
35 857–878.
- 36 Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Madey, S. 2014. Why are job seekers attracted by corporate  
37 social performance? Experimental and field tests of three signal-based mechanisms.  
38 *Academy of Management Journal*, 57: 383–404.
- 39 Kelly, J. R., & Barsade, S. G. 2001. Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams.  
40 *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86: 99–130.
- 41 Kline, R. B. 2005. *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- 42 Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. 2000. A multilevel approach to theory and research in  
43 organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein & S. W. J.  
44 Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations:*  
45 *Foundations, extensions, and new direction*: 3–90. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 46 Kuenzi, M., & Schminke, M. 2009. Assembling fragments into a lens: A review, critique, and  
47 proposed research agenda for the organizational work climate literature. *Journal of*  
48 *Management*, 35: 634–717.
- 49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Lai, X., Li, F., & Leung, K. 2013. A monte carlo study of the effects of common method variance on significance testing and parameter bias in hierarchical linear modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16: 243-269.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. 2000. Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79: 602-616.
- MacPhail, F., & Bowles, P. 2009. Corporate social responsibility as support for employee volunteers: Impacts, gender puzzles and policy implications in Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84: 405-416.
- Madden, L. T., Duchon, D., Madden, T. M., & Plowman, D. A. 2012. Emergent organizational capacity for compassion. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 689-708.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. 1992. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103-123.
- Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. 1992. Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: 828-847.
- McKee, J., & McKee, T. W. 2012. *The new breed: Understanding and equipping the 21st century volunteer* (2nd ed). Simply Youth Ministry.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1: 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. 1997. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mojza, E. J., & Sonnentag, S. 2010. Does volunteer work during leisure time buffer negative effects of job stressors? A diary study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19: 231-252.
- Mojza, E. J., Sonnentag, S., & Bornemann, C. 2011. Volunteer work as a valuable leisure-time activity: A day-level study on volunteer work, non-work experiences, and well-being at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84: 123-152.
- Muller, A. R., Pfarrer, M. D., & Little, L. M. 2014. A theory of collective empathy in corporate philanthropy decisions. *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 1-21.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. 2010. *Mplus user's guide* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, CA.
- Pajo, K., & Lee, L. 2011. Corporate-sponsored volunteering: A work design perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99: 467-482.
- Panera Cares. *Panera Cares Community Cafes*. <https://www.panerabread.com/en-us/articles/panera-cares-community.html>.
- Penner, L. A. 2002. Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58: 447-467.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, Y. L., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 879-903.
- Points of Light Foundation. 2006. *Standards for employee volunteer programs developed*. [http://www.csrwire.com/press\\_releases/16763-Standards-for-Employee-Volunteer-Programs-Developed](http://www.csrwire.com/press_releases/16763-Standards-for-Employee-Volunteer-Programs-Developed).
- Points of Light Institute. 2011. *Social Impact of volunteerism*. [http://www.pointsoflight.org/sites/default/files/site-content/files/social\\_impact\\_of\\_volunteerism.pdf](http://www.pointsoflight.org/sites/default/files/site-content/files/social_impact_of_volunteerism.pdf).
- Remington, N. A., Fabrigar, L. R., & Visser, P. S. 2000. Reexamining the circumplex model of



- 1  
2  
3 affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79: 286-300.
- 4 Rime, B. 2007. The social sharing of emotion as an interface between individual and collective  
5 processes in the construction of emotional climates. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63: 307-322.
- 6 Rodell, J. B. 2013. Finding meaning through volunteering: Why do employees volunteer and  
7 what does it mean for their jobs? *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1274-1294.
- 8 Rodell, J. B., & Lynch, J. W. In Press. Perceptions of employee volunteering: Is it “credited” or  
9 “stigmatized” by colleagues? *Academy of Management Journal*.
- 10 Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and  
11 task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23: 224-253.
- 12 Schein, E. H. 1990. Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45: 109-119.
- 13 Schein, E. H. 2010. *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 14 Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. 2011. Organizational climate research:  
15 Achievements and the road ahead. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F.  
16 Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*: 2nd Edition: 29-49.  
17 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 18 Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. E. 1983. On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36:  
19 19-39.
- 20 Simon, B., Loewy, M., Sturmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., Kampmeier, C., &  
21 Spahlinger, P. 1998. Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal*  
22 *of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74: 646-658.
- 23 Smith, E. R., Seger, C. R., & Mackie, D. M. 2007. Can emotions be truly group level? Evidence  
24 regarding four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93:  
25 431-446.
- 26 Swann, W. B., & Read, S. J. 1981. Self-verification processes: How we sustain our self-  
27 concepts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 17: 351-372.
- 28 The Darden Foundation. *Darden Harvest*. <http://www.dardenfoundation.com/cms/harvest>.
- 29 Thrash, T. M., Elliott, A. J., Maruskin L. A., & Cassidy, S. E. 2010. Inspiration and the  
30 promotion of well-being: Tests of causality and mediation. *Journal of Personality and*  
31 *Social Psychology*, 98: 488-506.
- 32 Toch, H. 1965. *The social psychology of social movements*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- 33 Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. 2001. Identity and cooperative behavior in groups. *Group Processes*  
34 *and Intergroup Relations*, 4: 207-226.
- 35 United Health Group. 2013. *Doing good is good for you: 2013 Health and volunteering study*.  
36 [http://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/newsroom/articles/feed/unitedhealth%20group/2013/0](http://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/newsroom/articles/feed/unitedhealth%20group/2013/0619studyhealthvolunteering.aspx)  
37 [619studyhealthvolunteering.aspx](http://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/newsroom/articles/feed/unitedhealth%20group/2013/0619studyhealthvolunteering.aspx)
- 38 United Way Worldwide. <http://www.unitedway.org/our-impact/mission>.
- 39 VolunteerMatch, 2013. *Top corporate volunteer programs to be recognized at 2013*  
40 *VolunteerMatch client summit*. [http://3blmedia.com/News/CSR/Top-Corporate-](http://3blmedia.com/News/CSR/Top-Corporate-Volunteer-Programs-Be-Recognized-2013-VolunteerMatch-Client-Summit)  
41 [Volunteer-Programs-Be-Recognized-2013-VolunteerMatch-Client-Summit](http://3blmedia.com/News/CSR/Top-Corporate-Volunteer-Programs-Be-Recognized-2013-VolunteerMatch-Client-Summit).
- 42 Volunteers of America. <https://www.voa.org/homeless-people>.
- 43 Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. 1994. *The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect*  
44 *schedule – expanded form*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Iowa.
- 45 Webb, T. L., & Sheeran, P. 2006. Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior  
46 change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132: 249-  
47 268.
- 48 Weick, K. E. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- World Hunger Education Service, 2015. *2015 World Hunger and Poverty Facts and Statistics*.  
<http://www.worldhunger.org/articles/Learn/world%20hunger%20facts%202002.htm>.
- Yik, M., Russell, J. A., & Steiger, J. 2011. A 12-point circumplex structure of core affect.  
*Emotion*, 11: 705-731.
- Zalesny, M. D., & Ford, J. K. 1990. Extending the social information processing perspective:  
 New links to attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human  
 Decision Processes*, 47: 205–246.

TABLE 1

## Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Individual Level Variables<sup>a</sup></b>											
1. Affective Commitment	3.76	.80									
2. Corporate Volunteering Intentions	3.39	.87	.15*								
3. Personal Volunteering Intentions	3.78	.84	.07	.52*							
4. Prosocial Identity	4.15	.54	.15*	.28*	.27*						
<b>Organizational Level Variables<sup>b</sup></b>											
5. Company-Provided Resources	4.13	.56	--	--	--	--					
6. Aggregate Belief in the Cause	4.51	.28	--	--	--	--	.03				
7. Corporate Volunteering Climate	3.81	.38	--	--	--	--	.21	-.34*			
8. Collective Pride	3.53	.49	--	--	--	--	.09	-.02	-.19		
9. Prosocial Climate	4.14	.31	--	--	--	--	.11	-.23	-.34*	.25	
10. Corporate Volunteering Climate Strength	0.75	.36	--	--	--	--	.12	-.15	-.25	.05	-.14

<sup>a</sup>  $N = 229$ , <sup>b</sup>  $N = 50$

\* $p < .05$

TABLE 2

**Breakdown of Indirect Effects of Corporate Volunteering Climate  
(through collective pride) for Volunteers vs. Non-Volunteers**


Outcome Variable	Non-Volunteers	Volunteers	Difference
Affective Commitment	.15*	.18*	.04
Corporate Volunteering Intentions	.08*	-.05	-.13 <sup>†</sup>
Personal Volunteering Intentions	.16*	.09	-.07

\* $p < .05$ , <sup>†</sup> $p < .10$ .

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FIGURE 1


Conceptual Model of Corporate Volunteering Climate



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

FIGURE 2


Summary of Study Results <sup>a</sup>



<sup>a</sup> Path coefficients are standardized  $*p < .05$ ,  $^\dagger p < .10$ .


FIGURE 3

Conditional Indirect Effects of Corporate Volunteering Climate through Collective Pride



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FIGURE 4

**Interaction between Employee Belief in the Cause  
and Company Provided Resources**1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Biographical Sketch

Jessica B. Rodell (jrodell@uga.edu) is an associate professor in the Department of Management at the University of Georgia's Terry College of Business. She received her Ph.D. and MBA from the University of Florida's Warrington College of Business. Her research focuses on employee volunteering, justice, and emotions.

Jonathan E. Booth (j.booth@lse.ac.uk) is an assistant professor in the Department of Management at the London School of Economics and Political Science. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management. His research interests include prosocial behavior, charitable giving, and volunteering; stigma and mistreatment; leadership; and the self-concept.

John W. Lynch (jwlynch@uic.edu) is an assistant professor in the Department of Managerial Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Georgia's Terry College of Business. He researches employee identity management, stigmas, and volunteering.

Kate P. Zipay (kzipay@uga.edu) is a doctoral student in the Department of Management at the University of Georgia's Terry College of Business. Her research interests include work and leisure interface, employee volunteering, mercy, and justice.