

**Microfoundations of Corporate Social Responsibility:  
Consolidating and bridging the sociological and psychological perspectives**

Friday, 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019

**Overview of the workshop**

CSR scholarship has shifted from its interest in macro levels of analysis to more micro levels of analysis for a deeper understanding of the microfoundations of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or ‘micro-CSR’ in recent years (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Gond et al., 2017; Gond & Moser, 2019). This micro-turn in CSR has largely focused on individuals and their actions based on two distinct streams of research: the psychological and the sociological microfoundations of CSR (Gond & Moser, 2019). Despite their common focus on individuals, the psychological approach of micro-CSR studies have examined individuals’ motivations, attributes, cognitive process, or evaluation (e.g., El Akremi et al., 2018; Farooq et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2014; Rupp et al., 2013), while the sociological stream has studied practices, processes, and dynamics in CSR implementation at an individual level (e.g., Brès & Gond, 2014; Costas & Kärreman, 2013; Risi & Wickert, 2017; Wickert & De Bakker, 2018). According to Gond and Moser (2019), the former is based on a person-centric view that explains the drivers for individual CSR actions, and the latter is based on a relational view that focuses on individuals’ CSR actions *per se*. Although each stream has a distinct contribution to micro-CSR studies, the two streams can be bridged to learn from each other (Gond & Moser, 2019). Sociological insights could help psychological micro-CSR capture the complex reality of CSR by embracing tensions (Costas & Kärreman, 2013), political dynamics (Bondy, 2008; Mitra & Buzzanell, 2017), and diversity of individuals engaging in CSR practices and processes (Brès & Gond, 2014; Soderstrom & Weber, 2019). Psychological micro-CSR studies could help sociological ones identify more concrete boundary conditions for micro-CSR practices and processes by providing substantial evidence for the role of individuals’ attributes, such as personal beliefs and values (Hemingway & Maclagan, 2004; Peterson, 2004) and gender (Brammer et al., 2007).

With a clear advantage of the cross-fertilization of the two streams, more research is needed to integrate those two streams in various ways to capture a more comprehensive understanding of the microfoundations of CSR. Gond and Moser (2019) suggest three ways of integrating the practice-based and the person centric view on micro-CSR: coupling the levels of micro-CSR analyses (*the intra-organisational, inter-individual, and intra-individual level of analysis*), integrating through studies focused on pervasive phenomena – such as power and meaningfulness—, and adopting new research designs or methods that allow to combine insights from both streams of research.

This workshop aims to provide a platform for the small but actively emerging academic community of micro-CSR and support the development of impactful micro-CSR papers. We welcome various methodologies (quantitative, qualitative, QCA/fsQCA, and mixed method) as well as various levels of analysis (the intra-organisational, inter-individual, intra-individual level, and multiple levels of analysis). This workshop can

offer an opportunity for researchers (including both early career scholars and Ph.D. students) who work within the micro-CSR at different levels to present their ongoing work, to share methodological and ontological challenges and opportunities, and to develop their ideas through extensive feedback from leading scholars in the field.

If you would like to discuss and receive feedback on your work, please **submit a long abstract** (up to 3,000 words without references) or a **full paper** (up to 10,000 words without references) related to the microfoundations of CSR to the organisers by **13<sup>th</sup> September 2019**. If you would like to participate without submitting a paper, please email us.

Please note that there is no registration fee for participation, but participants are expected to cover their own travel and accommodation expenses.

### Team of Organisers

Hyemi Shin – Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, UK & Visiting Fellow at ETHOS, Cass Business School, City, University of London, UK

[hyemi.shin@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:hyemi.shin@northumbria.ac.uk)

Szilvia Mosonyi – School of Business & Management, Queen Mary University of London, UK

[s.mosonyi@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:s.mosonyi@qmul.ac.uk)

Jean-Pascal Gond – Cass Business School, City, University of London, UK

[jean-pascal.gond.1@city.ac.uk](mailto:jean-pascal.gond.1@city.ac.uk)

### References

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 932–968.
- Bondy, K. (2008). The paradox of power in CSR: A case study on implementation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(2), 307-323.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10), 1701-1719.
- Brès, L., & Gond, J.-P. (2014). The visible hand of consultants in the construction of the markets for virtue: Translating issues, negotiating boundaries and enacting responsive regulations. *Human Relations*, 67(11), 1347–1382.
- Costas, J., & Kärreman, D. (2013). Conscience as control—managing employees through CSR. *Organization*, 20(3), 394-415.
- El Akremi, A., Gond, J. P., Swaen, V., De Roeck, K., & Igalens, J. (2018). How do employees perceive corporate responsibility? Development and validation of a multidimensional corporate stakeholder responsibility scale. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 619–657.
- Farooq, O., Rupp, D. E., & Farooq, M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifoci outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 954-985.
- Gond, J.-P., Cabantous, L., & Krikorian, F. (2018). How do things become strategic? “Strategifying” corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Organization*, 16(3), 241-272.
- Gond, J.-P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological micro-foundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 225–246.
- Gond, J. P., & Moser, C. (2019). The reconciliation of fraternal twins: Integrating the psychological and sociological approaches to ‘micro’corporate social responsibility. *Human Relations*.
- Hemingway, C. A., & MacLagan, P. W. (2004). Managers' personal values as drivers of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(1), 33-44.
- Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Madey, S. (2014). Why are job seekers attracted by corporate social performance? Experimental and field tests of three signal-based mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 383-404.

- Mitra, R., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2017). Communicative tensions of meaningful work: The case of sustainability practitioners. *Human Relations*, 70(5), 594-616.
- Peterson, D. K. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. *Business & Society*, 43(3), 296-319.
- Risi, D., & Wickert, C. (2017). Reconsidering the “symmetry” between institutionalization and professionalization: The case of corporate social responsibility managers. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(5), 613-646.
- Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Thornton, M. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 895-933.
- Soderstrom, S. B., & Weber, K. (2019). Organizational structure from interaction: Evidence from corporate sustainability efforts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219836670>
- Wickert, C., & De Bakker, F. G. (2018). Pitching for social change: Toward a relational approach to selling and buying social issues. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(1), 50-73.