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ABSTRACT

Mallory, Drew B.  M.S., Purdue University, December 2015. Who’s Responsible? Using Proactive Personality, Felt Responsibility, and CSR Context to Predict Socially Responsible and Irresponsible Behaviors at and Outside of Work. Major Professor: Deborah E. Rupp.

This research explores the antecedents and consequences of felt responsibility for constructive change within the context of corporate social responsibility (CSR). A moderated mediation model is proposed wherein proactive personality predicts felt responsibility, which in turn influences three types of individual-level socially (ir)responsible behaviors both within and beyond organizational boundaries (i.e., socially responsible behaviors in the workplace, counterproductive work behaviors, and socially responsible behaviors outside the workplace). Perceptions of CSR were predicted to place a situational boundary condition on the effects of felt responsibility. Predictions tested on a large employee sample showed that proactive personality drives socially (ir)responsible behaviors via felt responsibility, but that when individuals perceive a high level of CSR, the predictive power of felt responsibility is diminished (illustrating the potential power of socially responsible workplace environments). The findings from this work shed light on best-practices for the development of CSR initiatives in addition to furthering our understanding of individual-level responsibility.
INTRODUCTION

Worldwide, an increasing number of organizations now attempt to elicit positive social change by engaging in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities, defined as discretionary firm activities designed to accomplish social and environmental outcomes alongside traditional economic aims (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007; Davis, 1973). In parallel, CSR has also become an important domain of scholarship in various fields, including marketing, law, strategic management, and organizational behavior (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Each has approached the study of CSR from different angles, though all have sought to articulate the outcomes of CSR actions on the firm and a limited number of stakeholder groups (e.g., shareholders). Multiple meta-analytic studies have confirmed the positive effect of corporate social performance on corporate financial performance, suggesting a low risk on financial investment, if not an articulated financial reward (Margolis, Elfenbein, & Walsh, 2009; Orlitzky & Benjamin, 2001; Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003). The partial resolution of the profitability aspect of the so-called triple bottom line (people, planet, and profit) has paved the way for inquiries into how CSR creates value for the remaining stakeholders—from employees, to community members, to the environment (Freeman & Moutchnik, 2013).
The Move Toward the Micro

Whereas scholars in marketing, public relations, and sociology have studied the macro-level predictors of CSR participation and individual-level effects of firm CSR acts on consumers and the public, organizational scientists now examine the psychological effects, experiences, and outcomes of employees engaging in or witnessing CSR activities. The study of CSR as a psychological phenomenon is crucial as all corporate acts of (ir)responsibility begin in board rooms, offices, and hallways. Organizations do not make decisions—people do. Essentially, it is individuals that develop policies, enact programs, and carry out behaviors that cause either benefit or harm to stakeholders (Crilly, Schneider, & Zollo, 2008; Ones & Dilchert, 2012). Correspondingly, identifying the individual characteristics that are predictive of socially responsible behaviors at work—and the reasons behind their influence—stands to aid our understanding of CSR as a broad, multi-level, meta-phenomenon.

Employee Perceptions of Firm CSR

As opposed to assessing participants within CSR endeavors, the vast majority of individual-level CSR research has focused on how employees’ perceptions of CSR relate to their work-related behaviors and attitudes (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Rupp & Mallory, 2015). Among the many positive organization-related effects reported, favorable perceptions of CSR have been linked to employee engagement (Glavas & Piderit, 2009), organizational citizenship behaviors (de Luque, Washburn, Waldman, & House, 2008; Jones, 2010; Lin, Lyau, Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2010), job performance (Jones, 2010), and improved relations with others at work (Agle, Mitchell, & Sonnenfeld, 1999; Glavas & Piderit, 2009). Beyond performance-related outcomes,
research has also evidenced that perceived CSR affects job seekers attraction to organizations (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2014; Tsai, Joe, Lin, & Wang, 2013) as well as their subsequent job pursuit intentions (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Daniel, Daniel, Greening, & Turban, 2000; Evans & Davis, 2011; Jones, Willness, & MacNeil, 2009; Turban & Greening, 1997). Effects persist past employment as well. Once hired, employees with favorable firm CSR perceptions have been shown to experience increased organizational identification (Carmeli, Gilat, & Waldman, 2007), commitment to the organization (Maignan, Ferrell, & Hult, 1999), and intention to stay (Jones, 2010). Researchers have argued that perceptions of firm CSR may also influence the overall well-being of employees in the form of job satisfaction, lowered stress, and increased health, due increased feelings of safety and justice within the organization that a climate of social responsibility can provide (Rupp, 2011) as well as a sense of being affiliated with contributions toward something greater than the self/organization (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007).

The many positive individual-level findings on the effects of CSR on employees notwithstanding, scant research has placed employees (as opposed to organizations) as the focal actors of the responsible behaviors typical of CSR. This omission is quite apparent in the current micro-level CSR literature, where very little attention is given to the individual players in CSR behaviors themselves, or to the effects of perceptions of firm CSR on individuals’ pro- or anti-social behaviors.¹ Exclusively studying CSR in terms of its outcomes in this way can unintentionally omit

---

¹ For an exception, see Ones and Dilchert (2012).
a focus on the socially-responsible individual-level behaviors implicit to CSR policies and initiatives and thus overshadow the putative purpose of CSR: to improve the wellbeing of individuals, communities, and the environment (Margolis & Walsh, 2003). This is problematic as failing to recognize that it is individuals that make, respond to, and benefit from responsible decisions in and by organizations ultimately diverts CSR discourse from the study of the triple bottom line (people, planet, and profit; Elkington, 1998) to an naked emphasis on productivity and profit and (Crilly et al., 2008; Ones & Dilchert, 2012). Understanding which individuals may choose to engage in socially responsible behaviors at work—and why—links together these seemingly disparate aims. By decrypting individual CSR motivations and predictors, and by extension the internal determinants of firm-level CSR behaviors, CSR scholarship moves from the examination of a strategic management initiative toward one more in line with CSR’s putative intention: to bring about constructive social change (Carroll, 1999; Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Rupp & Mallory, 2015).

Thus, accepting that it is people—not corporations—that make decisions which, by their nature, vary in social responsibility, this research attempts to take steps toward understanding this variability. Drawing from research across management, as well as social, personality, and industrial-organizational psychology, a theoretical model is proposed centered around individual-level responsibility. It draws from and expands the work of previous responsibility scholars by exploring the nomological network of felt responsibility for constructive change, including a key proposed antecedent (i.e., proactive personality), and several (ir)responsible behaviors on and off the job. These relationships are simultaneously proposed to be bounded by the CSR context, which
we argue constrains the distinguishable effects of these personal characteristics. By placing individual differences as the primary determinant of socially responsible behaviors with casting CSR perceptions acting as cues for such acts, this research departs from the convention of positioning CSR as primary force acting upon employees, and assumes a person-centric exploration of the socially (ir)responsible employee (Weiss & Rupp, 2011). This study is also noteworthy in that it seeks to measure behaviors that correspond to opportunities actually present in the workplace (versus intentions toward broad/generic behaviors). The theoretical model, which is further articulated (and tested) below, is depicted in Figure 1.

**The Origins of the Felt Responsibility Construct**

Emerging from a storied lineage of diverse research, the construct of felt responsibility for constructive change is well-poised for inclusion in the current investigation. A distinct outgrowth of more general responsibility research, felt responsibility for constructive change refers to “an individual's belief that he or she is personally obligated to bring about constructive change" even in the face of risk or no reward (Morrison & Phelps, p. 407). Early development of the felt responsibility literature was rooted in social psychology, where researchers began linking a heightened sense of perceived responsibility to prosocial behaviors toward third parties (Berkowitz & Friedman, 1967; Berkowitz, 1968). From this expanding literature on help-giving emerged the nascent responsibility orientation, a dispositional tendency to help others regardless of benefit to the self. While drawing from research on social reciprocity norms (e.g., Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964), these nascent studies proposed that some individuals, due to their own diverse life experience, are more inclined to
render aid to others. The use of the term “responsibility” in these and other early works, might better have been titled “social responsibility,” due to the emphasis placed on some individuals' self-perceived obligations to contribute toward the greater benefit of humanity.

Later research departed from a dispositional hypothesis in favor of the situational by seeking to determine if and how such an orientation could be induced. The introduction of the bystander effect by Darley and Latane (1968) showed that individuals may fail to act on impulses to offer assistance if group norms contraindicate action. Replications unveiled moderators, including ascriptions of responsibility, competency, and gender, shown to explain and remediate this effect, (e.g., Schwartz & Clausen, 1970). Through modeling Milgram's studies of destructive obedience (1963), Tilker (1970) revealed that socially responsible behaviors could be inhibited or induced depending on how an individual ascribed responsibility for action. In their studies on cognitive dissonance, Collins and Hoyt (1972) drew attention to the link between feelings of personal responsibility and effective attitudinal change. Bringing a focus back to individual differences in feeling responsible, Schwartz (1973) showed that responsible behaviors grew from individuals’ ascribed responsibility for actions and with their personal norms toward the given behavior. Finally, Mayer, Duval, Holtz, and Bowman (1985) brought the construct back to its origins by showing that felt responsibility mediated the relationship between self-focus and helping behaviors as moderated by the salience of the helping request.
Felt Responsibility for Constructive Change

Though feelings of responsibility had been studied in a work context before (e.g., Goranson & Berkowitz, 1966), Hackman and Oldham (1976) brought the state of feeling personally responsible to work psychology by casting felt responsibility in a new light, as the degree to which employees felt accountable for the results of their work results. However, the employee-focused incarnation of the construct was markedly different from operationalizations within other responsibility research: it entirely omitted elements of social concern or obligation. Indeed, here the term “responsibility” applied only to *feelings of duty or obligation* to complete tasks related to one’s job, without extending to others in the organization (or beyond), or a more abstract sense of social or moral obligation. One of the three psychological states predicted in the job characteristics model as an antecedent of work motivation, *experienced responsibility*, was proposed as a mediator of the effects of work autonomy on beneficial work outcomes.

Much later, Morrison and Phelps (1999) repositioned and re-broadened felt responsibility at work by defining it in a way that reached beyond ownership of prescribed duties. They theorized that employees high in responsibility beliefs would experience positive feelings when acting in a proactive constructive way, while attaching negative valence to missed opportunities to do so. Combined, they predicted that these preferences would propel these employees to seek out varied opportunities to improve their environments. More similar to the helping literature than job characteristic theory’s “experienced responsibility,” the authors also placed felt responsibility for constructive as an “attribute” or dispositional tendency related to
individual initiative, not an induced state (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996). Empirically, the study linked felt responsibility to a beneficial proactive tendency toward taking charge, and recommend that employers select for initial high levels of employee felt responsibility for constructive change, striving to develop the tendency thereafter. Subsequently, in an effort to improve upon what they perceived as a deficient representation of proactive feelings of responsibility within organizations, Fuller, Marler, and Hester (2006) made expansive theoretical additions to Morrison and Phelps’ (1999) definition of felt responsibility, expanding the nomological network and reviving the prosocial nature of the characteristic. Arguing that the construct was best represented as a psychological state, empirically demonstrated links between trait proactivity, felt responsibility (acting as a state-like mediator), and several workplace change behaviors.
THEORIES AND HYPOTHESES

Antecedents to Felt Responsibility for Constructive Change

As the review above depicts, the trend of felt responsibility research in the context of work has been slowly edging back toward the prosocial origins of the construct. At the same time, strong feelings of responsibility have been portrayed as an induced psychological state (Fuller, Marler, & Hester, 2006; Hackman & Oldham, 1976) and an attribute (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). These views are not mutually exclusive, however. It is likely that the construct captures both trait-like and situational elements related to responsibility. Using a personality-based operationalization of felt responsibility for constructive change within a trait-activation framework (Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000), we adopt this latter perspective, and argue that a state of heightened felt responsibility can be affected by a variety of contextual cues, but that certain individuals independently experience such feelings across situations (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Lewin, 1938; Skarlicki & Rupp, 2010).

Proactive Personality

A proactive disposition and the tendency to go beyond what is formally required by the job was linked to felt responsibility early on (Frese et al., 1996). Individuals high in proactive personality are described as being “relatively unconstrained by situational forces, and who effect environmental change…. [and] take
it upon themselves to have an impact on the world around them” (Bateman & Crant, 1993, p. 104). These characteristics were foundational to Morrison and Phelps’ (1999) operationalization of felt responsibility for constructive change. Subsequently, Fuller at al. (2006) explicitly argued that proactive personality acts as a necessary antecedent for the trait-like aspects of felt responsibility for constructive change. Their data showed that more proactive individuals were more likely to achieve a state of felt responsibility at work, which subsequently affected the degree to which they achieved positive work outcomes (i.e., general proactive behaviors such as voice behavior and continuous improvement). A recent meta-analytic review of the proactive personality literature, surveying over 100 studies, connects proactive personality with objective (e.g., promotions, rank, salary level) and subjective (e.g., career satisfaction, job satisfaction) career success, a host of employability-related variables (e.g., learning goal orientation, career self-efficacy), and four of the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism; Fuller & Marler, 2009). Also argued to be a component of personal initiative (Rank, Pace, & Frese, 2004), proactive personality is related to actively taking charge in the professional, personal, and social domains. Toward the latter, proactive personality is specifically related to prosocial behaviors outside of work (e.g., volunteerism), which (though theorized) have not yet been empirically linked to felt responsibility for constructive change (Bateman & Crant, 1993). In light of these findings, and in order to replicate and expand on past research (i.e., Fuller et al., 2006), we hypothesize a positive relationship between proactive personality and felt responsibility for constructive change.
Hypothesis 1: Proactive personality will be positively related to felt responsibility for constructive change.

Outcomes of Felt Responsibility for Constructive Change

Fuller and colleagues (2006) significantly expanded the construct space for felt responsibility for constructive change by outlining the “other-oriented” nature of employees with strong feelings of felt responsibility for constructive change (p. 27). They strengthened Morrison and Phelps’ (1999) arguments that, in addition to behaviors directly advantageous for the organization, felt responsibility would lead to constructive workplace behaviors that target super-organizational organizational interests, such as those of external stakeholders. Yet despite these moves, both Morrison and Phelps (1999) and Fuller et al. (2006) principally couched the motivations for employees high in felt responsibility in organizational terms: an assumed desire to improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness. We contend that this depiction of felt responsibility for constructive change is incomplete. Indeed, we posit that past descriptions of felt responsibility for constructive change are merely a partial representations of a wider disposition for creating positive change that, in a similar fashion to and distinct from proactive personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Rank et al., 2004), reaches across life domains. To test this proposition, we consider three forms of (ir)responsible social behaviors in this context.

CSR Behaviors

By far, the most frequently measured prosocial behavioral construct within industrial-organizational and organizational behavior research is organizational
citizenship behavior (OCB; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Described generally as helpful extra-role acts that benefit the organization or its stakeholders, OCBs, by definition, are couched within taxonomies of job performance, and largely focus on behaviors that ultimately enhance the productivity of the organization (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). There is reason to suspect that felt responsibility relates to traditional OCBs. For one, feelings of responsibility have been shown in the workplace setting to lead to asymmetric extra-role behaviors (i.e., acts that do not result in quid pro quo response from the recipients; Pearce & Gregersen, 1991), and are reasoned to be necessary antecedents for performing altruistic behaviors (Krebs, 1970; Schwartz & Howard, 1982). However, the other-oriented orientation previous responsibility scholars have described also indicates prosocial behaviors beyond those captured by typical OCB measures. Thus, the current study proposes CSR behaviors (CSRBs) as an additional and relevant outcome of felt responsibility for constructive change as a contribution to the responsibility literature. In contrast to typical OCBs, CSRBs are defined as discretionary, pro-social behaviors employees may engage in while at work that benefit stakeholders outside of the company, such as community, society, or environment.\footnote{Similar constructs have been explored in the environmental sustainability literature, such as employee pro-environmental behaviors and employee green behaviors (see Dilchert & Ones, 2012, and Ones & Dilchert, 2012, respectively). These constructs limit prospective behaviors to those pertaining to acts aimed at protecting the environment alone, however.} Examples of CSRBs might include recycling, energy conservation, participation in corporate volunteering programs, or donating time or money to a firm-driven charitable initiative. Although CSRBs may relate to job
requirements in some situations, the majority of these types of behaviors are typically carried out by employees voluntarily and without a direct relationship to their formal work role (Ones & Dilchert, 2012). In most cases, CSRBs may be performed without direct benefits to the individuals performing them, making the acts relatively less self-serving than other discretionary workplace behaviors. Correspondingly, and in conjunction with the long history of research on felt responsibility across literatures, we expect that employees high in felt responsibility for constructive change will be more likely to not only be generally good citizens in general, but when afforded behavioral opportunities in the workplace, will also engage in behaviors focused on contributing to some greater good extending beyond organizational success (e.g., CSRBs).

*Hypothesis 2a: Employee felt responsibility for constructive change will be positively associated with CSRBs.*

**General Socially Responsible Behaviors**

Consistent with past research (Fuller et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 1985) and with the depiction of felt responsibility for constructive change as a contextual demonstration of proactive personality, we also contend that individual differences in felt responsibility for constructive change will be predictive of socially responsible change-oriented behaviors outside of work. For the purposes of this study, such

---

Or. and Dilchert (2012) report findings from two US-based studies, showing that roughly a third (29%) of more than two thousand reported employee environmental behaviors were required by the organization. The remaining 70% of behaviors (both positive and negative) were entirely discretionary.
activities are referred to as general socially responsible behaviors (GSRBs). Like CSRBs, GSRBs pertain to behaviors that show a personal concern and active interest in creating constructive change for people not directly connected to one’s inner group (i.e., colleagues or family). In contrast to CSRBs, however, GSRBs are constrained to actions initiated and carried outside of and unassociated with the ones employer or the work domain (e.g., community volunteering, mentoring programs, or recycling at home).

In many ways, we expect GSRBs to be more self-originating than CSRBs. While working, CSRB opportunities may be physically and psychologically structured into the work setting, thereby increasing the ease with which workers may carry out CSRBs due to reasons other than felt responsibility. The same may not be true outside the workplace. Conceivably fewer structured or accessible behavioral opportunities and additional cues exist outside of work for many people (Kaiser, 1998). That is to say, while there might technically be more varied opportunities to participate in community or environmental service activities outside of work, and although some of these activities may be embedded into formal systems (which act as cues; e.g., religious or community organizations), in most cases, individuals must seek out such opportunities themselves. Further, participation in these discreitional activities may actually be hindered by unique constraints not present in the workplace. Family responsibilities, scheduling conflicts, or financial concerns, for example, may all impede individuals’ abilities to engage in socially responsible behaviors outside of work. As an illustration, one might consider recycling, which many people participate in on and off the job. Recycling bins may be ubiquitous in many offices, but recycling may be more onerous
at home. In the United States, if the service is offered at all, it is not uncommon to charge a fee for pickup. Even then, not all materials may be recyclable. Added behavioral burdens (e.g., separating different types of materials, rinsing and removing labels, transporting recyclables separately to a curb or central location) may also account for a gap for some individuals between work and home recycling (cf., Domina & Koch, 2002). Nonetheless, despite these potential barriers to participation (and the resultant likelihood that the relationship will be less statistically discernable), due to the strong similarities between the work-related responsible behaviors depicted by CSRBs and those which can be undertaken entirely outside of the work role (i.e., GSRBs), we expect felt responsibility for constructive change will also predict GSRBs.

*Hypothesis 2b: Felt responsibility for constructive change will be positively associated to GSRBs.*

**Refrainment From Counterproductive Behaviors**

The final outcome variable explored in this investigation might be cast as a partial inverse of CSRBs—that of employee “irresponsible” behaviors. Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) broadly refer to any intentional behaviors from organizational members that the organization views to be contrary to its interests (Sackett, 2002). CWBs are not exactly the opposite of CSRBs. CSRBs are directed toward third-parties while CWBs are usually aimed at or affect the company or its representatives (in a negative way). Further, CWBs include many behaviors that do not have CSRB analogues (e.g., internet surfing, gossiping). Nonetheless, both sets of
actions pertain to behaviors that demonstrate differing levels of responsible behavior, with CWBs representing a form of irresponsible behavior restricted to the workplace.

Previous responsibility scholars have argued that employees with high felt responsibility for constructive change are expected to feel strong ownership for the outcomes of their behaviors and a clear desire to affect their environment in a positive way (Fuller et al., 2006; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Such employees are motivated, at least in part, by the feelings of personal satisfaction and accomplishment produced through participation in change behaviors (Frese et al., 1996; Graham, 1986; Morrison & Phelps, 1999). An orientation of this kind would likely inhibit participation in CWBs, most of which can rarely be construed as “constructive” change behaviors and are most often overtly destructive.\(^4\) Indirect support for a negative relationship between felt responsibility for constructive change and CWBs is provided by Tan and Tan (2008), who found that those higher in felt responsibility for constructive change engaged in less social loafing in comparison to those lower in felt responsibility. Extending this research, we predict a negative relationship between felt responsibility for constructive change and CWBs.

\textit{Hypothesis 2c: Felt responsibility for constructive change will negatively relate to CWBs.}

\(^4\) Certain forms of “positive deviance” (Warren, 2003), such as whistleblowing or prosocial rule breaking (Morrison, 2006), may be acted out on behalf of external stakeholders, such as society, in order to bring about change within the organization. In this way, there are circumstances wherein proactive change behaviors that violate organizational desires may overlap with conventional measures of CWBs. However, by and large, CWBs seem to fall outside of this category, driven more by a mix of hostile and instrumental, rather than constructive, motives (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, 2006).
Perceptions of CSR as a Boundary Condition

According to trait-activation theory (Tett & Guterman, 2000), while the presence of situational cues is necessary in order to accurately assess the presence of a behavioral tendency, situations with particularly strong behavioral cues can mask detection of underlying traits by reducing behavioral variability. Considering situational strength, or the degree to which a situation ensures a particular response across individuals, is thus essential in ascertaining which individuals are most likely to engage certain behaviors regardless of cues (Mischel, 1973). In so-called “strong” situations, behavioral demands on individuals tend to be clear and explicit, which has the tendency to reduce individual behavioral variation as the majority of people will conform the established norms. On the other hand, “weaker” situations provide a sense of expectation ambiguity and enable more individual variety in behavioral demonstrations as innate tendencies emerge (Tett & Guterman, 2000). In the assessment center literature, activities by which participants are evaluated are proposed to differ in their trait-activation potential, or the capacity to observe trait-related behaviors in a situation. Even when not purposefully designed to do so, some will offer more opportunities than others for specific behaviors than others, while also varying in the degree to which compliance with those behaviors is endorsed (e.g., Haaland & Christiansen, 2002). In a controlled environment like an assessment center, trait-activation potential for a given trait may thus be objectively defined—or designed—by experts, following which corresponding trait-related behaviors may be identified for measurement. Assessing participants for desired traits by focusing more closely on
activities both relevant to that trait and also moderate-to-weak in situational strength can thereby increase the accurate detection of desired traits.

Outside of a controlled context, like an assessment center, assessing trait-activation potential is more ambiguous, as elements of “the situation” will necessarily vary across individuals’ perceptions. That is to say, even when the presence of behavioral opportunities may be can be verified or controlled (e.g., through company-wide policies or ensuring universal-access to needed resources), maintaining the required consistency of perceived situational strength is likely to be a challenge due to the interplay between varying elements in the environment and individual differences. Although few studies examine perceptions of situational strength, and even fewer on discretionary behaviors such as CSR, one study reported that perceptions of situational robustly moderated the relationship between personality and discretionary behaviors (Meyer et al., 2014). However, contrary to existing theory and the predictions of the authors, the effects were stronger in strong situations, and weaker in weak situations. Nevertheless, consistent with traditional interpretations of trait activation theory, we contend that when individuals perceive moderate to weak situational strength, they are less likely to be behaviorally influenced by the situation, which thus allows for observation of a given trait. Indeed, in the present study, we expect that employees’ individual perceptions of their organization’s climate for CSR will act as the perceived situational strength for CSR, and will thus influence the degree to which individual differences in felt responsibility will statistically predict CSR-relevant behaviors. Regardless of perceptions of CSR, we expect employees with high felt responsibility will persist in their efforts to act in accordance with their pro-social tendencies.
However, as perceptions of CSR strengthen, we predict that the ability to independently distinguish the impact of felt responsibility for constructive change on these actions will attenuate. Consistent with this approach, we henceforth refer to employee perceptions of CSR as “strong” or “weak” rather than as “high” or “low,” as they are often referenced in CSR research. Weak perceptions of CSR will thus present the strongest potential to observe the influence of felt responsibility for constructive change as an expression of individual, rather than perceived situational, differences (Dubois, Astakhova, & DuBois, 2013).

*Hypothesis 3a: CSR perceptions will negatively moderate the effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on CSRBs such that the effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on CSRBs will increase as perceptions of CSR weaken.*

The negative effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on CWBs also be subject to CSR perceptions. If employees perceive strong norms for the prosocial cannon of CSR, they may assume that sanctions for irresponsible (or counterproductive) behavior would be particularly severe. In this case, strong CSR perceptions might constrain the tendencies for individuals low in felt responsibility to carry out CWBs. In other words, in environments associated with strong CSR perceptions, individuals may engage in fewer CWBs, regardless of responsibility orientation. We thus expect that as CSR perceptions strengthen, our ability to detect the influence of felt responsibility for constructive change will erode, such that we will detect a stronger effect when CSR perceptions are weak. Finally, consistent with
Hypothesis 2c, we also propose that it is possible that employees’ observations of CSR within in their working lives could cue socially responsible behaviors outside of work (i.e., GSRBs).

*Hypothesis 3b: CSR perceptions will also negatively moderate the effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on CWBs.*

*Hypothesis 3c: CSR perceptions will negatively moderate the effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on GSRBs.*

**A Moderated Mediation Model of Felt Responsibility**

In this paper, we seek to explore the extent to which proactive personality predicts felt responsibility for constructive change, and how felt responsibility for constructive change subsequently impacts socially responsible behaviors at work directed toward third-parties (CSRBs), general socially responsible behaviors outside of work (GSRBs), and CWBs. As a broader personality trait, proactive personality may be somewhat insensitive to specific contextual behaviors related to social responsibility. While heavily influenced by proactive personality, felt responsibility for constructive change serves to narrow and contextualize the realm of proactive actions to those that “do good.” Based on situational strength arguments, we contend that within workplace settings, perceptions of CSR serve to further constrain how employees’ different levels of felt responsibility, as enabled by proactive personality, will manifest in “constructive change” behaviors. The current study seeks to test these effects simultaneously by fitting the full moderated mediated model depicted in Figure 1 to an employee data sample (Hypothesis 4).
There are several advantages to this methodological approach. A piecemeal analysis of a moderated mediation model requires a good amount of subjectivity in jointly interpreting hypothesis. It lacks the ability to quantitatively integrate findings across hypotheses. That is, it cannot reveal which paths connecting the predictor, mediating, and outcome variables vary as a function of the moderator (i.e., the indirect effect represented by the product of the paths from X to M and from M to Y). In contrast, a path analytic framework, which expresses the paths of the model as a series of regression equations, may be used to quantitatively identify direct, indirect, and total effects of predictor variables on outcomes while also showing how these effects may vary across levels of a moderator. Quantifying conditional direct and indirect effects in an integrated model makes it possible to numerically describe the observed effects from each variable simultaneously (Hayes, 2012; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007).
METHOD

Participants and Procedures

In order to test our theoretical model, which required that employees had exposure to situational cues for prosocial CSR-related behaviors, a work site was selected that had an established track record for pro-environment and community CSR—a small public liberal arts university in the Northeastern United States. The site had recently undertaken a campus-wide environmental sustainability initiative, thus ensuring that employees were exposed to a range of CSR-related environmental cues. This initiative included a range of CSR activities in which employees could participate in, including lowering energy usage with accompanying postings and training, comprehensive recycling programs (along with posted information, marked receptacles, and training), and a collection of campus- and community-based activities (e.g., providing volunteering opportunities that could be carried out during work hours).

A survey containing measures of all study variables along with a demographic questionnaire was distributed to English and Spanish-speaking, full-time, non-academic employees across several departments. The survey was developed in English and was translated/back-translated into Spanish using the procedures outlined by (Brislin, 1970) and recommended in the International Test Adaptation Guidelines
(Muñiz, Elosua, & Hambleton, 2013). It was offered to employees in two forms. Employees without workplace computer access from departments with supervisors who had requested that units take the survey on paper \((n = 175)\) were invited by supervisors to participate in one of ten opportunities to take the survey on paper in small groups (between 5 and 15) over a four week period. Participation in data collection occurred during paid work time, and employees completing the survey in person were provided with light refreshments. Participants were assured that participation was voluntary, that their responses would remain confidential and would not be shared with the organization, and that the data collected would be used for research purposes only. They were informed that they may choose to skip any question desired and were also allowed to withdraw participation at any point up until completion of the survey. During pencil and paper administration sessions, one of the researchers briefly explained the purpose of the present study, distributed informed consent forms and surveys, and collected the surveys upon completion, having remained in the room throughout. Ninety-two employees completed surveys during this time period, yielding a response rate of 52.6%. After the paper-pencil administration period, an electronic survey was sent from the university Provost to the administrative employees email list, with instructions given that employees who had chosen to take the survey on paper should disregard the email. Of the 400 employees on the list, approximately 125 fell into this category, thus leaving 275 “new” invitations. From these, 142 individuals opened the survey, 99 attempted some parts of the survey but did not submit it, and 42 employees completed the survey, yielding a 15.3% response rate.
for the electronic surveys. Combined, 135 of the 450 employees solicited completed the survey, resulting in a 30% response rate.

Participants ranged in age from 20 to 77 years of age ($\bar{x} = 43, SD = 12.47$) and were 49.3% female. Of the respondents who listed their ethnicity ($n = 124$), 71% reported as being Caucasian, 14.5% as Hispanic, 6.4% as African American, and 8% as identifying with another ethnicity. On average, participants had worked for the organization for 8.29 years ($SD = 6.36$), and with 74.8% reporting that they had no supervisory responsibilities.

**Measurement**

All measures used in this study were self-report and incorporated a five-point Likert-type response scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree”. All items are reported in Appendix A.

**Proactive Personality**

Proactive personality was measured via the Proactive Personality Scale (Bateman & Crant, 1993). This 17-item measure has been used in many studies since its inception and shows adequate psychometric properties (for a review see Crant, 2000). Participants indicated their responses on statements such as “I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.” The items were averaged to form proactive personality scores with greater values representing higher levels of proactive personality.

**Felt Responsibility for Constructive Change**

Consistent with past research (e.g., Fuller et al., 2006; Hoon & Tan, 2008; López-Domínguez, Enache, Sallan, & Simo, 2013; Tucker, 2007), felt responsibility
for constructive change was measured using the five-item scale developed by Morrison and Phelps (1999). As opposed to using the items assessing experienced responsibility by Hackman and Oldham (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), which focus on feelings of accountability for task performance, or focusing on the more abstract urges captured by proactive personality measures, this scale invites respondents to rate their agreement with statements pertaining to feelings of responsibility for creating change (e.g., “I feel a personal sense of responsibility to bring about change at work”). The items were averaged to form felt responsibility for constructive change scores with higher values indicating higher levels of felt responsibility for constructive change.

**Employee Perceptions of CSR**

A modified version of Jones, Willness, and Madey's (2013) eight-item measure of Perceived Corporate Social Performance scale was used to capture employees’ perceptions of their employer’s CSR. Specifically, item wording was adjusted to reflect the organization surveyed in this study (e.g., “this company” became “my organization”). The measure included items such as, “My organization takes part in voluntary or charitable activities,” and “My organization is active in helping its community.” Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which the statements represent their organization. Responses were averaged to form CSR perception scores with higher values representing the perception of stronger CSR-related norms.

**CSR Behaviors**

As this study sought to measure actual reported CSRBs and GSRBs, as opposed to attitudes about behaviors or behavioral intentions, context-specific measures were formed especially for this sample. Respondents indicated their level of
agreement with statements about their own CSRBs. The behaviors comprising the scales were identified via a variety of means. First, the present literature on both micro and macro CSR was examined for possible individual-level CSR behaviors (B Lab, 2014; Chong, 2009; Graham, 1986; Gully, Phillips, Castellano, Han, & Kim, 2013; MSCI Inc., 2011; Ones & Dilchert, 2012; Ormiston & Wong, 2013; Rupp, Shao, Thornton, & Skarlicki, 2013), including research on employees’ contributions to environmental sustainability (i.e., “green behaviors”; e.g., Ones & Dilchert, 2012). This led to the generation of fifteen distinct CSR-type behaviors. This list was then presented to four subject matter experts (i.e., SMEs, scholars with expertise in both CSR and corporate environmental sustainability), to determine the suitability of behaviors for inclusion on a general CSRB measure. It was important in this case to ensure that presented behaviors were actually possible for employees to perform at work (e.g., querying participation in a corporate volunteering program would not produce insightful findings if such a project did not exist within the organization, nor would it indicate the presence of an environmental cue to do so). Consequently, four SMEs from the data collection site also reviewed the behaviors and suggested modifications, additions, and deletions. Following SME review and pilot testing, ten behaviors were included in the CSRB measure. Behaviors captured the domains of corporate volunteerism, environmental sensitivity, and charitable giving. Examples of employee CSR behaviors include “I recycle at the office,” “I participate in volunteer programs at work,” and “I donate money when my organization is raising funds for charity or disasters.” Items were averaged to form CSRBs scores with greater values representing more CSRBs.
General Socially Responsible Behaviors

The GSRB scale was developed in a similar fashion. Using a list of individual CSR behaviors drawn from the literature on firm CSR behaviors, three SMEs worked to rephrase potential items to reflect a non-work context. To mirror the CSRB items, special emphasis was given in the final list to community-focused, charitable, and green behaviors, while also including items reflecting support for the community. Following SME finalization and pilot testing, 11 items were included capturing voluntary pro-social, non-work behaviors aimed at the community, environment, and society. Examples include: “I try to avoid negative impact on environment by reducing gasoline consumption,” and “I recycle at home.” Ratings were averaged to derive GSRB scores. Higher values are indicative of more GSRBs.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

To test Hypotheses 2c and 3b, pertaining to CWBs, the organizational retaliatory behavior scale (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) was used, which includes 17 volitional counterproductive behaviors, ranging from “On purpose, I damaged equipment or work process,” to “I tried to look busy while wasting time,” to “I spent time on personal matters while at work.” Items were averaged to form CWB scores, with greater values representing a greater frequency of reported CWB.
RESULTS

As recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were first carried out to examine the unidimensionality of the constructs of interest and their distinction from each other. Single-factor measurement models for each of the constructs were tested to determine whether the items loaded significantly onto their associated scales. Overall, the results were mixed, and most scales required certain theoretically-driven justifications (see Table 1). The insufficient fit of some of the models is likely due to the low sample size and insufficient respondent-to-item ratio. New data are being collected now with the hopes of improving this situation.

Table 2 reports the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliabilities (coefficient alphas) for all study variables. As is shown, scores on all measures indicated an acceptable level of reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The full moderated mediation model was tested once for each outcome variable (CSRBs, GSRBs, and CWBs) using Hayes’ (2012) PROCESS macro (Model 14) for SPSS (v. 22), which applies conditional path analysis to simultaneously assess all the hypotheses collectively in a moderated mediation model. Following the recommendations of Edwards and Lambert (2007), we obtained bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals for the conditional indirect effects (using 5,000 bootstrap samples). Each
predictor was mean centered prior to analysis (Aiken & West, 1991). Participants with missing values for variables of any analyses were automatically excluded from all analyses by PROCESS, which reduced the sample size to 94. Analyses were all two-tailed with alpha set at .05.

As shown in Table 2, Hypothesis 1, predicting that proactive personality would positively relate to felt responsibility for constructive change, was supported via a strong positive relationship between the two variables \((r = .49, p < .00)\). Hypothesis 2a, which predicted a relationship between felt responsibility for constructive change and CSRBs, was also supported \((r = .29, p < .00)\). Supportive of Hypotheses 2b and 2c responsibility for constructive was significantly and positively related to GSRBs \((r = .35, p < .00)\) and negatively to CWBs \((r = -.41, p < .00)\).

The hypothesized model proposed second stage moderated mediation (PROCESS model 14; Hayes, 2012) wherein felt responsibility mediated the effect of proactive personality on CSRBs, GSRBs, and CWBS with CSR perceptions moderating the paths between felt responsibility and the same outcomes. This means that the proposed the effects of proactive personality (if any) on the three outcome variables would be conditional upon the interaction between felt responsibility and CSR perceptions, while felt responsibility’s effect would be constrained by the strength of CSR perceptions. As indicated by non-overlapping confidence intervals in the index of moderated mediation for both CSRBs and CWBs Hypotheses 3a and 3b were upheld. The regression results (shown in Table 3) showed a negative interaction between felt responsibility for constructive change and CSR perceptions on CSRBs \((B = -.57, SE = 0.17, p < .00)\), and CWBs \((B = .39, SE = 0.16, p < .05)\). Table 4 presents
the corresponding estimates and bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for the conditional indirect effects of proactive personality, via felt responsibility for constructive change on the three outcomes studied. As expected by Hypothesis 3a, felt responsibility for constructive change significantly and positively predicted CSRBs for employees with weaker CSR perceptions ($B = .32, SE = 0.13, p < .00$), but not for those reporting stronger CSR perceptions ($B = -.13, SE = 0.13, ns$). As predicted by Hypothesis 3b, felt responsibility also showed a negative relationship with CWBs for employees who perceived weak CSR ($B = -.42, SE = 0.12, p < .00$), while no such relationship was identified for those with strong CSR perceptions ($B = -.11, SE = 0.10, ns$). Hypothesis 3c was not supported, as no significant interaction effect was detected between felt responsibility and CSR strength on GSRBs ($B = .31, SE = 0.17, p < .07$).

The failure to achieve significance may be due to the relatively restricted sample size, as the pattern of the relationship is consistent with expectations. Figure 2 illustrates the simple main effects of felt responsibility on all three dependent variables at ±1 standard deviation of CSR.
DISCUSSION

Summary

This study presented evidence for a moderated mediation model whereby proactive personality, via felt responsibility for constructive change, predicted several socially (ir)responsible behaviors at and outside of work. Felt responsibility for constructive change mediated the effect of proactive personality on CSRBs and CWBs, while failing to show significance in the case of GSRBs. This supports our contentions that felt responsibility for constructive change is both narrower in focus than proactive personality and that it is also more specifically related to proactive tendencies toward specific socially responsible behaviors (i.e., those directed toward third parties). Consistent with the notion of situation strength (Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000), the predictive sequence at work was differentially contingent upon the extent to which employees’ perceptions of CSR were low (indicating a weak situational strength). When employees perceived the organization as engaging more strongly in CSR, the moderated mediated effect attenuated, indicating that felt responsibility was not a significant predictor of pro/anti-social behaviors in the presence of strong CSR perceptions.
Contributions to Theory

This study makes a number of theoretical contributions. Foremost, this research offers a valuable contribution to both the CSR and responsibility literatures by exploring the individual-level counterpart to the socially responsible corporation. Building on prior scholarship on felt responsibility for constructive change and strengthening claims behind proactive personality (an important antecedent of felt responsibility; Fuller et al., 2006), we identified an employee disposition that predicts responsible behaviors directed toward third parties. This is particularly significant in that the proactive change behaviors measured in this study were not related to in-role tasks, which demonstrates that the prosocial nature of the responsible employee may be extended to extra-role activities in the form of individual-level responsible behaviors that parallel firm-level CSR acts (CSRBs).

The moderated mediation found for both CSRBs and CWBs also supports the contention that felt responsibility for constructive change is narrower in scope than proactive personality, in that the former seems to better capture proactive change-oriented behaviors in the workplace, while necessarily preceded by the latter. This is the first time that we are aware of either construct being tested in this way with an actual workplace setting (Bateman & Crant, 1993). As detailed in the historical discussion of felt responsibility, while helping behaviors have been studied for many decades outside of the organizational sciences, relatively few studies have incorporated theory or findings into employee-related research.

This study also utilized arguments made by Rupp and Mallory (2015), who underscored the theoretical gap between micro-CSR studies that record the effects
perceptions of CSR that may or may not conform to CSR’s presence in the workplace (e.g., lab manipulations or other studies without objective confirmation of CSR practices) and research examining the direct effects of actual CSR on employees. The employees surveyed for this study were contacted under conditions wherein objective CSR practices and policies were confirmed by the researcher, thus tightening claims that the observed outcomes can be attributed in part to a real CSR presence, rather than to mere suggestion. In doing so, we also introduced and tested two novel interpretations of perceptions of actual CSR initiatives.

Whereas most literature on the employee experience with CSR has adopted a causal perspective, suggesting that firm CSR can influence employee experiences directly (mostly in terms of work outcomes; Rupp & Mallory, 2015), this study adopted a person-centric perspective approach to CSR, which more closely mirrors the actual experience of employees working in organizations with CSR programs in place. The data suggest that felt responsibility for constructive change may be an important indicator of responsible behaviors—though only when employees perceive CSR situational strength to be weak. As individuals, and not corporations, are ultimately responsible for corporate acts of social and environmental (ir)responsibility, such knowledge may have implications for selection, promotion, and training. These findings are unique within CSR scholarship.

Separately, this study is the first of its kind to demonstrate that CSR perceptions can act as an indicator of perceived situational strength. Consonant with the notion of situational strength (Tett & Guterman, 2000), the data evidenced that CSR perceptions can engender parallel actions from employees of various orientations. When CSR
perceptions were strong, evidencing a robust CSR situational strength, individuals’ likelihood for engaging in socially responsible behaviors at work (and refraining from counterproductive work behaviors) were relatively higher (and lower, respectively) and were uninfluenced by felt responsibility. However, when a climate for CSR was not readily apparent, felt responsibly was key to driving prosocial behaviors (and quelling deviant behaviors). In other words, organizations have an important impact on employees’ socially responsible behaviors – even for those less predisposed to act in proactively socially responsible ways.

**Practical Implications**

These findings from this study provide important considerations for employee selection and development. Whereas an abundance of employee-focused micro-CSR research has evidenced the attractive quality of favorable firm CSR perceptions on prospective and current employees (see Rupp & Mallory, 2015), which incentivizes employers to both hold and emphasize their successful CSR orientations, less is known about whether employees likely to engage in such programs similarly give back to the organization and its stakeholders. Firms interested in selecting employees who act as corporate and community citizens may find the use of felt responsibility for constructive change as a useful indicator in anticipating future behaviors and attitudes. This study showed that even when employees perceived a weak climate for CSR, those high in felt responsibility were more likely to express themselves in a proactive and prosocial way compatible with CSR. On the other hand, it is not always feasible to select based on psychometric questionnaires, nor is it practical to expect widespread cultural change through the infusion of a small number of individual high on a
desirable trait. A more reasonable alternative is to develop natural tendencies within the extant workforce.

While individuals reporting high levels of felt responsibility for constructive change were significantly more likely to engage in prosocial behaviors even when CSR situational strength was weak, a strong situational strength reduced the ability to distinguish these individuals from their lower felt responsibility counterparts. In other words, strong CSR perceptions had a compensatory effect across individuals, “making up” for lower levels of felt responsibility in such a way that all individuals perceiving strong CSR reported better behavior toward organizational- and third-parties. Armed with this knowledge, organizations can strive to capitalize on the effects borne of strong CSR perceptions through reducing the perceptual variance across employees in such a way that employees more consistently experience the organization as “CSR strong.”

Of course, this may not be a straightforward task. The host organization in this study had existing CSR initiatives in place, and care had been taken to ensure all employees were adequately aware of the organization’s efforts. Despite this, the variance in employee perceptions of CSR indicates employees ranged in their subjective beliefs about the organization’s CSR practices. Though this may seem surprising given the strong CSR activity and awareness efforts at the site of this study, it is expected to find discrepant views on CSR among employees within a single organization, and consider this an addition to former warnings to organizations on how to manage internal CSR communication. Previous research has revealed that many employees are often simply unaware—or even mistrusting of CSR initiatives.
(Bhattacharya, Sen, & Korschun, 2008). Although we were not able to probe this phenomenon deeper in this study, it is possible that any number of moderators might explain why this variance exists. Most significantly, perceptual variance may simply be a reflection of program knowledge, with those employees with the least information about firm CSR efforts ranking CSR perceptions as weakest. Including items polling employees for program or policy awareness may work toward removing this possibility from concern. Beyond this, it may be that group or unit level analyses (such as work locations, supervisors, or hours worked) affect exposure to or impressions of CSR efforts. Similarly, differences in individual values, justice experiences, or perceptions CSR authenticity have been shown to affect how individuals process information relevant to CSR (Mallory & Rupp, 2014; Rupp et al., 2013). These potential moderators should be examined in future studies so as to best understand how CSR perceptions form and develop best practices for organizations. Indeed, we suggest that the inclusion of items capturing a collection of known or probable moderators of CSR formation become standard practice in employee micro-CSR research. Regardless, as a norm, companies may do well to accept that significant fluctuations will exist across employees’ CSR experiences. Developing clear employee communication strategies on firm socially responsible activities can increase exposure and reduce discrepant perceptions. In turn, this may increase CSR situational strength—and its consequences—across employees.

The relationship described above between felt responsibility and CSR perceptions also applied to CWBs in that those with the highest levels of felt responsibility were observed to withhold negative workplace behaviors when CSR
perceptions were weak, but were not distinguishable from their peers with less felt responsibility in the presence of strong CSR perceptions. This indicates that the prosocial “norming” influence of CSR extends beyond prosocial behaviors directed at third parties to withholding negative behaviors that may affect the firm. Estimates indicate that every year the corporate sector in the United States loses roughly $6 – 200 billion due to a range of deviant behaviors at work (Murphy, 1993). The damage extends to individual organizational members as well. Targets of CWBs experience negative effects on physical health and wellbeing (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002). Even those who carry out CWBs may experience deleterious effects of their own, including stress-related health risks and termination (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996). Even in the face of weak CSR climates, employees in this study with feelings of responsibility for change maintained a responsible disposition as compared to those with lower levels. Together, the findings from this study provide further evidence for the benefit of CSR programs for the organizations themselves and should be directly explored in future research. If CSR efforts directed at external stakeholders can directly affect internal stakeholders’ activities toward the firm, organizations stand to gain financially in addition to the social and wellbeing gains reaped from other CSR effects.

Finally, while we were unable to confirm a significant direct effect of felt responsibility for constructive change on activities outside of work, subsequent research may capture this effect, as the data trended in this direction and results could have been biased due to the low sample size. In the future, should such an effect be found, companies may rightfully count this as an increased social benefit to their CSR initiatives. If CSR initiatives can motivate employees to more positively affect society
and the environment outside of work, companies may take steps to emphasize these
effects to bring their efforts in closer alignment with the true purpose of CSR:
improving the welfare of individuals, society, and the environment.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

A number of limitations inherent to this research should be noted. Most
importantly, all of the data were self-reported and taken from the same instrument at
the same time, which can introduce several forms of common method bias (CMB). As
suggested by Spector (2006), we took several steps to structurally reduce the chances
for specific types of CMB. Social desirability bias can affect self-report data as
respondents’ feel compelled to answer in ways that positively reflect upon the
respondents themselves, the organization, or its representatives. To address this,
following the recommendations of Chung and Monroe (2003), participants were
instructed that no personal information would be shared with the university or their
supervisor. Respondents were also not personally identified on any research materials.
Moreover, we felt self-report strategies were appropriate in this case. That is, many of
the key constructs in this study were perceptual (i.e., felt responsibility for constructive
change, CSR perceptions, etc.) and therefore unlikely to be known by others (cf. Pratt,
1998). In using self-report measures for participant prosocial behaviors (i.e., CSRBs
and GSRBs), we adopted arguments made by others (Rupp et al., 2013; VanDyne &
Vandewalle, 2000; Williams & Shiaw, 1999), who have reasoned that using self-report
measure for certain prosocial behaviors may be preferable over third-party observations
when the focal research question pertains to respondent motivations and intentions
behind the target behaviors. This logic applied in our case. Future research in this area
may consider using objective reports, such as hours volunteered or dollars donated, as a balance to self-reported behaviors.

This study adopted a trait activation framework in interpreting CSR perceptions. That is to say, it assumed that participants were both subject to trait-related behavioral cues and opportunities for CSRBs and that individual CSR perceptions, acting as a proxy for perceived situational strength, would influence the degree to which individual differences would predict engagement in these behaviors. So far as we are aware, this is the first situation in which CSR perceptions have been used in this way. As we have described, we took pains to determine the trait-activation potential for CSRBs across the organization prior to administering the survey, through interviews with organizational representatives and consultation with subject matter experts. However, the objective situational strength for each individual surveyed was, of course, not possible to determine. Nor was it our focus. Broad job-based situational strength measures (Meyer et al., 2014) expansively survey individuals across many aspects of a job, are designed to capture the strength of the entire work experience, but contain many items that may be irrelevant to a more narrowly-defined psychological experience. Adapting such a measure for a CSR context seemed unlikely to capture the on-the-job CSR experience of employees, who may not have information on company CSR practices or policies beyond a general knowledge. We used a traditional measure of CSR perceptions because it, in conjunction with the objectively verified behavioral opportunities and communication strategies provided by the organization, allowed us to capture only the perceptions of normative organizational practices of CSR, rather than of the job more widely. However, we acknowledge that the measure we adopted was
not designed with this theoretical purpose in mind, and thus may not act as the ideal proxy for assessing perceived situational strength. In the future, comparing measures of CSR perceptions to existing or modified scales for situational strength would shed light on the proposed convergent validity between the measures.

The cross-sectional and non-random nature of our data also degrades the ability to make concrete inferences surrounding causality and similarly increases the chance of certain forms of bias, specifically in the form of mono-method bias. Given the nature of research on CSR perceptions, an *in vivo* experimental design is often not feasible and was not possible in this case. Furthermore, as publically available employee datasets or participant pools including items on our intended variables were not available, it was not possible for us to otherwise use random sampling of any form. Nevertheless, we recognize that the concerns over temporal precedence and mono-method bias present significant problems. For one, we cannot state with certainty whether individuals’ levels of felt responsibility existed prior to working with the organization (or exposure to the CSR program), or whether they were subject to influence by the workplace environment. In future research, this might be addressed through longitudinal designs assessing employees’ levels of proactive personality, felt responsibility for constructive change, and CSR perceptions polled a) prior to employment or b) the initiation of a CSR initiative would have allowed us to strengthen the narrative that felt responsibility, as a disposition, interacts with CSR perceptions to affect their prosocial behaviors. Of course, these models present their own issues. Although graduate students or other non-working populations may be followed through employment, each individual would likely end up with a separate
employer. For the present model, this would have necessitated objectively verifying the CSR efforts in each organization in order to establish the presence of situational cues and behavioral opportunities (Tett & Burnett, 2003). The second scenario, observing a single organization over the course of a CSR program rollout, would have presented a more feasible option that may have strengthened several of our claims. Even here, because we would lack pre-employment data, it could offer no guarantees that employees’ perceptions and dispositions were extant/missing prior the CSR imitative.

Given the relative novelty of our study aims, we compromised with the single-instance survey, supplemented by several cautionary steps. For example, in an order to secure a representative sample, we ensured that all employees at the organization were given an opportunity to take the survey. To address mono-method bias, we also took steps to structurally separate measures on the survey addressing similar constructs from one another (e.g., proactive personality and felt responsibility for constructive change).

Finally, as mentioned earlier in this study, the CSRB and GSRB measures were developed specifically for this research. On one hand, this afforded behavioral lists confirmed to be relevant for the study context and participants sampled. On the other hand, these measures have not been afforded the benefit vetting by past research. Although we were systematic in the development of the scales, future research is needed to provide further construct validity evidence for these measures. A full taxonomy of CSRBs, developed much in the way that Dilchert and Ones (2012) and Ones and Dilchert (2012) have done for employee green behaviors, may be required to more fully probe the relationships between CSR perceptions and CSRBs.
Conclusion

This study offers insight into the disposition of the proactively responsible individual while on and off the job. It clarifies the antecedent role and nature of proactive personality on felt responsibility for constructive change, and expanded the theoretical space for each. Furthermore, it introduced the contextual significance of perceptions of firm CSR in understanding the relationship between felt responsibility and two work-related behavioral domains (CSRBs and CWBs) and a set of prosocial behaviors outside of work (GSRBs). The highly responsible individual behaves in the predicted prosocial fashion regardless of the strength of CSR situational norms. However, strong perceptions of firm social responsibility can have a unique overriding function on employees’ proactively responsible behaviors regardless of responsibility orientation, making it difficult to tell the difference between the dispositionally responsible individual and the employee who succumbs to situational norms. This underscores the importance firms must place on ensuring that the CSR message is understood in a homogenous way across the organization, as the variance of perceptions observed in this study indicates a certain amount of “noise” between the firm acts and employees’ responses. Together, these findings emphasize the need organizations must place on the design, participation, and perceptions of firm CSR programs and the utility of selecting for or encouraging proactive responsible characteristics in employees. This study contributes to the literature of proactive helping orientations and CSR by revealing further interplay between prosocial dispositional behavioral tendencies and firm prosocial actions.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Table 1

*Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of Single-factor Models for Study Variables (n = 134)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Personality</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>178.44**</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Responsibility</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.80**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRB</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>48.59**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSRB</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79.26**</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06-14</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>233.23**</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18.40*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .01, \**p < .001.

PP: Last item removed. Item 13 and 9, 12 and 8, and 16 and 15 were allowed to correlate due to the theoretical similarities between items.

CSRB: Item 7 contained problematic wording issues and was thus removed. Items 6 and 1, 8 and 5, and 10 and 9 were allowed to correlate due to paired concepts.

GSRB: 1, 10, and 11 were removed, while 4 and 9 were allowed to correlate due to related subject-matter.

CWB: Item 1 was not predictive and was removed; items 2 and 3 as well as 9 and 8 were allowed to correlate due to similar themes.

CSRP: Items 1 and 4 were removed due to wording issues; 2 and 3 were allowed to correlate due to overlapping subject matter.
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Internal Consistency Reliabilities of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proactive Personality</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Felt Responsibility</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CSR Perceptions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CSRBs</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GSRBs</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CWBs</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CSRBs = CSR behaviors; GSRBs = general socially responsible behaviors; CWBs = counterproductive work behaviors.

\( N = 94 \). Internal-consistency reliability estimates (coefficient alphas) are reported in the parentheses along the diagonal.

* \( p < .05 \). ** \( p < .01 \).
Table 3

Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>FRCC</th>
<th>CSRBs</th>
<th>GSRBs</th>
<th>CWBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRCC</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRCC*CSRP</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PP = proactive personality; FRCC = felt responsibility for constructive change; CSRP = perceptions of CSR; CSRBs = CSR behaviors; GSRBs = general socially responsible behaviors; CWBs = counterproductive work behaviors.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 4

Estimates and Bias-Corrected Bootstrapped 95% Confidence Intervals for the Conditional Indirect Effect of Proactive Personality on Employee Behaviors at +1 and -1 Standard Deviation of Supervisor CSR Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of CSRP</th>
<th>CSRBs Estimate (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>GSRBs Estimate (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CWBs Estimate (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD CSRP</td>
<td>.32 (.13)</td>
<td>[.12, .63]</td>
<td>.27 (.12)</td>
<td>[.08, .56]</td>
<td>-.42 (.12)</td>
<td>[-.70, -.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD CSRP</td>
<td>-.13 (.13)</td>
<td>[-.44, .09]</td>
<td>.02 (.14)</td>
<td>[-.28, .28]</td>
<td>-.11 (.10)</td>
<td>[-.33, .08]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PP = proactive personality; FRCC = felt responsibility for constructive change; CSRP = perceptions of CSR; CSRBs = CSR behaviors; GSRBs = general socially responsible behaviors; CWBs = counterproductive work behaviors, CI = confidence interval.

* Bootstrapped estimates for the standard error (SE) are presented.
Figure 1. The proposed relationships between proactive personality, felt responsibility for constructive change, CSR Behaviors (CSRBs), general socially responsible behaviors (GSRBs), and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), as moderated by employee CSR perceptions.

Note. The full model is hypothesized in Hypothesis 4.
Figure 2. Interaction between felt responsibility for constructive change (FRCC) and employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility (CSRP) predicting employee CSR behaviors, employee GSR behaviors (GSRBs), and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). The x-axis represents felt responsibility for constructive change at one standard deviation (SD) above and below the mean. The y-axis reflects the Likert scale points of the measures.
Appendix C

Measurement Items

**Proactive Personality** (Bateman & Crant, 1993)

I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.

I feel driven to make a difference in my community, and maybe the world.

I tend to let others take the initiative to start new projects.

Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.

I enjoy facing and overcoming obstacles to my ideas.

Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.

If I see something I don’t like, I fix it.

No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.

I like being a champion for my ideas, even against others’ opposition.

I excel at identifying opportunities.

I am always looking for better ways to do things.

If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.

I like to challenge the status quo.

When I have a problem, I tackle it head-on.

I am great at turning problems into opportunities.

I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.

If I see someone in trouble, I help out in any way I can.

**Felt Responsibility for Constructive Change** (Morrison & Phelps, 1999)

I feel a personal sense of responsibility to bring about change at work.

It is up to me to bring about improvement in my workplace.

I feel obligated to try to introduce new procedures where appropriate.
Correcting problems is not really my responsibility. (Reversed)

I feel little obligation to challenge or change the status quo (how things currently are). (Reversed)

**Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility** (adapted from Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2013)

My organization gives back to its community (locally, nationally, or internationally).

My organization takes part in voluntary or charitable activities.

My organization is active in helping its community.

My organization tries to have a positive influence on its community.

My organization has good environmental policies.

My organization is concerned about environmental sustainability.

My organization tries to reduce its impact on the environment.

My organization is an environmentally-friendly organization.

**Employee CSR Behaviors (CSRBs)**

I recycle at the office.

I consider the environmental impact of the products I purchase for my work.

I am influenced by the type of environmentally responsible activities that my company participates in.

I participate in environmentally conscious activities at work.

I participate in volunteer programs at work.

I use the recycle bins at work.

I carry my own water bottle instead of using disposable bottles/cups.

I donate money when my organization is raising funds for charity or disasters.

I provide constructive criticism when someone ignores safety warnings.

I protest with my coworkers when my organization minimizes its responsibility.
General Socially Responsible Behaviors (GSRBs)

I recycle at home.

I am concerned about the environmental impact of the products I use.

I shut off the lights when I leave the room.

I act in the best interest of the environment.

I give up/make sacrifices in order to be environmentally friendly.

I engage in community service.

I try to avoid creating a negative impact on the environment by reducing gasoline consumption.

I try to avoid creating a negative impact on the environment by saving electricity.

I try to offset my carbon footprint by donating/recycling/etc.

I avoid engaging in behaviors that may damage the environment.

I volunteer my time toward a cause that I believe in that is not related to my work.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997)

On purpose, damaged equipment or work process

Took supplies home without permission

Wasted company materials

Called in sick when not ill

Spoke poorly about the university to others

Refused to work weekends or overtime when asked

Left a mess unnecessarily (did not clean up)

Disobeyed a supervisor’s instructions

“Talked back” to a supervisor or boss

Gossiped about a supervisor or boss

Spread rumors about coworkers
Gave a coworker the “silent treatment”

Failed to give a coworker required information

Tried to look busy while wasting time

Took an extended coffee or lunch break

Intentionally worked slower

Spent time on personal matters while at work