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Abstract

In the present study, the topic under scrutiny is how Philanthropic Corporate Social Responsibility plays a role within the workplace. This study is being presented due to the fact that CSR is often researched with the frame of reference of marketing, whereas the managerial perspective is not often considered. The research question addressed will take a managerial perspective on CSR and examine if implementing Philanthropic CSR only affects extrinsic factors, or if it also has an intrinsic effect on employee motivation. In this research, the questions undergoing discussion to support the study are 1) To what extent does CSR motivate employees? 2) What involvement level of CSR is required for employee motivation? 3) What level does CSR fit into on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs?

This thesis focuses mainly on connecting Philanthropic CSR to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Other supporting theories that will be used include: Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory, McGregor’s X and Y Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Motivational Crowding Theory.

To conduct the research needed, the authors have conducted a deductive study through a comparative design, obtaining qualitative data by the means of semi structured skype interviews. These interviews focus on American for-profit companies that have CSR in their strategy but focus on profit. The data collected has then been analyzed through a thematic approach.

The information obtained suggests that Philanthropic CSR plays a role within the workplace, however, it is not seen as an incentive by employees. Moreover, an employee must be personally involved within the company’s CSR program to fully feel the effects that the program has to offer. This is due to the emotional investments made while participating in the said philanthropy.

The conclusion found from this study is that Philanthropic CSR does have an intrinsic effect on employees because of the ‘feel good feeling’ they benefit from when they do participate in the Philanthropic CSR. However, to fully understand the effects of the motivational aspects, further research must be conducted.

Keywords: Philanthropic, Corporate Social Responsibility, Motivation, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory, McGregor’s X and Y Theory, Self-Determination Theory, Motivation Crowding Theory, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background of Corporate Social Responsibility

The authors describe corporate social responsibility to be a corporation’s initiative to take responsibility for the company’s effects on environmental and social concerns, in both their business operations and stakeholders. This concept is integrated into their business model, where it is then applied to endeavors that go beyond what is obligated by law or protection groups. This generally results in the company incurring short-term costs, that in aspirations advocate for the business. The long-term goal of this theory is to heighten profits and the shareholders’ trust.

Overall, this theory of corporate social responsibility, CSR, develops a way to encourage the company to make a positive impact, this includes on the stakeholders, consisting of: employees, investors, communities, and the consumers (Lee, 2008).

For several decades CSR has been depicted and broken down into many constructs, however, the most popular of this, that has been practiced for several decades, is a four-part framework of a definition of corporate social responsibility by Archie Carroll. Carroll established, in 1991, a rendering of CSR in the construct of a pyramid. Since its publication, Carroll’s CSR Pyramid, has become the most well-known model of CSR (Visser, 2006). Beyond this, Carroll’s article that published the four-part model of CSR has since become, in the field of business and society, one of the most widely cited articles (Lee, 2008).

The CSR Pyramid depicts these four sections as: Economic Responsibility, Legal Responsibility, Ethical Responsibility, and Philanthropic Responsibility.

![Figure 1: A model of Carroll’s CSR Pyramid (Authors’ own creation, 2018)]
The breakdown, beginning with Economic Responsibility, states that businesses were created to be profitable entities designed to produce goods and services to members of society. Moreover, a large emphasis was placed on profit, establishing it as the primary incentive for organizations. Carroll depicts this economic responsibility as the principle role for organizations. This role is to produce its goods and services as needed and wanted by consumers, all the while making a respectable profit. (Carroll, 1991) Carroll conveys that without profit, no other responsibilities can be carried out by the organization, leaving them impractical.

The second layer of the pyramid is Legal Responsibility; this step of the pyramid expresses the importance that while the company operates in pursuance of a profit, that it must also comply with the laws and regulations placed forth by the federal and local government (Carroll, 1991).

Thirdly, is Ethical Responsibility, this layer embraces that which is not only mandated by law, but also, activities that are expected and/or immoral by means of society. This layer is to protect and respect the “moral rights” of all stakeholders involved (Carroll, 1991). This third step of the pyramid refers to the community’s, in which the organization operates in, unwritten rules, those of which are simply implied.

Lastly, situated upon the top of the pyramid is Philanthropic Responsibilities. This section advocates that the organization goes beyond the needs of economic, legality, and ethics. Philanthropic Responsibility is characterized as the organization actively engaging in programs to promote the goodwill and welfare of the community, arts, education, etc. Carroll gives examples of acts and programs that businesses may take part in, such as: financial contributions, volunteering of time, or donation of resources (Carroll, 1991). The differentiating characteristic between philanthropic and ethical responsibility is the expectation and moral sense given to the organization by its societal peers. The biggest differentiation setting Philanthropic Responsibility apart is that the company, nor its stakeholders, depend on this factor, it is completely voluntary. As Carroll once went on to describe this section he said, “philanthropy is icing on the cake.”

With Carroll’s pyramid and construct of CSR it is clear that there are many levels and definitions that belong to this one term. Similarly, motivation is something with a vast majority of definitions and forms of fulfillment. Corporate Social Responsibility and motivation alike are both very subjective terms. Through the breakdown of their backgrounds, one can examine that there are many facets that they both contain. Nevertheless, these two depicted topics never entangle together and impact one another by definition.
1.2 Background of Motivation

In both public service and not-for-profit organizations, there is a competition for potential personnel within the market in which they work; each company wants the most competent employees. This is in due to the fact that, the success of a company is due to its employees’ capabilities and output that they put forth. This is especially true with today’s ever changing fast pace environment. A key determinant for a company to succeeded is to attract, retain, and develop their employees. One way that organizations have found to attract and retain its employees has been through compensation (Anthony et al. 1992). Nevertheless, all organizations have a limited amount of funds allocated to its employees, and do not want to raise their overall fixed costs for the company. This arises the inquiry of how to retain employees with more than just compensation; as without retention of employees can cause high expenditures for the company with training costs.

Consequently, each employee has needs, wants, and desires-which must be met by the company to fulfill their demand for attraction and retention. The ramification of this is that today’s managers are striving to fulfil employees’ needs and motivate them to ensure the best possible results. Motivation can be said to be the focal point of how innovative and productive employees are within an organization (Bloisi et al., 2003). Motivation in term, is the question of what factors influence people to behave in a certain manner. Arnold et al. (1991) established three components of motivation: 1) Direction: what the person is trying to do 2) Effort: how hard a person is trying 3) Persistence: how long a person keeps on trying (Armstrong, 2006).

Nevertheless, motivation is much more than just the employees working hard; motivation in captures the ability to inspire creativity and intelligence. This is important to note as inspired employees will make better decisions, develop new ideas and ways to think, as well as inspire fellow employees within the organization. (Anthony et al. 1992)

By understanding employees needs and wants, a manager can begin to understand what type of reward system motivates them. With all of this said, there is criticism given to organizations that only fairly compensate and inspire their employees, as some believe that this is not enough.
1.3 Background Summary

This poses the question of if these two highly subjective terms, with their many definitions can impact one another. Is it possible that these two terms that have had vast numbers of research, explanations, and constructs of themselves failed to miss the opportunity to play a role with one another? Could CSR be used as a reward system that motivates companies’ employees? A reward system that is more than just compensation, a motivational incentive that could provide inspiration and creativity within organizations. Is it feasible that CSR could help companies to attract, retain, and develop their employees?

1.4 Problem Statement

It can be noted that many scholarly articles and an abundance of research surrounding different CSR topics have been written and analyzed; however, the authors note that these topics typically highly revolve around the frame of reference of the consumer, or for the viewpoint of marketing. Whereas, the managerial aspect is not highly considered. Nevertheless, as a manager, it is important to create a positive workplace atmosphere and motivate one’s employees. Beyond this, the authors find this to be an eminent topic as CSR is a rising subject in today’s news; and becoming more and more commonly involved into organization's workplace. In fact, American individuals, estates, foundations and corporations contributed an estimated $390.05 billion to U.S. charities in 2016 alone, according to Giving USA 2017: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2016. Aggie Sweeney, CFRE, chair of Giving USA Foundation says: “We saw growth in every major sector, indicating the resilience of philanthropy and diverse motivations of donors.” Proving that philanthropic donations are on the rise and costing individuals and companies billions a year. Yet, there is still the question of what extent these donations make within the workplace intrinsically. With this study the authors aim to study motivational theories and connect them to CSR to examine their motivational effects.

1.5 Aim of Research

Through this thesis, Corporate Social Responsibility will be examined through a managerial perspective using the definition of Philanthropic Responsibility. With this definition, investigation into the role that CSR plays into the motivational factors for employees will take place. Research will be conducted on organizations that do not have a primary focus on philanthropic concerns, but rather have a concentration on profit. This is in part because
corporations whose main focus is on philanthropic concerns will have a greater reliance on CSR and will therefore potentially skew the results obtained.

1.6 Research Question

This study will take a managerial perspective on CSR and examine if implementing Philanthropic CSR only affects extrinsic factors, such as consumer value, or if it also has an intrinsic effect on employee motivation?

Supporting Research Questions:

- To what extent does Philanthropic CSR motivate employees?
- What involvement level of Philanthropic CSR is required for employee motivation?
- What level does Philanthropic CSR fit into on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs?

1.7 Contribution

Previous research has suggested that CSR affects extrinsic factors such as marketing efforts and consumer perception. Nevertheless, the authors would like to note that there is insufficient information on the effects of CSR and its intrinsic motivational factors on employees. With hopes that this research affirms the relevance and inspires remark, the aim of this research is to, hopefully, lead to future investigation into this inquiry.

This research also hopes to create awareness to managers of the versatility of Philanthropic CSR in the workplace. As CSR has mainly been a focus for marketing and brand value awareness, the results of the study could cause managers to see a need of creating a greater Philanthropic CSR focus into their company strategy, if they are aware it could potentially increase employee motivation in the workplace.
2. Theoretical Framework

The following theoretical framework presented in this section will connect long-established motivational theories and CSR. The goal of this section is to question where Philanthropic CSR fits within the motivational theories, principally Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, and the role it plays within the workplace. This section will come to a close with a discussion of the prominent aspects examined below.

2.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs provided management a new perspective into determining how employees are affected by motivational factors, this could then be applied to an organization and its employees’ performance (Gordon, 1965). Abraham Maslow (1954), a psychologist, believed that if people inhabit within an environment in which an individuals’ needs were not met, they would be unable to fully function in a healthy manner. Maslow placed five levels of personal needs into a hierarchical manner; with this, the lowest-order need must be fulfilled before the next one can be felt, and so on. In spite of this, Maslow’s theory sets a limitation, as he says that a need can never fully be met (Maslow, 1954). Nevertheless, a need that is essentially filled will no longer provide motivational incentive. Consequently, for a manager to motivate an employee they must be aware on what step an individual’s hierarchical needs still needs to be fulfilled.

![Figure 2: A model of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs](Author's own creation, 2018)

The hierarchical pyramid was broken down into five aspects. Beginning with physiological needs, this step requires the fundamental biological needs of an individual to be filled. These needs consist of: water, food, oxygen, and shelter (Maslow, 1954). The physiological needs are
the base of the pyramid due to the fact that, without them a person could not find satisfaction elsewhere; as these needs come first. These needs are easily satisfied by employers as they provide salaries that allows employees to afford living spaces, food, water, etc.

The second hierarchical need is that of safety. When an individual's physiological needs are met, the next need a person searches for is security. This is often times seen as a more urgent need from children as they are seen showing displays of insecurity with need of reassurance; whereas, with adults this is often times an unaware need, unless it is in a time of emergency (Maslow, 1954). Organizations fulfil this need by providing safe and comfortable work environments that are free of harm and threat for their employees.

Followingly, is the need for love, affection, and the feeling of belonging. This step in the pyramid involves both the act of giving and receiving love, affection, and belonging. People who are in search of fulfilling this stage crave family, friendship, and intimacy. Maslow (1954) states that people will seek out the comfort of not feeling loneliness and alienation. People pursue the want to feel accepted by others. Organizations fulfill this need by promoting events for employees such as: company parties, retreats, and other organized events.

Similarly, people have a need for esteem. After the below needs on the pyramid have been met an individual will seek out both self-esteem and the esteem they get from another person; this includes the feelings of self-confidence and that of value (Maslow, 1954). One has a desire of feeling and giving respect. When this need is not met one can become frustrated, and feelings of weakness and helplessness may develop. With this need there is demanding approval from others, the fulfilment of this level is met by recognition by awards banquets, promotions, and bonuses to represent achievements.

Lastly, upon the top of the pyramid is the need for self-actualization. This stage is described as a person’s need to be who they are; for them to do what they were “born to do... a musician must make music, an artist must paint, and a poet must write.” (Maslow, 1954, p.383) Despite the practicality of this level, people struggle with this one the most. This is in due to the fact, when an individual is hungry, they know that food will satisfy this void that they have. With the first four levels of the hierarchy of needs, it is easy for one to spot what they are missing and in need of. Whereas, with self-actualization it is not always clear what the person is lacking, they are just aware that they are not at their true fullest potential.
2.2 Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory

Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory is one of the most symbolic theory when speaking about job satisfaction (Dion, 2006). Herzberg’s (1968) Motivation-Hygiene theory claims that an employee is motivated when they are faced with challenging, but enjoyable work where they can grow, achieve, and advance within the organization. This theory says that employees’ motivation is satisfied when they are recognized for their efforts; however, are dissatisfied with negative working conditions such as: poor lighting, poor working conditions, low salaries, and negative relationships between managers and employees (Herzberg, 1968). Herzberg found that working at a job one considered significant, would lead to satisfaction within their workplace. An important aspect of this theory is that Herzberg’s motivational factors do not cause dissatisfaction when they are exempt, but only cause a lack of satisfaction (Herzberg, 1968). Due to this, Herzberg created a two-factor theory.

![Figure 3 Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory](Authors’ own creation, 2018)

The two-factors composing of Herzberg’s theory is motivators, which cause satisfaction within the workplace; and hygiene, which can only cause dissatisfaction. The motivator factors pertain to the intrinsic physiological need for growth and achievement; fulfilment of these factors leads to positive attitudes towards the job (Herzberg, 1966). The motivation factors include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement and the possibility for personal growth (Herzberg, 1966). The absence of these factors does not show to cause high dissatisfaction, but yet, just an absence of motivation.
Hygiene factors are commonly referred to as the maintenance factors comprising of the physiological needs for love and security. These factors do not necessarily relate to the job being done, but the conditions that surround it. The hygiene factors include things such as those listed above, poor working conditions, and in addition: company policies and administration, relationship with supervisors and peers, security, and salary (Herzberg, 1996).

2.3 McGregor’s X and Y Theory


![Figure 4 McGregor’s X & Y Theory](Authors’ own creation, 2018)

In his book, “The Human Side of Enterprise”, McGregor (1960) describes Theory X as the ‘Conventional View’. The management has tight control and the employees have little autonomy, due to them resisting work. He also describes human beings as lazy and states that they want to be managed in this aspect (McGregor, 1960). In the text, McGregor (1960) states that if a man’s lower level needs (physiological and safety) are not satisfied, then “they are not motivated to satisfy those needs any longer” (McGregor, 1960, p.168). To fix this problem, opportunities must be presented to the employees to satisfy the higher-level needs.

Theory Y is a new Theory of management proposed by McGregor (1960) which modifies the inadequacies of Theory X. In Theory Y, human beings are not resistant of organizational needs, and therefore are able to experience responsibility and autonomy. Management's role in Theory Y is to create conditions in which employees can achieve their own goals. This relationship
between management and employee allows the employee to heighten their egotistical and self-fulfillment needs (McGregor, 1960).

2.4 Self Determination Theory

Originating from Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan in 1985, the Self-Determination theory is an important theory that focuses on extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. For this theory, Deci and Ryan state that self-motivation is created when three psychological needs, competence, autonomy, and relatedness, are fulfilled.

On top of these psychological needs, social environments are also examined. Deci and Ryan (2000) claim that intrinsic motivation can be increased by the feeling of autonomy, which is created by choices and opportunities of self-direction. According to the 2000 article, there are two sub theories within the self-determination theory:

The first being the Cognitive Evaluation theory (CET). This theory is focused on intrinsic motivation and how incentives can impact said motivation. It also studies how social environments can positively affect this phenomenon (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

The second sub theory is the Organismic Integration theory (OIT). By focusing on the different forms of extrinsic motivation and factors that affect internalization, the Organismic Integration theory allows researchers to assign more specific terms to motivation, not as a singular concept. One key term that is presented is ‘amotivation,’ which is on the opposite side of the spectrum of intrinsic motivation. Amotivation is described as acts that are done by going through the
motions (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These individuals are unmotivated and the intention to act is absent. Because OIT is extrinsically based, the Deci and Ryan suggest how to adjust the extrinsic motivation to be intrinsic. They do this by stating the importance of connectedness and satisfying the need of belonging, as this prompts internalization.

2.5 Motivational Crowding Theory

Motivation Crowding Theory (MCT), based in the Self-Determination theory, focuses on how intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors relate to one another (Anthony et al. 1992). More specifically, this theory claims that extrinsic factors have an effect on intrinsic factors. For example, the text explains that if extrinsic motivation increases, and intrinsic motivation stays the same, it will ‘crowd’ out the intrinsic motivation, causing it to decrease and therefore decrease overall motivation.

The authors of this theory, Bruno S. Frey and Reto Jegen explain in their 1999 paper, *Motivation Crowding Theory: A Survey of Empirical Evidence*, that incentives of monetary value or punishments may cause the crowding out of the intrinsic motivation. This phenomenon seems to occur when, “a previously non-monetary relationship is transformed into a monetary one” (Frey & Jegen, 1999, p.3).

2.6 Discussion

This section, of Theoretical Framework, begins with the breakdown and explanation of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs; this is in part due to the detail that is given with this definition of motivation, as well as the fact that the other theories stated above also correlate and fit into Maslow’s findings. These correlations can help explain the tiers of Maslow’s pyramid and help place where Philanthropic CSR fits within Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. An example of this correlation between theories is seen when looking at McGregor’s Y Theory; as stated above, Theory Y based relationship between the manager and employee allows the employee to heighten their egotistical and self-fulfillment needs (McGregor, 1960). This can lead one to believe that Theory Y can be placed upon the fourth and fifth levels of Maslow’s pyramid, fulfilling the levels of esteem and self-actualization.

Based on Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory, intrinsic motivation can be morphed from extrinsic by satisfying the need for belonging. Moving down the latter of Maslow’s pyramid, this theory fits and corresponds with the third tier of belonging and love. Beyond this, when examining the Self-Determination Theory alongside of McGregor’s Theory Y one can see
correlation. One can argue for this correlation due to the fact both theories thrive on autonomy and creating intrinsic motivation.

Additionally, the Motivation Crowding Theory is important to this research as it is the key to figuring out which factors are motivational in the workplace. This theory can relate to Herzberg’s Hygiene Theory, since they can both be incentive related. For Herzberg, the job satisfaction variables are motivators. These motivators are especially active when the employees are recognized for their efforts. This recognition can be associated with Maslow’s fourth pillar of esteem, where people are motivated by their feeling of being valued. However, based on the Motivation Crowding Theory, it is known that this recognition must remain of non-monetary value to continue to be a motivating factor.

Each of the above theories discussed add relevance to this study as they connect to one another in some way and help to categorize the tiers within Maslow’s theory. With this better understanding of the sections that compose Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, the authors are able to determine, alongside the empirical data collected, whether Philanthropic CSR can be used as a motivating factor for employees. Beyond this, once the theories were analyzed they were able to assist in the development of questions for research to collect the empirical data.
3. Methodology

Due to there being many crucial elements to consider when conducting research, this section will divulge the strategy and approach to the research administered. This section will also examine further the explanation and reason behind the study; and the philosophical approach used. Additionally, the methods used to gather empirical data, as well as the interview and analysis methods are construed. Moreover, the research validity and reliability will be discussed, similarly with the ethical considerations. To conclude this section the limitations placed upon the study will be explored.

3.1 Purpose of Research

The following study that is being presented will examine how the implementation of Philanthropic CSR affects the intrinsic factors of employees’ motivation. As a result, this research is not only useful for the reader, but, will in hopes spark inquiries for future research.

3.2 Research Philosophy

The study is based on understanding which aspect of CSR will motivate an employee within an organization. Therefore, the ontological position, “concerned with the nature of social entities” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.20), influencing the results expected and study’s vision, to be constructionism. This position has been chosen based upon the fact the accounts of the researchers’ social worlds are constructs. “In other words, the researcher always presents a specific version of social reality, rather than one that can be regarded as definitive. Knowledge is viewed as indeterminate.” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.22) In simple terms, the authors will be subjective to the information collected through the research.

In terms of the Epistemological considerations, concerning “the question of what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline,” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.15), the study is done with an interpretivist stance. Interpretivism is the belief that knowledge is gathered from a social construct, rather than that of objectively determined and perceived. Researchers in this field have prior knowledge of the subject, however, believe that it is insufficient due to complex and unpredictable nature of what is perceived as reality. (Hudson & Ozanne, 1988) For this research to be done it is required that the authors keep an open mind as they attempt to interpret the actions behind human behavior. For interpretive research, it is needed that the study attempts to understand motives, meanings, reasons, and other subjective experiences
which are time and context bound (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988; Neuman, 2000) as well as try and see things from interviewees point of view (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975).

3.3 Research Approach

When choosing a methodological approach, there are two options: deductive or inductive. Deductive studies begin with an existing theory and create a hypothesis, from here one is able to compare their results to their theory. In an inductive study, the aim is to create new theories based upon discoveries made. (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

To begin this study, theory based upon CSR and motivation were the catalyst for the research question. These theories have helped to create the premise for this study; for this reason, a deductive approach has been taken.

3.4 Research Strategy

After addressing which philosophy and approach will be used through this study, the authors may now discuss the strategy that will be used. For this thesis the authors have chosen to follow the model of a comparative design. In simplicity, a comparative design uses two or more contrasting cases for its study, these cases are carried out at “more or less the same point in time” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.63); specifically, when used in a qualitative research strategy, it is used in the form of a multi-case study. As Bryman and Bell (2011, p.63) state: “that it implies that we can understand social phenomena better when they are compared in relation to two or more meaningfully contrasting cases or situations.” For this reason, the authors have done four case studies of individuals that will be used to compare.

As explained previously, this study is in hopes of sparking inquires for future research, this research strategy only assists the authors with these aspirations. This is in due to the fact that the main favoritism of a multi-case study is its ability to improve theory building (Bryman & Bell, 2011). As the authors take their four cases and compare the results, they are in the best position to assess where their “theory will or will not hold” (Yin 1984; Eisenhardt, 1989, p.66).

Nevertheless, as said, the authors will be using four individuals for the case studies, these individuals will be at different levels of hierarchy. For this reason, it is crucial that the authors avoid misrepresentation and do not take data from one level and represent it at another (Rousseau, 1985).
3.5 Method

The intent of this thesis is to provide an understanding of the motivational factor that CSR does or does not give to employees. To obtain this information through primary data, a qualitative study was conducted. The authors have chosen qualitative, rather than quantitative, due to its ability to provide a deeper understanding of the participants’ responses; whereas quantitative would only supply shallow, and generalized results (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Qualitative Research is primarily an exploratory form, in which is used to find underlying reasons and motivators. This will allow the authors to explore deeper into research then quantitative would allow.

Nevertheless, there are recognized disadvantages to this research approach; it is sometimes criticized to be subjective and hard to replicate (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Beyond this, due to there not being a number associated to the research it is hard to justify the measurements given.

3.6 Sampling

Before research could begin, it was needed to determine who would be the participants within the study. The authors have chosen to do a convenience sample. “A convenience sample is one that is simply available to the researcher by virtue of its accessibility;” a convenience sample guarantees a good response rate, due to this accessibility (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.190). The participants partaking within the interviews were those who the authors already knew or had connections to. With this in mind, four companies were chosen to take place in this research. This form of a research instrument is a beneficial and an easy way to administer preliminary research to a new topic. Beyond this, it could provide a “springboard for further research” and allow for connections with existing findings to be made (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.190).

3.7 Data Collection

The chosen method of data collection chosen has been by interview. The authors have chosen to conduct research by interview due to its ability to produce qualitative results. This research instrument will allow the interviewers to get a better understanding of how employees are directly affected by the companies’ participation in CSR. This will also allow for respondents to expand on their perspectives and feelings, without being given baseline answers. Additionally, it grants the researchers the ability to ask follow up questions that were not necessarily planned.
Moreover, the interviews conducted will be semi-structured. Meaning that there are prepared questions, and a structure to follow in order to aim at receiving feedback on a specific subject. However, it allows for additional questions to be asked, and for questions to be asked without word for word repetition. (Bryman & Bell, 2011) Furthermore, this semi structure allows the authors the ability to compare the difference between the employees and companies being interviewed.

In addition, these interviews have taken place over Skype while the participant was at their place of work. This has granted the flexibility for the authors to interview individuals from many locations, while still maintaining the accessibility that convenience sampling has given. This also allowed for the respondents to partake in the interview session at work so it would preserve them “in the physical context of their organizational role” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.469) as the study is based upon the motivational factors the organization promotes.

3.8 Data Analysis

After the study has been conducted the authors will need to examine the research that they find. To do this the authors have chosen to take a thematic approach to their study. This approach to analyze the data collected is one where the researchers will connect long established theoretical framework with the newly collected data. The authors will do this by highlighting and taking note of repetitive themes and circumstances that are expressed throughout the course of the interviews.

These repetitive themes will then be categorized and compared. Once this has been done the authors will begin to examine and place where the redundancies fit within the theoretical framework that has been previously discussed.

3.9 Reliability & Validity

An important aspect of research is the research consistency, in other words reliability. The study must be considered as a reliable measure for comparison in future endeavors. The term reliability is split into three aspects: stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency. Stability refers to the ability to test and retest on two separate occasions to the same group. One should be able to see a correlation between to results of both tests. Internal reliability raised the question of coherence between study and results. This factor is a crucial aspect as we examine the results and how the indicators affect our interpretation. It is needed to prove that these indicators are not related to other factors and incoherent. However, it is important to note with
research conducted by interview, that interpretation of information can be contrasting. (Bryman & Bell, 2011)

The most essential criteria of evaluation is validity. Validity has to do with the concept of measurement and if it truly measures the concept; in simple terms validity refers to the accuracy of a measure. There are several ways of establishing validity, they are: face validity, concurrent validity, predictive validity, construct validity, and convergent validity. (Bryman & Bell, 2011)

To commence validity, it is needed to establish that the measure properly reflects the content. By the conduction of an interview, it is crucial that the authors establish validity between acts of CSR and the impact on employees. Construct validity, is the primary validity in this study as we deduce hypothesis from theory. (Bryman & Bell, 2011)

3.10 Ethical Consideration

Before initiating the interview, there is obligation to take into consideration the ethical issues that may appear when administering research. As Bryman & Bell (2011, p.122) state that ethics “relate directly to the integrity of a piece of research and of the disciplines that are involved.” When conducting business research, the authors and participants must be aware of what is and is not ethical in a study; the four areas of ethics by Diener & Crandall (1978) contain: harm to participants, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and deception.

Firstly, to take into consideration the potential harm to the participant. This harm can be done in a variety of context, for example, Diener & Crandall (1978) discuss not only physical, but psychological, emotional and professional harm. The issue of harm to participants can further be addressed by the AoM Code of Ethical Conduct, that suggests that confidentiality, or anonymity, be negotiated and agreed upon with potential study participants before research is conducted. If/when confidentiality or anonymity is requested, it is honored. This also goes to the extent to say that when findings are published that participants and/or organizations are not identifiable, unless permission has been granted. As addressed in the MRS Code of Conduct

1) the respondent has first been told “to whom the information would be supplied and the purposes for which it will be used; 2) the researcher have ensured that the “information will not be used for any non-research purpose and that the recipient of the information has agreed to conform to the requirements of the Code.” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.129) Furthermore, a third party has reviewed this thesis before its final printing to ensure no harm has been made to its participants.
The second portion of ethical consideration takes into the account to which the participants have been informed of purpose and to which extent of transparency is held. Participants have been priory informed of researcher’s identities, thesis subject, and the research’s aim of study. As presented in the AoM Code of Ethical Conduct, participants have been made aware the nature of research and have the ability to “freely choose whether or not to become involved” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.133). Moreover, the respondents were made aware and consented to being audio recorded during their interviews.

The next ethical consideration is based upon the consent of the participant within the study. Based upon the detailed information provided by the researchers, participants have given consent and have “a sense acknowledges that the right to privacy has been surrendered for that limited domain.” However, with this in mind, interviewees have the right to refuse to answer any question on the grounds that they feel it discloses private information that they find sensitive. (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.136) As the authors acknowledge, that while subjects that are sensitive by nature have been avoided; it is impossible to know topics which may be sensitive to each participant individually. For this reason, the authors have handled each case individually and given the participants the opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time.

The final ethical consideration deals with deception between the researcher and their participants. This deception is characterized as presenting the study as something other than what it is (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This has been avoided as all participants are fully aware of the aim of research in this study and the authors’ identities. Beyond this, deception has also been avoided as participants have granted permission to record the interview before it occurred.

Nevertheless, it is to the authors’ realization that that there is a great deal of complicity to ethical considerations established by Diener & Crandall; it is pretentious to believe these ethic conditions have been followed perfectly, however, they have been followed to the best of ability.

3.11 Limitations

Before proceeding with the research, the authors would like to note the limitations that are placed upon this study. There is a limitation seen with the form of sampling that has been done, as it is hard to generalize the information due to there being a small group of participants interviewed to represent a larger sum. Along with this, due to a semi structured interview process, it is needed for the authors to be aware that their additional and follow up questions do not lead or prompt answers. Furthermore, as stated with the method of qualitative study, it is hard to determine the measurement of the findings.
4. Empirical Data

This portion of the study contains the empirical data obtained through the four interviews conducted, as well as additional information collected from their company websites. All of the following interviews have been conducted through a skype interview while the participants were at their workplace.

The interviewees were chosen from American for-profit companies that have Philanthropic CSR programs, with the main priority of the organization being profit. Once the companies that would be participating within this study were chosen, the authors decided to contact employees who work in different levels of the hierarchical system to better receive a variety of responses, and opinions, in hopes of being able to develop a broader knowledge to help further explain the effects of Philanthropic CSR in the workplace.

At the beginning of each interview, the steps outlined within the ethical consideration section were followed, the interviewees were reminded that the interview was being recorded for the benefit of the researchers’ data accuracy. Additionally, they were reminded that they were able to withdraw from the study at any time without being asked why. Lastly, the participants were once again asked about their preference to remain anonymous and disclose their name or their company's. For this section, it is important to note that the interviewees have chosen to remain anonymous; nevertheless, they have granted permission and understand that, as stated by the authors, their “words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs.” To keep the desire of the interviewees, by remaining anonymous, they will be referred to as Interviewee 1, with their corresponding company being, Company A, and so forth. To further grant anonymity, each interviewee will be referred to in terms of the male gender; use of he, him, and his will be used for each interviewee.

After the question of anonymity was addressed, the interviews progressed with questions relating to their demographic and personal questions. These questions were asked so the authors could obtain a base level of information and understanding of the interviewees’ working positions more clearly. These questions also allowed to help gauge the interviewees demeanor, as well as aid in the establishment of a bases level relationship; the authors found this to be an important factor for a successful interview, providing the most accurate and honest answers.
4.1 Interview 1

Interviewee 1 is a shift supervisor at a large coffee serving company; he has worked at Company A for four years. Through the interview process, Interviewee 1 was very amiable and relaxed, which made the interview process informative, as well as relaxed and personable.

When asked about incentives that were used to motivate employees, Interviewee 1, mentioned tips, as he is in the customer service field. He made sure to also state that these tips are not a company based incentive program, but the company is aware of this incentive and is allowing them to obtain said tips, making it a ‘roundabout’ company incentive. Another incentive program that Company A has, is when employees vote for a peer who they feel has worked especially hard, that peer will then be recognized and will earn a cash bonus at the end of the quarter. On top of this, Company A has a partnership with a university in which employees have the option to take online classes while they work at the employer’s expense.

Interviewee 1 was then asked about the company’s CSR involvement. There have been partnerships with Company A in which allows a percentage of the earnings made from the purchase of the partnered drink to be donated to a certain fund, usually global related, whenever a customer orders this specific drink. The employees are encouraged to market these drinks to the customers, but there is no specific quota that they need to sell.

The following question asked was if the interviewee felt anything different when they sold a regular drink versus selling the partnered, donation drinks. Interviewee 1 stated that he personally likes to market the partnered items to customers; however, that it is discouraging and less heartening, since he does not see the rewards being reaped from the program. Because of this, Interviewee 1 believes that it would be more motivating in the workplace if the CSR was local.

Local stores also have a CSR impact.; for example, Company A donates old bakery products to a local food shelter twice a week. In the month of April, the corporate level of Company A sends service opportunities to each store. There are different service opportunities that employees can choose from, which vary from year to year, but they all benefit the individual store’s local area. These service events are highly encouraged, but not mandatory. Interviewee 1 believes that approximately 30% of employees at Company A participate in the service events. Even though these events are not mandatory and there is no recognition for those who do join the activity, Interviewee 1 states that, “... it’s good to feel good, so generally people participate.” Interviewee
1 adds that some employees are extremely passionate about the service projects, as they have a great time with them every single year.

It is also important to note the connection that the local company and employees have with the local causes after the service is done. Unlike with the charitable drinks, in which the employees cannot see the benefit, Local Company A receives a Christmas card from the local food shelter thanking them for the food donations. There is also interaction between the two entities throughout the year, creating more personal relationships.

Interviewee 1 was also asked several questions based on their managerial perspective. He believes that the financial aspect of receiving tips is a motivator in the workplace, however he does not believe, in his personal experience, that CSR has acted as a motivator in everyday work. He even goes to explain that it’s hard to ask employees to go the extra mile and ask them to do unpaid volunteer work, when it’s difficult to motivate them in the workplace as it is. Moreover, employees are not asking for more CSR opportunities. Interviewee 1 believes that this could be from the employees only having a part time job with Company A, and that they are there solely for a paycheck.

**4.2 Interview 2**

Interviewee 2 is a program director for volunteering at a large farming equipment manufacturer, referred to as Company B. They have been working at Company B for 17 years, having several job titles. The interviewee was patient and pleasant throughout the interview despite some technical difficulties.

Interviewee 2 works in the citizenship department and is closely connected with Company B’s foundation, which funds their efforts. When finding different organizations to partner with, Interviewee 2 actively seeks partnerships in which employees can actively engage in volunteerism efforts; “... we don’t want to just give the money, we want to make sure we can support through volunteerism as well.” In his work, Interviewee 2 also works on programs to support Company B’s employees with their volunteerism and their giving. Dollars for Doers, in which Company B donates a grant to a non-profit, where employees volunteer regularly.

At Company B, these programs are voluntary, although there are some companywide activities that are more strongly encouraged than others. Interviewee 2 believes that approximately 30% of eligible employees partake in volunteerism programs, based on a tool that he has that tracks employee involvement. There is no formal recognition for the employees who do participate in
the programs and activities, although Company B does write news stories and articles about the volunteer efforts for the employees. Some employees are also recognized by the causes that they partake in, but nothing directly by Company B.

When asked about incentives that Company B offers to motivate their employees, Company B has a “…big focus on the employee/manager relationship in terms of allowing and supporting development” and programs that support diversity and inclusion within employees. Interviewee 2 also believes that just working at Company B in an incentive within itself. “The culture and the pride in the company is something that I know is motivating to employees.”

Since Interviewee 2 has been involved with Company B for over a decade, the question of if he believes that there has been a change in the implementation of CSR was asked. Upon asking this question, Interviewee 2 responded saying he believes that the CSR implementation has become more strategic within the company. The employees are becoming more familiar with CSR as it becomes more a part of the company plan, the strategy becomes better. Interviewee 2 explains through employee resource groups, there is a stronger tie to their citizenship efforts, which make the CSR more public in the company. However, he states that there is still a gap within the company since CSR still is not incorporated in everyday work as much as he would like.

At Company B, more diverse CSR opportunities are becoming available to employees. Through these opportunities, which are sometimes skill based, Interviewee 2 can see the employees step up to make meaningful relationships and be able to give back to their community, while also making networking connections, and developing their skills. There are multitudes of options for CSR opportunities at Company B in the catalog that it has; beyond this, requests for special CSR opportunities that are not in the catalog are allowed. Company B offers participation with the United Way Day of Caring in the fall and spring for options for volunteerism to provide even more options for the employees, through a local United Way.

Most of the work for volunteerism and CSR of Company B has to do with their home communities, however they are also very passionate about CSR on a global scale. Having a more strategic focus, the global efforts utilize global partnerships to improve quality of life for all global citizens. When helping the home communities, Interviewee 2, believes that the employees are moved and connected. For example, he describes how when an employee volunteers at a local food bank, these employees are able to see the face of hunger in their home communities; and how these opportunities sometimes allows stereotypes to be broken down. There is also an invested emotional interest when an employee is taking their time to volunteer in their home.
community. The interviewee stated that these types of events can tend to be an emotional experience for the people who participate.

Interviewee 2 does believe that CSR motivates in the workplace because the products that Company B is producing and the services they offer are connected to solutions for people in need. To be motivated by the CSR, Interviewee 2 says the employees “need to participate in a meaningful volunteer activity to understand that what they are doing is impacting the higher purpose of Company B”.

However, when asked if there was a difference of the work performance between an employee who does participate in the service events and one who does not, Interviewee 2 could not answer definitively. He would have to look at all of the individual performances of the employees, including how frequently the employee volunteers, and look at their performance. Due to their position, Interviewee 2 is not able to analyze this for each individual employee, therefore leaving this question inconclusive.

4.3 Interview 3

Interviewee 3 is an Account Representative at Company C, a company that provides technology products and services. He has worked for this company for the past 2 years following his graduation from University. One of the authors already had a preexisting baseline relationship with the interviewee, meaning this interview had a comfortable and trusting feeling from the start.

When asked about motivators and incentives used by Company C, he stated that financial and many tangible items were used. Employees were often receiving tickets to major sporting events, name brand clothing, and new popular technology products. Moreover, technology products that the company sells are offered at discount to employees. Additionally, Company C provides employees with tuition reimbursements, as well as, supplying industry recognized certificates for employees to gain. These incentives were described by Interviewee 3 in a very appreciative manner as he talked about how Company C expresses their admiration for their employees often and sometimes even without reason.

When asked about the company’s CSR efforts, Interviewee 3 spoke with passion and appreciation for his company. Company C expresses on their company webpage that they “work to build a better tomorrow...” for the past 30 years the company has contributed “millions of dollars and thousands of volunteer hours to support and improve the communities where we
live and work.” Interviewee 3 explained that Company C allows for paid time off to attend what they call “Community Service Day.” Company C invests most of its philanthropic CSR efforts to neighboring communities where employees can see and feel the effects of the contributions. These contributions include to the local Children’s Miracle Network Hospital, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, and Junior Achievement. For Interviewee 3’s Community Service Day he attended a rally at a nearby children’s hospital where he was able to hear the story of a mother speak about her child who was diagnosed with Leukemia. This endorsed the ability to see what the donations Company C makes each year effects.

The second half of his day was spent listening to another non-profit organization and recent movement “Because I said I Would.” This social movement, as stated on the Because I said I Would website, “is dedicated to the betterment of humanity through promises made and kept.” Interviewee 3 said through this presentation he “sat with tears in [his] eyes.” That this presentation made him question things that were going on around him in his personal life and encouraged him to “...cut out the negative people in my life and have been focusing on what truly matters...”

When asked how this personal involvement in the CSR made him feel, Interviewee 3 said that being a helping hand, attending events, and working for a company that raises over a million dollars for a children’s hospital is “an indescribable feeling.” That on the company’s Community Service Day they promised to himself and the organization that he will “...stay passionate in everything I do and make sure I always stay positive to those that need me.”

4.4 Interview 4

The fourth interview conducted was with Interviewee 4 who works at Clark Material Handling Company. Interviewee 4 has worked there for the past 18 years, while having many positions throughout this company.

As with the previous three interviews, when asked about incentive that the company offers, Interviewee 4 referred to financial incentives that are given, for example: commission based work and bonuses; in addition to this Interviewee 3 has three weeks paid vacation time. Clark also provides its employees with training and professional development programs, on top of their tuition reimbursement program.

When asked about Philanthropic CSR that the company partakes in, Interviewee 4 stated while there are a variety of philanthropies that the company is involved with, a predominant one is the
Susan G. Komen Foundation. According to the company website they are involved with over 50 different agencies. Additionally, for personal involvement the company allows for up to 12 hours paid time off to “make a difference in the community.”

When Interviewee 4 was asked about his personal involvement with the philanthropy he placed emphasis on the main one with Susan G. Komen. Interviewee 4 plays an important part in this partnership as his day job includes selling forklifts and similar products; when he sell one painted pink with the breast cancer ribbon upon it, 20% of the price is donated to the Susan G. Komen Foundation. These pink products include forklifts, pallet jacks, and burden carriers. So far, the company has donated “$350,000 to the research and treatment of breast cancer.” Interviewee 4 states that it “makes you feel good for selling somethings that helps a good cause.”

Followingly, the participant was asked how he is made aware of the philanthropy opportunities that the company provides; Interviewee 4 responded saying that he attended a Clark Factory Training School, where he learned the importance of philanthropy and information about the products the company has to offer. Over the course of this day they also teach the history of Clark and its previous defeats where they reached bankruptcy. This resulted in Clark being put up for sale. The current owner was the only one who was willing to buy Clark with the mindset to keep it the company that it already was; his reason behind buying was so the employees would not lose their jobs. However, the presentation given goes even further back into the history of this new owner; a man who was left as an orphan as a child. He grew up in a family that helped defect people from North Korea, and while doing so a boat left while he was still in it taking him to South Korea, leaving his family behind. From that day forward, he has worked and “grown from rags to riches.” Due to this Clark lives by the “...governing principle as supporting our local communities through philanthropy and community service.” Interviewee 4 says that learning this story encourages them to want to succeed for the company and gives them a sense of “...working for more than just myself.”
5. Analysis

This section will focus on the prominent aspects discussed in the empirical data and connect it to the previously discussed theoretical frameworks. This analysis will be organized through a thematic approach. Through this approach, each theory will be presented and then connected to the empirical data collected through the interviews to find a correlation and to better answer the research questions.

5.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

As the main theory of the research, multiple levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs can be connected to the empirical data throughout the interviews.

For the first pillar, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1954) can be connected in the means that money is a motivating incentive provided by the company. Out of the four interviewees none of them initially stated anything along the means of CSR when asked about incentives that the company provides. Nevertheless, all interviewees did express gratitude for the companies’ available CSR programs and enjoyed the ability to participate. Yet, this expressed gratitude did not provoke thought to be a motivator. Thus, the first pillar is fulfilled through the employee’s salary and other financial incentives, so the employees can provide base level needs (i.e. food, shelter, warmth) for themselves.

The main connecting factor for Maslow’s theory is that the CSR involvement gives the employees a “feel good feeling.” This is a crucial aspect as it ties into Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs; the tie is into the third pillar of the pyramid: Belonging/Love. This is argued on the basis that people who need this hierarchical level fulfilled crave to give and receive love; they wish to be surrounded by family, friends, and intimacy (Maslow, 1954). They want to be a part of something bigger than themselves. By partaking within the company’s CSR program, they are participating in an event that surrounds the interviewee; as stated in Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs section below the Theoretical Framework, this level is fulfilled with events such as organized events by the company (Maslow, 1954). By not only participating in these events, the relationships made during the CSR activities are also important for the third pillar to be fulfilled. This can be seen through Interview 1, as he describes how the company has a relationship with the local food shelter in which they help throughout the year, creating more of a motivation to keep the relationship maintained. Interviewee 3 also described an emotional experience he had
through the CSR program offered by his company, which encouraged him to focus on people and things that truly matter to him.

The fourth pillar, esteem, can be fulfilled through CSR, as information from the empirical data suggest. Fulfillment is seen where some companies, community, or the foundation recognize the individual for participation for their contributions. Company recognition can be done through bonuses, company gifts, and developments programs. (Maslow, 1954) Even without recognition, the fourth pillar is fulfilled as participating within these CSR programs allow one to be valued and appreciated—adding to their esteem.

Lastly, on top of the pyramid, self-actualization; as mentioned in the Theoretical Framework, this pillar is often hard to fulfill as people are unaware what they are missing in their lives (Maslow, 1954). The authors believe that those partaking within Philanthropic CSR activities that are local, where the participant can see the effects, may add to their self-actualization. That this contribution may be what they were lacking in life and is now fulfilled, causing them to feel they gave their full potential to something larger than themselves. Interviewee 3 gives implies to this as he states that working for a company that raises over a million dollars for a children’s hospital is “an indescribable feeling”.

5.2 Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory

For this empirical data collection, Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory can be closely tied into the fulfillment of the first and fourth pillars of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. As stated above, although the interviewees did appreciate CSR, none of them explicitly claim CSR to be a motivator. Instead, monetary aspects were focused on as motivational incentives. For example, this can be associated with Herzberg’s Motivation factors of work interest, advancement, and personal growth (Herzberg, 1968).

The aspect of personal growth on the job satisfaction side of the two-factor theory can be further explained as a motivator on several occasions throughout the empirical data. The best example of personal growth as a motivator is through tuition reimbursements. All four of the company’s interviewed offer funds for their employees to further their personal education. This is first seen with Company A, as they provide the ability for their employees to take online courses in pursuance of a degree while working. This is also seen during Interview 2, when Interviewee 2 described how his company paid for him to go to grad school. Other examples of opportunities of personal growth were evident through Company B as Interviewee 2 described how some of the volunteer opportunities that are available for employees are skill based and that by
participating in these activities, employees can develop their skills as well as make networking connections for their future. Moreover, Company C provides tuition reimbursement, as well as, supplying the opportunity for employees to earn industry certificates. Personal growth opportunities at Clark are also an important motivational incentive as they provide employees with professional development programs as well as other training opportunities.

Another aspect of Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory is recognition (Herzberg, 1996). At company C, employees are recognized by their efforts through certificates. Unlike this formal recognition, the other companies interviewed do not have formal recognition for employees who participate in their citizenship efforts.

The factors discussed are on the Motivator side of the two-factor theory, these suggest ways that these employees can be satisfied within their jobs. Throughout the interviews, there is no indication found of any job dissatisfaction, or hygiene factors, that correlate with the research.

5.3 McGregor’s X and Y Theory

As stated in the Theoretical Framework, McGregor’s X and Y Theory is focused on autonomy and how the relationship between the manager and employee can be used to motivate the employees in a beneficial way (McGregor, 1960).

No implication of Theory X behavior was found in the empirical data. As seen through the text in the Empirical Data section, all the employees interviewed seem satisfied with their lower level needs. As well as this, no signs from the interviews suggest that the employees are avoiding work or prefer direction from their managers to complete their tasks.

The autonomy of Theory Y can first be demonstrated through the fact that the CSR opportunities of all the companies interviewed are not mandatory, and yet employees are signing up to participate year after year. For company A and B, around 30% of the employees are signing up for the philanthropic volunteer events on their own free will. On top of this, Interviewee 2 also explains that employees sometimes request special CSR opportunities for causes in which they are passionate about. This is also the case for Company D as they partner with over 50 organizations nationwide, which allows employees to decide where they want to share their efforts. The autonomous aspect of theory Y is also present in Company A and Clark, as their employees are choosing to market CSR related products that they are not required to sell or recognized for doing so. Instead, these employees are autonomously motivated to market these products since they know they help the greater good.
Interviewee 2 explains the importance of a healthy manager/employee relationship during his interview. As stated in the empirical data, Company B has a “...big focus on the employee/manager relationship in terms of allowing and supporting development.” This relationship is important as it allows the company to support diversity and increase inclusion within the employees. By having this Theory Y based relationship, Interviewee 2 believes that the pride that the employee possesses about Company B increases, as does their motivation in the workplace. This belief that Interviewee 2 has about his company and their practices fully support what McGregor describes as Theory Y behavior as it will allow employees to create and achieve goals in ways that benefit their personal working style (McGregor, 1960).

5.4 Self Determination Theory

The Self Determination Theory focuses on the extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors. As stated above in the Theoretical Framework, this theory contains two sub theories which can relate to the empirical data (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

The first sub theory, Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET), like the Herzberg Motivation Hygiene theory, focuses on incentives and how they can impact motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). As previously mentioned, the incentives that the interviewees refer to mainly focus on monetary aspects, rather than intrinsic motivators. Since the question was prompted by the authors without mentioning CSR to the interviewees, one can assume that these employee’s intrinsic motivation is more impacted by monetary aspects rather than CSR. The environment can also affect how the employees are motivated within CET (Deci & Ryan, 2000). This is prevalent to Company A, as it is a service-based company and one of the main incentives is a tipping system, which may alter the work environment of the company.

Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) is the second sub theory in the Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000). With this comes the term, ‘amotivation’, which is described previously by Deci and Ryan (2000) as the opposite of motivation. Like McGregor’s Theory Y (1960), employees are unmotivated to work and are passive by going through the motions (Deci & Ryan, 2000). An example of amotivation can be found in the interview of Company A when Interviewee 1 describes how hard it can be to motivate his employees. To counteract this amotivation, Deci & Ryan (2000) suggest adjusting the extrinsic motivators to be intrinsic. For the example of Company A, the main extrinsic motivator is the tipping system. As Deci & Ryan (2000) suggest, to decrease the amotivation and increase intrinsic motivation, internalization
needs to be prompted though stating the importance of connectedness and satisfying the need of belonging.

5.5 Motivational Crowding Theory

Closely related to the Self Determination Theory, the Motivational Crowding can further explain the relationship between extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors of the companies interviewed. Since with this theory, when non-monetary incentives are turned into monetary ones, they can tend to crowd out the intrinsic motivation (Anthony et al. 1992).

For this research, it is important to note that none of the companies have expressed clear signs of the Motivational Crowding Theory already occurring, but it is important for managers to understand this theory so that it does not happen to their companies. An example of this phenomenon could occur if managers from company A and B try to increase their employee participation in CSR activities from 30%. As CSR has non-monetary incentives, one possible solution that managers might do to increase employee participation of the volunteer opportunities is to incorporate monetary incentives to the CSR volunteer opportunities. By doing this, the managers could run the risk of the new extrinsic motivator, money, crowding out the intrinsic motivator of CSR. Thereby, causing motivation overall to decrease since the employee is participation in the activities for money rather than the good feeling of helping their community.

For example, to encourage participation, Clark Material Handling Company offers up to 12 hours of paid time off in which their employees can “make a difference in the community.” With the Motivational Crowding Theory, this could be a large risk if at first, Clark did not pay their employees for their volunteer efforts at one point in time. The new extrinsic motivator of receiving payment could ‘crowd’ out the intrinsic motivator of ‘helping the greater good’ through volunteerism.
6. Conclusion

This section will address the empirical data and theoretical framework covered in the analysis section, as well as the introduction section. Through this section the authors will connect the previously stated section, Analysis, with the study’s objectives. This will end with a discussion of the contributions made and suggestions for future research.

6.1 Research Objective

Through this thesis, Corporate Social Responsibility has been examined through a managerial perspective, using the definition of Philanthropic Responsibility. While using this definition, investigation into the role that CSR plays within the motivational factors for employees has occurred. Research was conducted on organizations that did not have a primary focus on philanthropic concerns, but rather concentrate on their profits.

6.2 Discussion

The discussion section of the conclusion will be separated in to each of the supporting research questions asked in the introduction of this paper. By using information from the theoretical framework, empirical data, and analysis sections, the authors will answer the supporting research questions, therefore concluding the research. Following the supporting research question conclusions, a summarization of the questions and how they correlate with the main research question will be presented.

6.2 A To what extent does Philanthropic CSR motivate employees?

At the end of this research, it cannot be explicitly stated at what extent Philanthropic CSR motivates employees. However, as discussed in the Analysis section, Philanthropic CSR is able to be connected to multiple established motivational theories; indicating that it potentially could be a motivator. Nevertheless, the main determining factor of this conclusion, of inconclusion, is that the interviewees give varying answers on whether they believe that Philanthropic CSR can be a motivational incentive in the workplace. Because of this, this supporting research question in this thesis remains inconclusive.
6.2 B What involvement level of Philanthropic CSR is required for employee motivation?

It can be concluded, as seen through the analysis, that the most impactful Philanthropic CSR occurs when employees are actively involved in the volunteering process. All four of the interviewees describe how enriching it is to be involved in some form of Philanthropic CSR; some of the interviewees went into detail on how it can be motivating for the employees, which could lead to intrinsic motivation. During the course of the interviewees, it is also suggested by the interviewees that those who do not partake, do not fully gain the influences that participating in Philanthropic CSR potentially provides. This may imply that participation in Philanthropic CSR is required for employee motivation. However, as stated above, the fact that inconsistencies were found in whether Philanthropic CSR is a motivating factor leads this question to be inconclusive as well.

6.2 C What level does Philanthropic CSR fit into on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs?

Based on the analysis, Philanthropic CSR can fit into multiple levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. More specifically, it can be argued through the analysis that Philanthropic CSR can lead to fulfilling the higher levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of needs.

With the third pillar of Belonging/Love, people wish to contribute to something bigger than themselves, usually through organized events. By creating relationships with the people who the employees are helping, they can give and receive love, which is a crucial component to fulfill the third pillar, according to Maslow (1954).

Philanthropic CSR can also be believed to lead to fulfillment of the fourth pillar, Esteem, as Philanthropic CSR can lead to employee recognition, which can heighten said esteem of the employees who are involved.

Self-actualization, the final pillar, can also be argued to be fulfilled through Philanthropic CSR. Like the third pillar of Belonging/Love, people wish to be a part of something bigger than themselves, and this can be fulfilled through Philanthropic CSR. This is the effect of when the employees participate in Philanthropic CSR, there is potential for the employees to see the impact of their actions, and because of this, their self-actualization is increased.

Ultimately, because it can be argued that Philanthropic CSR can fit on multiple levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, it can be difficult to determine where exactly it can be placed. The authors believe that because of the research, Philanthropic CSR fits best in the final pillar of self-
actualization. This is because of the intrinsic effect that the volunteerism has on the employees, as they can see how their actions can help the greater good of their community.

6.2 D Summary

The current research presented seems to validate the view that when taking a managerial perspective on Philanthropic CSR; that the implementation of corporate philanthropy programs not only affect extrinsic factors, such as consumer value, but it also has intrinsic effects on its employee. Regardless, the available insights also suggest that employees must not only work for a company that has CSR activities, but also, partake personally within these acts. With this in mind, the biggest effects are when these philanthropic acts are able to be seen within the local community.

Although this may all be true, employees do not recognize CSR as a motivator or incentive within the workplace. This may very well be due to the fact it is a new, up, and rising concept within today’s society, and something that one may potentially see a shift in the near future.

In spite of this, philanthropic CSR motivates employees that are involved by creating a “feel good feeling” and giving them a sense of working for a higher purpose. Additionally, the authors were able to connect Philanthropic CSR participation with many of the long established motivational theories, predominantly Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. This connection was made not only in one of his pillars, but in the top three: Belong/Love, Esteem, and Self-actualization.

As a final analysis the authors admit that this study has not presented all the needed answers on if Philanthropic CSR truly is a motivational incentive and how large of a role it plays within an employee’s workplace life. Nonetheless, all things considered within this study shows that there are apparent effects on employees whose company do participate within Philanthropic CSR.

6.3 Future Research

As said above, this study has concluded as inconclusive and supplementary research is needed. The authors advise that for additional research to be conducted that the limitations placed upon this study be taken into consideration. For example, due to the form of sampling that was done only a small group of participants have been chosen to represent a larger sum. To further research a larger group of participants should be taken into consideration for the conduction of research. Beyond this, observational data of employees should be explored. The authors
presume that this will lead to fascinating results if exploring the aftermath of employees at work after partaking within a company’s CSR event.

In addition, based up the method of conducting a qualitative data study the authors have struggled to measure the effects of CSR within the workplace; for future investigation the authors suggest that a measuring scale is made and agreed upon before research is conducted.
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8. Appendices

The four interviews that took place were conducted in a semi-structured way and allowed for follow up questions. The below appendix were the questions that were asked to each interviewee. For managers the same questions (Appendix A) were asked, with additional questions (Appendix B).

8.1 Appendix A: Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Motivation of Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State your name please</td>
<td>This was solely for the benefit of the researchers to refer to when listening to the recording of the interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What company do you work for?</td>
<td>To gain a better understanding of the work participants do and to be able to do personal research on company’s webpage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your job title?</td>
<td>This allowed to provide validation to the interviewees’ answers as well as help the authors understand what questions the interviewee was capable of answering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you worked at your company?</td>
<td>This question allowed for follow up questions on the changing of CSR of the company and how many changes the participant has been given to partake within CSR activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are some incentives that your company uses to motivate employees?</td>
<td>This question was asked for the authors to understand what the participant believed the companies incentives were and if they included CSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your personal involvement with the company’s philanthropic CSR?</td>
<td>To help the authors understand the interviewees participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this involvement voluntary or mandatory?</td>
<td>Motivated by the Self Determination Theory and Theory X &amp; Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Motivation of Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there options for the types of CSR involvement?</td>
<td>To connect to the Self Determination Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the personal involvement make you feel after?</td>
<td>To help place CSR within Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any recognition for those who partake in the CSR activities?</td>
<td>To help place CSR within Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs as well as Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does your company tell you about CSR/keep you updated?</td>
<td>Asked to assess interviewees ability to self-motivate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Appendix B: Additional Questions for Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Motivation of Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that employees are motivated by CSR?</td>
<td>To get the perception of management on their beliefs of CSR within the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what level of involvement do you think employees needs to be motivated by?</td>
<td>To assist the authors in answering their research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are employees asking for more CSR opportunities?</td>
<td>Motivated by Self Determination Theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see a difference in employees who are involved in CSR in their work?</td>
<td>To see if managers see a difference in the work performed by employees and if they believe they are more motivated after participating within CSR activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Appendix C: Interview Guide

Introduction

❖ Presentation of the Authors and Research

Ethics

❖ Thank you for participating in this interview, before we begin we first want to remind you of a few things:

➢ that this interview process is being recorded for only the researchers’ benefit of data accuracy.
➢ we want to ask your preference of anonymity-do you wish to disclose your name or companies in the research?
➢ if you wish for anonymity you understand that your words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs, but your name will not be used.
➢ You understand that you can withdraw from the study at any time and will not be asked any questions about why you no longer want to take part.

Questions

1. State your name please
2. What company do you work for?
3. What is your job title?
4. How many years have you worked at your company?
5. What are some incentives that your company uses to motivate employees?
6. What do you know about your company’s involvement for philanthropic CSR?
   6.1. If been there for a while, were you there when CSR plan was implemented
   6.2. Have you seen a change in the company since CSR has been implemented?
7. What is your personal involvement with the company’s philanthropic CSR?
   7.1. Is this involvement voluntary or mandatory?
   7.2. Are there options for the types of CSR involvement?
   7.3. How does the personal involvement make you feel after?
8. Is there any recognition for those who partake in the CSR activities?
9. How does your company tell you about CSR/ keep you updated?
Closure

❖ Thank you for your corporation.
❖ May we contact you if we have additional questions?

8.4 Appendix D: Additional Interview Guide for Managers

Since you are a manager, we would like to ask some questions in regard to your managerial perspective

1. Do you believe that employees are motivated by CSR?
2. At what level of involvement do you think they need to be to be motivated?
3. Are employees asking for more CSR opportunities?
4. Do you see a difference in employees who are involved in CSR in their work?