

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Personality Profiles and the Effect of CSR Participation on Organizational Commitment

Min-woo Lee

Doctor's Course, Management, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, South Korea

Gi-ryung Song

Doctor's Course, Management, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, South Korea

Kyung-seok Kim

Professor, Management, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, South Korea

Abstract:

This research is performed for examining change of causal relationship between CSR participation and organizational commitment when the samples of different personality traits are applied. The 214 respondents are used and divided into four groups of different personality traits so that regression analyses about causal relationship between CSR participation and organizational commitment are performed against each group. The result indicates that the causal relationship is only significant when the samples have low neuroticism.

Keywords: *Big 5 personality, Personality profile, CSR participation, Organizational commitment.*

1. Introduction

CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) becomes important issue for almost recent corporates because today those corporates are being requested to do a role as a member of society. Indeed, the demand of social responsibility of corporate were already argued by many researchers. Friedman & Miles (2006) emphasized the multi-dimensional roles of corporate among various stakeholders such as suppliers, customers, retailers, rivals and so on. The core point of their argument is that the company not only exist for the income or revenue but they also exist to get good relationships with stakeholders and make balance among those relationships. CSR has important role in this 'stakeholder theory' as one represent form of the part of the relationship between social and corporate. On the other side, many studies discovered that CSR has positive effects onto the inside of the companies (e.g. He & Yi, 2011; Kang, Lee, & Huh, 2010; Vlachos, Tsamakos, Vrechopoulos, & Avramidis, 2009; Mohr & Webb, 2005). The needs from outside and the inner benefits of CSR made companies focusing on the activities of CSR, and now, the problem of the companies is about how the companies conduct the CSR more effectively rather than the problem of 'do or not'. This positive effects of CSR is also examined by many studies in the academic field of organizational behavior (e.g. Raman & Zboja, 2006; Glider, Schuyt, & Breedijk, 2005; Lewin, 1991). Many studies consistently showed the results of empirical analysis supporting the positive causal relationship between CSR and the variables of organizational behavior such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational identification.

However, it is not that there is no doubt. Almost researchers investigated positive effects of CSR on employees' attitudes with consistent framework considering those employees having same personality type. Many studies have discovered the effects of employees' personality traits on their attitudes and behaviors (Organ, 1994; Van Emmerik & Euwema, 2007; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009; Shaffer, Li, & Bagger, 2015). Considering those effects of personality traits of employees, we can infer the needs of one research that examines the positive effect of CSR consistently existing in different personality types. To investigate the issue, this study analyzed the causal relationship between CSR and organizational commitment with different types of employees' personality traits via dividing employees' personality traits into four groups.

2. Background Theory and Hypothesis

2.1. CSR and Organizational Commitment

The concept of CSR comes from Bowen (1953) concerning the social responsibilities of entrepreneurs. He pointed that companies should focus on the social advantages because they are closely related to their society and they are a member of the society. After Bowen's considering, Carroll (1979) studied more deeply and classified the concept of CSR. Carroll divided CSR concept into four dimensions. As Carroll's classification, CSR have four parts involving economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibility.

Many researchers have empirically proved positive causal relationship between CSR and employees attitudes and behavior. Peterson & Seligman (2004) found that CSR has positive impact on employees' OCB (organizational citizenship behavior) and organizational

citizenship. Raman & Zboja (2006) showed that the employees participating the activity of donation conducted in their companies has explicitly high organizational commitment comparing to other colleagues who do not join the donation event. In addition, Lee, Song, & Kim (2015) found that CSR participation have positive effect on employees' OCB (both OCB to individual and organization).

By the way, organizational commitment is classical concept representing many attitude variables that have positive effect on organization effectiveness. This concept is one of best-studied variable of employee attitudes (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Mowday, Porter, & Steers (1982) defined organizational commitment as the level of employee's engagement and identification with their organization. This concept is very important to organizations and their managers because there are various evidences proving organizational commitment have positive effect on organization effectiveness both directly and indirectly (e.g. Organ et al., 2006; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993).

2.2. Employee's Personality Types with Big Five Personality Framework

The big five model is one of the most widely used models of personality (Major, Turner and Fletcher, 2006). This personality model is from Costa & McCrae (1992), and they divided personality into five dimensions involving extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.

Personality is very important factor when we debate about person's attitudes and behaviors. Individuals form their attitudes and behave along with the attitudes. Personality has significant impact on the process that perceptions become attitudes, and this determining the way of receiving external stimulations. For example, someone who have outgoing personality type are likely to be interested in new stimulation like meeting new people or participating new activity. Thus, based on considering effect of personality, we can postulate hypothesis below.

Hypotheses. The causal relationships between CSR participation and organizational commitment are different along employee's personality type.

3. Methods

3.1. Respondents

Samples for the empirical analysis is collected from employees who work in corporates that are listed in Korean stock market. Totally 214 questionnaires were collected. Of the samples, 116 respondents are male and 98 are females. Almost respondents are ordinary employees (127 respondents) and 50 respondents are assistant managers, 22 are section chiefs, and 15 are department or deputy heads.

3.2. Measurements

- *CSR participation.* Although, there are many studies about CSR, unfortunately there is no formal measurement of CSR participation. Almost measurement is about solely CSR, not about employee's participation to the CSR. Thus, we used our own measurement used by Lee, Song, & Kim (2015).
- *Organizational commitment.* Mowday, Steer, & Porter (1979) used the 15 item- Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) to measure the level of employees' focus on their organizations. Along existence study, we employed this typical measuring device, but modified the items to fit the Korean context.
- *Big five personality traits.* Costa & McCrae's (1992) measurement were used to this research. This measurement is composed of 25 items that could be divided into each five items of sub-dimension such as extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

4. Results

To examine causal relationship between CSR participation and organizational commitment of each personality type, first we divided sample into few groups along their personality characteristic.

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Neuroticism	1.10248	-.49965	.27421	-.57721
Extraversion	-.26956	.01566	-1.17626	.91691
Conscientiousness	-.36819	-.17766	-.64653	.85394
Openness to experience	.11950	-.15935	-1.30305	.84821
Agreeableness	-.37828	.03106	-1.13824	.96594
Sample size	50	60	40	64

Table 1: Results of cluster analysis

Table 1 is showing the central value of each group and sample size. Group 1 has feature with high neuroticism and slightly low extraversion, conscientiousness and agreeableness. Group 2 has little low neuroticism and other four dimensions with normal level. Group 3 is generally low and particularly extraversion, openness to experience and agreeableness is quite low. Finally, group 4 has values opposite to group 1, which is low in neuroticism and high in other four dimensions.

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Gender	.119	-.073	.497	.030
Age	.135	-.160	.524	.353
Education	.185	.086	.294	-.391**
Tenure	.013	.327**	.009	-.013
Position	.205	-.025	.292	.062
CSR Participation	.063	.137***	.072	.135***
Adjust R ²	.041	.303	.295	.350
P Value of F Test	.128	.001***	.007**	.001***

Table 2: The Results of Regression Analyses

Dependent variable = Organizational commitment, N = 214, **= $p < .01$, ***= $p < .001$.

Using the four personality trait groups, we conducted regression analysis Table 2 is the results of regression analyses about the causal relationship between CSR participation and organizational commitment. The results are showing that the coefficient of CSR participation against organizational commitment is significant on the group 2 and 4. These groups which are 2 and 4 have common feature of low neuroticism, and group 1 and 3 have high level of neuroticism. Based on the regression analyses, research hypothesis is supported.

5. Conclusion

This research was performed to examine that the causal relationship of CSR participation and organizational commitment can significantly exist at the various samples of different personality types. To investigate, we divided our samples into four groups of different personality profiles and conducted regression analysis about every each group.

Along the results, it is indicated that the causal relationship of CSR participation and organizational commitment is only significant when the samples have low neuroticism. This is very interested because various causal relationships considered as significant cannot be it when the sample has different personality type.

However, this research has some limitations. First, the sample sizes of each group are small, and second longitudinal study is necessary to identify the causal relationship between variables.

6. References

- i. Bowen, H. R. (1953). Social responsibilities of the businessman (No. 3). Harper.
- ii. Carroll. A. B (1979), A Three-dimensional Conceptual Model Corporate Performance, Academy of Management Review, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 497-505.
- iii. Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. 1992. Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: PAR
- iv. Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S. (2006). Stakeholders: Theory and practice. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- v. He, H., & Li, Y. (2011). CSR and service brand: The mediating effect of brand identification and moderating effect of service quality. Journal of Business Ethics, 100(4), 673-688.
- vi. Illies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(4), 945-959.
- vii. Kang, K. H., Lee, S., & Huh, C. (2010). Impacts of positive and negative corporate social responsibility activities on company performance in the hospitality industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29(1), 72-82.
- viii. Lee, M. W., Song, G. R., & Kim, K. S. (2015) The effect of CSR participation of employee on employee attitudes and behaviors: The moderating role of conscientiousness. The SIJ Transactions on Industrial, Financial & Business Management, 3(3), 32-35.
- ix. Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. 2006. Linking proactive personality and the big five to motivation to learn and development activity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4), 927-935.
- x. Mohr, L. A., & Webb, D. J. (2005). The effects of corporate social responsibility and price on consumer responses. Journal of Consumer Affairs, 39(1), 121-147.
- xi. Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. 1993. Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6: 209-225.
- xii. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. 1982. Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- xiii. Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Management, 20(2), 465-478.
- xiv. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 2006. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- xv. Shaffer, J. A., Li, A., & Bagger, J. (2015). A moderated mediation model of personality, self-monitoring, and OCB. Human Performance, 28(2), 93-111.

- xvi. Van Emmerik, I. J. H., & Euwema, M. C. (2007). Who is offering a helping hand? Associations between personality and OCBs, and the moderating role of team leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 530-548.
- xvii. Vlachos, P. A., Tsamakos, A., Vrechopoulos, A. P., & Avramidis, P. K. (2009). Corporate social responsibility: attributions, loyalty, and the mediating role of trust. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(2), 170-180.
- xviii. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. 1991. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17: 601-617.