Designing corporate community programs.

How corporate volunteering can be instrumental in reaching personal fulfillment, and loyal employees

Msc. Lonneke Roza
Research Associate
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam
Department of Business-Society Management & Erasmus Centre for Strategic Philanthropy
Contact: lroza@rsm.nl or 0031-645304190

Prof. Dr. Lucas Meijs
Professor of Strategic Philanthropy and Professor of Volunteering, Civil Society and Business’
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam
Department of Business Society Management & Erasmus Centre for Strategic Philanthropy

Dr. Ir. Peeter Verlegh
Associate Professor Marketing Management and Academic Director of MScBA in Marketing Management
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam
Department of Marketing Management
Introduction

Although in practice the concept of corporate social responsibility is rapidly gaining territory within companies’ policies, it is still questioned whether or not social behavior of firms is their responsibility (Friedman, 1962; Henderson, 2001). Companies tend to engage in social responsible behavior due to the pressure of stakeholders (Davies, 2003; Freeman et al., 2001; Logsdon & Wood, 2002). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not a new phenomenon, but a dynamic one. It can be very broad interpreted and at least goes beyond the firms economic (Davis, 1960; 1973; McGuire, 1963), technical (Davis, 1960;1973) and legal (McGuire, 1963) responsibilities. Moreover, it is seen in both a national and international context (Wartick and Wood, 1998). In the Dutch context CSR is also a very broad term and mainly focus on the international/global issues, such as emission reduction, while the (small) local needs are addressed with Corporate Community Involvement (CCI). Therefore, CCI is seen as different from CSR, while in for example the United States, CSR and CCI are integral.

Several authors have indicated that local involvement is an important part of CSR (Carroll, 1998; Matten et al., 2003) or at least a very visible component (Keim, 1978; Epstein, 1989). In this article we follow the definition of Corporate Community Involvement (CCI) of Edmund Burke (1999), who describes CCI as the relationship between a company and the community in which it’s operates. CCI programs increases the interest of both the community as the company, including corporate volunteering programs.

Within the activities of a corporate community program, a large amount of companies engage in corporate volunteering (Basil et. al., 2009; Benjamin, 2001). Corporate volunteering refers to volunteering encouraged, or even facilitated, by the organization by which an individual is employed (Brewis, 2004). This kind of volunteer work usually entails providing one’s time and expertise to non-profit organizations; this is either done in the employee’s own time or during official working hours (Meijs & Van der Voort, 2004).

So far, most scholars have concentrated their research on the effects of corporate volunteerism on the business organization ((Ellen et. al, 2000; De Gilder, et. al, 2005; Geroy et. al, 2000; Lewin, 1991; Peloza and Hassay, 2006; Steel, 1995; Tuffrey, 1999; Turban and Greening, 2002). Corporate volunteerism can contribute to marketing and reputation related activities ((Ellen et. al, 2000, Peloza and Hassay, 2006), but also contributes to HR goals (Meijs and Kerkhof, 2001, Turban and Greening, 1997, Tuffrey, 1997). Although the literature on corporate volunteering is growing, Tschirhart (2005) called for solid academic research in this area as “employee volunteering is a research area desperately in need of theory…the deeper, more theoretical understanding of employee volunteering can help guide policies and practices” (p. 25). Moreover, Cihlar (2004) classifies the state of the literature on corporate community programs as one in which there are few rigorous studies. Most research is based on anecdotal evidence (Tuffrey, 2003).
According to Tuffrey (2003, p. 4) ‘corporate community involvement programs can play a significant role in addressing the key challenges faced by human resources managers, leading to direct benefits to a company’s bottom line’. The retention of workers may be seen as central to the maintenance of firm specific advantages (Lado and Wilson, 1994; Pfeffer, 1994; Scarbrough, 1999; Wright et al., 1995). Corporate community involvement policies have a positive influence on several elements within human resource management, such as skill development, employee morale, commitment, retention and recruitment. Therefore, an increased role for the HRM function should be expected if the popularity of community involvement programs like employee volunteering increases (Weiser and Zadek 2000; Tuffrey 2003). Porter and Kramer (2002) argue that corporate charitable contributions, such as corporate community involvement initiatives should have a strategic viewpoint. We state that both the external as the internal business environment can be strategically enhanced by a corporate community program. Porter and Kramer (2002) acknowledge the importance of (among others) motivated employees. It can even been seen as a competitive advantage. However, in their Harvard Business Review article they only mention examples from companies that want to secure the potential of future ‘good’ employees in their environment and suggest that business’ should therefore socially invest in their environment. From our perspective, such programs may increase retention the retention through loyalty and personal fulfillment of present employees.

In the light of HRM practices, Booth et al. (2009) called for further research in the corporate community area focused upon the benefits for both the employee as the employer in terms of (among others) organizational commitment and personal fulfillment. In this research we use 9 variables to measure the effects of a corporate volunteer program as part of corporate community involvement. In addition to the basic description of these effects, we look into the design elements that are necessary to reach 2 HRM goals: loyalty towards the employer and personal fulfillment. We will shed light how corporate community involvement – and more specific corporate volunteering- could be a means to this end.

The first part of this paper reviews literature about corporate community involvement and corporate volunteering. The second part is an empirical analysis based on quantitative research of 1) the effects of corporate volunteering as part of a corporate community program and 2) the determination of design elements that are necessary to reach the goals of an increased personal fulfillment and loyalty towards the employer. The third part will draw conclusions on the relationship between certain design choices in setting up a corporate volunteering program, and present ideas for further research.

**Designing a Corporate Community Program**

The central message of almost every corporate community involvement program is the win-win situation for all parties involved. There are social benefits (Peloza and Hassay, 2006) as well as benefits for the organization. From the perspective of nonprofits, corporate community programs can:
1. contribute to the pool of potential volunteers from which the nonprofit organization can select and use volunteers (De Gilder et al., Phillips 2000)
2. attract more financial resources (Phillips 2000).
3. add knowledge and expertise to the organization
4. provide additional means (e.g. use of office space) to achieve their mission (Meijs and Van der Voort, 2004).
5. increase credibility and awareness (Fiske Gwin, 2000).

From the perspective of companies, community programs are set up and organized to
1. create a license to operate (Luijk, 2000)
2. achieve positive reputational and marketing effects (Ellen et al., 2000; Pelzoa and Hassay, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2002)
4. answer to the increasing pressure of stakeholders to behave as a corporate citizen (Austin, 2000; Brammer and Millington, 2003; Tschirhart and St. Clair, 2008)

The diversity in the design of corporate community programs is enormous. From a resource-exchange perspective, Meijs and Van der Voort (2004) identified 5 Ms to explain the range in corporate community programs; Money, Means, Manpower, Mass, Media. Money stands for the financial support in terms of the corporate donations or social sponsoring of an organization. Means are the physical goods organizations provide nonprofit organizations. Manpower refers to employee volunteerism, where volunteerism is encouraged or even facilitated by the organization. Mass refers to opening the network of the organization to strengthen the nonprofit organizations and attract new donors. Porter and Kramer (2002) illustrate the Mass by explaining that collecting a range of other companies and communicating about the joined community investment will attract other donors as well, and as such this collective investment will be far more effective than individual contributions. Finally media refers to the possibility for the organizations to use the media outlets of their partner (Meijs and van der Voort, 2004), such as cause related marketing (Bronn and Vrioni, 2000; Varadarajan and Menon 1988) These components of the design of a corporate community program are not stand-alones. Most organizations have several design elements in their program.

Corporate volunteering, employee volunteerism or employer supported volunteering (ESV) refers to employees who are voluntarily active to make a contribution towards society, supported in some way by their employer (Brewis, 2004). In addition, Tschirhart and St. Clair (2008) explain that a volunteer program facilitated by the employer consists of formal and informal policies to encourage and support employees to participate in community involvement. Meijs and Van der Voort (2004) describe corporate volunteering as when a organization encourage their employees to use their time and skills voluntarily to a non-profit organization, within or outside official workhours. The support can be given in several ways, such as time off work to volunteer (Miller, 1997; Romano 1994), an organization (or department within an organization) acting as a broker to find volunteer opportunities for staff
members (Meijs and van der Voort, 2004), organizations acting as clearinghouses to identify volunteer opportunities (Finney, 1997), or organizing volunteer activities outside official working hours (Caudron, 1994).

There are differences in the level of commitment of the organization. Meijs and Kerkhof (2001) identified 4 levels of commitment. First there is recognition, which refers to activities of organizations that prove that they value the voluntary activities of their employees. Second, there is support of the organization, which implies that the organization let the employee use organization resources or let employees have a flexible working schedule in order to participate in volunteerism. Organizing the voluntary activities or opportunities for the employees is a third option. Here, the organization is actively involved as they organize the volunteer opportunities for their employees. Finally, sponsoring refers to allowing employees to volunteer during working hours and support them with (financial) resources.

Worthy to mention is the influence of expectations employees perceive to participate in the community or in a corporate community program. There can be a certain degree of expectation of the employer for the employee to do voluntary work, especially for those who are high level employees. Some employees believe it is mandatory (and therefore feel a pressure) to act as a representative of the organization, while others feel the pressure of expecting to participate in certain employee volunteer programs (Hall et. al, 2001; Walker and Pharoah, 2000). Tschirhart and St. Clair (2008) explain that in their research most of the senior level executives accept that participation is part of their job. Moreover, they find that most of the senior level executives find it rightly that their performance evaluation will be influenced by the degree of participation in community involvement and governance board (Tschirhart and St. Clair, 2008). Sometimes formal performance rewards are included in volunteer projects and therefore it can be formally praised by a organization (Meijs and Van der Voort, 2004) to participate in a corporate community program.

Brewis (2004) suggests that organizations need to make the motivations and procedures clear of the corporate community programs in order to maximize the benefits for the organization, the employees as well as for the community and the non-profit organization. However, Tschirhart and St. Clair (2008) imply that there is a fine line of appropriateness which organizations can cross according to their employees when designing and implementing a corporate community program. Encouragement of participation, recognition of participants, use of program to promote the organization image and flexibility in choice are interrelated as they influence each other on the perception of certain lines which they can cross. The degree of appropriateness of these areas seem to depend on how employees perceive volunteering and the link of a corporate community program with organization objectives (Tschirhart and St. Clair, 2008). This suggests that there is no strict definition of what is ‘wrong’ or ‘right’ to do.
Effects of Corporate Community Involvement

Several effects occur when facilitating or participating in a corporate community program. Most literature is two-folded as they often describe the benefits along Marketing/PR or HRM effects.

Marketing/PR effects are described in terms of brand image (Ellen et al, 2000), enhanced reputation (Austin, 1997; Brammer and Millington, 2003; Corporate Public Affairs, 2001, Hess et al., 2002; Pancer et al., 2002) and better community relations (Backhaus et al., 2002, Corporate Public Affairs, 2001). Brammer and Millington (2005) explain that corporate philanthropy in the broadest sense can enhance positive stakeholder perceptions about philanthropic companies. Among other factors, reputation has been identified as playing a significant role in raising employee morale, productivity and improving recruitment and retention (Garbett, 1988; Gregory, 1991; Turban and Cable, 2003). Moreover, enhanced reputation is an acknowledged effect of corporate community investment (Austin, 1997; Brammer and Millington, 2003; Corporate Public Affairs, 2001, Hess et al., 2002; Pancer et al., 2002).

The HR effects are also broadly described, although few conducted thorough quantitative research. Cave (2002) implies that one of the drivers of corporate community involvement is to give employees personal fulfillment. From the general volunteer literature it is known that personal fulfillment is one of the goals of voluntary participation among volunteers (Musick and Wilson, 2008). According to Judge et al. (1999) it is crucial to organizational performance to have employees that feel accomplished and satisfied. Furthermore, Zappalà (2003) indicates that employees are looking for altruistic motives such as improving their self esteem while volunteering. Personal satisfaction thus seems to be an important factor for 1) participating in a corporate community program and 2) to enhance corporate performance, due to satisfied employees.

Corporate Community Involvement Programs seem to contribute to the positive feelings towards the company. In the literature these are described in terms of increased willingness to speak highly of their employer (Peloza and Hassay, 2006), increased morale (Corporate Public Affairs, 2001; Pancer et al., 2002; Tuffrey, 1997; Tuffrey, 2003), loyalty towards the employer (Lewin, 1991; Steel, 1995). According to an international research from Environics International (2002), 80% of the people who work in large companies indicate that they feel more loyal towards their employer the more social responsible the company became. Weiser and Zadek (2000) report that the employees that were involved in employer sponsored community events were 30% more likely to retain at their organization.

Corporate community programs can create recruiting efficiencies as corporate volunteering can be attractive for future employees (Meijs and Kerkhof, 2001; Turban and Greening, 1997). Pereira (2003) found in a case study that 95% of the employees stated that the primary reason to choose Timberland as their employer was the opportunity to participate in corporate community programs. Research suggests that employees think it is important that the organization by whom they are employed is committed to society (Business in Community, 2003; Peloza and Hassay, 2006). According to Booth et al. (2009) recent research indicates
that new workforce entrants will expect that employers will provide corporate volunteering opportunities, which can create a competitive advantage for employers to hire new employees.

Furthermore, skill development is a very commonly recognized benefit of corporate volunteer programs (Caudron, 1994; Finney, 1997; Lidstat, 1995; Meijs and Kerkhof, 2001; Peterson, 2004; Romano, 1994). Cave (2002) notes that more and more companies are realizing that employees are looking for personal development (and meaning) at their job. Corporate volunteering can facilitate employees to gain professional and interpersonal skills (Ross, 1997), job related skills (Caudron, 1994), people and leadership skills (Peterson, 2004). Caudron (1994) concludes that organizations perceived less need for training programs, because their community program was so successful. It is obvious that skill development is not only a benefit for the employer, but for the employee as well. Booth et al. (2009) suggest the need for creating community programs that satisfy the needs for both the employer and employee.

The qualitative research of Peloza and Hassay (2006) revealed that internal networking is one of the effects of corporate volunteering. Meeting other people within the organization is perceived as one of the benefits of a corporate community program. It even made the corporate interaction more enjoyable and easier. In addition, they found that fun is an effect of corporate volunteering. Not only the internal network is one of the effects of corporate community involvement programs, it could also be important for companies to look into the broadness of society. Booth et al. (2009) explain the importance of understanding community and social issues through corporate community involvement as this can lead to a better understanding of (potential) customers. The diversity in society leads to a diversity in demands from a customer perspective. Having knowledge about this diversity could lead to more customized products for a diversity of people.

As the general literature about volunteering suggest, time spend on volunteering has influence on the effects that occur (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Moreover, Booth et al. (2009) found a positive relationship between the hours spend and certain effects of corporate volunteering such as) skill development, employer recognition and perceived job success.

**Method**

**Measures**

Based on available literature, 9 variables will be subjected to further analysis to measure the effects of corporate volunteering. In addition, we included the variable of time spend on the activity as this could influence the effects that occur. Generally, the more time one spends on an activity the higher the effects (Booth et al., 2009). In total we use 10 variables. Table 1 is a summarizing table which shows the 10 variables used in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: summary of variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Thoughts and Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal fulfillment</td>
<td>Participating at this voluntary activity really inspired me. Participating at this project really motivated me. It satisfies me that I can do something for others. It satisfies me that I can participate as a volunteer and connect to society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>By participating I feel more loyal towards my employer. It feels good that my employer makes this possible. I’m proud that I work for an organization which enables and support these social initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>During this voluntary activity my personal skills were very useful. During this voluntary activity my social skills were very useful. Participating at this voluntary activity contributes to my personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>The voluntary activity contributes to the preferred reputation of the organization. This voluntary activity leads to more media attention for our organization. In our own media there has been attention for our organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction</td>
<td>Participating makes me proud of myself, because I can help others. It satisfies me that I have the opportunity to try something new. By participating, my personal satisfaction increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal network</td>
<td>By participating my internal network is increased. By participating I’ve been giving the chance to meet new people within the organization. By participating I feel more concerned/I’m more interested in with co-workers from other departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadening perspective</td>
<td>By participating, I’ve gained more interest in the employees of the nonprofit organization. I created more appreciation for the employees of the nonprofit organization. The activity has broaden my perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in end-users</td>
<td>By participating I’ve gained more interest in the clients of the nonprofit organization. I positively changed my perspective about the clients of the nonprofit organization. I’ve gained more insight in the world of the clients of the nonprofit organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>The activity was really fun to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend at the activity</td>
<td>How much time did you spend on the activity? 0-4 hours, 4-8 hours and more than 8 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Data collection
For this research data gathered by the Wellventure Monitor of Fortis Foundation Netherlands is used. The Wellventure monitor is develop by Fortis Foundation Netherlands and the RSM Erasmus University as an instrument to deliver management information to improve corporate community programs. It is inspired by the Balanced Score Card (Kaplan and Norton, 1992) using different fields of performance. In total there are 6 performance fields.

For this paper the questions within two performance fields ‘participants and the organization’ are used. Approximately 85% of the data comes from the community investment program of Fortis Foundation Netherlands. In addition, we used data from another large Dutch financial service provider and of an intermediary/broker of community projects for companies. Data is collected between 2006-2009. The questionnaires are constructed as such that the manager of the particular community project can identify the questions that (s)he finds relevant. After selecting the questions, they have sent the online survey by email (with link) to the participants. Due to the fact that not every user of the Wellventure monitor asks the same questions, there is a diversity in responses per question and thus in the variables constructed for this paper.

Sample
The sample consists of data detracted from an existing dataset and in total 1257 respondents filled in a questionnaire. Answers are based on a likert scale from 1-7. We subjected the respondents to an analysis that excluded all respondents that did not meet our minimal requirement of 66,67% (based on a three item variable, 75% is the minimum for a four item variable) response to the variable. This resulted in a range of respondents between 283 and 802 respondents per variable. Variables are constructed with a factor and reliability analysis. The factor and reliability analysis have shown that all variables are valid for use (see table 2 in the next section). Regression analysis is used to explain the influence of the effects of corporate volunteering on the dependent variables Loyalty and Personal Fulfillment. The goal of this regression analysis is to indicate what components of general accepted effects and by this research validated effects have to be present in the activities of a corporate community program in order to reach the two presented HR-goals; Loyalty towards the employer and Personal Fulfillment.

Analysis

General information
Table 2 shows the general outcomes of the variables (effects on a scale of 1-7) and the outcomes of the factor and reliability analysis.

Table 2: General outcomes, factor and reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Bartlett’s KMO</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal fullfilment</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1,02</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, on a scale from 1-7 all effects of corporate volunteering have a positive outcome. The highest score is for Fun (Mean=6.18; Sd=1.07), the lowest score is on Internal Network (Mean=4.61, Sd=1.34). This research thus indicates that the generally accepted effects of corporate volunteering are indeed present in a quantitative research among a relatively large sample. Although this analysis is based on self-reporting data, there is no indication that this has influence on the outcomes.

Table 3 reveals the correlations between the variables. With exception of the correlation with the time spend on the activity, all variables have a significant positive correlation (p<0.001). The variable of the time spend on a activity has only a significant correlation (p<0.05) with personal fulfillment and this relationship is negative.

### Table 3: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Fulfillment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.695**</td>
<td>0.650**</td>
<td>0.620**</td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>0.430**</td>
<td>0.421**</td>
<td>0.615**</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.695**</td>
<td>0.578**</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
<td>0.467**</td>
<td>0.399**</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>0.595**</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.578**</td>
<td>0.528**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.693**</td>
<td>0.392**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>0.511**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad. Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td>0.528**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.494**</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in end-users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.520**</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.608**</td>
<td>0.476**</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
<td>0.472**</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.448**</td>
<td>0.399**</td>
<td>0.476**</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.421**</td>
<td>0.319**</td>
<td>0.273**</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.615**</td>
<td>0.581**</td>
<td>0.595**</td>
<td>0.482**</td>
<td>0.283**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5%  
**Significant at 1%

### Analyzing the design elements

With use of the regression analysis we explain which independent variables (e.g. personal satisfaction, personal development, broadening perspective, interest in end users, loyalty, exposure, internal network, fun and time spend) influence the dependent variable (personal fulfillment). The analysis shows that the model is significant (F=40.137; p<0.001). 67% of the model is explained by the independent variables (R²=0.670). Regression analysis shows that personal fulfillment is significant positively influenced by Personal Development (B=0.261; P<0.001), Internal Network (B=0.095; p<0.05), Personal Satisfaction (B=0.267; p<0.001),
Loyalty (B=0.130; p<0.05) and Fun (B=0.128; p<0.001). However, it is significant negatively influenced by the time spend on the activity (B= - 0.074; p<0.05). Table 4 summarizes the outcomes.

### Table 4: Regression Analysis Personal Fulfillment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (Unstandardized)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Development</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad. Perspective</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in end-users</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal network</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>2.390</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>2.278</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-2.621</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(R²= 0.670)

Analysis of the influence on Loyalty shows that the model is significant (F=21.052; p<0.001). Furthermore, 51.6% of the model is explained by the independent variables (R²=0.516). The analysis shows that loyalty is significantly positively influenced by Personal Satisfaction (B=0.157; p<0.05), Personal Fulfillment (B=0.176; p<0.05), Exposure (B=0.131; p<0.019) and Internal Network (B=0.206; p<0.001). Table 5 summarizes the outcomes of the regression analysis for loyalty towards the employer.

### Table 5: Outcomes regression Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (Unstandardized)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Development</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad. Perspective</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in end-users</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. fulfillment</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal network</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>4.661</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(R²=0.516)

### Results and discussion

In general, the effects of corporate volunteering all show positive outcomes. This is in line with the suggestions from earlier research, although few conducted thorough quantitative
Most evidence for effects of corporate volunteering is based on anecdotic evidence. This analysis confirms that corporate volunteering seem to contribute to employees in terms of personal fulfillment, interest in end-users, personal satisfaction, internal network, broadening perspective, fun and personal development. In addition, in the perception of the employees, corporate volunteering seems to contribute to the exposure of the company (internally and externally) and the loyalty towards the employer. On a scale from 1-7, the variable Fun has the highest score (6.18), followed by loyalty towards the employer (5.92). The lowest scores are for interest in end-users (4.83) and internal network (4.61). Although correlation matrices do not show the causal relationship between two variables, it is likely that that the employees that participate in such programs think that such activities are fun and therefore make them loyal employees.

While some of these effects where described in literature before (and which we have validated by our analysis), our analysis included a few new variables that describe the effects of corporate volunteering. Earlier, Zappala (2003) already mentioned that people seek for altruism and enhancing their self esteem while volunteering. This research has shown that personal satisfaction is indeed an effect of corporate volunteering. Satisfaction through the workplace eventually could influence organizational performance (Judge et al., 1999). In addition, this research reveals that broadening horizon and interest in end-users are effects of corporate volunteering. Although Booth et al. (2009) acknowledged the importance of understanding community and social issues in order to understand (potential) customers, this is the first indication that broadening perspectives actually occur. Lastly, Cave (2002) introduced personal fulfillment as one of the drivers of CCI, but did not measure if this actually occurred. This research has shown that personal fulfillment is indeed an effect of participation in a corporate community program.

From the perspective of Porter and Kramer (2002), using corporate social initiatives with a strategic approach, we also conducted an analysis to look at the elements that have to be present in a corporate community program when striving for HR goals, such as personal fulfillment and loyalty. These are elements that determine the retention of employees. Regression analysis indicate that if an organization uses their corporate community program for personal fulfillment as part of their job enrichment, an organization have to make sure certain other elements are presents as well. The analysis implies that employees have to learn something (personal development), have fun (fun), have a good feeling about themselves (personal satisfaction) and meet and connect to colleagues (internal network) in order to reach the personal fulfillment. Exposure is of less importance as the regression shows that this relationship is not significant. Derived from this data, we suggest that when the goal is to reach personal fulfillment, a corporate community activity must include a group element (Internal network), learning aspect or at least the use of their skills (personal development), but not seem to have to be to complex (personal satisfaction). Furthermore, the analysis also indicate that there is a negative relationship between the time spend on the activity and personal fulfillment. This could imply that a corporate community activity should have a limited timeframe in order to reach personal fulfillment.
When placing Loyalty as the variable to be explained, it looks that a corporate community program has some other elements that are necessary to reach this goal. Regression analysis has shown that in order to increase the loyalty towards the employer, a corporate community program has to make sure that people have a good feeling about themselves after the activity (personal satisfaction and personal fulfillment), can meet and connect to other people within the organization (internal network) and make sure that others know about the social activity of the organization (exposure). Personal development, time spend (negative influence) and fun are not significant, thus their influence is of less importance. Derived from this data it can be suggested that a corporate community activity constructed to increase the loyalty towards the employer must include internal and external media coverage (communicate that the employees have done something charitable; exposure), a group element (internal network) and not to complex, but a visible outcome in order to give them a good feeling about themselves and their contribution towards society (personal satisfaction and personal fulfillment).

For both dependent variables (Loyalty and Personal Fulfillment) it appears that broadening horizon and interest in end-users are not significantly of influence when reaching the HR-goals. This would imply that it is not necessary for managers of corporate community programs to have activities that enables direct service for the end-users nor for the employees of the nonprofit organization. This does not imply that broadening horizon and the interest in end-users are not important. But it does imply that not all activities have to be organized as such that there is a direct service. In designing a community program, this would make it much easier to organize for the nonprofit organization, especially those who have complex end-users, such as nonprofit organizations which work for mentally and disabled children or people with large psychological problems. In addition, indirect service activities are less complex to organize for the company as well and they are very suitable for group activities, such as fundraising activities, gardening, building a website and painting a local children’s farm.

**Conclusion**

Overall corporate community program seem to have effect for both employees as employers. This research contributes to present literature in terms of the validation of acknowledged effects, the extension of measured variables (4 new variables) and approach we have taken (quantitative research). Another major contribution is that although effects of corporate volunteering indeed occur, in this paper we looked beyond the general effects and analyzed which elements have to be present in a corporate community program in order to reach certain (strategic) goals. From a HR perspective, this research shows that certain elements within a corporate community program are necessary to increase the probability of retention of the employees by increasing the loyalty towards the employer and having personal fulfillment in their on-the-job additional philanthropic activities. It seems that the goals of loyalty and personal fulfillment have specific requirements in order to reach (or at least increase the likehood to increase) that goal. In figure 1, a summary is provided. As this research suggest, it is very important to set goals beforehand. When using a corporate
community program with a strategic approach. This strategic approach would increase the effects of the program.

**Figure 1: Summarizing the findings**

![Diagram showing the relationship between CCI Program, Internal Network, Personal Satisfaction, Personal Development, Time spent, Personal Fulfillment, Loyalty, Exposition, Broadening Horizon, Interest in end-users, and CCI Program.]

**Restrictions and limitations**
In this research we used an existing dataset. This places a few constrains. First, we could only use the items available that were not specifically designed to test our theory. Although the variables constructed are very usable for this research, these variables were not constructed beforehand. Second, no additional general information (besides time spend on the activity) of the respondents nor the activity could be included in this research to look at specific attributes that could explain differences in effects. For example, much literature about volunteering, explain the differences in effects according to gender, marital status and age. Because of the lack of respondents at this point we were not able to control for these characteristics. Third, there is a risk that there was inappropriate questioning. Due to the flexibility and possibility for customization of the Wellventure Monitor, every survey included is subjected to the capability of the constructor. Although this is a limitation to our research, we expect that it has little effect on the present results.

**Suggestions for future research**
Although this paper is another step in the research of corporate community involvement and more specifically corporate volunteering, future research is necessary to refine these findings. Characteristics of the participants, the activity, the organization and the partner (nonprofit) organization could influence the effects that occur and thus influence the design of the program. Furthermore, as it becomes more and more clear what effects occur for the company, it remains unknown what specific effects could occur for nonprofit organizations and their end-users.
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