



Employee Volunteering

Risa Bhinekawati, Wiwiek M. Daryanto, Amelia Naim Indradjaja, Chrysanti Hasibuan-Sedyono, and Yanti Triwadiantini

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Employee Volunteering Definitions: Different Terminologies with Slightly Different Meanings	4
3	Global Trends in Employee Volunteering	6
4	Effective Implementation of Employee Volunteering	8
4.1	Employers' and Employees' Motives in Conducting Employee Volunteering	8
4.2	Managing Employee Volunteering Effectively	9
4.3	Types of Employee Volunteering Activities	12
4.4	Benefits of Employee Volunteering	13
5	A Snapshot of EV Implementation in Indonesia	14
5.1	Respondents' Profile	15
5.2	Practices and Employers' Investment on Employee Volunteering	17
5.3	Measuring Employee Volunteering Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts	19
5.4	The Benefits of Employee Volunteering to Employers and Society	21
5.5	Challenges and Key Success Factors in Conducting Employee Volunteering	21
6	Discussions	23
7	Summary	25
8	Cross-References	25
	References	26

Abstract

Employee volunteering (EV) was introduced as employer-supported volunteering and now also covers employee-led volunteering initiatives. For employers, EV is usually embedded in the company's corporate social responsibility (CSR)

R. Bhinekawati (✉) · W. M. Daryanto · A. N. Indradjaja
Business and Management, Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen IPMI, Jakarta Selatan, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: risa.bhinekawati@ipmi.ac.id; wiwiek.daryanto@ipmi.ac.id; amelia.naim@ipmi.ac.id

C. Hasibuan-Sedyono · Y. Triwadiantini
Indonesia Business Links, Central Jakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: chrysantihs@ibl.or.id; yanti@ibl.or.id

strategy in addressing social issues by involving employees. Research has shown that EV can fulfill intrinsic and extrinsic motives for employees in achieving their economic, social, and environmental performances simultaneously. As for employees, working for companies that allow them to do EV has given them more job satisfaction that enhance their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Globally, EV has achieved its importance as a way of companies to contribute to global issues and the achievements of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). To contribute to EV discussions, this chapter covers several aspects of EV, including different terminologies used by researchers and companies; global trends of EV implementation; effective management of EV; impacts of EV to the employers, employees, and society; and challenges in EV implementation. To illustrate EV practices, this chapter highlights EV implementation in Indonesia based on a recent survey designed for gaining empirical evidence. In the conclusion, a virtuous cycle between EV, corporate sustainability, and SDGs is suggested.

Keywords

Corporate volunteering · Corporate social responsibility · Employee volunteering · Organizational citizenship behavior · Sustainable Development Goals

1 Introduction

Globally, more and more employees around the world are expecting their employers to contribute to solutions of social issues and improve social conditions in the area where their employers operate (Edelman 2019, p. 35). Corporations are expected to perform their corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the way they perform their “economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary” actions (Carroll 1979, p. 500). In many contexts, CSR relates to the company’s stakeholder management, policies, and actions to achieve its economic, social, and environmental performances simultaneously and to contribute to sustainable development (Aguinis and Glavas 2012, p. 2). Through CSR, corporations can collectively address global issues stipulated in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) including poverty eradication and improvements in health, education, employment, and the environment (United Nations 2019). Companies’ contributions to SDGs through CSR can be justified for intrinsic and extrinsic reasons. The intrinsic rationales of CSR provide ethical justifications for CSR actions where companies contribute to universal issues like poverty, whereas extrinsic reasons of CSR will justify the company’s investment toward more pragmatic goals such as compliance with regulations, risk management, and improvement of corporate reputation (Basu and Palazzo 2008, pp. 122–127).

With regard to CSR programs, employee volunteering (EV) or an employee volunteer program (EVP) is defined as “a planned, managed effort that seeks to motivate and enable employees to effectively serve community needs through the

employer... are typically one component of a company's corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategy ... that addresses the company's involvement in societal causes" (Points of Light 2017, p. 5). EV can be implemented by private or public employers by giving "financial incentives, provisions for special leave, special rewards, or other means of direct support" (European Commission 2014, p. 34). EV has been seen as one of the most effective ways in conducting CSR for companies to contribute to SDGs (Cook and Burchell 2018), and it can be considered as a tactical and strategic implementation of CSR (Mozes et al. 2011) where companies can solve social issues by deploying employee talents and skills (Peloza et al. 2009). Collectively, EV can make a grand contribution to the world's problems if companies around the globe deploy their employees to solve social issues in their surrounding communities while benefitting from increased employee loyalty to the companies with an increased affective commitment (Rodell et al. 2017). Besides, EV will contribute to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) when the employees trust and feel proud of the altruistic purposes of volunteering efforts conducted by the company (Im and Chung 2018). Eventually, CSR programs that are implemented through EV will contribute to corporate sustainability (Im and Chung 2018) which can be achieved through employee loyalty that leads to the company's ability to achieve its business social performance simultaneously (Lee and Chen 2018).

To manage EV effectively, employers need to consider the motives of employees for being volunteers and apply EV strategies accordingly. Like companies, employees have intrinsic or social-oriented and extrinsic or career-oriented rationales in conducting EV (Lough and Turner 2018; Points of Light 2015). Points of Light (2015) found that the social-oriented volunteers use volunteering opportunities to collaborate with peers and friends in handling social services like helping homeless shelters or park cleanups, whereas career-oriented volunteers prefer activities that are linked to skill development like doing consulting or mentoring, and they are more motivated if the volunteering assignments are recognized formally by the organization. Furthermore, companies need to be alert that social-oriented employees will support the company's EV programs which are truly altruistic in nature and they may view negatively on the company's self-serving motives like public relations purposes of EV (Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac 2015, p. 7). The attitudes of employees toward the company's motives in conducting EV support the social exchange and social identity theories (Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac 2015). When employees feel supported by the companies in implementing their "pro-social motives," they will reciprocate emotionally to the company (Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac 2015, p. 9).

As EV has become a global practice for CSR, institutions like Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship (BCCCC), Points of Light, Volunteering Australia, and London Benchmarking Group have conducted a global survey and developed tools for successful EV management. Researchers have also started to contribute to academic research to investigate the links between EV and corporate performance (Dreesbach-Bundy and Scheck 2017; Rodell et al. 2016). Hence, this chapter attempts to contribute to discussions on EV by providing an overview of EV development thus far. The chapter is outlined by discussing (1) different

terminologies of EV; (2) global trends of EV; (3) effective management of EV, which covers motivations of employers and employees in conducting EV, mechanisms for effective EV implementation, key success factors and challenges in EV implementation, types of EV activities, and benefits of EV to employers, employees, and society; (4) a snapshot of EV implementation in Indonesia; (5) how Indonesian experience relates to previous studies on EV; and (6) conclusion and ways forward.

2 Employee Volunteering Definitions: Different Terminologies with Slightly Different Meanings

Employee volunteering (EV) differs from personal volunteering (PV) in terms of supports given by employers. While EV activities are usually done with the knowledge and supports from employers, PV activities are conducted “without employer involvement and directions” (Runte and Basil 2011, p. 133). The literature review on definitions of EV has shown different terminologies with similarities in meanings, including employee volunteering (EV), corporate volunteerism (CV), employer-supported volunteering (ESV), employee volunteering program (EVP), workplace volunteer programs (WVP), company-sponsored volunteer programs (CSVP), and company support for employee volunteering (CSEV) as listed in Table 1.

From EV definitions listed in Table 1, it can be concluded that most of the authors suggest that EV involves activities that are planned and organized by employers or companies (European Commission 2014; Lorenz et al. 2011; Mathieu et al. 2004; Points of Light 2017; Rodell 2013; Rodell et al. 2016). However, EV can also be initiated by both employers and employees (Lukka 2000). In terms of the type of employers, the European Commission (2014) suggests that employers can be both private and public organizations, while some authors mention the “employer” without being specific (Mathieu et al. 2004; Points of Light 2017; Rodell 2013; Rodell et al. 2016) or employers are specifically mentioned as companies (Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac 2015; Lorenz et al. 2011; Runte and Basil 2011). EV activities are usually coordinated with nonprofit organizations or charitable groups as partners and beneficiaries of the activities (Lorenz et al. 2011; Rodell 2013; Rodell et al. 2016), or they can also be addressed directly to community needs (Points of Light 2017). In terms of resources given by employers, authors agree that the employers allow the employees to become volunteers by giving their time and skills, besides giving financial supports and other incentives. Based on similarities and differences of EV definitions developed by the cited authors, for the purpose of this chapter, common terminologies are used: (1) EV can be initiated by employers or employees with the knowledge and support of employers. (2) The employers are both public and private organizations. (3) EV can be done in partnership with nonprofit or charity organizations or directly with community groups.

Table 1 Definitions related to employee volunteering

Terminology	Author(s)	Definition
Employee volunteering (EV)	European Commission (2014, p. 34)	“Volunteering organized and/or supported by private or public employers, be it through financial incentives, provisions for special leave, special rewards, or other means of direct support.”
	Lorenz et al. (2011, p. 184)	“company’s invitation to employees to get involved voluntarily in charitable efforts beyond their job descriptions, where the company provide resources and collaborate with non-profit organizations”
	Mathieu et al. (2004, p. 8)	“a planned, managed effort that seeks to motivate and enable employees to effectively volunteer under the sponsorship and leadership of the employer.” (p. 8)
	Rodell (2013, p. 1274).	“Giving time or skills during a planned activity for a volunteer group or organization.”
	Rodell et al. (2016, p. 3)	“Employed individuals giving time during a planned activity for an external non-profit or charitable group or organization.” (p.3)
	Dreesbach-Bundy and Scheck (2017, p. 1)	“The encouragement and facilitation of volunteering in the community through the organization by which an individual is employed” which is a subset of corporate social responsibility”
Corporate volunteerism (CV)	Runte and Basil (2011, p. 133)	“Volunteering activities which are initiated and supported by companies”
Employer-supported volunteering (ESV)	Lukka (2000, p. 4)	“An activity which has been developed by an employer with a view to involving those members of the workforce who wish to volunteer, or initiated by the employee themselves, with full knowledge and approval on the part of the employer”
Employee volunteering program (EVP)	Points of Light (2017, p. 5)	“An employee volunteer program (EVP) is defined as a planned, managed effort that seeks to motivate and enable employees to effectively serve community needs through the employer. . .” EVPs, also called workplace volunteer programs or company-sponsored volunteer programs”
Company support for employee volunteering (CSEV)	Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2015, p. 7)	“Companies’ encouragement or an accommodation of employee’s volunteer activities during working hours and/or own time.”

3 Global Trends in Employee Volunteering

Globally, EV has been conducted by employers in contributing to common goods and societal causes. In North America, especially in the USA, research by Grant (2012) found growing importance of EV as a way for a company to contribute to society. Since the 1990s, companies in the USA have started to include EV into their business plans, and employees stated to learn about volunteering from their companies (Toppe et al. 2001). The Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship (BCCCC) survey found that nine of ten Fortune 500 companies operating globally have formal employee volunteering and giving programs and have already embedded EV in the ways of business, where the majority of large companies are very supportive to corporate volunteering (Boccalandro 2009, p. 4). BCCCC found strong indications that EV has contributed to business operations in terms of the development of employee skills, teamwork, and morale. Hence, EV helps companies in recruiting and retaining employees which then contribute to stakeholder relations, corporate branding, and reputation and eventually enhance sales performance (Boccalandro 2009, p. 15).

In Canada, a study was conducted by Runte and Basil (2011) on the employees' views on volunteering. They found the difference between personal volunteerism and corporate volunteerism among employees. Personal volunteerism refers to "activities during personal time undertaken without employer involvement or direction" whereas corporate volunteerism refers to volunteering activities which are initiated and supported by companies" (Runte and Basil 2011, p. 133). In both cases, employees are driven by their beliefs in the cause and the "feeling good" about what they are doing when volunteering. However, personal volunteers are more driven by "intrinsic" motives in helping others, solving social issues, building their capacity, and developing a social network, as compared to corporate volunteering which is motivated by more "extrinsic" matters like career progression (Runte and Basil 2011).

In Latin America, although the progress is not as advanced as in North America, EV activities have started to emerge in countries like Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile as they are practiced by multinational companies such as P&G working in the countries (Schlenkhoff-Hus 2018).

In Western Europe, in a survey of 103 companies in 53 European Union countries, 80% of companies make employee volunteering programs available for their employee (Perez et al. 2014). According to Perez et al. (2014), EV has been growing in Europe, and it is in line with the growth of CSR practices of European companies. EV has been implemented not only by corporations but also by public and nonprofit organizations. The study also found that EV has given benefits to the companies, employees, and communities at large, hence helping employers to build their sustainability objectives (Perez et al. 2014).

In the UK, EV has grown its significance in the way in which companies conduct their business. In 2018, it was predicted that over 11 million employees in the UK were allowed by their employers to do voluntary work (Benefacto 2018). Indeed, EV has been supported by the government with the Prime Minister's encouragement for

UK companies to provide a day in a year for volunteering activities (Bussell and Forbes 2008).

Like in Western Europe, there are also interests in EV in Eastern Europe, for example, in Russia. Krasnopolskaya et al. (2016) found from their research in 37 Russian companies four types of employee volunteering which are effective in building community engagement: informal volunteering, formal volunteering, formal monetary donation, and informal monetary donation (p. 1). They observed that employee volunteering can enhance community engagement because of three reasons: First, employee volunteering can generate trust between the company and the community. Second, employee volunteering gives opportunities for employees to encounter social issues. Third, employee volunteering enhances employees' spirit of volunteerism.

In the Asia Pacific, countries like Australia, South Korea, and Japan are very advanced in corporate volunteering, while in China, India, and ASEAN countries, the practice of corporate volunteering is emerging very fast (Schlenkhoff-Hus 2018). Points of Light (2017) found that volunteerism, including employee volunteerism, has shaped the way in which companies conduct their CSR and nonprofit organization operates in Asian countries. For example, in South Korea, over 50% of employees are participating in employee volunteering activities which are provided by more than 70% of companies in the country (Federation of Korean Industries 2018). Points of Light (2017) argue that the growth of volunteerism among youth in Asian countries will exceed other regions in the world as increasing numbers of nonprofit organizations and CSR programs of companies will utilize highly skilled laborers that can be made available through volunteering programs. Besides, the governments and the nonprofit organizations are increasingly aware of the potential of employee volunteerism to be a powerful source for humanitarian activities like disaster response, poverty alleviation, skill development of communities, and people with special needs. Hence, they may look for better collaborations with companies in handling social issues through employee volunteering. In Asian countries, measurements of the social impact of employee volunteering have been developed and are expected to be adopted as good practice by leading companies as employee volunteering has proven to benefit the brands of the company and the morale of its employees (Points of Light 2017). However, despite the rapid growth of EV in Asian countries, in Arab nations, corporate volunteering is also at early development as the company prefers to give cash donations rather than conducting employee volunteering (Allen et al. 2011, p. 44).

In Australia, EV which is also commonly called corporate volunteering (CV) (Volunteering Australia 2015, p. 1) has grown its significance as a company strategy to contribute to society and enhance employees' motivation (Volunteering Australia 2015). Volunteering Australia (2015) found that 24% of Australian employees work for employers that provide them with volunteering activities. In Australia, EV has also contributed to consumer perception of the company. A study by Plewa et al. (2015) found that corporate volunteering contributes to consumers' perception of the corporate image, thereby improving consumer loyalty. Australian companies consider CSR or the intention to be socially responsible companies as the driver or the

reason why they are doing corporate volunteering. Plewa et al. (2015) found that by having corporate volunteering program, it is then easier for companies to have good stories to project their image as a responsible company through their internal and external communication channel, including the marketing and promotion channels. By creating awareness about the company's CSR achievement, company can increase consumers' knowledge about the company's CSR that leads to enhancing their perception about the company's image (Plewa et al. 2015).

As in New Zealand, Lee and Higgins (2001) found that EV opens opportunities for a company to contribute to social issues and engage with local communities. Through dialogue among stakeholders, employee volunteering generates sustainable business-community partnerships which bring benefits to the company, employee, and the community.

Finally, in Africa, corporate volunteering is not yet a known concept as people volunteers privately to help the needs of families and communities, except in South Africa where many multinational companies operate and implement corporate volunteering (Allen et al. 2011, p. 34).

In sum, EV has become a global phenomenon with a continuing awareness of companies in contributing to global issues although the practices around the globe vary among countries and regions. Indeed, EV allows companies to conduct their CSR programs which contribute to employee morale and common goods. While most of the EV activities are conducted directly with communities or in partnership with nonprofit organizations, EV programs have been able to contribute to solutions to social issues. Globally and collectively, corporations can address global issues stipulated in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals where 181 member countries of the United Nations pledge their commitment to improve significantly the world's conditions, especially in dealing with the issues of poverty, hunger, health and well-being, inequality, and sustainable cities and communities (United Nations 2019; Volonteuropée 2015, p. 47).

4 Effective Implementation of Employee Volunteering

4.1 Employers' and Employees' Motives in Conducting Employee Volunteering

Research has shown that both employers and employees have intrinsic and extrinsic motives in doing EV. Hence, the ability to recognize the motives as the drivers in conducting EV from the employers and employees' sides will be one of the key success factors of EV implementation. For employers, there are three main drivers in conducting EV: first, charity to support a good cause with a minimum expectation of getting something in return; second, community investment, which is a strategic involvement of a company in solving long-term social issues that will impact the company (Boccalandro 2009); and third, commercial initiatives including commercial and marketing activities, as well as the promotion of corporate identities and corporate branding involving employee volunteers (Barkay 2012; Boccalandro

2009). As for the third reason, employers use EV to build their branding by publishing community development projects through public relations channels in the public media and their own reports to show that they perform good corporate governance and participate in global Sustainable Development Goals (Crowther 2008). From these three reasons, the first and the second reasons to contribute to common goods can be categorized as intrinsic, while the third reasons in portraying corporate image can be categorized as extrinsic motives of conducting EV.

As for employees, Runte and Basil (2011) found extrinsic and extrinsic motives in conducting EV. They found that intrinsic motivational factors, including “the desire to help others, the feeling good, the intention to gain new knowledge, and the ability to make social contacts,” are the top four drivers for employees to volunteer. On the contrary, the extrinsic motive is “to help my career” rank fifth the motivational factors (p. 140). Similarly, Points of Light (2015, p. 1) classifies two types of employees’ orientations in corporate volunteering, that is, “social-oriented volunteers” and “career-oriented volunteers.” The social-oriented volunteers would have intrinsic motives to use volunteering opportunities to collaborate with peers and friends in handling social issues that require social services like helping homeless shelters or park cleanups, whereas career-oriented volunteers have more extrinsic motives and prefer activities that are linked to skill development like doing consulting or mentoring, and they are more motivated if the volunteering assignments are recognized formally by the organization.

Therefore, companies need to apply a suitable strategy to cater to employees who have intrinsic and extrinsic motives. Lough and Turner (2018) found that company leadership would attract social-oriented volunteers, while the integration of EV activities in performance management would entice employees who are motivated by career progression. Besides, putting EV in performance review will be beneficial when the company wants to establish a culture of volunteering within the company and increase the company’s commitment to helping communities (Allen 2012; Lough and Turner 2018). Furthermore, companies need to consider putting their intrinsic before extrinsic purposes when communicating with employees. As found by Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2015), volunteers would appreciate and enhance their organizational citizenship behavior if their volunteerism is utilized for truly altruistic purposes rather than for supporting “self-serving intentions” of the employers (p. 14).

4.2 Managing Employee Volunteering Effectively

For effective management of EV, employers need to integrate internal mechanisms to ensure optimum benefits of EV for employees, employers, and communities. Points of Light (2017) suggest seven practices that have helped employers to manage their employee volunteering program (EVP) effectively, which cover “the plan, design, leadership, partnerships, employee engagement, measurement, and success and growth” practices of EV (Points of Light 2017, pp. 7–40). Another tool that has been used to measure EV performance of Fortune 500 companies is developed by

Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship (BCCCC). BCCCC calls it as “Drivers of Effectiveness for Employee Volunteering and Giving Program (EVGPs)” (Boccalandro 2009, p. 1). For employers that aspire to implement effective EV programs, Points of Light and BCCCC have developed comprehensive tool kits available from their websites.

The tool kits of Points of Light and BCCCC are summarized in Table 2, which captures similarities between the practices suggested by the Points of Light (in column 1) and the drivers suggested by BCCCC (in column 2).

As shown in Table 2, Points of Light’s seven practices and BCCCC’s drivers are interrelated and complementary to each other. They fit into employers’ strategic management process that flows from strategic analysis, strategic formulation, and strategic implementation.

At the strategic analysis phase, employers need to have a good understanding of internal and external environment and the organization’s overarching goals. At this stage, Points of Light and BCCCC suggest employers’ clear vision and strategic

Table 2 Mechanisms for effective employee volunteering

Seven practices of effective EVP (Points of Light)	Drivers of effectiveness for EVGPs (BCCCC)
1. The <i>Plan</i> – Clear vision, strategies, efforts, and tactics to achieve specific goals for business, employees, and society	<i>Driver 1:</i> Cause-effective configuration – Structuring EVGPs to focus on specific causes, leverage employers’ resources, integrated to employer’s philanthropy, and productive partnerships
2. The <i>Design</i> – Alignment of employees’ motives, talents with corporate resources, societal impacts	<i>Driver 2:</i> Strategic business positioning – Aligning EVGPs with business goals, infrastructure, resonant causes, corporate citizenship strategy
3. <i>Leadership</i> – leadership supports at all level to further EV mission, goals, and plans	<i>Driver 3:</i> Sufficient investment – The existence of a strong team, operating budget, and grant support
4. <i>Partnership</i> – Strategic, high-impact collaborations with government, private, and nonprofit partners	<i>Driver 4:</i> Culture of engagement – Encouragement and facilitation to encourage employee involvement, including procedures, encouragement, departmental support, middle management outreach, senior management modeling, accessible information
5. <i>Employee Engagement</i> – Appeal to extrinsic and intrinsic motives of employees and access to all employees	<i>Driver 5:</i> Strong participation – Involving more than 50% of employees, generating at least 8 h/employee/year of volunteering
6. <i>Measurement</i> – Measurements of output, outcomes, and impact on business and societal causes	<i>Driver 6:</i> Actionable evaluation – Tracing participation and volume metrics, employee and nonprofit feedback, business, and social sector outcome metrics
7. <i>Success and Growth</i> – Communicating and celebrating success with internal and external stakeholders	

Adapted from (Boccalandro 2009; Points of Light 2017)

goals to tackle the intersection between the needs of business, employees, and society. Indeed, a study on the mission statements of 100 companies listed in Fortune 500 has found that employers that explicitly mention their commitment to solving social issues in their mission statements would ensure that they take necessary actions (Bartkus and Glassman 2008). Furthermore, Bhinekawati (2016) confirms that the mission statements containing CSR and corporate sustainability strategy would guide companies to achieve their strategic intent in contributing to Sustainable Development Goals.

At the strategy formulation phase, employers need to develop overall plans to succeed in EV implementation by using their strength, maximizing the opportunities, understanding their own weaknesses, and mitigating the threats simultaneously. At this stage, Points of Light and BCCCC suggest that employers should develop strategic business positioning by aligning EV with corporate citizenship strategy, societal causes, and business goals. Hence, companies can deploy suitable infrastructure and resources, as well as employees' talents and skills. By ensuring a strategic fit between EV activities with the company's strategic goals, core values, and resources, EV will bring competitive advantage for the employers (McCallum et al. 2013).

Lastly at the strategic implementation stage, Points of Light and BCCCC posit that leadership commitment at all level is important to build the culture, to ensure sufficient investment, to develop a strategic partnership with stakeholders, and to gain a high level of employee engagement. In this stage, employers should be able to cater to both intrinsic and extrinsic motives of the employees and make EV accessible to employees. BCCCC suggests that for large companies, it is expected that employers should provide at least 8 h of volunteering per year and involve more than 50% of employees to volunteer (Boccalandro 2009). Employers also need to evaluate the EV programs by measuring the output, outcomes, and impact of EV to the employees, business, and social causes. Lastly, Points of Light suggest that the lessons learned and success stories from EV should be communicated and celebrated with both internal and external stakeholders.

The whole process of strategic management is necessary to ensure the effective implementation of EV. A review of available documents issued by Fortune's 100 most admired companies reveals that those companies strategically integrate their EV into their CSR that leads to increased employee's organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and the external benefits for the company, especially the company reputation (Cycyota et al. 2016, p. 326). Indeed, EV requires employers to have a system within the organization in managing EV programs as there is a positive linkage between the effectiveness of EV and enabling policies (European Commission 2014).

In sum, effective EV management will mitigate potential sources of failures. BCCCC found the following five main weaknesses that contribute to the failures of EV programs implemented by Fortune 500 companies (Boccalandro 2009, p. i):

- EV programs are not strategically positioned as a business functioning
- Insufficient resources to support EV programs.

- Lack of procedures, practices, and guidelines to facilitate EV programs.
- Low employee participation due to lack of engagement.
- Lack of measurements and evaluation on the impacts of EV programs.

Those five reasons resonate with the findings from other studies. For example, Lukka (2000) found several reasons why EV fails, including lack of employees' awareness due to the lack of internal communication when a company has an EV program, the cultural difference between the company and its nonprofit partners, and the lack of support from top- and middle-level management. Another research by Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2015) reveals that volunteers would appreciate if the company shows true altruistic motives by supporting them to volunteer without expecting something in return. Hence, Gatignon-Turnau and Mignonac (2015) argue that CSEV may not necessarily bring positive impact to organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, depending on employees' perception on company's motives, whether it is perceived as truly altruistic or it is seen as a tactic to support company's "self-serving intentions" (p. 15). Furthermore, Lough and Turner (2018) also found that company leadership influences EV participation of employees who have intrinsic motives, while the integration of EV as part of performance management will attract employees who are motivated by extrinsic motives such as career progression. Nevertheless, it is necessary for employers to integrate EV in a performance review when they want to establish a culture of and commitment to volunteering within the organization (Allen 2012; Lough and Turner 2018). To conclude, the integration of EV into the strategic management process will mitigate potential risks of EV failures and enhance the possibility of EV contribution to an employer's strategic objectives.

4.3 Types of Employee Volunteering Activities

As discussed above, employee participation is one of the key success factors of the EV program. Therefore, when designing EV activities, employers need to consider employees' intrinsic (social-oriented) and extrinsic (career-oriented) motivations. Halley (1999) and Lukka (2000) found that employee-led activities will satisfy employees' intrinsic motives, while employer-initiated activities will attract employees with extrinsic motives. Table 3 summarizes the types of EV activities as suggested by Halley (1999) in Lukka (2000).

Several studies have shown interesting findings on the impacts of the above categories of EV activities. Lough and Turner (2018) found that offering employees with matching funds and time off for their volunteering activities will trigger their intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The types of employee-initiated activities like collaborating with peers and friends in handling social issues that require social services like helping homeless shelters or park cleanups will trigger social-oriented volunteers, whereas career-oriented volunteers prefer activities that are linked to skill development like doing consulting or mentoring, and they are more motivated if the

Table 3 Employee-led and employer-initiated employee volunteering activities

Employee-led activity supported and recognized by the employer	Employer- initiated activity
<p><i>Matching funds.</i> Employers match fundraised by employees through their volunteering events</p> <p><i>One-time local events.</i> Employee’s friends and families are invited to participate in an event organized by the local community</p> <p><i>In-kind contributions.</i> Employees donate equipment, facilities, or furniture on behalf of the company</p> <p><i>Volunteer awards.</i> Employer rewards employee’s achievement in their volunteering work</p> <p><i>Volunteering committees.</i> Employer allows employees to use the building facilities and resources to organize events which can generate publicity for the company</p> <p><i>Charity of the year.</i> Employee-initiated events supported by the employer to focus on a certain organization</p> <p><i>Time banks.</i> Employer allocates the same amount as the time invested by employees to volunteer in the community</p>	<p><i>Employee placement for a transition.</i> Full-time work for 6–24 months, usually in line with organizational change or employee retirement</p> <p><i>Short-term assignment.</i> A placement for about 100 h in a community organization so both the employees and the nonprofit organizations can learn from each other</p> <p><i>Team-building assignment.</i> An assignment in team-building training for about 3–4 days</p> <p><i>Coaching.</i> An assignment for one-on-one mentoring, usually on interpersonal skills for a few hours per month, for students or nonprofit organization staff</p> <p><i>Secondment.</i> The employees can bring managerial expertise while learning about decision-making and policy-making processes, as a board member of schools or nonprofit organizations</p>

Source: Adapted from Halley (1999) in Lukka (2000)

volunteering assignments are recognized formally by the organization (Points of Light 2015).

4.4 Benefits of Employee Volunteering

The benefits of EV to the employers and employees and society have been widely researched. EV will benefit the employees, companies, communities, and nonprofit organizations that work as the company’s partners in implementing employee volunteering programs (Rochlin et al. 2015). Generally, EV will enhance the relationships of related stakeholders involved in the program, as it gives opportunities for the employees, the nonprofit sectors, and the community to build social relationships, thereby building the quality of social capital in terms of the strength of the network, shared norms, and trust among parties involved in the EV program (Muthuri et al. 2009). Specifically, the benefits of EV can be categorized into “internal and external” benefits (Cycyota et al. 2016, p. 326) which can be summarized in Table 4.

In a nutshell, Cycyota et al. (2016) argue that internally, EV would enhance employee motivation as the EV opportunities will give a sense of altruism, meaningfulness that would give tangible and intangible rewards for companies that will increase their organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). In terms of skill

development, it can be achieved as employees gain variety in their tasks and improve their relational and social skills. Increased motivations and skills will contribute to employees' job satisfaction and higher organizational commitment. These will reduce turnover, increase productivity, and increase morale. Externally, EV would increase the company reputation that will attract potential employees, retain current employees, improve organizational culture, and strengthen brand equity. As for the contribution of EV to increase profitability, it can be achieved through enhanced customer perceptions about the company which contributes to customer loyalty. Finally, as there are improvements in stakeholder engagement through EV, the company will gain its legitimacy, community relations, and shareholder relations (p. 326).

The EV benefits listed in Table 4 are aligned with other research, including BCCCC survey on the impacts of EV to Fortune 500 companies (Boccalandro 2009) and the literature review by Lukka (2000). Lukka (2000) further posits that EV would enhance communication and caring culture within the company and between the community and the company. As such, EV will help companies to manage risks and reduce costs due to improvements in employee's skills and knowledge in dealing with stakeholders. EV also facilitates companies' strategic goal achievements in leadership development, builds their reputation as they are perceived as responsible companies by their related stakeholders, and create value for both the employees and nonprofit partners or larger communities through mutual relationship and continuous learning (McCallum et al. 2013).

5 A Snapshot of EV Implementation in Indonesia

To provide empirical evidence on the findings and tools from studies discussed in previous subchapters, a survey to 106 Indonesian employers was conducted during the period of January to March 2020. A convenience sampling method was used, with questionnaires distributed to 254 employers who are connected to the networks of Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen IPMI (IPMI) and Indonesia Business Links (IBL). Of

Table 4 Benefits of employee volunteering to employers

Internal benefits	External benefits
Enhanced employee motivation	Increased of company reputation
Enhanced organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB)	Attractive to potential employees
Enhanced employee soft skill	Enhanced employee retention
Enhanced employee satisfaction	Enhanced organizational culture
Enhanced organizational commitment	Strengthened brand equity
Reduced employee turnover	Increased profitability
Increased employee productivity	Enhanced customer perceptions
Increased employee morale	Enhanced customer loyalty
	Improved stakeholder engagement
	Enhanced company legitimacy

Source: Adapted from Cycyota et al. (2016)

254 questionnaires, 106 are returned, showing 60 employers (57%) integrate their EV with CSR strategy, 33 employers (31%) have EV programs but not integrated into CSR strategy, and 13 employers (12%) do not have EV programs.

The reasons of 13 employers for not having EV program is because EV is not part of their strategy and the organizations only have ad hoc charity activities, not involving volunteers, for their community relations purposes.

As for 33 employers who conduct EV but do not integrate it into their CSR strategy, they have EV programs as their corporate giving activities and community engagement programs. However, they do not claim those activities as CSR. The summary of the types of EV programs which are not part of CSR is depicted in Table 5.

As the purpose of this chapter is to get a deeper understanding of how employers integrate EV with their organizational strategy, this chapter focuses on exploring the practices of 60 respondents who stated that EV is part of their CSR strategy. The employers here are both public and private organizations that support EV which are initiated by employers or employees as defined by the European Commission (2014). The findings of the survey capture the demographic profiles of the respondents, the types of activities, the resources deployed for EV program, the benefits of EV to the employers, and the challenges faced by employers in managing EV.

5.1 Respondents' Profile

The unit of analysis of this chapter is the employer. As shown in Table 6, the majority of employers (75%) are private companies, followed by state-owned enterprises (13%), government (7%), and private higher education (5%).

Table 5 Employers with employee volunteering not part of CSR program

Categories	Activities	Respondents	Percent (%)
1. Health	Health-related donations	1	3
2. Education	Teaching children, scholarships, internships	12	37
3. Economic development	Entrepreneurship training for farmers, tourism village development, partnership with small business, financial literacy, asset management	8	24
4. Environment	Tree planting, waste management	2	6
5. Infrastructure	Small repairs for mosque, schools	2	6
6. Relief programs	Donations for orphans, foster children, lunches for surrounding communities	8	24
Total		33	100

Table 6 Type of institutions

Type of the institution	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Private higher education	3	5
Government	4	7
Private enterprise	45	75
State-owned enterprises	8	13
TOTAL	60	100

Table 7 Gender of respondents

Gender	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Male	38	63
Female	22	37
TOTAL	60	100

Table 8 Age group of respondents

Age group	Age	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Boomers	56–74 years old	9	15
Gen X	44–55 years old	11	18
Millennials	25–43 years old	38	63
Gen Z	< 25 years old	2	3
TOTAL		60	100

Table 9 Respondent's position in the organization

Positions	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Lower-level management	4	7
Middle-level management	31	52
Staff	6	10
Top-level management	19	32
TOTAL	60	100

As for the profile of respondents representing the employers to fill in the questionnaires, the survey categorizes them into gender (see Table 7), age group (see Table 8), and their positions in the companies (see Table 9).

In terms of business size, most of the employers are large companies employing more than 250 people (66%), followed by medium-sized enterprises (17%), small enterprises (10%), and microenterprises (7%) as presented in Table 10.

As for the lines of business, the respondents come from a diverse organization, but the majority comes from the banking and financial services (23%), mining and energy (17%), and consumer goods (10%), as shown in Table 11.

Table 10 Business sizes of respondents

Business size	Number of employees employed ^a	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Microenterprises	<10 employees	4	7
Small enterprises	10–49 employees	6	10
Medium-sized enterprises	50–249 employees	10	17
Large enterprises	>250 employees	40	66
TOTAL		60	100

^aNote: OECD categories of company size (<https://data.oecd.org/entrepreneur/enterprises-by-business-size.htm>)

Table 11 Types of industry integrating EV as a CSR strategy

The industry of the institutions	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Agriculture and agribusiness	2	3
Automotive	1	2
Banking, insurance, and financial services	14	23
Construction	3	5
Consulting	4	7
Consumer goods	6	10
Education	3	5
Mining and energy	10	17
Health	1	2
Manufacturing	1	2
Pharmaceuticals	2	3
Publishing	1	2
Real estate	2	3
Service	1	2
Shipping	5	8
Technology	2	3
Travel	2	3
TOTAL	60	100

5.2 Practices and Employers' Investment on Employee Volunteering

The survey found that EV has been practiced by the majority of respondents for more than 1 year, where the 42% of the respondents have conducted EV for over 6 years, as shown in Table 12.

The respondents also report the numbers of employees involved in EV, where half of the respondents (50%) have more than 50 employees per year as volunteers in their EV programs, of which 20% even have 250 employees or more per year which is considerably high, as summarized in Table 13.

As presented in Table 14, in terms of the time when the employees conduct their EV programs, the majority of respondents (60%) report that their employees are

Table 12 Length of experience in employee volunteering program

Length in conducting EV	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
<1 year	9	15
1–3 years	20	33
4–6 years	6	10
>6 (years	25	42
Total	60	100

Table 13 Average participants of employee volunteering program per year

Average participants of EV in a year	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
<10 persons	12	20
10–49 persons	10	17
50–249 persons	18	30
>249 persons	12	20
No data or don't know	8	13
TOTAL	60	100

Table 14 Time of employee volunteering implementation

Time of EV implementation	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Both inside and outside working hours	36	60
During free time or outside working hours	13	22
During working hours	11	18
Total	60	100

conducting EV programs both inside and outside working hours. Coupled with the above figures of Table 13, those reflect generous and serious attitudes of majority of the respondents toward EV.

As for the stakeholders involved in EV, from multiple answers from the respondents, the survey has captured that EV has actually involved both internal and external stakeholders of the employers, including the employees, customers, NGOs, and other social organizations, educational institutions, and local communities (see Table 15).

The survey also shows that the employers invest in the resources to support EV activities, including the use of company facilities, the time for employees to do volunteering activities, the money to support volunteers or to donate, and the training for volunteers (see Table 16).

When it comes to the types of facilities provided by employers to support EV programs, the survey captures a variety of facilities, including electronic equipment, vehicle building, transportations and accommodation, farmland, books, cleaning equipment, and merchandise (see Table 17).

Table 15 Stakeholders involved in employee volunteering

Stakeholders involved in EV	Number of respondents (multiple answers)	Percentage (%)
Customer of the company	24	40
NGO or other social organizations	27	45
Employees	60	100
Educational institutions	2	3
Local community	2	3
Government	2	3

Table 16 Employers' resources to support employee volunteering

Resources of the company	Number of respondents (multiple answers)	Percentage (%)
Use of company facilities	58	97
Time off exchange, where the company provides leave to the employees for volunteering	31	52
Money, as a reward to volunteers or for donations	28	47
Human resources for training or mentoring the volunteers	43	72

Table 17 Types of facilities provided for employee volunteering

Input (type of facilities)	Number of respondents (multiple answers)	Percentage (%)
Electronic equipment, e.g., laptop, projector, etc.	48	80
Vehicle	40	67
Building or venue	33	55
Flight ticket or accommodation	4	7
Agricultural or farmland	2	3
Books	1	2
Cleaning supplies or equipment (boots, gloves, trash bags, etc.)	1	2
Merchandise for people in the community who involved in the EV program (e.g., participants in training or workshop sessions)	1	2

5.3 Measuring Employee Volunteering Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts

One of the key success factors of EV is that the programs should be measured. All respondents measure the outputs of EV quantitatively on the numbers of activities or the numbers of people receiving benefits from EV programs as presented in Table 18.

Table 18 Outputs of employee volunteering

Outputs	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Number of participants based on the EV activities or program	3	5
Number of people reached for health services	3	5
Number of local people or community (teaching community)	11	18
Number of donation to children in needs	3	5
Number of scholarship distributed	1	2
Number of children or students being taught	14	23
Number of public facilities	6	10
Number of entrepreneurs and UMKM	6	10
Number of participants and sponsor in the event	1	2
Number of events	2	3
Number of houses built for the poor	1	2
Numbers of nutritional package	2	3
Numbers of the living environment covered	6	10
Number of worshippers	1	2
TOTAL	60	100

Table 19 Outcomes of employee volunteering programs

Outcomes	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Attitudes toward a sustainable environment	10	17
Conditions of public facilities	5	8
Understand the concept of financial literacy	5	8
Quality of home as a place to live	1	2
Employee's understanding of the culture of local people	1	2
Entrepreneurial capability	6	10
Improvement of children's education	6	10
Motivation to pursue higher education	3	5
Better health condition	4	7
Better condition for natural disaster victims	2	3
Nutritional improvement	2	3
Various life quality improvements	6	10
Volunteer understanding of social issues	2	3
Public understanding of the company	3	5
Better company operations	4	7
TOTAL	60	100

As for the outcomes, respondents measure the changes made through EV programs as shown in Table 19.

5.4 The Benefits of Employee Volunteering to Employers and Society

In terms of benefits of EV to the company, the survey supports previous studies about the internal and external benefits of EV. As shown in Table 20, EV has contributed to the employers in the aspects of human capital development, organizational citizenship behavior, business performance, and social responsibility of the organization.

As for the benefits of EV to broader societal and environmental issues as stipulated in Sustainable Development Goals, the survey found that respondents' activities relate and contribute to the achievement of the 17 SDGs through EV activities where companies focus on certain social and environmental issues. Table 19 shows respondents' contributions to the improvements of environmental quality and climate change (32%), quality education (23%), economic opportunities and decent work (20%), eradication of poverty and hunger (13%), and improvement of health and well-being (12%) (Table 21).

5.5 Challenges and Key Success Factors in Conducting Employee Volunteering

In terms of challenges in conducting EV, the survey supports previous findings suggested by BCCC discussed in Sect. 4. Table 22 shows the challenges faced by respondents in conducting effective EV, relating the major challenges captured, i.e., lack of employee engagement (32%) and limited time and fund (27%), with findings

Table 20 Employers' internal and external benefits of employee volunteering

Internal and external benefits of EV	Number of respondents (multi-answers)	Percentage (%)
Employee recruitment	7	12
Employee retention, morale, or work-life balance	11	18
Employee skill development	33	55
Employee team building	2	3
Public relations, branding, and reputation	24	40
Improved morale and motivation	14	23
Development of caring culture and community service	13	22
Better communication across the company	1	2
Being seen as a good citizen, trust-building with the community, and gaining a "license to operate"	3	5
Sales and profitability	5	8

Table 21 Employee volunteering contributions to SDGs

Sustainable Development Goals	Activities	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
No poverty and zero hunger	Charity event management, food supplies to surrounding communities	8	13
Good health and well-being	Counseling on health services, nutrition improvement programs	7	12
Quality education	Book donations, scholarships, internships	14	23
Decent work, economic growth, inequalities	Entrepreneurship education, women entrepreneur development, financial literacy	12	20
Environmental issues – Sustainable cities and communities, climate change, life on land, life below water	Biopore infiltration holes, environmental research and observation, trash cleanup in tourism areas, waste management	19	32
TOTAL		60	100

Table 22 Challenges in implementing employee volunteering

Challenges in EV implementation	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Lack of employee engagement	19	32
The capacity of the third sector organization	2	3
The knowledge gap between company and its partners	2	3
Limited time and funds	16	27
Partnerships with community groups	9	15
Permit to execute the program	1	2
Consistency and continuity	4	7
Access to the EV location	1	2
Integration of social and business benefits	2	3
No obstacles yet	4	7
TOTAL	60	100

in Table 13. With the average participants of EV program per year, there is an indication that despite the challenges, half of the respondents have done well in overcoming them, therefore enabling to attract a good number of employee volunteers.

Finally, the survey also captures the key success factors for EV implementation which resonates with the BCCCC and Points of Light assertions discussed in Sect. 4. The summary of respondents' views of key success factors is depicted in Table 23.

Overall, the survey on EV implementations in Indonesia provides empirical evidence that illuminates the linkages between EV motivations, inputs, and activities

Table 23 Key success factors of employee volunteering programs

Key success factors in EV	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
It focuses on causes for which the company is especially well suited to support	23	38
A company culture that promotes the employee involvement in the community	13	22
A good evaluation for the results of the employee volunteering program	9	15
Sufficient investment or resources from the company	2	3
Levels of investment or participation from the majority of employees	5	8
The goals of volunteer project contribute toward the company business success	8	13
TOTAL	60	100

conducted by employers and employees, the benefits of EV to internal and external stakeholders, key success factors and challenges of implementing EV, and overall impact of EV to SDGs.

6 Discussions

The phenomena of EV in Indonesia support the findings of previous research on EV in several ways. Firstly, EV as part of CSR program is driven by intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to serve business needs and societal causes, respectively (Basu and Palazzo 2008), as illustrated by HR Manager of a Consumer Goods Company 2, “Our corporate values drive us to care for communities. . . . We work with communities with mutual respects to solve social issues while helping the company to achieve its long-term sustainability goals,” and by the Manager of Private Bank 2, “Our EV programs are designed to involve employees in social activities aside from their routine work responsibilities.”

Secondly, as suggested by previous studies (e.g., Lukka 2000), EV can be initiated by the employers and employees, and it can be implemented within and outside working hours where companies provide supports in terms of facilities and time off for employees. The survey in Indonesia reveals that the program can be driven by employees: “Our employee volunteering activities are driven by employees’ initiatives, and they are integrated into our overall CSR strategy. . . . It makes me feel motivated because I see my company cares about our surrounding communities” (IT Manager, Insurance Company). Furthermore, the survey shows that employers allow EV programs to use company facilities, provide time off for employees involved in EV, give monetary donations for the programs, and provide training and mentoring for employees to conduct EV.

Thirdly, EV generates internal and external benefits to employers (Cycyota et al. 2016). Internally, EV would enhance employee skills and motivation that lead to

increase their organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). The survey shows that 33 respondents stated that EV has improved the skills, for instance: “Employee volunteering has improved our employees’ public speaking skills” (Executive Director, Central Bank). Furthermore, 11 respondents expressed their pride for working in company that have EV program, for example: “I am very proud to be part of my company’s volunteering program as I can make a difference by contributing directly to improving social conditions” (Senior Analyst, State Owned Company 1). Externally, EV would increase of company reputation that will attract potential employees, retain current employees, improve organizational culture, and strengthen brand equity and eventually increase profitability (Cycyota et al. 2016). The evidence from Indonesia has shown that EV contributes to the enhancement of the employers’ public relations, branding, and reputation, in addition to being seen as a good citizen. Overall, EV have facilitated trust-building with the community and gaining a “license to operate” which reduce social risks and contribute to higher profitability.

Fourthly, EV can contribute to the mitigation of the world’s problems if companies around the globe allow their employees to volunteer (Rodell et al. 2017). The survey in Indonesia shows that EV contributes to the achievement of SDGs in eradicating poverty and hunger by providing food supplies to surrounding communities; in improving good health and well-being by providing counseling on health services and nutrition improvement programs; in supporting quality education by donating books and providing scholarships and internships; in facilitating decent work, economic growth, and reduction of inequalities by providing entrepreneurship education, women entrepreneurs development, and financial literacy; and in dealing with environmental issues related to sustainable cities and communities, climate change, life on land, and life below water by preserving the land, conducting environmental research and observation and trash cleanup in tourism areas, and improving waste management system.

Finally, the survey also identifies the key success factors and challenges in conducting EV. Points of Light (2017) and BCCCC (Boccalandro 2009) suggest that employers need to have clear vision and strategic goals to tackle the intersection between the needs of business, employees, and society. The survey found that majority of respondents agree that EV should be placed within the strategic goals of the company. For instance: “Employee volunteering is integrated into our corporate strategy, so we can sustain our program. . . The program has to be aligned with our overall strategy in entering new market or in promoting our brands to community” (Manager, Private Bank 2). As for the challenges, the study found that the biggest challenges for implementing EV are lack of employee engagement, limited resources, and difficulties to finding the right partners to collaborate. The Department Head of Private Bank 3 mentioned: “We still have challenges in attracting employees to join our employee volunteering program,” and a Group Head of an Agribusiness Company said: “Finding suitable local champions and partners to collaborate is one of the main challenges in our employee volunteering.”

Overall, a linkages between CSR strategies; benefits of EV to the employers, employees, and society; and EV impacts in contributing to SDGs can be drawn from

a combination of empirical evidence from Indonesia and findings from previous studies on EV. Such a conclusion is discussed in the next section.

7 Summary

This chapter contribute to EV, CSR, OCB, corporate sustainability, and sustainable development discussions by providing snapshots of important aspects of EV, including different terminologies used by researchers and companies; global trends of EV implementation; effective management of EV; impacts of EV to the employers, employees, and society; and challenges in EV implementation. This chapter also highlights EV implementation in Indonesia based on a recent survey designed for gaining empirical evidence to support this chapter. In conclusion, a virtuous cycle between EV as part of CSR strategy, corporate sustainability, and SDGs can be drawn. Firstly, the chapter has shown that EV can be applied as a strategic management tool of an employer to obtain internal benefits of improving OCB and external benefits of enhancing stakeholder management and corporate reputation while solving sustainable development issues. Secondly, the chapter has provided insights on how employers can implement EV effectively by considering intrinsic and extrinsic motives of both employers and employees. Thirdly, EV programs have the potential to contribute to every aspect of SDGs as the activities are conducted at community level, touching the lives of people directly. The global trends of EV have shown that over 90% Fortune 500 companies are having EV program, while in Indonesia, 88% companies in the survey also have EV activities (57% have integrated EV into their CSR strategy). Evidence from Indonesia also shown that EV programs have dealt with the issues stipulated in SDGs including poverty, hunger, good health and well-being, education, decent work, economic growth, and inequalities, as well as environmental issues covering sustainable cities and communities, climate change, life on land, and life below water. Therefore, globally EV can be a very powerful force for employers around the globe to achieve their economic, social, and environmental goals simultaneously by contributing to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals collectively.

8 Cross-References

- ▶ [Community Involvement](#)
- ▶ [Corporate Social Responsibility \(CSR\) in Multinational Companies \(MNCs\), Small-to-Medium Enterprises \(SMEs\), and Small Businesses](#)
- ▶ [CSR / Sustainability Reporting and Disclosure](#)
- ▶ [Definitions of Corporate Social Responsibility](#)
- ▶ [Ethics and Sustainability](#)
- ▶ [Triple Bottom Line](#)
- ▶ [Work-Life-Balance and Well-Being at Work](#)

Acknowledgments This chapter is jointly funded by the research funds of Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen IPMI and PT Bhineka Belitung Lestari.

References

- Aguinis H, Glavas A (2012) What we know and Don't know about corporate social responsibility: a review and research agenda. *J Manag* 38(4):932–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311436079>
- Allen K (2012) The big tent: corporate volunteering in the global age. Ariel and Fundación Telefónica, Madrid
- Allen K, Galiano M, Hayes S (2011) Global companies volunteering globally – final report of the global corporate volunteering research project. The International Association for Volunteer Effort, Dulles. <https://iave.org/iavewp/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Global-Companies-Volunteering-Globally-English.pdf>
- Barkay T (2012) Employee volunteering: soul, body and CSR. *Soc Responsibility J* 8(1):48–62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1747111211196566>
- Bartkus BR, Glassman M (2008) Do firms practice what they preach? The relationship between mission statements and stakeholder management. *J Bus Ethics* 83:207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9612-0>
- Basu K, Palazzo G (2008) Corporate social responsibility: a process model of sensemaking. *Acad Manag Rev* 33(1):122–136. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2008.27745504>
- Benefacto (2018) Employee volunteering statistics in the UK 2018. Benefacto, London. <https://benefacto.org/employee-volunteering-statistics-uk/>
- Bhinekawati R (2016) Corporate social responsibility and sustainable development: social capital and corporate development in developing economies. Routledge, Oxon. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315395463>
- Boccalandro (2009) Mapping success in employee volunteering: the drivers of effectiveness for employee volunteering giving programs and fortune 500 performance. Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship, Boston. www.abccc.net/document/docWindow.cfm?fuseaction=01%0Adocument.viewDocument&documentid%011308%0A&documentFormatId%012312
- Bussell H, Forbes D (2008) How UK universities engage with their local communities: a study of employer supported volunteering. *Int J Nonprofit Volunt Sect Mark* 13(14):363–378. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.331>
- Carroll AB (1979) A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Acad Manag Rev* 4(4):497–505. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257850>
- Cook J, Burchell J (2018) Bridging the gaps in employee volunteering: why the third sector Doesn't always win. *Nonprofit Volunt Sect Q* 47(1):165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764017734649>
- Crowther D (2008) The maturing of corporate social responsibility: a developmental process. In: Crowther D, Capaldi N (eds) *The Ashgate research companion to corporate social responsibility*. Routledge, Oxon, p n.d.
- Cycyota CS, Ferrante CJ, Schroeder JM (2016) Corporate social responsibility and employee volunteerism: what do the best companies do? *Bus Horiz* 59(3):321–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2016.01.004>
- Dreesbach-Bundy S, Scheck B (2017) Corporate volunteering: a bibliometric analysis from 1990 to 2015. *Bus Ethics* 26(3):240–256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12148>
- Edelman (2019) 2019 Edelman trust barometer: global report. https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2019-02/2019_Edelman_Trust_Barometer_Global_Report.pdf
- European Commission (2014) Employee volunteering and employee volunteering in humanitarian aid in Europe. https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/euaidvolunteers/EUAV_Study_Employee_Volunteering_Europe_FINAL_en.pdf

- Federation of Korean Industries (2018) Social Contribution White Paper. 2018. Available online: <http://www.fki.or.kr> (accessed on 20 February 2020)
- Gatignon-Turnau AL, Mignonac K (2015) (Mis) using employee volunteering for public relations: implications for corporate volunteers' organizational commitment. *J Bus Res* 68(2015):7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.05.013>
- Grant AM (2012) Giving time, time after time: work design and sustained employee participation in corporate volunteering. *Acad Manag Rev* 37(4):589–615. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0280>
- Halley D (1999) Complete guide to employee community involvement: for employers and employees and community Organisations. Corporate Citizenship, London
- Im S, Chung YW (2018) Employee volunteering meaningfulness and organizational citizenship behavior: exploring the effects of organizational support, pride, and trust. *Sustainability (Switzerland)* 10:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10124835>
- Krasnopolskaya I, Roza L, Meijs LCPM (2016) The relationship between corporate volunteering and employee civic engagement outside the workplace in Russia. *Voluntas*:1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-015-9599-6>
- Lee L, Chen LF (2018) Boosting employee retention through CSR: a configurational analysis. *Corp Soc Responsib Environ Manag* 25:948–960. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1511>
- Lee L, Higgins C (2001) Corporate volunteering. *J Corp Citizsh* 4:79–90. <https://doi.org/10.9774/gleaf.4700.2001.wi.00008>
- Lorenz C, Gentile GC, Wehner T (2011) How, why, and to what end? Corporate volunteering as corporate social performance. *Int J Bus Environ* 4(2):183–205. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbe.2011.040174>
- Lough BJ, Turner YS (2018) How to accelerate volunteering through employee volunteer Programmes. *J Corp Citizsh* 67:77–94. <https://doi.org/10.9774/tandf.4700.2017.se.00007>
- Lukka P (2000) Employee volunteering: a literature review. The Institute of Volunteering Research, London. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Employee-volunteering%3A-A-literature-review-Lukka/8257639222eb8c52ca10c34666ad02590d1f9f89>
- Mathieu M, Gibson C, Kim J (2004) Developing excellence in workplace volunteer programs: guidelines for success. Hands On Network, Washington, DC. https://www.unitedwayjwc.org/sites/unitedwayjwc.org/files/Developing_Excellence_Workplace_Volunteer_Programs.pdf
- McCallum S, Schmid MA, Price L (2013) CSR: a case for employee skills-based volunteering. *Soc Responsibility J* 9(3):479–495. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-04-2012-0053>
- Mozes M, Josman Z, Yaniv E (2011) Corporate social responsibility organizational identification and motivation. *Soc Responsibility J* 7(2):310–325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1747111111111141558>
- Muthuri JN, Matten D, Moon J (2009) Employee volunteering and social capital: contributions to corporate social responsibility. *Br J Manag* 20:75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00551.x>
- Pelozo J, Hudson S, Hassay DN (2009) The marketing of employee volunteerism. *J Bus Ethics* 85:371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9734-z>
- Perez MJ, Poyatos JA, Bosioc D, Civico G, Kahn K, Loro S (2014) Employee volunteering and employee volunteering in humanitarian AID in Europe. European Commission, Brussels. http://ec.europa.eu/%0Aecho/files/eauidvolunteers/EUAV_Study_Employee_Volunteering_Europe_FINAL_en.pdf
- Plewa C, Conduit J, Quester PG, Johnson C (2015) The impact of corporate volunteering on CSR image: a consumer perspective. *J Bus Ethics*:1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2066-2>
- Points of Light (2015) What makes your employees tick? Understanding your workforce and engaging your employees in service. Points of Light Corporate Institute, Washington, DC. <https://www.pointsoflight.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/What-Makes-Your-Employees-Tick.pdf>

- Points of Light (2017) What's working: effective employee volunteering in Asia a framework for corporate volunteer leaders. Points of Light Corporate Institute, Washington, DC. <https://www.pointsoflight.org/resources/whats-working-effective-employee-volunteering-in-asia/>
- Rochlin S, Bliss R, Jordan S, Kiser YC (2015) Defining the competitive and financial advantages of corporate responsibility and sustainability. IO Sustainability, Boston
- Rodell JB (2013) Finding meaning through volunteering: why do employees volunteer and what does it mean for their jobs? *Acad Manag J* 56:1274–1294. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0611>
- Rodell JB, Breitsohl H, Schröder M, Keating DJ (2016) Employee volunteering: a review and framework for future research. *J Manag* 42:55–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315614374>
- Rodell JB, Booth JE, Lynch JW, Zipay KP (2017) Corporate volunteering climate: mobilizing employee passion for societal causes and inspiring future charitable action. *Acad Manag J* 60(5):1662–1681. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0726>
- Runte M, Basil DZ (2011) Personal and corporate volunteerism: employee motivations. *Int J Bus Environ* 4(2):133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbe.2011.040171>
- Schlenkhoff-Hus A (2018) Corporate volunteering: an international comparison. In: Dreesbach-Bundy S, Scheck B (eds) *CSR und corporate volunteering*, pp 91–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54092-3_6
- Toppe CM, Kirsch AD, Michel J (2001) Giving and volunteering in the United States: findings from a National Survey, 2001 Edition. Independent Sector, Washington, DC. <http://www.cpanda.org/pdfs/gv/GV01Report.pdf>
- United Nations (2019) The sustainable development goals report 2019. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2019.pdf>
- Volonteuropa (2015) Mobilising citizens for global justice (2015). Volonteuropa, London. <https://volonteuropa.eu/resources/mobilising-citizens-for-global-justice-2015/>
- Volunteering Australia (2015) Key facts and statistics about volunteering in Australia. Volunteering Australia, Victoria. Retrieved from <https://www.volunteeringaustralia.org/wp-content/uploads/VA-Key-statistics-about-Australian-volunteering-16-April-20151.pdf>