

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study found out that:

1. Corporate social responsibility has positive impact on internal employees only when the company truly incorporate those in their policies. Otherwise the employees tend to perceive them as a mere alternative in marketing campaign.
2. Corporate social responsibility has a positive relationship where the sense of pride described in previous point encourage the employee to take initiatives in representing the company's value proposition and reputation.
3. Employee activism in company S is not as high as expected though from interviews conducted with the sources there are statements indicating the trend, as explained before in previous chapter where almost all of the employees interviewed even when their engagement level is different, they still want to represent their company in the eyes of public. They defend their company's reputation both online and off.

5.2. Recommendation

1. For next researcher

It is hoped the next researcher could extend the time frame required for observation to fully capture the working environment of

company S and also expand the type of sources in order to obtain richer and more robust data.

2. For management

Surely having activism will benefit the company as explained before, but since not all employees are the same, so for each category there is a different suggestion:

- a. Pro-Activist: since their activism level is already high, all the company S need to do is to reinforce their behaviour further, especially their perception on top activism drivers (leadership, internal communication, human resources development and corporate social responsibility). By improving these factors they would be even more eager to share with others the company values.
- b. Pre-Activist: this category has a potential to be pro-activist., however they lack the necessary thrust forward. So management or the employer need to boost their motivation through ways of communication that matter, encouraging these people to take action. Other action would be modifying leadership style to that respond to employees' changes quickly. Decreasing the bridge between employer and employees thus enabling more meaningful motivation. The more employees feel they're making real contribution, they become more eager in becoming activist.
- c. Hyper-actives: same as previous category, this category has a potential to be activist. But since their unpredictable nature,

they can bring damage or bring fortune to the company hence careful management is required. The employer, company S, should provide socially 'shareable' content with them while supervising it by providing guidelines of what to do and not. This category has somewhat changing perception about the top drivers, therefore the management should communicate with them frequently. When these people feel acknowledged and appreciated, they would be motivated and perform better.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barney, J. B. (2009). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: a ten year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, 643-650.
- Bourne, L. (2012). *Stakeholder Relationship Management: A Maturity Model for Organisational Implementation*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing Ltd.
- Carroll, A. B. (2000). Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct. *Business and Society*, 268-295.
- Chemiss, C. (1989). *Staff Burnout - Job Stress in Human Services*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Cox, D. (2015, May 5). *The true impact of employee engagement in business performance*. Retrieved from International Association Business Communicators: <http://cw.iabc.com/2015/05/05/true-impact-employee-engagement-business-performance/>
- Forbes. (2016, February). *America's Best Employers*. Retrieved from Forbes: <http://www.forbes.com/best-employers/list>
- Gallup. (2014). *Q12 Employee Engagement Survey Report*. Washington D.C.: Gallup.
- Harrison, K. (2010). *Why a good corporate reputation is important to organisation*. Retrieved from Cutting Edge PR : http://www.cuttingedgepr.com/articles/corprep_important.asp
- Jawa Pos. (2015, October 24). *Sampoerna Patut Ditiru, Sejahterakan Petani Tembakau dan Cengkeh*. Retrieved from JawaPos: <http://www.jawapos.com/read/2015/10/24/8097/sampoerna-patut-ditiru-sejahterakan-petani-tembakau-dan-cengkeh/1>

- Jawa Post. (2015, May 16). *Larang Iklan Rokok di TV, Potensi Pemasukan Rp 750 M Menghilang*. Retrieved from Jawa Pos: <http://www2.jawapos.com/baca/artikel/17344/Larang-Iklan-Rokok-di-TV-Potensi-Pemasukan-Rp-750-M-Hilang>
- Kielmas, M. (2013). *Pro and Cons of CSR*. Retrieved from Chron: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/pros-cons-corporate-social-responsibility-56247.html>
- Knight, R. (2015, April 9). *How to Overcome Burnout and Stay Motivated*. Retrieved from Harvard Business Review: <https://hbr.org/2015/04/how-to-overcome-burnout-and-stay-motivated>
- Kruse, K. (2012, June 22). *What is Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from Forbes: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kevinkruse/2012/06/22/employee-engagement-what-and-why/#5a8ef0cb4629>
- Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, B. C. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Satisfaction and Market Value. *Journal of Marketing*, 1-18.
- Mehdi, T. (2008). *Corporate Social Responsibility*. Melbourne: Deakin University.
- Mirvis, P. H. (2012, June). Employee Engagement and CSR: Transactional, Relational and Developmental Approaches. *California Management Review*, pp. 93-100.
- Ray, G., Barney, J. B., & Muhanna, W. A. (2004). Capabilities, Business Process, and Competitive Advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23-27.
- Redmond, B. F. (2016, January 15). *PSYCH 484: Work Attitudes and Job Motivation*. Retrieved from Confluence: Pennsylvania State University:

<https://wikispaces.psu.edu/display/PSYCH484/3.+Reinforcement+Theory>

- Saul, D. (2012, October 12). *CSR and Its Impact on Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from HR: <http://www.hr magazine.co.uk/article-details/csr-and-its-impact-on-employee-engagement>
- Shuch, B., & Wollard, K. K. (2011). *Antecedents to Employees Engagement: A Structured Review of the Literature*. Fort Lauderdale: Sage Publishing.
- Siegel, D., & D.F., V. (2007). An Empirical Analysis of the Strategic Use of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 773-792.
- Siwden, R., & Office, C. (2011, August 30). Managing successful programmes.
- Team, T. (2014, September 9). *Philip Morris is Likely to Further Gains in Indonesia*. Retrieved from Forbes: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/greatspeculations/2014/09/12/p hilip-morris-likely-to-further-gains-in-indonesia/#30c2d5e36562>
- Weber Shandwick. (2014). *Employees Rising: Seizing the Opportunity in Employee Activism*. New York: Weber Shandwick.
- Werther, W., & Chandler, D. (2006). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Stakeholders in a Global Environment*. London: Sage Publications.
- Windsor, D. (2001). *Corporate Citizenship: Evolution and Interpretation*. Sheffield: Greenleaf.
- Zhang, D. (2011). *Organisational Citizenship Behaviour*. Auckland: White Paper.

