**Background**

A lot of organizations around the world attempt to elicit positive social change by engaging in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Within organizations, “micro-CSR”, or CSR experienced and measured at the level of the employee, has been woefully underrepresented (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Accordingly, this research moves toward a greater understanding of the experience employee “felt responsibility” on socially (ir)responsible actions in and out of the organization as impacted by a number of personal and environmental traits.

**Model**
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**Hypotheses**

1. Higher employee felt responsibility will be positively associated with a) greater CSR behaviors at work and b) greater general socially responsible behavior outside of work.
2. Employee proactive personality moderates the positive relationship between felt responsibility and a) CSR behaviors, b) general socially responsible behaviors at outside of work such that the relationship is strengthened when proactive personality is higher.
3. Individuals’ moral identity moderates the positive relationship between felt responsibility and a) employee CSR behaviors and b) general socially responsible behaviors such that the relationship is stronger when moral identity is higher.
4. Individuals’ felt responsibility will negatively predict deontic retaliatory behaviors when they perceive organizational CSR as low.
5. The interaction effect between CSR perception and felt responsibility on deontic retaliatory behaviors will be moderated by individual differences in moral identity, such that the interaction will be attenuated when moral identity is high (due to moral self-regulatory processes).

**Methods**

**Participants:** Surveys were distributed to employees of a university in the United States. All participants were asked to indicate how much they agree to the statements in Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5.

**Measures:** All measures were adopted from validated scales, except for employee CSR behavior and general social responsibility. For these measures, items were adopted from various literatures and scales as well as in consultation with administrators of a major CSR endeavor in play at the university site.

**Results**

**Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Internal Consistency Reliabilities of Study Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Felt Responsibility</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee CSR Perception</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proactive Personality</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moral Identity</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee CSR Behaviors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. General Social Responsibility</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Deontic Retaliation</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 94. Reliability estimates were reported in the parentheses along the diagonal. *p < .05. **p < .01.

**Figure 1. Two way interaction testing for Hypothesis 4**

**Figure 2. Three way interaction testing for Hypothesis 5**

**Conclusion**

- H1 was supported. Main effects showed that individuals’ felt responsibility predicted socially responsible behaviors at work (Employee CSR Behavior) and outside the workplace (General Socially Responsible Behaviors).
- H2 & H3 were not supported. Both proactive personality and moral identity had significant effects directly on socially responsible behaviors. However, as moderators, they did not account for variance beyond the initial effect of felt responsibility for either type of socially responsible behaviors.
- H4 (the two-way interaction of FR and CSR Percep) was confirmed. Low felt responsibility individuals showed “deontic reactions” (punishment behaviors when observing injustice); whereas high felt responsibility individuals acted in ways consistent with “moral licensing” (i.e., retaliating more when CSR is low).
- H5 also received support. The three-way interaction was such that moral licensing only held for individuals high in both felt responsibility and moral identity. For all other MI/FR combinations, individuals showed deontic reactions. This suggests that although felt responsibility and moral identity seems to engage moral self-regulation, these “positive” traits can also backfire to cause unexpected consequences, even within organizations with ethical/responsible climates.
- Sample size and consequently, statistical power should be considered when interpreting our results. Future research is needed.