

Contextualizing Individual Competencies for Managing the Corporate Social Responsibility Adaptation Process: The Apparent Influence of the Business Case Logic

Business & Society

1–35

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0007650316676270

bas.sagepub.com



Eghe R. Osagie¹, Renate Wesselink¹,
Vincent Blok¹, and Martin Mulder¹

Abstract

Companies committed to corporate social responsibility (CSR) should ensure that their managers possess the appropriate competencies to effectively manage the CSR adaptation process. The literature provides insights into the individual competencies these managers need but fails to prioritize them and adequately contextualize them in a manner that makes them meaningful in practice. In this study, we contextualized the competencies within the different job roles CSR managers have in the CSR adaptation process. We interviewed 28 CSR managers, followed by a survey to explore the relative importance of the competencies within each job role. Based on our analysis, we identified six distinct managerial roles, including strategic, coordinating, and stimulating roles. Next, we identified per role key individual CSR-related competencies as prioritized by the respondents. Our results show that

¹Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands

Corresponding Author:

Eghe R. Osagie, Chair Group Education and Competence Studies, Social Science Group, Wageningen School of Social Sciences, Wageningen University & Research, P.O. Box 8130, 6700 EW Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Email: eghe.osagie@han.nl

the context, as indicated in this study by CSR managers' job roles, indeed influenced the importance of particular CSR-related competencies, because each role seems to require a different combination and prioritization of these competencies. Moreover, the results suggest that the relative importance of these competencies within each role may be driven by business logic rather than an idealistic logic. The results are presented as a competence profile which can serve as a reflection tool and as a frame of reference to further develop the competence profile for CSR managers.

Keywords

corporate social responsibility (CSR), CSR adaptation process, CSR manager, individual competencies, job roles

In addition to ensuring profits for their shareholders, companies should also account for their societal and environmental performance. Most companies address these issues through their corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs. CSR is often referred to as a company's continuing commitment to integrate ecological, social, and economic concerns in company's operations and in its interactions with stakeholders; CSR is usually done on a voluntary basis (Dahlsrud, 2008). Some companies include CSR in their strategic agenda, as they consider it their moral obligation to ensure economic prosperity as well as to contribute to society; others view CSR primarily as a business opportunity (Banerjee, 2001), engage in CSR in response to external pressures (Marano & Kostova, 2016), or are motivated by a combination of these factors (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). Regardless of the nature of their decision, a company's CSR ambition and resulting CSR-related activities can benefit stakeholders, including the company's employees, local communities, and environmental representatives (Nguyen & Slater, 2010; Veldhuizen, Blok, & Dentoni, 2013). For example, CSR can attract highly competent workers via the promise of favorable working conditions (Greening & Turban, 2000) and potentially increase company's financial performance (Tang, Hull, & Rothenberg, 2012; Van Beurden & Gössling, 2008). Thus, understanding how a company can improve its CSR performance is highly relevant for all stakeholders involved.

For companies that perceive CSR as a strategic objective, adapting to CSR principles involves more than simply implementing CSR in isolated business practices (e.g., sustainable procurement) or developing a code of conduct. These companies need to pay continuous attention to the adaptation process because CSR challenges are complex, meaning that there is no definite formulation of

what the problem is because it is ever-changing and context dependent (Maon, Lindgreen, & Swaen, 2009; Rittel & Webber, 1973). Thus, strategic CSR requires a continuous adaptation process in which a company's structure and competencies are continuously developed to improve or maintain company's effectiveness in dealing with the changing needs of internal and external stakeholders (Moran & Brightman, 2001). As such, it is generally accepted that companies should internalize CSR into business processes, policies, and systems when aiming to establish CSR practices that are effective in the long run (Holder-Webb, Cohen, Nath, & Wood, 2009; Jamali, 2008). For many established companies, however, adapting to and internalizing CSR principles remains a significant challenge (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Carroll & Shabana, 2010). Consequently, many scholars have studied factors that can facilitate the CSR adaptation process and have proposed CSR change models (e.g., Vidal, Kozak, & Hansen, 2012).

Scholars have also studied the role and influence of company's human capital on the CSR adaptation process. That is, managers and leaders play a crucial role in change processes, as they greatly influence employees' work behavior and because they can increase employees' commitment to achieving company's goals with respect to the change by being visible and supportive toward the intended change (Burge, 2003; Furst & Cable, 2008). As such, many scholars study CSR leadership and management by primarily addressing the role and support of the CEO. However, Waldman, Siegel, and Javidan (2006) called for more research on CSR leadership and management at various levels within a company, because other professionals within the company are usually the ones who actually drive and manage the CSR adaptation process. This study focuses on these professionals, who are referred here to as CSR managers.

There is some research available on the job profile of CSR managers. Several of these studies focus on characteristics such as managers' cognitive style (Wong, Ormiston, & Tetlock, 2011) and personality and values (e.g., Fernández, Junquera, & Ordiz, 2006). Most recently, there is an emergent research area that focuses on the individual competencies that are needed by CSR managers (e.g., Osagie, Wesselink, Blok, Lans, & Mulder, 2016; Rieckmann, 2012). These studies provide laundry lists of individual competencies, including competencies such as "systems thinking" and "anticipatory thinking." However, for the proposed individual competencies to be meaningful and useful for practitioners and as such contribute to the company's strategic objectives, the competencies must be contextualized in such a way that they can inform current and future CSR managers about effective behavior in the CSR adaptation process (Delamare Le Deist & Winterton, 2005). To date, such contextualization is largely lacking. Moreover, there is still the

question whether CSR managers need to develop all of the proposed individual competencies, or whether there are particular competencies that must be emphasized due, for example, to job roles they have in the CSR adaptation process. Contextualization can help to prioritize these CSR-related individual competencies.

An accepted way to contextualize work-related behavior, such as competencies, is to determine the job roles and tasks needed to reach a specific objective (Johns, 2006). A job role can be perceived as a set of related tasks that is assigned to a person. Several roles can be assigned to one individual, and each role can require a specific set of competencies (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2007). Therefore, our aim is to contextualize the proposed CSR competencies within the CSR manager's job roles. In doing so, this study adds to the existing literature regarding individual CSR-related competencies by (a) empirically identifying and exploring the important job roles CSR managers have in the CSR adaptation process and by (b) exploring the relative importance of the individual competencies that are proposed in the literature within these job roles. Gaining insight into these matters will help frame the context in which CSR managers' behavior should be interpreted by researchers and practitioners. Furthermore, this study will provide practitioners and researchers with an initial competence profile which can guide CSR managers' personal reflection process and which researchers can use as an initial step to further develop the competence profile for CSR managers.

The remaining sections of this article are organized as follows. First, we will elaborate on the concept of "competence" and relate it to the concept of dynamic capabilities. Next, we will discuss the literature regarding individual competencies with respect to the CSR adaptation process and the importance of identifying relevant job roles. Third, we will describe the methods used in this study. Fourth, we will present our findings. Finally, we will discuss the study's theoretical and practical contributions.

Theoretical Framework

Dynamic Capabilities and Competencies

Several scholars have stressed the importance of dynamic capabilities for strategic CSR. According to the dynamic capability perspective, companies generate and sustain competitive advantages through their dynamic capabilities. These capabilities refer to a company's capacity to integrate, reconfigure, renew, and update its resources in response to the changing environment (Teece & Pisano, 1994; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Wang & Ahmed, 2007). The ever-changing nature of CSR challenges makes such dynamic

capabilities especially important for companies aiming for strategic advantages through CSR.

Ramachandran (2011) identified two essential dynamic capabilities needed for strategic CSR success, namely, “sense and respond capability” and “execution capability.” *Sense and respond capability* refers to a company’s ability to sense and identify relevant CSR challenges and to design an adequate response to these challenges, and *execution capability* refers to a company’s ability to integrate internal and external resources into subcombinations and new combinations of resources (Ramachandran, 2011, p. 288). By making explicit that the dynamic capability perspective includes the ability to sense changes within the environment, Ramachandran addressed a critique of this perspective on CSR, which is that little attention is paid to the ability to sense and identify environmental changes (here CSR challenges; see Day, 1994). However, a company’s dynamic capability originates, at least in part, from the individual competencies of its members; individuals within the company utilize, adjust, and improve their competencies through feedback processes, and share it with others to embed the competencies within the organization and make it an organizational capability (cf. Heugens, 2006). This learning process can transform superior individual competencies of key actors with decision-making and boundary-spanning job roles into “sense and respond capability” and “execution capability” (Ramachandran, 2011). In other words, the individual competencies of CSR managers, as important decision makers, may be an important source for a company to develop the capabilities to effectively deal with changing societal demands with respect to CSR. Therefore, this study focuses on CSR managers’ individual competencies.

The Concept of Individual Competence

As described in the previous section, individual competencies of CSR manager may stimulate the CSR adaptation process. The concept of individual competence has a relatively long history in business literature. It became popular in the business literature due to the disconnection between formal education and professional practice (Grant et al., 1979). Competence profiles were created to ensure a good fit between the individual competencies developed in school and the individual competencies required for effective performance in practice. The profiles provide a structured overview of the critical elements required for effective performance. However, the way in which individual competence is conceptualized largely determines the way in which essential work behaviors are described.

One can distinguish three dominant perspectives for approaching the concept of competence (Delamare Le Deist & Winterton, 2005). With the *behavioral approach* (Neumann, 1979), one focuses on atomized behaviors and knowledge elements required to perform specific tasks. With the *generic approach* (Eraut, 1994), one focuses on underlying personal characteristics (e.g., knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or personal attributes) that separate successful performers from less successful performers and that are applicable in multiple contexts. Nowadays, most researchers use a more *comprehensive approach* that takes the complexity of the practice into account without resulting in fragmented behavior requirements—to identify competencies and develop competence profiles (Delamare Le Deist & Winterton, 2005). In the comprehensive approach, which we also used in the present study, one focuses on the work, on the professional, and on contextualizing the competencies. Here, individual competence can be defined as a professional's integrated performance-oriented ability to achieve specific objectives. This ability is a cohesive combination of knowledge elements, skills, and other elements of being (e.g., attitudes; cf. Sandberg & Pinnington, 2009). Each element can be seen as a specification of a competence and is situated in the context in which performance must be successful (Mulder, 2014).

Contextualizing Individual Competencies for CSR

Many scholars denote the importance that context has on work behavior (e.g., Griffin, 2007; Johns, 2006; Robert & Fulop, 2014; Whetten, 2009). In its broadest definition, these so-called context effects refer to “the set of factors surrounding a phenomenon that exert some direct or indirect influence on it” (Whetten, 2009, p. 31). Considering the role of these effects on work behavior is important (Johns, 2006; Whetten, 2009) because it shapes our understanding and evaluation of effective work behavior, which is of particular relevance in the current study. In other words, a specific work behavior (e.g., using medical terminology) can be highly effective in one context (e.g., among surgeons) yet largely ineffective in a different context (e.g., with patients).

According to Johns (2006), there are two broad levels of contextualization, commonly referred to as the “omnibus-level” and the “discrete-level.” With the *omnibus-level*, the focus is on a broad consideration of the context as a whole. For example, one is interested in questions such as *who* (e.g., profession) or *what* (e.g., work behavior) has been studied, as well as questions such as *when* (e.g., an absolute or relative period of time), *where* (e.g., the country), and *why* the phenomena were studied. With the *discrete-level* of contextualization, the focus is on the particular consideration of the context

that shapes one's behavior. This level is nested within the omnibus-level, and examples of contextual factors at the discrete-level include specific *job roles and tasks* (e.g., the stimulating role), *social components* (e.g., values), and *physical components* (e.g., physical working conditions).

Studies that attempt to identify individual CSR competencies regularly use the omnibus-level of contextualizing relevant competencies, thereby applying the omnibus factor of the CSR profession. Often, these studies are intended to aid curriculum development in education for sustainable development (ESD), making it important that the competencies are broadly applicable. As a consequence, the competencies lose their connection with the context in which CSR professionals have to operate. Wiek, Withycombe, and Redman's (2011) study, for example, identified relevant sustainability competencies for CSR professionals that can guide the development of academic ESD programs. Based on the results of their literature review, they formulated the following five key competencies: systems thinking competence, anticipatory competence, normative competence, strategic competence, and interpersonal competence. Similarly, De Haan (2006) identified 12 individual competencies (such as foresighted thinking and being able to work interdisciplinary). According to De Haan, these 12 competencies enable active, reflective, and cooperative participation toward sustainable development. Conducting a Delphi study among 70 ESD experts, Rieckmann (2012) formulated 12 key competencies that students in ESD programs should develop when training for a CSR-related profession. Among these 12 competencies, systems thinking, anticipatory thinking, and critical thinking are considered to be the most important ones (Rieckmann, 2012).

More recently scholars focused on individual CSR-related competencies within a business context. In one of the first empirical studies in this context, Willard et al. (2010) composed six key skills that are needed for success as a CSR professional. With respect to hard skills, strategic planning, systems thinking, and project management skills were deemed most important to enable a strategic approach. With respect to soft skills, communication skills, problem-solving skills, and inspirational skills were deemed most important. Using a more comprehensive approach to the concept of competence, Osagie and her colleagues (2016) conducted a mixed-method study in which they systematically reviewed CSR-literature on individual competencies; they also interviewed CSR managers responsible for the CSR adaptation process. Their analyses resulted in eight distinct individual CSR-related competencies for the CSR profession (see Table 1 for more detailed description of these competencies): (1) anticipating CSR-related challenges; (2) understanding CSR-relevant systems and subsystems; (3) understanding CSR-relevant standards; (4) CSR management competencies, including (4a) leading CSR

Table 1. Individual CSR-Related Competencies.

Competence label	Competence description
Cognition-oriented competence domain	
1. Anticipating CSR-related challenges	The CSR professional must be able to mentally construct scenarios to describe how CSR-related challenges will develop in the future and how these challenges might affect the company. This definition includes the ability to think critically and anticipate potential consequences for future local and global CSR-related challenges of decisions made by the company today.
2. Understanding CSR-relevant systems and subsystems	Systems thinking is the ability to identify and understand relevant socioecological systems from different domains and disciplines and reflect on their interdependency. This competence has both an internal component and an external component. Here, “external component” refers to the ability to have a systemwide perspective on CSR challenges. The “internal component” reflects the notion that the company is perceived as a system comprised of several interdependent subsystems (i.e., business units and disciplines). In this internal perspective, “systems thinking” refers to the ability of a CSR professional to analyze CSR-related challenges in an interdisciplinary manner.
3. Understanding CSR drivers, CSR standards, and CSR regulations.	When faced with CSR challenges, a CSR professional must understand how the company should cope with and apply important industrial regulations (e.g., collective industrial standards and integrity pacts), national and international regulations, political processes, and corporate governance (such as codes of conduct). Moreover, the CSR professional should be able to contribute to the development of these standards, for example, by participating in roundtable meetings.
Functional-oriented competence domain	
4a. CSR leadership competencies	The CSR professional must be able to develop a CSR vision and give the company’s CSR program direction. This includes being prepared to take risks and seek new ways to pursue CSR (i.e., being a pioneer) and thinking about future CSR developments, as well as how those developments might affect the company’s current CSR program.
4b. Identifying and realizing CSR-related business opportunities	A CSR professional should also have entrepreneurial competencies. Thus, the CSR professional should be alert to trends in CSR and should be able to translate and realize these developments into business opportunities for the company. To do so, the CSR professional must have at least some business, organizational, and sector-specific knowledge, and the CSR professional must be able to make a business case for CSR. At the same time, the professional must not lose sight of the bigger picture (i.e., tackling local and global CSR challenges) and should therefore avoid the trap of thinking in terms of short-term financial gains. Moreover, to realize CSR-related business opportunities, the professional must be able to deal with the company’s formal and informal decision-making processes and its organizational politics and culture.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Competence label	Competence description
4c. Managing CSR implementation	These change management–related and program management–related competencies include the ability to lead the transition toward CSR, to develop crucial alliances with important individuals both within and outside the company, and to deal with “resistance to change” by inspiring and motivating others. The CSR professional must be able to translate a strategy into individual milestones, targets, and concrete actions. The CSR professional must also be able to organize, facilitate, and manage this process and the people involved, all within the specified time frame and budget. To do so, the professional must have good problem-solving skills, and he or she must be able to prepare reports and present results in a clear and convincing manner.
Social-oriented competence domain	
5. Realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes	The CSR professional must have good social, communication, and networking skills, as he or she must be able to raise awareness of CSR, as well as challenge and stimulate ownership of CSR in others. Moreover, the CSR professional should be able to coach and help others integrate CSR into their daily work. Finally, the CSR professional must be able to work well in multidisciplinary and multicultural collaborations, and he or she must be able to represent the company’s interests while mapping and showing respect to distinctive ideas and inputs of stakeholders.
Meta-oriented competence domain	
6. Employing CSR-supportive personal characteristics and attitudes	In implementing CSR in his or her company, the CSR professional must deal with various stakeholders, each of whom can have their own unique interests. Moreover, CSR implementation is a process of change that involves changing people’s mind-set. Thus, CSR professionals often encounter resistance to change and will need to possess certain personal characteristics and attitudes to address these challenges. The most commonly mentioned features include patience, resilience, flexibility, a realistic attitude, pragmatism, innovativeness, empathy, and a positive attitude.
7a. Ethical normative competencies	The CSR professional is convinced of the urgency of CSR challenges and is intrinsically driven (i.e., intrinsic motivated) to address these challenges. This competence involves the ability to apply one’s personal ethical standards and values while assessing CSR-related issues.
7b. Balancing personal ethical values and business objectives	This competence is functionally oriented and includes the ability to strike a balance between idealism and pragmatism. Thus, the CSR professional must have the adaptive capacity to pursue both financial objectives and CSR objectives without losing sight of (or overstepping) his or her personal ethical boundaries and values.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Competence label	Competence description
7c. Realizing self-regulated CSR-related behaviors and active involvement	This competence involves the ability to apply one's personal ethical standards and values to CSR implementation. The CSR professional feels personally responsible for behaving ethically and assumes this responsibility. The CSR professional is actively involved in the implementation of CSR by being action oriented and decisive; the CSR professional also serves as a role model for others by performing CSR-related activities. This competence is functionally oriented and is interpreted in practice as the congruence between what you stand for, what you say, and what you do.
8. Reflecting on personal CSR views and experiences	This competence includes the ability to recognize and challenge one's own prior ideas, habits, and assumptions, as well as the ability to derive meaning from this self-evaluation. Thus, CSR professionals use self-evaluation and self-learning approaches when working on CSR challenges.

Source: Osagie, Wesselink, Blok, Lans, and Mulder (2016).

Note. CSR = corporate social responsibility.

programs, (4b) managing CSR programs, and (4c) identifying and realizing CSR-related business opportunities; (5) realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes; (6) employing CSR-supportive personal characteristics and attitudes; (7) personal value-driven competencies, including (7a) ethical normative competencies, (7b) balancing personal ethical values and business objectives, and (7c) realizing self-regulated CSR-related behaviors and active involvement; and (8) reflecting on personal CSR views and experiences.

As mentioned earlier, an important limitation of the aforementioned studies is that they all used an omnibus-level of analysis to determine which individual competencies CSR professionals need. According to Johns (2006), the omnibus-level factors only influence an employee's behavior through discrete-level factors. Thus, competencies contextualized at the level of professions can only guide actual work behavior when they are interpreted within—or when they account for—discrete-level factors (e.g., contextualized within specific job roles). This discrete-level of analysis has remained largely unexplored in the literature as to yet.

In short, previous studies of individual CSR-related competencies have provided us with valuable insights regarding important competencies for the CSR manager; however, further specification and contextualization at a discrete-level are needed to provide guidelines for specific behaviors in the management of the CSR adaptation process and to determine the relative importance of specific individual competencies that are needed by CSR managers.

Job Roles in the Adaptation Process

An accepted and often employed way to contextualize work-related behavior, such as competencies, is to determine the job roles and tasks needed to reach a specific objective (Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff, & Thakor, 2006; Johns, 2006; Mulder, 2014). A widely used taxonomy of job roles for management-related tasks is the competing value framework (CVF; Cameron et al., 2006; Quinn, 1988; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). This framework was developed initially through research on major indicators of organizational effectiveness but was later also converted into a normative framework of effective leadership behavior (Quinn, 1988). Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) identified two key dimensions underlying organizational effectiveness, namely, the focus of the manager (internally focused on internal processes and valuing human resources vs. externally focused on maximizing output and expansion and adaptation to the external environment) and manager's preference for structure (a preference for control and stability vs. a preference for change and flexibility). The two dimensions are juxtaposed, forming four competing managerial models which include eight key managerial roles (Quinn, 1988): the *mentoring role*, *stimulating role*, *innovating role*, *networking role*, *monitoring role*, *coordinating role*, *producing role*, and the *strategic role* (see Appendix A for the descriptions of the roles).

The CVF has been criticized mainly for being a simplistic reflection of reality and for its assumption that the values are competing. Several scholars (e.g., Belasen & Frank, 2008; Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995; Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011) assert that they are neither competing nor paradoxical; rather they can coexist and strengthen each other. This notion was recently confirmed by a meta-analysis conducted by Hartnell and colleagues (2011), showing the limited value of using the CVF to position one's dominant managerial value. However, the model describes a broad range of managerial roles, which can be and is widely used to explore and identify relevant managerial roles in research and in practice (Cameron et al., 2006; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2003).

Scholars have identified similar managerial roles in different change contexts as described by Quinn (1988). However, unlike the CSR adaptation process, these contexts mostly involved discontinuous or incremental organizational changes, which are rapid or successive but limited changes. For example, Barratt-Pugh, Bahn, and Gakere (2013) conducted a case study and signified the importance of the role of change agents (which seems to be a combination of the stimulating and mentoring roles in the CVF) in driving an organizational merger between two state government departments in Western Australia. An example in which both discontinuous and incremental change

processes were studied is the study of Higgs and Rowland (2011). These scholars interviewed change leaders from 33 organizations and found that certain leadership behavior (which corresponds to the strategic, coordinating, stimulating, and mentoring roles in the CVF) supports effective change management. Belasen, Benke, DiPadova, and Fortunato's (1996) research directly studied all eight managerial roles of the CVF simultaneously in the context of a discontinuous change process (significant downsizing) and found that all eight roles were considered important during the change process. These previous studies indicate that the CVF provides a useful framework to identify the job roles involved in change management. Contrary to the aforementioned studies, however, (a) we explore the relevance of these managerial roles within the context of the CSR adaptation process, which has a large normative component and involves a continuous change. (b) Moreover, we use these managerial roles to determine which individual CSR-related competencies are needed to perform these roles effectively. Therefore, the following research questions were formulated:

Research Question 1: Which of the eight managerial roles described in the CVF are relevant in the context of the CSR adaptation process?

Research Question 2: Which individual competencies do CSR managers need in each role to effectively perform that role?

Method

Procedure

We conducted a qualitative study, which enabled us to explore, identify, and prioritize important job roles (and tasks) with respect to the CSR adaptation process, as well as the subsequent key individual CSR-related competencies. The data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, we interviewed 28 CSR professionals (primarily CSR directors and managers; see Appendix B) over a time span of 3 months (April 2013 through June 2013) to identify key roles, tasks, and individual competencies.¹ These 28 CSR professionals were recruited from 20 Dutch multinational companies, including companies that are internationally known for their CSR-related practices (e.g., Philips, Unilever, and DSM). The companies were selected from the 2012 Sustainability Transparency Benchmark.² This annual benchmark provides a clear indication of how active the included Dutch companies are with respect to addressing CSR-related challenges. We initially contacted the 100 highest ranked companies from various sectors as we perceived these companies to be the most active in terms of CSR. The companies represented the following

sectors, as categorized by the Sustainability Transparency Benchmark: bank and insurance ($n = 16$); construction and maritime ($n = 10$); consumer products ($n = 3$); energy, oil, and gas ($n = 8$); trading companies ($n = 2$); industrial ($n = 5$); media ($n = 4$); services ($n = 17$); technology ($n = 6$); transport ($n = 11$); real estate ($n = 3$); food and drinks ($n = 12$); and retail ($n = 3$). Each company's principal CSR professional (i.e., the individual responsible for developing the company's CSR policy and strategy and/or responsible for implementing CSR) was then identified and invited to participate in the study. Those who did not participate in this study could not be reached or declined our request due to time constraints, as for many companies the annual sustainability reporting was due in this period. As a consequence, no CSR manager from the construction and maritime, trading companies, and the media sector were interviewed in this study (see Appendix B for more information about the companies and sector represented in this study). Moreover, we included only CSR managers from companies that are not founded on CSR principles to ensure that their tasks and experiences reflected the difficulties faced by CSR managers in mainstream businesses (e.g., potential friction between economic interests and CSR objectives).

The interviews were conducted using a standardized, semistructured interview format, and the interviews were continued until saturation was reached (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), meaning that after the 28th interview, it was decided to end the data collection because the last three interviews did not yield significant new information about the job roles and individual competencies needed in the CSR adaptation process. One researcher (the first author) conducted all of the interviews to minimize any potential bias. The interviewer addressed the following topics sequentially: (a) basic background information (e.g., education, age, and prior work experience), (b) the job roles held and/or deemed important in the CSR adaptation process (exemplary question: "Can you please describe your role in the CSR adaptation process?"), (c) CSR-related competencies that were used by the professional and/or which the professional deemed effective in the CSR adaptation process, and (d) reflection on the CSR-related competencies identified in the literature (see Table 1).

In the second phase of the data collection, we aimed to show that the context can affect the individual competencies CSR managers need by determining the relative importance of the individual competencies within each managerial role. We decided to explore the prioritization of the competencies among the CSR managers interviewed in Phase 1 and as such provide the first insights into the relative importance of the competencies for each job roles. Thus, in the second phase of the data collection and after the interview transcripts were analyzed, the results were sent to the participants via an online

questionnaire. The questionnaire was completed by 18 of the 28 participating CSR professionals and consisted of two parts. In the first part, we asked participants to provide feedback regarding the list of identified job roles and individual CSR-related competencies. In the second part of the questionnaire, we asked the participants to prioritize these individual competencies for each role. The participants were instructed to rank the three competencies they considered most essential for successful role performance. The participants could choose from among the individual CSR-related competencies listed in Table 1. We ensured diverse perspectives with respect to important competencies for each role by allowing all of the participants to rank all of the roles, even if a participant was not directly engaged in that particular role.

Data Analysis

We performed a content and domain analysis on the interview transcripts to better understand the job roles that are considered important in the CSR adaptation process. The software program ATLAS.ti was used to organize and analyze the transcripts (for a detailed description of this program, see Friese, 2012). First, all interview transcripts were read thoroughly by the first author to identify and extract meaningful excerpts—those excerpts that explicitly describe the role, tasks, or responsibilities involved in the adaptation process—from the interviewees' responses. All coders were instructed to read the transcripts before coding and to check whether all relevant excerpts were identified. If other sentences were found that were not yet identified as relevant for analysis, they were added following a discussion and agreement between the coders. Next, the first and second authors independently assigned codes to the selected excerpts. The management-related roles and tasks were categorized using the eight managerial roles of Quinn (1988; see Appendix A). We included a category "others" as an additional code to account for excerpts that did not fit within any of these managerial roles.

Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1960) was calculated for each role and revealed that agreement between the two coders ranged from good to very good for seven of the eight roles, with kappa values ranging from 0.62 to 0.87 (see Altman, 1991, p. 404; Landis & Koch, 1977). Agreement between the two coders with respect to the "monitoring role" was reasonable ($\kappa = 0.48$). To improve reliability for the "monitoring role," all excerpts coded as such—as well as differences between the two coders with respect to the other seven roles—were discussed until agreement was reached. The excerpts coded as "others" were also discussed. These excerpts mainly represented tasks that are related to learning and working with peers. We concluded that being a "peer" is an important role for a CSR manager's personal development, which can

affect their individual competence development and consequently influence the change process. However, we found that within the context of the CSR adaptation process, it is the exposure to and sharing of best practices that is directly relevant for the change process; CSR managers can select these experiences through seeking and maintaining contact with peers; as such, these statements were included in the definition of the “networking role.” The selected excerpts were then used to define the job roles specifically in the context of the CSR adaptation process (see Table 2 for exemplar quotations). We were unable to obtain conclusive results for two of the eight managerial roles included in CVF (Cameron et al., 2006; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), as only a few CSR professionals acknowledged their importance and provided information regarding these job roles within the context of CSR adaptation; thus, the “innovating role” and the “producing role” were excluded from further analyses.

Next, for each role, we appointed scores to the competencies selected by the respondents to prioritize and prevent the creation of a laundry list of individual CSR-related competencies with respect to the job roles. The competencies that were ranked by a respondent as being the most, second-most, and third-most important were assigned 3 points, 2 points, and 1 point, respectively. Thereafter, we constructed a ranking of key CSR-related competencies for specific roles in the CSR adaptation process; this ranking was calculated by summing all of the individual scores given by the respondents for each competence within a particular role. To clearly distinguish between what respondent considered more important and less important competencies, we show here only the top half of the ranking³ and we specifically denote the three highest ranked individual competencies in the “Results and Discussion” section.

Results and Discussion

Research Question 1: Which of the eight managerial roles described in the CVF are relevant in the context of the CSR adaptation process?

First, we explored which of the eight managerial roles of Quinn (1988) could be identified within a CSR adaptation context. Belasen et al. (1996) showed that in a discontinuous change context (i.e., significant downsizing), all eight managerial roles could be identified and were considered important for the management of the change process. In contrast, we found that in the case of the CSR adaptation process, which involves a continuous change process, not all roles were considered as important. Six of the eight managerial roles described in the CVF were supported by the analysis of the interview data.

Table 2. CSR-Related Roles and Supporting Exemplar Quotations Extracted from the Interview Transcripts.

Roles	Exemplar quotation	Source
A. Coordinating role	"I am responsible for the implementation of CSR within core business processes. That is, the CSR-related strategic objectives formulated by the top management reaches the rest of the company through me. I lead and coordinate the implementation of these objectives."	Interviewee GI, program manager, CSR
	"From my management role I need to have that helicopter view, and be alert of all the developments that are put in motion to see what needs adjustment, are where people need to be activated, to ensure that the right objectives are reached. Though the actual project and process management is done by others, it is my task to have that oversight and provide guidance to officers where and if needed."	Interviewee S, director, corporate responsibility
B. Stimulating role	"It is a role in which you need to continuously trigger and stimulate people to set the bars higher, discuss with them what is going well and what can be improved, and link it to the bottom line. However, you need to be careful as it can come across as pushy, but what you want and need to be is an inspirer and a motivator."	Interviewee I, CSR manager
	"The Board of Directors has formulated strategic CSR objectives, which are recognizable throughout the company. It is my task to ensure that we keep up a good performance with respect to these objectives, and to continuously stimulate the Board's and the company's ambitions regarding CSR, in that the bars are raised each year. I do the same for the various business units. For them I am their sustainability business partner and through this role I try to motivate them to set their own CSR objective and challenge themselves with respect to CSR while still earning money for the company."	Interviewee K, CSR manager
C. Networking role	"You often represent the company's CSR program. You have to present your company's CSR program and objectives to business groups such as Finance and R&D department. But we are also involved in curricula development of schools."	Interviewee I, CSR manager
	"I am the company's CSR representative for other organizations, so I am representing my company's CSR ambitions and program during conferences, anchoring our message, our vision and definitely live up to our corporate and personal values. And I am in charge of our communication with external stakeholders so . . ."	Interviewee EI, director, sustainability
D. Strategic role	"When you take into account the plan-do-check-act-cycle, then I am responsible for the planning. I have the task to develop CSR policies and programs and provide input for our CSR ambitions and strategic objectives. The Board sets the strategic objectives, but my department prepares and provides the input for the decision-making process."	Interviewee N, manager, sustainability
	"I am a member of the steering committee that was formed based on the PPP idea. We included the financial director to ensure that the projects are profitable, marketing director for communicating and marketing our CSR efforts, and me for CSR. Together we formulate the company's CSR vision, CSR objectives and CSR agenda."	Interviewee O, senior advisor and strategist, sustainability
	"I was also assigned the task to earn money for the company . . . It makes no sense to do all sorts of cool green things, if ultimately you cannot make a business out of it. Such "projects" are not sustainable by definition . . . and that is what I do, I develop new and plan sustainability business concepts."	Interviewee HI, director, sourcing and sustainability

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Roles	Exemplar quotation	Source
E. Monitoring role	<p>“Each year we publish a sustainability report, which includes three sections, of which the environment is one. It is my tasks to collect and verify relevant environmental data, from various sites and departments and establish a report of the results.”</p> <p>“It is our tasks to improve and broaden our CSR reporting. As such I also conduct internal audits for the set sustainability-related key performance indicators. As such it I collect and verify relevant data, and report on the results.”</p>	<p>Interviewee E2, sustainability manager, supply</p> <p>Interviewee F2, compliance officer</p>
F. Mentoring role	<p>“For example, I am not responsible for sustainable procurement. The people from the procurement department are. I am not there to determine how they should do their jobs and include CSR principles in their jobs. They themselves are more knowledgeable in that respect. But I am there to think along and help them, bring those officers together so they can learn from each other, get them in touch with suppliers or stakeholders so they can discuss how to include sustainability objectives in their procurement activities, or brainstorm together to find ways to really make a difference, like using fewer air travels through more efficient logistics.”</p> <p>“It is my task to train others to integrate sustainability in their dealings with customers. I teach them how to discuss sustainability issues with the customers, translate the outcomes of these interactions into concrete investments that contributes to sustainable development and benefits our company financially.”</p>	<p>Interviewee Q, director, corporate communications and CSR</p> <p>Interviewee A2, business developer, sustainability</p>

Note. CSR = corporate social responsibility.

These six job roles are the coordinating, stimulating, networking, strategic, monitoring, and mentoring roles. The roles and their interpretation within the context of CSR adaptation are presented below in descending order based on the total number of interview participants that identified each role (see Table 2 for exemplar quotations).

Coordinating Role

According to Quinn (1988), managers in this role coordinate the process through which a set strategy is embedded within the company. Twenty-six out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a similar role as Quinn’s coordinating role within the CSR adaptation process. Based on their responses, we could define the coordinating role of CSR managers as follows: *The CSR manager in his or her role as coordinator supports the various business units during the CSR adaptation process. He or she is aware of the full range of changes that will be set in motion by the company’s CSR strategy, and he or she organizes, manages, coordinates, and facilitates people, processes, changes, and projects. Actual responsibility for integrating CSR*

into the organization's daily activities lies with the various business units and employees. Nevertheless, the CSR manager provides support and monitors the progress.

Stimulating Role

According to Quinn (1988), this role focuses on encouraging others and developing and maintaining a supportive group moral. Twenty-four out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a job role that resembles Quinn's stimulating role. Many interviewees described this role in terms of activating, stimulating, and inspiring others on a continuous basis because CSR challenges change over time. These "others" include not only fellow employees but also the board members. One CSR manager argued in favor of an "idealistic role," which he described as "a role in which the CSR manager's personal ideals and way of living are based on CSR principles. This individual employs these ideals, authenticity, and engaging attitude in activating others to engage in CSR behavior." Because his description fits well with the role of the "stimulator," we included this idealistic role in the definition of the stimulating role. Based on the interviewees' responses, we could define the stimulating role of CSR managers as follows: *The CSR manager acts as an ambassador of CSR. His or her personal ideals and way of living are based upon CSR principles, through which he or she motivates, stimulates, inspires, and activates others to integrate CSR objectives into their assigned tasks. The CSR manager often does so despite having no formal authority.*

Networking Role

According to Quinn (1988), this role is oriented toward the external environment in which the manager seeks and maintains a network of contacts. Twenty-two out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a similar job role as Quinn's networking role. Many stated to be the CSR spokesperson for their respective companies and described how they represent their companies in various external CSR events. Some also stressed the importance of having contact with peers to keep up to date and exchange best practices. Based on the interviewees' responses, we could define the networking role of CSR managers as follows: *In this role, the CSR manager acts as a representative of the CSR profession and for his or her company's CSR program at external venues (e.g., panels and platforms) or in meetings with external parties (e.g., stakeholder dialogs). He or she seeks and maintains contact with external parties, meets with and learns from his or her peers,*

and is responsible for formally communicating his or her company's CSR performance (e.g., by giving presentations).

Strategic Role

According to Quinn (1988), in this role, it is the task of the manager to formulate objectives and develop a company's strategy. Twenty-one out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a job role that resembles Quinn's strategic role. The CSR managers interviewed in this study often reported directly to the CEO or board of directors (if they were not members of the board themselves). Based on their responses, we could define CSR manager's strategic role as follows: *In this role, the CSR manager is particularly focused on developing a CSR strategy and is responsible—at least in part—for integrating this strategy into the company's general strategy. The manager establishes and refines CSR-related business models and establishes CSR initiatives, and he or she is perceived and approached as a business partner by other business units.*

Monitoring Role

According to Quinn (1988), evaluating and reporting is one of the key tasks in this role. Twenty-one out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a similar job role in which auditing and reporting on company's CSR activities was mentioned most often. Based on the interviewees' responses, we could define the monitoring role of CSR managers as follows: *In this role, the CSR manager monitors and evaluates specific applications of the CSR strategy and policies (for example, by performing internal audits). He or she also develops CSR standards, tools, and procedures for promoting specific CSR activities and internal measurement systems. He or she is also responsible for—or contributes to—the content of the annual CSR report. Therefore, he or she collects and analyzes relevant data (e.g., data regarding the company's CSR performance and carbon footprint).*

Mentoring Role

According to Quinn (1988), the manager acts as a coach and stimulates the professional development of individuals. Eighteen out of the 28 CSR managers who were interviewed described a job role that resembles this role and in which the manager is the CSR expert within the company. Based on the interviewees' responses, we could define the mentoring role of CSR managers as follows: *In this role, the manager advises, informs, and trains employees, so*

they can achieve CSR objectives in their respective assigned tasks. He or she collects relevant information and ensures that employees are informed with respect to CSR in the context of their company. Because employees often know best how to integrate CSR into their assigned tasks, the mentor's task is to support, counsel, and coach others.

With respect to the “innovating role,” though the support was limited, some evidence could be found in the interviews to support this role, which focuses on creating new—or improving existing—CSR activities. For example, Interviewee H1 (director, sourcing and sustainability), described how it is his responsibility to develop new business models:

I was also assigned the task to earn money for the company . . . It makes no sense to do all sorts of cool green things, if ultimately you cannot make a business out of it. Such “projects” are not sustainable by definition . . . and that is what I do, I develop new and plan sustainability business concepts.

The interview transcripts provided little evidence for the “producing role,” which focuses on performing the actual execution of specific CSR activities. Thus, the results suggest that Dutch CSR managers consider these two roles to be less important for their daily practice in the context of CSR adaptation. A possible explanation is that the CSR managers were often positioned as supporting staff members and were therefore not the ones that were involved in the actual production and R&D process, which are managed by line managers. Interviewee K and Interviewee Q describe it as follows:

It is not per se that you are the one that innovates, but rather that you manage and facilitate innovative ideas from others or organize innovation sessions to stimulate original thinking. If we want to develop our CSR program even further we need to set the bars higher and innovate. We therefore try to be innovating within our sector. (Interviewee K, CSR manager).

For example, I am not responsible for sustainable procurement. The people from the procurement department are. I am not there to determine how they should do their job and include CSR principles in their jobs. They themselves are more knowledgeable in that respect. But I am there to think along and help them, bring those officers together so they can learn from each other, get them in touch with suppliers or stakeholders so they can discuss how to include sustainability objectives in their procurement activities, or brainstorm together to find ways to really make a difference, like using fewer air travels through more efficient logistics. (Interviewee Q, director, corporate communications and CSR)

These findings confirm that CSR managers may have different roles and tasks and that six of the eight managerial roles described by Quinn (1988) are important for driving the CSR adaptation process. In this study, we provide a definition for these job roles for CSR managers.

Research Question 2: Which individual competencies do CSR managers need in each role to effectively perform that role?

Following the identification of the roles in CSR adaptation, we explored the relative importance of the CSR-related competencies within each role. Table 3 shows the ranking for each managerial role. The results show that the CSR-related competencies are differently prioritized within the six managerial roles.

These results differ somewhat from previous research. That is, studies on CSR-related competencies have yielded inconsistent results with respect to the importance of systems thinking competencies (i.e., “understanding CSR-relevant systems”), “ethical normative competencies,” and foresight competencies (i.e., “anticipating CSR-related challenges”). Some scholars such as De Haan (2006), Rieckmann (2012), and Wiek et al. (2011) asserted that systems thinking, ethical normative, and foresight thinking competencies are crucial in the CSR profession. For example, Rieckmann (2012) asked 70 scientific and public experts which competencies they thought are needed to understand CSR-related challenges and to contribute to sustainable development. Foresight competencies were ranked as the second most important, with systems thinking competencies ranking first. Although according to Rieckmann these competencies are needed by anyone wanting to understand and contribute to sustainable development, these tasks are according to Wiek et al. (2011) in particular essential to the CSR profession, indicating that foresight competencies and systems competencies are also important for CSR managers. In addition to foresight thinking and systems thinking, Wiek et al. (2011) also stressed the significance of normative competencies for the CSR profession, through which professionals develop and generate virtues that constitutes his or her good character, and which forms a basis for decision-making processes concerning CSR (Blok, Gremmen, & Wesselink, 2016). Others like Willard et al. (2010) and Osagie et al. (2016), who surveyed CSR professionals and interviewed CSR managers, respectively, found little empirical evidence for the importance of “ethical normative competence” in a business context.

Contrary to the abovementioned studies, our findings enabled us to go beyond a list of general CSR competencies and better explore the relative importance of these particular CSR competencies in a CSR adaptation context. That is, when looking at the three key individual CSR-related competencies for

Table 3. Ranking of Individual CSR-Related Competencies According to Level of Importance for Effective Role Performance.

A. Coordinating role	B. Stimulating role	C. Networking role
1. Managing CSR implementation (28)	1. Realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes (32)	1. Realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes (39)
2. Realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes (18)	2. Identifying and realizing CSR-related business opportunities (15)	2. Employing CSR-supportive personal characteristics and attitudes (15)
3. Anticipating CSR-related challenges (18)	3. Anticipating CSR-related challenges (15)	3. Ethical normative competencies (14)
4. Understanding CSR-relevant systems (11)	4. Employing CSR-supportive personal characteristics and attitudes (13)	4. Understanding CSR-relevant systems (8)
5. Realizing self-regulated CSR-related behaviors and active involvement (9)	5. CSR leadership competencies (11)	5. Anticipating CSR-related challenges (6)
6. Understanding CSR-relevant standards (8)	6. Ethical normative competencies (6)	6. CSR leadership competencies (6)
D. Strategic role	E. Monitoring role	F. Mentoring role
1. CSR leadership competencies (31)	1. Understanding CSR-relevant standards (35)	1. Realizing CSR-supportive interpersonal processes (25)
2. Identifying and realizing CSR-related business opportunities (18)	2. Understanding CSR-relevant systems (23)	2. Reflecting on personal CSR views and experiences (18)
3. Anticipating CSR-related challenges (11)	3. Balancing personal ethical values and business objectives (11)	3. Employing CSR-supportive personal characteristics and attitudes (17)
4. Balancing personal ethical values and business objectives (10)	4. Ethical normative competencies (10)	4. Understanding CSR-relevant systems (12)
5. Understanding CSR-relevant systems (10)	5. Realizing self-regulated CSR-related behaviors and active involvement (10)	5. Ethical normative competencies (12)
6. Ethical normative competencies (8)	6. Reflecting on personal CSR views and experiences (7)	6. Anticipating CSR-related challenges (6)

Note. The scores between parentheses are sum scores based on the individual rankings of all CSR professionals ($n = 18$). CSR = corporate social responsibility.

each role (Table 3), we found that systems thinking was only considered crucial in the monitoring role, foresight competencies is crucial in three out of the six managerial roles, and ethical normative competencies is crucial only in the networking role. Thus, although our study was explorative in nature, the results strongly suggest that it is worthwhile to include discrete-level contextual factors, and managers' job roles in particular, when determining the importance of particular CSR-related competencies, as each role seems to require a different combination and prioritization of these competencies.

Interestingly, "ethical normative competencies" was not ranked among the three most essential individual competencies for the "stimulating role"—a role focused on activating and inspiring others to integrate CSR principles into their assigned jobs. During the interviews, the CSR managers were very passionate about CSR and about their work. We expected that "ethical normative competencies" and specific personal attitudes would have ranked higher in terms of prominence in the stimulating role; personal involvement and authenticity are incremental in stimulating others (cf. Gardner & Schermerhorn, 2004), and according to the literature, personal values are an essential determinant of one's actions at work (e.g., Hay & Gray, 1974; Swanson, 1999). We were surprised to see that these competencies were considered less important in the stimulating role when prioritizing the competencies and that the business case logic (i.e., a bottom-line rationale) seems to be far more prominent than the idealistic logic. The key competencies with respect to the stimulating role are interpersonal competencies, being able to anticipate CSR challenges, and being able to translate these challenges into business opportunities. Here, the business context evidently guides the individual competencies that CSR managers must use, suggesting that in the case of the CSR adaptation process, there might be a discrepancy between CSR managers' personal beliefs and the behaviors that they consider effective in stimulating sustainable work behavior in others. In fact, besides idealistic logic, one must clarify how the business—and as such, the company—could benefit from engaging in these initiatives to stimulate others within the company. The following excerpt from the interview with CSR Manager K illustrates this notion:

The Board of Directors has formulated strategic CSR objectives, which are recognizable throughout the company. It is my task to ensure that we keep up a good performance with respect to these objectives, and to continuously stimulate the Board's and the company's ambitions regarding CSR, in that the bars are raised each year. I do the same for the various business units. For them I am their sustainability business partner and through this role I try to motivate them to set their own CSR objective and challenge themselves with respect to CSR while still earning money for the company.

The discrepancy between CSR managers' beliefs and their work behavior reinforces Hahn and Aragón-Correa's (2015) and Hemingway (2005) suggestion that employees' personal beliefs about CSR may not be aligned with what they themselves do at work because a mismatch between employees' beliefs and that of their companies may lead them to align their work behavior with what is acceptable within their companies (Hemingway, 2005); CSR managers particularly use the business case discourse and the economic language to effectively stimulate others to engage in CSR activities.

Moreover, the study findings strongly suggest that besides the stimulating role, the business case logic may even influence the relative importance of specific individual competencies in the other managerial roles; the results show that the more general management-related competencies (e.g., interpersonal competencies, being able to anticipate CSR challenges, and being able to translate these challenges into business opportunities) are considered important in multiple roles (see Table 3). This provides support for previous research that show that business case arguments for engaging in CSR are dominant and remain directive for employees' CSR work behavior (e.g., Gao & Bansal, 2013; Hahn & Aragón-Correa, 2015).

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Our study has some limitations that merit discussion. First, we stressed the importance of contextualizing reported individual CSR-related competencies. Yet, as discussed earlier, contextual effects can include different factors at both the omnibus-level and the discrete-level (Johns, 2006). Here, we contextualized reported CSR competencies within relevant job roles, an essential yet initial step in contextualizing CSR competencies at a discrete-level, because other discrete-level factors may also have provided valuable information about the relative importance of the individual competencies for CSR managers' managerial roles. For example, the social context in which individuals work can also influence work behavior (Johns, 2006), indicating that the configuration of relevant CSR competencies can also differ between different social situations. Moreover, Rieckmann (2012) showed that the relative importance of CSR-related competencies may differ between cultures. Thus, company's internal and external context, which has its specific culture and governance, might also affect the individual competencies that should be denoted in the CSR adaptation process. Future studies should include this and/or other factors at the discrete-level to yield further insight into contextual effects on individual CSR competencies.

A second limitation is that we sent the survey, in which we asked respondents to prioritize the individual competencies, to the original interview sample. As our aim was not to provide a validated competence profile, but rather to show that the context can affect the individual competencies and the relative importance of the competencies CSR managers need, we decided to explore this issue by first asking those we interviewed to provide a prioritized list. Moreover, this choice also allowed us to member check the results that we derived from the interviews. Nevertheless, to validate the competence profile presented in Table 3, it is important to assess it in a larger sample. By working together with national CSR associations, scholars can distribute an online questionnaire with both closed- and open-ended questions among a larger group of CSR professionals. Respondents could be asked to list and explain their three most important job roles including the individual competencies they need to master to be effective in those roles. This step is important to validate and perhaps complement the job roles and competencies identified in the present study. Next, respondents can be asked to provide feedback regarding the list of identified job roles and individual CSR-related competencies as presented in this study. Here, one can also ask respondents to add their proposed job roles and competencies that are not yet represented in this list. Finally, to validate the competence profile presented in this study, respondents could be asked to prioritize the competencies within each job role—If technically possible, one could add the competencies and job roles respondents proposed in the previous step to the list.

Another limitation of the present study is the fact that not all sectors were represented in this study and that we only included large companies in our study. It is well documented that small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) differ from large companies in a number of respects, aside from simply the number of employees. SMEs also differ from large companies with respect to resource availability, organization, and management (Roper & Scott, 2009; Spence, 1999). More importantly, other factors such as support for CSR, the company's view of their role in CSR, their implementation of CSR, and CSR practices differ between SMEs and large companies (Apospori, Zografos, & Magrizos, 2012; Castka, Balzarova, Bamber, & Sharp, 2004; Gallo & Christensen, 2011). Thus, key job roles and individual competencies may differ as well between SMEs and large companies and between the sectors included in this study and other sectors. Future studies may provide additional insight into these matters.

Furthermore, as adapting to CSR principles involves joint efforts of all employees within the company, future studies may also assess to what extent the proposed individual CSR-related competencies are useful for others

within the companies. Because managers play a crucial role in promoting sustainable work behavior among their subordinates, it might be interesting to conduct a study among different types of managers (e.g., asset managers), using a similar research method as was done in the current study. Moreover, a focus on other managers within the company might be especially interesting, because in an ideal situation, CSR managers are no longer needed as CSR is fully integrated within core business process. In such situations, the role of other managers within the company becomes more essential for ensuring CSR.

Conclusion

We present in this study one of the first empirical contextualization of individual competencies needed in the CSR adaptation process. We showed that CSR managers have different managerial roles in the adaptation process, the individual competencies that are needed to effectively perform these roles may differ between roles, and the relative importance of these competencies within each role may be driven by business logic rather than an idealistic logic.

The limitations notwithstanding, our results have several practical implications. First, our study addresses a concern that is often voiced by many CEOs. Specifically, previous research suggests that CEOs of leading companies express the need to improve the competencies and mindsets of their managers to address CSR-related challenges (United Nations Global Compact & Accenture, 2010). Here, we report that CSR managers have unique roles in the CSR adaptation process; moreover, depending on his or her actual role(s) in the adaptation process, different individual CSR-related competencies might be needed to successfully perform the role(s). Our study findings are particularly relevant to CSR professionals and researchers. Our competence profile, though an initial version due to the exploratory nature of this study, can guide CSR managers' personal reflection process. It can especially aid those CSR managers in companies that are in the earlier stages of the CSR adaptation process; it helps them understand their role in the CSR adaptation process, reflect on the competencies they have and perhaps need to develop, and helps them pinpoint the job roles (including subsequent competencies) that might aid the advancement of the CSR adaptation process. Researchers can use the competence profile as a framework to further develop the competence profile for CSR managers and unravel the micro-, meso-, and macro-level influences on a company's CSR adaptation process (cf. Aguinis & Glavas, 2012).

Appendix A

Quinn's (1988) Managerial Roles.

Role	Description
1. Innovating role	In this role, the professional identifies trends, envisions the future, and anticipates changes that need to be made to ensure the existence of the company.
2. Networking role	In this role, the professional is focused on maintaining the company's external legitimacy. Key tasks are developing, scanning, and maintaining a network of contacts.
3. Producing role	In this role, the professional is task oriented and focused on completing the actual activities that need to be executed.
4. Strategic role	In this role, the professional is focused on determining and setting the strategy, goals, and objectives.
5. Coordinating role	In this role, the professional is focused on implementing set strategy. Key tasks here are scheduling, coordinating, and problem solving.
6. Monitoring role	In this role, the professional is in charge of collecting and distributing information for evaluation and reporting purposes.
7. Stimulating role	In this role, the professional is focused on internal group relations, and the professional facilitates and stimulates collaboration and teamwork among employees, encourages others, and stimulates the development of group moral.
8. Mentoring role	In this role, the professional is focused on individual employees. The professional listens to individual needs and stimulates and attempts to facilitate professional development.

Appendix B

Specifications From CSR Professionals Interviewed (N = 28).

Company	Interviewee's ID	Gender	Age	Job title	Job experience (years)	Sector ^a	Certified GRI complaint ^b
A	A1	Male	47	Manager, CSR and sustainable development ^c	7.5	Banks and insurance	GRI
	A2	Male	34	Business developer, sustainability	6	Banks and insurance	GRI
B	B1	Male	38	Group coordinator, corporate responsibility ^c	4	Service	External
	B2	Female	44	Development manager and lawyer ^c	16	Service	External
C	C1	Male	48	Manager, HR Europe	13	Retail	External
	C2	Male	36	Manager, CSR and quality ^c	2	Retail	External
D	D1	Female	50	Corporate responsibility and sustainability lead and health manager ^c	7.5	Service	Self
	D2	Female	50	Manager portfolio and innovation	10	Service	Self
E	E1	Male	40	Director, sustainability	6	Consumer products	External
	E2	Female	39	Sustainability manager, supply ^c	8	Consumer products	External
F	F1	Male	55	Compliance manager	4	Service	GRI
	F2	Male	27	Compliance officer ^c	2	Service	GRI
G	G1	Female	48	Program manager, CSR	2.5	Banks and insurance	External
	G2	Male	48	Sustainability officer ^c	5	Banks and insurance	External

(continued)

Appendix B (continued)

Company	Interviewee's ID	Gender	Age	Job title	Job experience (years)	Sector ^a	Certified GRI complaint ^b
H	H1	Male	43	Director, sourcing and sustainability ^c	2	Transport	External
	H2	Male	33	Project manager, sustainable contracting ^c	1.5	Transport	External
I	I	Female	40	CSR manager	5	Food and drink	External
J	J	Male	34	Program manager, sustainability and advisor sustainability ^c	2	Service	Self
K	K	Male	42	CSR manager	3	Energy, oil, and gas	GRI
L	L	Male	57	Global director, sustainable sourcing development ^c	18	Food and drink	External
M	M	Female	43	Corporate responsibility officer ^c	1	Service	External
N	N	Female	36	Sustainability manager ^c	3	Energy, oil, and gas	GRI
O	O	Male	44	Senior advisor and strategist sustainability ^c	17	Banks and insurance	GRI
P	P	Male	53	Manager, safety, health, environment, and quality ^c	5	Food and drink	External
Q	Q	Male	50	Director, corporate communications and CSR	12	Technology	External
R	R	Female	49	Sustainability manager, engagement and learning ^c	20	Industrial	External
S	S	Female	45	Director, corporate responsibility ^c	1	Service	External
T	T	Female	40	Manager, global sustainable development	3	Food and drink	External

Note. CSR = corporate social responsibility.

^aSector categorization is based on the Transparency Benchmark 2012.

^bCertified by Global Reporting Initiative: GRI, external: external auditor, self: self-certified.

^cRespondent included in the questionnaire sample.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. The current study focuses on identifying relevant job role. See Osagic, Wesselink, Blok, Lans, and Mulder (2016) for more information regarding the process of identifying individual competencies for the corporate social responsibility (CSR) adaptation process.
2. The Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs uses this benchmark to provide insight into the quality and quantity of CSR reporting by Dutch companies. The 550 largest Dutch companies and organizations (based on the number of employees and/or the highest turnover) are included in this benchmark. The 2012 Transparency Benchmark is at <https://www.transparantiebenchmark.nl/resultaat-2012>.
3. The complete ranking will be provided upon request from the corresponding author.

References

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932-968.
- Altman, D. G. (1991). *Practical statistics for medical research*. London, England: Chapman & Hall.
- Apospori, E., Zografos, K. G., & Magrizos, S. (2012). SME corporate social responsibility and competitiveness: A literature review. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 58, 10-31.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2001). Managerial perceptions of corporate environmentalism: Interpretations from industry and strategic implications for organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 489-513.
- Barratt-Pugh, L., Bahn, S., & Gakere, E. (2013). Managers as change agents: Implication for human resource managers engaging with culture changes. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26, 748-764.
- Belasen, A. T., Benke, M., DiPadova, L. N., & Fortunato, M. V. (1996). Downsizing and the hyper-effective manager: The shifting importance of managerial roles during organizational transformation. *Human Resource Management*, 35, 87-117.
- Belasen, A. T., & Frank, N. (2008). Competing values leadership: Quadrant roles and personality traits. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29, 127-143.

- Blok, V., Gremmen, B., & Wesselink, R. (2016). Dealing with the wicked problem of sustainability: The role of individual virtuous competence. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 34(3), 297-327.
- Burge, R. J. (2003). Healthcare restructuring in Canada. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 23, 1-7.
- Cameron, K. S., Quinn, R. E., DeGraff, J., & Thakor, A. (2006). *Competing values leadership: Creating value in organizations*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Carroll, A. B., & Shabana, K. M. (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12, 85-105.
- Castka, P., Balzarova, M. A., Bamber, C. J., & Sharp, J. M. (2004). How can SMEs effectively implement the CSR agenda? A UK case study perspective. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 11, 140-149.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 37-46.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15, 1-13. doi:10.1002/csr.132
- Day, G. (1994). The capabilities of market driven organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 37-52.
- De Haan, G. (2006). The BLK "21" programme in Germany: A "Gestaltungskompetenz" based model for education for sustainable development. *Environmental Education Research*, 12, 19-32.
- Delamare Le Deist, F., & Winterton, J. (2005). What is competence? *Human Resource Development International*, 8, 27-46.
- Denison, D. R., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R. E. (1995). Paradox and performance: Towards a theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science*, 6, 524-540.
- Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London, England: The Falmer Press.
- Fernández, E., Junquera, B., & Ordiz, M. (2006). Managers' profile in environmental strategy: A review of the literature. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 13, 261-274.
- Friese, S. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS.ti* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Furst, S. A., & Cable, D. M. (2008). Employees resistance to organizational change: Managerial influence tactics and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 453-462.
- Gallo, P. J., & Christensen, L. J. (2011). Firm size matters: An empirical investigation of organizational size and ownership on sustainability-related behaviors. *Business & Society*, 50, 315-349.
- Gao, J., & Bansal, P. (2013). Instrumental and integrative logics in business sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112, 241-255.

- Gardner, W. L., & Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. (2004). Unleashing individual potential: Performance gains through positive organizational behavior and authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 270-281.
- Grant, G., Elbow, P., Ewens, T., Gamson, Z., Kohli, W., Neumann, W., . . . Riesman, D. (1979). *On competence: A critical analysis of competence-based reforms in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business & Society*, 39, 254-280.
- Griffin, M. A. (2007). Specifying organizational contexts: Systematic links between contexts and processes in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 859-863.
- Hahn, T., & Aragón-Correa, J. A. (2015). Towards cognitive plurality on corporate sustainability in organization: The role of organizational factors. *Organization & Environment*, 28, 255-263.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 677-694.
- Hay, R., & Gray, E. (1974). Social responsibilities of business managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17, 135-143.
- Hemingway, C. A. (2005). Personal values as a catalyst for corporate social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60, 233-249.
- Heugens, P. P. M. A. R. (2006). Environmental issue management: Towards a multi-level theory of environmental management competence. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15, 363-376.
- Higgs, M., & Rowland, D. (2011). What does it take to implement change successfully? A study of the behaviors of successful change leaders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47, 309-335.
- Holder-Webb, L., Cohen, J. R., Nath, L., & Wood, D. (2009). The supply of corporate social responsibility disclosures among U.S. firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 497-527.
- Huczynski, A. A., & Buchanan, D. A. (2007). *Organizational behavior* (6th ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Jamali, D. (2008). A stakeholder approach to corporate social responsibility: A fresh perspective into theory and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 213-231.
- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 396-408.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159-174.
- Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2009). Designing and implementing corporate social responsibility: An integrative framework grounded in theory and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 71-89.
- Marano, V., & Kostova, T. (2016). Unpacking the institutional complexity in adoption of CSR practices in multinational enterprises. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53, 28-54.

- Moran, J. W., & Brightman, B. K. (2001). Leading organizational change. *Career Development International*, 6, 111-118.
- Mulder, M. (2014). Conceptions of professional competence. In S. Billett, C. Harteis & H. Gruber (Eds.), *International handbook on research into professional and practice-based learning* (pp. 107-137). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Neumann, W. (1979). Educational responses to the concern for proficiency. In G. Grant. (Eds.), *On competence, a critical analysis of competence-based reform in higher education* (pp. 66-94). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nguyen, D. K., & Slater, S. F. (2010). Hitting the sustainability sweet spot: Having it all. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 31(3), 5-11.
- Osagie, E. R., Wesselink, R., Blok, V., Lans, T., & Mulder, M. (2016). Individual competencies for corporate social responsibility: A literature and practice perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 233-252.
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski & I. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 565-593). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Quinn, R. E. (1988). *Beyond rational management: Mastering the paradoxes and competing demands of high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29, 363-377.
- Ramachandran, V. (2011). Strategic corporate social responsibility: A “dynamic capabilities” perspective. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 18, 285-293.
- Rieckmann, M. (2012). Future-oriented higher education: Which key competencies should be fostered through university teaching and learning? *Futures*, 44, 127-135.
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.
- Robert, G., & Fulop, N. (2014). *Perspectives on the context: The role of context in successful improvement*. Retrieved from www.health.org.uk/publications/perspectives-on-context/
- Roper, S., & Scott, J. M. (2009). Perceived financial barriers and the start-up decision: An econometric analysis of gender differences using GEM data. *International Small Business Journal*, 27, 149-172.
- Sandberg, J., & Pinnington, H. (2009). Professional competence as ways of being: An existential ontological perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 1138-1170.
- Spence, L. J. (1999). Does size matter? The state of the art in small business ethics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 8, 163-174.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Swanson, D. L. (1999). Toward an integrative theory of business and society: A research strategy for corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 506-521.

- Tang, Z., Hull, C. E., & Rothenberg, S. (2012). How corporate social responsibility engagement strategy moderates the CSR–financial performance relationship. *Journal of Management Studies*, *49*, 1274-1303.
- Teece, D. J., & Pisano, G. (1994). The dynamic capabilities of firms: An introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *3*, 537-556.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*, 509-533.
- United Nations Global Compact & Accenture. (2010). *A new era of sustainability: The United Nations Global Compact–Accenture 2010 CEO Study*. United Nations and Accenture. Retrieved from <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/230>
- Van Beurden, P., & Gössling, T. (2008). The worth of values: A literature review on the relation between corporate social and financial performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*, 407-424.
- Veldhuizen, M., Blok, V., & Dentoni, D. (2013). Organizational drivers of capabilities for multi-stakeholder dialogue and knowledge integration. *Journal of Chain and Network Science*, *13*, 107-117.
- Vidal, N., Kozak, R., & Hansen, E. (2012). Adoption and implementation of corporate responsibility practices: A proposed framework. *Business & Society*, *31*, 1-17. doi:10.1177/0007650312464028
- Waldman, D. A., Siegel, D. S., & Javidan, M. (2006). Components of CEO transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*, 1703-1725.
- Wang, C., & Ahmed, P. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *9*, 31-51.
- Whetten, D. A. (2009). An examination of the interface between context and theory applied to the study of Chinese organizations. *Management and Organization Review*, *5*, 29-55.
- Wiek, A., Withycombe, L., & Redman, C. L. (2011). Key competencies in sustainability: A reference framework for academic program development. *Sustainability Science*, *6*, 203-218.
- Willard, M., Wiedmeyer, C., Warren Flint, R., Weedon, J. S., Woodward, R., Feldman, I., & Edwards, M. (2010). The sustainability professional: 2010 competency survey report. *Environmental Quality Management*, *20*, 49-83.
- Wong, E. M., Ormiston, M. E., & Tetlock, P. E. (2011). The effects of top management team integrative complexity and decentralized decision making on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*, 1207-1228.

Author Biographies

Eghe R. Osagie is a PhD student at the Education and Competence Studies, Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands. She is also a researcher at the research group HRM at the HAN University of Applied Sciences. Her research interests include topics like corporate social responsibility, human resource management, human resource development, employability, and work ability.

Renate Wesselink (PhD, Wageningen University & Research) is an assistant professor at Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands. Her research interests focus on (team) learning and Human Resource Development (HRD) for corporate social responsibility and multistakeholder cooperations. Her articles have appeared in journals such as *Business and Professional Ethics Journal*, *Environmental Education Research*, *International Journal of Training and Development*, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, and *Vocations and Learning*.

Vincent Blok (PhD, Wageningen University & Research) is an associate professor in business ethics and responsible innovation at the Management Studies Group, and associate professor in philosophy of management, technology, and innovation at the Philosophy Group, Wageningen University & Research (The Netherlands). His research group is involved in several (European) research projects at the crossroads of business, philosophy, and innovation. His work has appeared in *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, and other journals. See www.vincentblok.nl for more information about his current research.

Martin Mulder (PhD, Wageningen University & Research) is professor and head of the Education and Competence Studies at Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands. His research focuses on competence theory, and research and development. He edited the book *Competence-Based Vocational and Professional Education* (Springer, 2017) and (co)authored numerous other books and articles in peer-reviewed scientific research journals, such as in *Educational Research Review*, *International Journal of Science Education, Learning and Instruction*, *Studies in Higher Education*, and *Vocations and Learning*. He is editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*.