

# Transforming Corporate Social Responsibilities Toward an Intellectual Activist Research Agenda for Micro-CSR Research

Girschik, Verena; Svystunova, Liudmyla; Lysova, Evgenia I.

*Document Version*  
Accepted author manuscript

*Published in:*  
Human Relations

*DOI:*  
[10.1177/0018726720970275](https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720970275)

*Publication date:*  
2022

*License*  
Unspecified

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Girschik, V., Svystunova, L., & Lysova, E. I. (2022). Transforming Corporate Social Responsibilities: Toward an Intellectual Activist Research Agenda for Micro-CSR Research. *Human Relations*, 75(1), 3-32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720970275>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

## General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

## Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us ([research.lib@cbs.dk](mailto:research.lib@cbs.dk)) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 05. Oct. 2023



*Critical Essay*

**Transforming corporate social responsibilities:  
Toward an intellectual activist research agenda for micro-CSR research**

Verena Girschik

Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Liudmyla Svystunova

Loughborough University London, UK

Lysova, Evgenia I.

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands

**Corresponding author:** Verena Girschik, Copenhagen Business School,  
Dalgas Have 15, 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark  
Email: [vg.msc@cbs.dk](mailto:vg.msc@cbs.dk)

## **Abstract**

In their recent essay, Gond and Moser (2019) have proposed that micro-CSR research has the potential to “matter” and transform business practices as it engages closely with how individuals in companies work with and experience CSR. But can micro-CSR research in its current form realize this transformative potential and serve social justice? Adopting an intellectual activist position, we argue that the transformative potential of micro-CSR is severely limited by its predominant focus on CSR as defined, presented and promoted by companies themselves, thereby serving to sustain the hegemony of the business case for CSR, promoting narrow interests and maintaining managerial control over corporate responsibilities. We propose that micro-CSR researchers broaden the scope of their research to cultivate the potential of alternative ideas, voices, and activities found in organizational life. In so doing we lay out a research agenda that embraces employee activism, listens to alternative voices, and unfolds confrontational, subversive, and covert activities. In the hope of inspiring other micro-CSR researchers to explore these unconventional paths, we also offer suggestions as to how we can pursue them through empirical research.

## **Keywords**

Corporate social responsibility, critical performativity, employee activism; intellectual activism, micro-CSR

The multibillion-dollar tech industry has come under moral scrutiny both from the outside world and from within. The Tech Workers Coalition based in the San Francisco Bay Area started as an attempt to connect to the local community and has grown into a movement that seeks to challenge the tech industry's practices, including questionable use of technology and the exploitation of low-paid and temporary workers, from janitors to Uber drivers (Sheets & Schaefer, 2017; Tech Workers Coalition, 2018). The Coalition's 2018 zine *Tech Won't Build It!* states its mission as follows:

Our labor has transformed the lives of technocrats, CEOs, and investors – all at the expense of the most oppressed in society [...] But like many workers in many industries before us, we too have skills to self-organize, to refuse to do harm, to make demands, to fight for the things our communities so desperately need, and to win [...] We don't have to be complicit, and we don't have to be silent.

The tech workers' movement uses a range of tactics, including the leaking of now infamous Google and Facebook memos, online activism enabled by social media tools, as well as more traditional tactics such as strikes and protests. Pressure from employees has led numerous companies in the sector to abandon plans to work with US President Donald Trump. Google has been pressured to cancel its intended collaboration with the Chinese government, while employees at Amazon have halted the company's plans to develop and sell facial recognition technology that could have been used by US law enforcement with potentially catastrophic implications for minorities.

The successes of the Tech Workers Coalition illustrate that employees can at times pressure their companies to take a moral stance and act on issues of social justice. Yet, these transformative dynamics still fall outside the scope of current micro-CSR research. The burgeoning literature on micro-CSR has been developing the micro-foundations of CSR, or 'the individual actions and interactions underlying any CSR-related practices', by advancing

our understanding of how CSR professionals work with CSR as well as how other employees perceive, evaluate, and react to companies' CSR practices (Gond & Moser, 2019: 3). Gond and Moser (2019) comprehensively make the case that this literature has offered much-needed theoretical insights into the intra-organizational dynamics around CSR and is well-positioned to deliver important insights for practitioners. By conceptualizing CSR as comprising organizational policies and actions (Aguinis, 2011: 858), however, the micro-CSR literature adopts a narrow focus on the practices that companies present and promote under the CSR banner and thereby overlooks the abundance of alternative ideas, voices and activities that reside in organizational life and which, perhaps even more potently, contribute to corporate responsabilization.

Our purpose in this essay is to explore how we as micro-CSR researchers can push for more socially responsible business practices as we pursue our research. In the spirit of intellectual activism (Contu, 2018, 2020), we ask how we can walk our own talk and place the power of our ideas 'in service to social justice' (Collins, 2013: ix). The intellectual activist stance we adopt here is grounded in black feminist thought and rests on an understanding of social justice as a part of progressive democratic politics that value freedom, equality, and solidarity (Contu, 2020). It insists that we as scholars use our position of privilege to partake in such politics and take responsibility for how our research matters. To motivate our endeavor, this critical essay first sets out the ways in which the current focus of micro-CSR research serves to reproduce and stabilize business-as-usual. We then explore alternative directions for future research that broaden the scope of micro-CSR research to include overlooked ideas, voices, and activities that hold transformative potential. We close by offering methodological considerations and reflections that seek to inspire others to walk this path with us.

## **Why micro-CSR research needs intellectual activism**

Companies can serve both as vehicles for change and perpetrators of injustice: they often have the means to tackle societal challenges, including financial resources, managerial competences and political clout, yet they equally often benefit from maintaining the status quo to extract economic rents (Surroca et al., 2013; George et al., 2016). It had been hoped that CSR would lead companies to participate in positive change insofar as it encourages them to take on more responsibility for social issues (Bowen, 1953; Margolis and Walsh, 2003). Yet critics have observed that many companies have responded to the pressure for CSR by adopting such practices only ceremonially without actually practicing what they preach (see, for example, Fleming and Jones, 2013). In this way companies ward off criticism and pre-empt activist strikes while business continues as usual behind the façade (Delmas and Burbano, 2011; McDonnell et al., 2015).

The micro-CSR literature has looked behind this façade by focusing on how individuals in companies work with and experience CSR. In their comprehensive review of this burgeoning field, Gond and Moser (2019) bring together the sociological and the psychological streams of micro-CSR scholarship. Contributions that adopt a sociological perspective have focused on how CSR professionals legitimate and promote social issues in their companies and the discursive, political, and identity-related struggles they face in doing so (e.g. Risi and Wickert, 2017; Wright and Nyberg, 2012). In contrast, works that adopt a psychological perspective have mostly been concerned with how (prospective) employees perceive and react to organizational efforts to implement CSR (for reviews of this literature, see Gond et al., 2017; Jones and Rupp, 2017; Rupp and Mallory, 2015), and to some extent with how employees engage with CSR in their organizations (Aguilera et al., 2007; Hemingway, 2005; Sendlhofer, 2019; Slack et al., 2015). These studies have enriched our understanding of the factors that impact employees' reactions to corporate CSR practices and strategies, linking them to several

work-related attitudes and behaviors such as organizational identification, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (for a review, see Gond et al., 2017). Taken together, the two streams of micro-CSR research have shed light on the intra-organizational dynamics that obstruct or foster CSR within companies.

Laying out directions for future micro-CSR research, Gond and Moser (2019) emphasize that by virtue of its engagement with intra-organizational dynamics such research has the potential to be critically performative, i.e. to make itself matter by producing impacts on CSR practice. Encouraging more critical research into the negative impact of CSR on employees, as well as the uses and abuses of managerial control and power, Gond and Moser (2019) propose that future micro-CSR research can be progressive while at the same time raising points of critique in fruitful dialogue with practitioners. Because micro-CSR research focuses on how CSR is practiced on the ground, it can develop tools and frameworks that are within the reach of practitioners and may enable them to act upon CSR. Micro-CSR research thus has potential to matter insofar as we as scholars aim to be critical, progressive and engaged.

To fully realize this potential, however, micro-CSR scholars will need to be both much more ambitious and much humbler. We need to be more ambitious because a truly critical and progressive research agenda must interrogate rather than merely accept the institutionalized power relations within which people struggle as given (Cabantous et al., 2016; Contu, 2020). To do so our research needs to be centered on analyses of power that recognize and take seriously the ways in which institutionalized power relations manifest themselves in the construction of identities and subject positions *in situ*, and how these enable and constrain the ways that individuals make sense of, communicate, and act on their lived experiences (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Meyer and Vaara, 2020). At the same time we need to be humbler and to critically reflect on our own practices by asking what we study and how, scrutinizing the extent to which our practices contribute to social justice. In this spirit, and inspired by recent critical

assessments of CSR practices and scholarship, we review the micro-CSR literature and conceptualise three challenges that currently limit the transformative potential of micro-CSR research.

*Challenge 1: Micro-CSR research sustains the hegemony of the business case*

The dominant narrative around CSR in the discourses of both scholars and practitioners centers on companies' aligning CSR with strategy by identifying a business case (Feix and Philippe 2020; Kaplan, 2020; Porter and Kramer, 2006). Constructing such alignment is not an easy task, however, and micro-CSR research has highlighted how CSR professionals struggle to cope with the multiple tensions inherent in their work, including tensions between business and social goals (Dahlmann and Grosvold, 2017; Hunoldt et al., 2020; Kok et al., 2019), between their companies' business objectives and practices and their own personal values and beliefs (Hahn et al., 2015), as well as the inconsistent temporal horizons of financial reporting, building stakeholder relationships and even tackling climate issues (Mitra and Buzzanell, 2017; Gond and Moser, 2019). Although Mitra and Buzzanell (2017) suggest that reflecting on these tensions enables CSR professionals to experience their work as meaningful, these tensions typically also lead to considerable frustration as CSR professionals struggle and often fail to genuinely incorporate CSR into the managerial reality of the companies in which they work (Carollo and Guerci, 2018; Wright et al., 2012; Wright and Nyberg, 2012).

Professionals promoting CSR typically have to resort to rhetoric adapted to traditional business logic in order to avoid the rolling eyes of management and business-minded colleagues (Shamir, 2004; Carollo and Guerci, 2017; Gond et al., 2018). Given that senior managers have been shown to believe in the business case for CSR (Hafenbradl and Waeger, 2017), they do not need to be convinced *of* but rather *by* the business case for CSR, i.e. social causes must contribute to a company's bottom line to be legitimate in the eyes of senior



managers who have ultimate control of resources and strategy (Carollo and Guerci, 2017; Mitra and Buzzanell, 2018). For example, Brès and Gond (2014) show how the ways in which CSR consultants translate issues advanced by social movements both enable such issues to be embedded in corporate practices while at the same time commodifying them. In this way, alignment with corporate strategy becomes a more important part of their professional role than that of being the company's conscience and source of alternative CSR definitions. This in turn further limits the sources and scope of viable ideas about a company's responsibilities to those who instrumentalize people and the planet to serve profit.

In a recent critique, Roth and colleagues (2020) note that CSR may at best act as a mechanism of employee self-deception, and at worst as an inadvertent means by which to stabilize the status quo rather than address problems that threaten corporate legitimacy. Especially when companies have strongly espoused CSR commitments, employees may be co-opted into management's idealized description of how the company deals with social issues, thus compromising the discursive space for critique (Kourula and Delalieux, 2016). Even when employees promote more progressive and bottom-up initiatives, they soon decouple those from their 'moral responsibility for CSR' as they have to deal with the internal procedures that maintain the conventional business model (Sendlhofer, 2019). The effects of such processes are illustrated powerfully in Wright and Nyberg's (2017) study of how Australian companies gradually resolved the tensions associated with climate change by translating them into 'business as usual'. In doing so, corporate commitments to tackle climate change were effectively diluted as climate initiatives were realigned 'with the dominant market discourse of maximizing shareholder value' (p. 1651).

These contributions to micro-CSR vividly illustrate the intra-organizational dynamics through which companies instrumentalize CSR to serve the status quo, with CSR professionals reinforcing the business case as they struggle to promote ideas about CSR that are perceived

as viable within the dominant managerial reality. As Kaplan (2020: 2) puts it: ‘the very ideology that makes the business case for CSR sound appealing also predicts the absence of actual engagement with CSR issues.’ Unsurprisingly, then, CSR has so far delivered too little corporate action even on low-hanging fruits (De Bakker et al., 2020). While most micro-CSR researchers do not shy away from adopting a more normative stance, our review shows that their contributions reflect the tensions inherent in practitioners’ attempts to promote corporate responsibility – and thereby unwittingly maintain them. If we are to leverage the performative potential of micro-CSR research, therefore, we need to find more powerful ways to challenge the hegemony of the business case and cultivate a broader spectrum of ideas around companies’ social responsibilities.

*Challenge 2: Micro-CSR research promotes narrow interests*

Micro-CSR research has shown that CSR professionals often have activist leanings or experiences (Girschik, 2020; Risi and Wickert, 2017; Wickert and De Bakker, 2018). The diffusion of CSR across the corporate landscape has been accompanied by increasing professionalization, however, leading to the rise of established experts in the field and enabling CSR to be constructed as an attractive market in its own right (Brès et al., 2019, Brès and Gond, 2014). For example, Porter and Kramer’s consulting firm FSG has become a dominant voice in promoting CSR discourse while at the same time monetizing the idea of measurable win-win strategies. Similarly, micro-CSR research has shown individuals can instrumentalize CSR for a variety of purposes, including self-interested attempts to improve their own positions and advance their careers, with only a secondary interest in promoting responsible business practices (Bondy, 2008; Furusten et al., 2013). For example, Bondy (2008: 313) describes individuals who were disinterested in and even dismissive of CSR but who were nonetheless ‘intent on being in control of it and used power sources and influence tactics to further control

the CSR agenda within their organization'. Insofar as CSR is driven primarily by people who may benefit from it, there is a risk that it becomes apolitical and self-interested.

This risk is exacerbated when CSR is compartmentalized as a distinct function at corporate headquarters. While the idea that CSR should be integrated across all business functions has gained momentum, micro-CSR research shows it is still formally defined by a select group of people while other employees have little say in what social issues matter to the company and how it should act on them. Most studies portray employees as passive recipients of organizational CSR strategies and frameworks (for definitions and reviews, see: Gond et al., 2017; Jones and Rupp, 2017; Rupp and Mallory, 2015). As illustrated in studies on employees' pro-environmental and green behaviors (Boiral, 2009; Norton et al., 2015; Ones and Dilchert, 2012; Ramus and Steger, 2000) and CSR engagement (e.g., Aguilera et al., 2007; Slack et al., 2015), employees who engage more actively often merely support the implementation of an already existing CSR strategy. For example, Boiral (2009: 231) explains that employees' pro-environmental initiatives may constitute a 'less formalist vision of environmental management' through which employees support, but do not challenge, the organizational greening strategy. Further, the literature has tended to regard them as a single group, regardless of whether and in which ways they are affected by the company's activities. This approach does not fully account for the fact that employees may belong to more than one stakeholder category on account of their membership of other organizations such as trade unions or their own local communities (Hejjas et al., 2019). As a result, the many voices that reside in companies may not be heard in the construction of their companies' responsibilities.

This lack of attention to the diversity of voices in companies is particularly salient when considering the international dimensions of CSR. Global CSR policies usually originate at corporate headquarters and then have to be implemented and re-negotiated in idiosyncratic national contexts (Gutierrez-Huerter et al., 2019; Acosta et al., 2019). Despite local

adaptations, legitimating processes are usually still oriented toward Western countries where the corporate headquarters, major investors, target audiences and (aspirational) peer groups are located (Jamali, 2010). As a result, such CSR policies do not do justice to the plurality of voices on the ground where social justice issues actually unfold (Atal, 2017; Ehrnström-Fuentes, 2016; Lauwo, 2018). These Western-centric practices serve the purpose first and foremost of legitimating corporate activities. Not unlike polar bears and orang-utans, the people who are actually affected in the global South are portrayed as a ‘poor, exotic Other in need of some Western-led, market-based development intervention’ (Archer, 2020: 5; see also Schneider, 2020). These tropes may perform well in glossy CSR reports but they indicate little interest in the lived experiences of those whom they claim to help or to empower, instead serving to perpetuate gendered neocolonial relations (McCarthy, 2017; McCarthy et al., 2020; Ozkazanc-Pan 2019; see also Kaplan, 2020; Rhodes et al., 2020). Such detachment may have grave unintended consequences, for example when even well-intentioned CSR policies such as micro-financing or the abandonment of child labour have detrimental outcomes for the communities affected (Gond and Moser, 2019; Khan et al., 2007).

Previous contributions to micro-CSR literature have thus far served to reinforce the voices that dominate the CSR discourse, thereby reflecting a lack of engagement on the part of companies with those who are not associated with (formally) defined CSR practices. In doing so, the literature has largely failed to take into consideration the extent to which CSR practices are both symptomatic of and reproduce societal inequalities (Kourula and Delalieux, 2016). In order to leverage the performative potential of micro-CSR research we need to embrace a richer diversity of voices, especially those that draw attention to the problems of people most adversely affected by corporate activities.

### *Challenge 3: Micro-CSR research maintains managerial control*

Given the enduring primacy of the business case and the continuing prevalence of a narrow set of interests, CSR professionals have a relatively limited repertoire of appropriate actions with which they can seek to drive change. Micro-CSR research has shown that even where their intentions are driven by passion and commitment to the causes they advocate, CSR managers face internal legitimacy deficits (see, for instance, Frandsen et al., 2013 for an illustration) as well as the challenge of overcoming marginalization and of gaining access to the management who ultimately control the allocation of resources (Risi and Wickert, 2017). Their relatively weak position in the company and their need for management support can curtail the range of identities and actions considered viable for CSR professionals. To legitimate their role in organizations and appeal to higher echelons, CSR managers often have to speak the language of profit (Wickert and De Bakker, 2018). In doing so they legitimize their role by describing themselves as ‘motors of change’ or ‘business-oriented managers’ while downplaying any characterization of their work as idealistic or philanthropic (Carollo and Guerci, 2017).

When focusing on how CSR professionals drive CSR in companies it is thus not surprising that the focus in the micro-CSR literature has primarily been on their overt and collaborative actions, in many cases comprising attempts to sweet-talk management into undertaking more socially responsible activities. Often such practices on the part of CSR professionals are captured by the notion of issue-selling, i.e. ‘behaviours that are directed towards affecting others’ attention to and understanding of issues’ (Dutton and Ashford, 1993: 398). The main purpose of issue-selling is, by definition, to win the attention of top management and convince them to allocate resources to social causes (Dutton et al., 2001; Sonenshein, 2016), hence approaching the selling of social issues like ‘any other business issue’ is one way CSR professionals can succeed, at least outwardly, in their efforts (Anderson and Bateman, 2000). For example, Wickert and De Bakker (2018: 65) find that in their issue

selling efforts CSR managers emphasize the need to ‘speak the buyers’ language’, addressing them in the way that tie to these buyers’ motivations and incentives. Such overt and collaborative activities undertaken within their organizational roles may indeed have an impact on management’s decision-making if the initiatives they propose are considered economically viable (Alt and Craig, 2016). These issue-selling efforts can only ever bring incremental change, however, so long as CSR professionals focus on achieving small wins rather than promoting an overwhelming vision of a better world (Wickert and De Bakker, 2018).

Similarly, bottom-up activities within an organization’s CSR framework tend to deliver new initiatives, but they do not promote change. As captured by the literature on employees’ pro-environmental and green behaviors (Boiral, 2009; Norton et al., 2015; Ones and Dilchert, 2012; Ramus & Steger, 2000) and employees’ engagement with CSR (e.g., Aguilera et al., 2007; Hemingway, 2005; Slack et al., 2015), employees may engage in behaviors beyond their formal organizational roles and take initiatives on social issues. Again, however, such employee-driven initiatives typically involve a certain degree of organizational oversight and are not completely spontaneous or independent of existing managerial practices (Norton et al., 2015; Ones and Dilchert, 2012), i.e. they typically fall within the description of ‘formal organizational activities that have a socio economic focus’ (Opoku Dakwa et al., 2018: 581). Moreover, as Slack and colleagues (2015: 543) find, employees reflecting on their engagement with CSR often refer to initiatives that happen ‘notably not within the organization’, such as planting trees in one’s spare time. Overall, since employee-driven initiatives are relatively innocuous and benign, their impact tends to be marginal rather than transformative. Meanwhile, employee efforts that actually challenge dominant ways of thinking and doing CSR have remained underexplored.

Our review shows that the micro-CSR literature has thus far been focused on tactics, routes and initiatives deemed viable under the CSR banner. This focus is further constrained

by our tools of the trade (Kaplan, 1964), i.e. our choice of settings, participants and methods, and how we frame the questions to guide our research. For as long as we focus exclusively on CSR managers and employees developing and implementing CSR practices and initiatives under the CSR banner, we cannot hope to promote the less appropriate, uncomfortable and disruptive activities required to challenge the status quo and drive more radical change.

### **New directions for micro-CSR research**

Given the evidence that social justice does not fare well under the current CSR banner, we cannot be content with simply pointing out how others could do CSR better. The question is how we can overcome such ‘decaf’ performativity (Contu, 2008) and radically transform CSR to serve social justice. To develop an intellectual activist research agenda, we first need to broaden the scope of micro-CSR research and engage with alternative ideas, voices and activities. What we propose is not a ‘grand plan’, however; rather, we hope to encourage micro-CSR researchers to join us in nurturing change by ‘finding and promoting such practices within hives of activity already buzzing with as-yet-thwarted potential’ (Ashcraft, 2018: 618). In what follows we sketch the contours of a micro-CSR research agenda that counters the hegemony of the business case by embracing employee activism, moving beyond narrow interests to include alternative voices and challenging managerial control by unfolding confrontational, subversive and covert activities. Table 1 provides an overview of the topics discussed and possible exploratory research questions.

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

*Beyond the business case: Embracing employee activism*

The hegemony of the business case renders CSR a legitimate means to further corporate interests, thus instrumentalizing people and the planet in order to serve profit. How then can we, as micro-CSR researchers, tap into, engage with and cultivate alternative ideas that challenge the hegemony of the business case and privilege social justice? And how can these ideas be protected from being subsumed into business-as-usual?

To engage with ideas that are less commonly included in the micro-CSR literature and which might not be considered viable under the CSR banner, we suggest expanding our focus to employee activism. Activist employees have social purposes in pursuit of which they challenge the status quo in the companies that formally employ them and of which they are considered members (Risi et al., 2014; Wickert and De Bakker, 2018). Having a social purpose means they aim ‘to remedy a perceived social problem, or to promote or counter changes to the existing social order’ (Briscoe and Gupta, 2016: 4). Crucially, regardless of their formal titles and positions, activist employees do not view their companies merely as places where they work but are also concerned with the role of these companies in society and how the companies’ activities serve or hinder social justice. By embracing employee activism, we thus draw attention to people who, for a variety of reasons, care about issues of social justice.

This shift in focus requires broadening the scope of micro-CSR inquiry beyond individuals working under the CSR banner (i.e. CSR professionals) to include activist accountants, activist human resource managers, and activist manual and service workers. Perhaps more importantly, this approach demands noticing people rather than just the roles and identities they perform, paying attention to ideas, ideologies and identities considered inappropriate to express at work and kept hidden behind a façade of professionalism, in this way enabling us to capture the ‘misfits’ that are ‘undone’ in the organizational setting (Butler, 2005). Such misfits may keep nagging at people and moving them to promote change in their



organizations (Creed et al., 2010). By embracing activist employees and the misfits that would not normally pass through the organizational filter, we can foster people's multiple identities and nonviable ideas, especially those that help both us and them to envision companies' responsibilities differently.

As illustrated in our opening example of the Tech Workers Coalition, employee activism may accumulate into social movements around alternative ideas of corporate responsibilities. While this is a timely example, however, employee activism has been theorized as 'bureaucratic insurgency' (Zald and Berger, 1978; Briscoe and Safford 2008; Soule, 2012). Previous studies have shown how activist employees can mobilize and form internal social movements that raise pressing social issues unaddressed by their employers (Scully and Segal, 2002; Van Der Voort et al., 2009). Not unlike their external counterparts, these social movements can engage in exerting pressure on companies to take responsibility for the causes they champion. For instance, the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers' Union that operated between 1970 and 1977 questioned their employer's collaboration with the apartheid-era government of South Africa in providing film for the passbooks South Africans had to carry (Soule, 2009). Nevertheless, we still know relatively little about how activist employees take up issues of social justice and develop alternative ideas about the social responsibilities of their companies – whether as a result of their personal convictions or professional encounters. We need to understand how such alternative, often non-viable, ideas emerge, are fostered and pursued despite corporate pressures for conformity.

A distinguishing feature of activist employees identified in previous contributions is their dual membership of both the organizations that employ them and of external social movements, whether formalized or informal, and thus the possibility of their simultaneously identifying with both (Creed, 2003; Meyerson, 2001; Meyerson and Scully, 1995; 1999). To understand how activist employees develop, cultivate and protect alternative ideas around their

companies' responsibilities, we can usefully draw on the previous theorizations of how actors work across organizational boundaries (Langley et al., 2019; Weber and Waeger, 2017; DeJordy et al., 2020). Through their boundary-spanning activities, including building alliances within, across and beyond organizational settings, activist employees may come to develop alternative ideas (DeJordy et al., 2020). For instance, Rothenberg (2007) studied the ways in which environmental managers responded to technical and institutional pressures and found that, as boundary-spanners, these managers were exposed to multiple fields and discourses and therefore often initiated sustainability initiatives that served to change the framing of environmental issues within their company. This suggests that maintaining exposure to the ideas and understandings of external activists or other societal actors might help employee activists to stay on track, enabling them to keep a critical distance from the dominant discourses in their companies and so avoid co-optation into business-as-usual and the consequent dilution of their causes (Wright and Nyberg, 2017). Yet, there is also an urgent need to understand how activists protect their ideas from being instrumentalized by managers – and whether they may be able to do so without sacrificing their corporate careers.

*Beyond narrow interests: Listening to alternative voices*

CSR risks serving narrow interests by giving a platform to prominent voices that determine and reproduce CSR discourses without much attention to the actual social problems they claim to address or to the people most affected. By drawing attention to employee activism, we have already called for a broadening of the scope of micro-CSR research to consider a more diverse group of people as agents of social change, thereby inviting alternative voices into our studies. But how can we, as micro-CSR researchers, gain a better understanding of what problems are being voiced, by whom, and to what effects?

Some activist employees are inevitably likely to be better equipped to voice problems than others, since individuals' positions in companies usually mirror and reproduce wider

social inequalities (Amis et al., 2018). To understand the power relations implicated in the reproduction of inequalities, we turn to intersectionality. This concept captures the notion that people's experiences are rarely defined around a single axis (Crenshaw, 1989) and that privileges and penalties are re-constituted by interlocking axes of power and oppression (Contu, 2020; Villesèche et al., 2018). In management studies these axes include gender and race, for example, as defining social identities that reproduce occupational segregation (Ashcraft, 2013). To illustrate, consider how differently most would perceive an activist man in finance, a queer activist accountant, or an activist mother in human resources. In an international context, additional axes include language (Vaara et al., 2005) and the status of subsidiary units, particularly when there are neo-colonial tendencies at play (Storgaard et al., 2020; Boussebaa, 2015). Such intersections constitute privileges and penalties by promoting or impairing access to networks, thus conferring different resonances and amplitudes on the voices of activist employees.

As different social problems compete for attention and resources, the question of who engages in employee activism has implications for the kinds of issues they address and their effectiveness in these pursuits. Those who occupy powerful roles will likely have difficulty relating to the experiences of powerless groups (Rhodes et al., 2020). For example, mid-level managers are less likely to be interested in or even effective in securing a living wage for low-paid workers (Scully, 2015). Nevertheless, individuals may use their privileges to represent or amplify the voices of those who would otherwise not be heard (Smith, 2002). Once we discern privileges and penalties, we will be able to become sensitive to how different groups of people compete with, represent or stand in solidarity with each other's causes, and with what consequences they do so. In addition, this raises questions around how various social problems may complement or crowd each other out in the definition of corporate responsibilities.

Micro-CSR has recognized that positive emotions arise when people promote social issues. Indeed, Gond and Moser (2019) advocate closely interrogating the emotional dimension of employees' engagement in CSR. Acknowledging a diversity of voices, however, also entails taking seriously and investigating the penalties people face when challenging the status quo. When people make claims that are considered inappropriate or outright offensive within extant normative frameworks, including a company's dominant CSR narrative, they prompt others to mobilize an arsenal of defences that silence, discredit, or exclude them (Hafenbradl and Waeger, 2017; Kenny, 2018). Activist employees may be portrayed as hippies with unrealistic ideals, for example, (Wright et al., 2012) and may face micro-aggression, shaming, and accusations of disloyalty from colleagues and superiors (Scully and Segal, 2002), or even be ridiculed as being mentally unstable (Kenny et al., 2020). Further research may usefully explore activists' coping and community-building strategies in the face of these hardships.

Challenging the status quo is a frustrating endeavour and activist employees may struggle with exhaustion and anxiety as a result. Feeling a sense of duty or even a calling to bring about radical change, they may pursue their purposes in unhealthy ways, including workaholism and alcoholism, and may harbor unrealistic expectations of themselves and others (Carollo and Guerci, 2018; Cardador and Caza, 2012). By fighting for their goals, they may distance themselves from or even shame 'those who do nothing' (Kenny, 2015). Such a loss of collegial ties and appreciation, combined with a perceived failure to create a meaningful impact, may take a personal emotional toll on activists and engender a sense of meaninglessness (Bailey and Madden, 2019; Driscoll, 2020). Being seen as people who rock the boat may prove detrimental to their careers (Meyerson, 2008) and even their livelihoods if they lose their jobs (see, for example: Soule, 2009). The potential negative consequences associated with pushing for change in the workplace may leave activist employees incapacitated by fear and thus effectively silenced (DeCelles et al., 2019). To understand why

and how people speak up or remain silent, we suggest that future research should be informed by an emotional agenda that looks not only at the emotions that drive activists but also at those emotions that wear them out (Ashkanasy et al., 2017; Goodwin et al., 2009).

*Challenging managerial control: unfolding subversive, confrontational, and covert activities*

Previous micro-CSR literature has focused on rather innocuous and moderate tactics, routes and initiatives considered viable under the CSR banner. Leveraging their insidership and pursuing their ‘passion with an umbrella’ (Scully and Segal, 2002), employee activists may use conventional channels of politics within organizations, thus adopting a collaborative approach to top management. Indeed, previous work has observed how some activist employees position themselves as protagonists of CSR and use various forms of sweet talk to persuade others to adopt new ideas and practices in their company, including through gracious appeals and issue-selling (Girschik, 2020; Risi et al., 2014; Skoglund and Böhm, 2020). These observations align with micro-CSR research on the activities of CSR professionals aimed at gaining management support and securing resources for addressing social issues (e.g. Gond et al., 2018; Wickert and Schaefer 2015). In advancing an activist research agenda, however, we should look for alternative and more progressive activities.

One major tactical advantage of employee activists is that they often have a dual affiliation with both their companies and external social movements and can switch between their insider and outsider roles (Creed, 2003; Meyerson, 2001; Meyerson and Scully, 1995, 1999; Zald and Berger, 1978). As ‘bureaucratic insiders’ (Binder, 2002; Rojas, 2006), they likely have access to complex social knowledge, resources and power (Briscoe and Gupta, 2016). However, dually-affiliated employee activists are also outsiders to the dominant corporate culture because of their ideas, identities, and ambitions (Meyerson and Scully, 1995; Pettinicchio, 2012). As sympathetic outsiders they may be receptive to and even recruited by external activists who seek to build internal coalitions (Briscoe and Gupta, 2016; Raeburn,

2004). Yet, it is possible that activist employees themselves may seek to collaborate with, support and even join social movements. In what follows, we explore a variety of tactics that activist employees may pursue and how they can leverage their connections with external groups and organizations to advance their causes more potently inside companies.

Activist employees may wisely choose to refrain from overtly challenging the status quo and instead ‘wear a corporate mask’ at all times to remain shrouded in invisibility (Scully, 2015). By espousing compliance (Fleming and Sewell, 2002), they may drive their social purpose without incurring the costs of breaking out of managements’ umbrella (Contu, 2008). Following Haack and colleagues (2012), we label these as ‘Trojan horse tactics’ because they may entail seemingly harmless or even productive activities that do not alert management, but which enable activist employees to subvert the status quo and effectuate change over time (see also Carrington et al., 2019). Such tactics may involve mundane and pragmatic acts of resistance that are not recognized as such by management (McCabe et al., 2020; Fleming and Sewell, 2002). For example, activist employees may avoid the spotlight by quietly pushing radical adjustments at times of ongoing organizational change (Meyerson, 2001). Similarly, they may leverage existing CSR policies to initiate partnerships with NGOs or participate in multi-stakeholder initiatives whose influence they can then leverage to increase pressure on the organization (Haack et al., 2012; Soderstrom and Weber, 2020). Further research may usefully explore how activist employees mobilize others inside and outside their company — while avoiding drawing attention to their potentially undercover activities. As well, we need to learn more about how activist employees experience and cope with hiding what actually matters to them.

If conventional channels have been exhausted or are inaccessible or deemed ineffective, activist employees may confront management more overtly, violating the rules of the corporate game (Farrell and Petersen, 1982) and forming what Zald and Berger (1978) referred to as

‘bureaucratic insurgency’. In doing so, employees may openly protest, for example by contesting decisions and forming coalitions to organize their resistance, drawing effectively on their knowledge of their colleagues’ values and orientations (Farrell and Petersen, 1982, Briscoe and Gupta, 2016). Protests may have a symbolic character and assume miniature forms of organizational revolt. For instance, employee activists may wear indicative buttons or dress differently to express their ideological views and prompt other employees to do the same (Lounsbury et al., 2003). During the Black Lives Matter protests of 2020, for example, Starbucks employees in the US fought for their right to wear clothing and accessories indicative of their support for the movement despite the company’s policy of prohibiting personal political clothing, further mounting pressure against the company on social media (Murphy, 2020).

To strengthen their protest, activist employees often use their ‘indirect’ voice (Hirschman, 1970) by building external coalitions or even filing complaints with external authorities. Amazon’s US employees, for example, have been vocal about their stance on climate change, expressing their opinions through walkouts, protests and conversations with the press, as well as using social media to amplify their cause, such as the Twitter account *Amazon Employees for Climate Justice* that allows these workers to express even more radical views to the wider public while preserving individual anonymity. A recent tweet posed the following question: ‘Amazon is still funding climate-denying and climate-delaying politicians and lobbyists. Why are we still funding accomplices to the fossil fuel industry's destruction?’ (Amazon Employees for Climate Justice, 2019). As another example of protest, workers at Wayfair, the international online furniture retailer, protested against Wayfair’s collaboration with the US immigration authorities in selling furniture to a government contractor operating shelters for migrant children separated from their parents at the US border. This protest involved the employees staging a walkout that was coordinated and publicized on Twitter,

eventually leading management to engage with them in discussions to address the issue (Taylor, 2019).

Openly protesting and confronting managerial control is a costly path to walk, however, since activist employees may face retaliation, as has been noted in numerous cases of labor movement protests. During a nation-wide strike of the United Auto Workers against General Motors, for instance, General Motors stopped paying healthcare coverage for striking employees (LaReau, 2019). Similarly, Atal (2017) describes the case of the Lonmin mining company in South Africa that ran a hospital for mining-related health risks as well as clinics attending to workers with HIV/Aids under the CSR banner, and which, in times of labour unrest, would suspend anti-retroviral treatments for workers on strike. As these cases illustrate, activists can incur penalties extending even to the withdrawal of the supposed safety nets that companies – and employment systems - might provide (Allen and Tüselmann, 2009; Bidwell et al., 2013; Tüselmann et al., 2015). Institutional contexts further define how easily companies can retaliate against troublemakers by firing them, as illustrated by Google’s dismissal of activist employees (known as the ‘Thanksgiving Four’) for their attempts to organize in part because of their discomfort with the company’s US Border Patrol cooperation (Lee, 2019). We therefore suggest bringing the state back and examine its role as the ultimate umbrella under which employees can expect their efforts to be protected or to attain policy enforcement (Scully, 2015), which in turn is likely to shape their strategies and tactics.

To avoid such risky and overt confrontation, activist employees may even resort to sabotage, i.e. tactics that undermine or threaten their company. They may use their external alliances to leak information to the media or to regulators. In 2010, for example, 116 Shell employees concerned about the company’s environmental impact sought to initiate a ‘peaceful corporate revolution’ by emailing staff contacts to NGOs. The email set out a ‘four-stage strategy for raising awareness of allegations about Shell’s practices in Nigeria, including



campaigns to target the media and institutional investors’, not least by encouraging NGO professionals to infiltrate the company. The senders wanted to remain anonymous and ‘badly’ needed to keep their jobs because they had ‘families to feed, clothe, and shelter’ (Crooks, 2010). More recently, reports of Google terminating its racial justice-focused diversity training program were leaked to the media by concerned employees (Glaser, 2019). Instead of communicative tactics, activist employees may also directly sabotage a company’s operations, either by manipulating or damaging physical assets or equipment, or by mobilizing a large number of employees to simultaneously call in sick (Zald and Berger, 1978). Indeed, it would be especially useful to study the varied ways in which activist employees might leverage the support of powerful external actors.

Since activist employees need not present their motives and activities overtly, they may operate as double agents and leverage a broad repertoire of tactics to maximize their impact on their company. To generate and maintain momentum, we expect that activist employees will use combinations of the above tactics simultaneously or in sequence. They may talk sweetly to management but catalyze protest among colleagues, or resort to subversive tactics if overt protest fails to generate sufficient impact. Different types of tactics can be mutually reinforcing and enabling, moreover: for example, a top management decision with disastrous consequences might lead activist employees to use sweet talk at first and then protest tactics to halt the decision, and then if these efforts fail they may resort to leaking information to the press to generate external pressure, later returning as allies to management and offering to fix public relations by implementing a better social strategy. How various tactics oriented at internal and external actors complement or undermine each other is a fruitful question for further research. Moreover, as outlined above, employee activism takes a toll on people and is difficult to sustain. Especially when their efforts are met with resistance and limited success, we need to ask how employee activists sustain momentum and participation in their movement over time.

Conversely, the very success of employee activism may make it attractive for companies to promote it. Once identified, activist employees run the risk of being designated as resident activists within their companies, perhaps attaining higher status but ultimately functioning as figureheads and thereby allowing the company to espouse commitment. The roles of activists themselves and their demands of the companies they work for can thus be subsumed within and serve the corporate status quo. The tendency of companies to co-opt critical voices raises questions of how employee activists can withstand the temptation to settle for more comfortable positions in the long run.

### **A toolkit for activist micro-CSR researchers**

With this critical essay, we hope to encourage micro-CSR researcher to join us in the endeavour to promote alternative ideas, practices and activities that may transform corporate responsibilities to serve social justice. Yet engaging in research that matters requires us to be unapologetically political (Cabantous et al., 2016), not only in our conceptual but also in our empirical approach. In what follows, we argue that we need to embrace three key commitments that should guide our methodological choices: we have to commit to political participation, inclusiveness and care. We recognize that using our position as scholars to ‘transform and uplift our research, local, and global communities’ (Tillmann-Healy, 2003: 735) might require sacrificing the comfort of conventional methodological approaches. To aid micro-CSR scholars in this undertaking, in this final section of our essay we hope to equip them with a helpful toolkit for pursuing an intellectual activist agenda.

#### *Committing to political participation*

As micro-CSR scholars, we often draw on rather conventional methods that allow us to maintain a discrete distance and stay well within our comfort zones. Yet, to advance an

intellectual activist agenda, we advocate constructing new knowledge while forging solidarity with and empowering research participants. To do so, social movement scholars have long engaged in ‘activist ethnographies’ in which they participate in the roles of activists as well as researchers (Reedy and King, 2019). As a variant of institutional ethnography (Smith, 2005, see also Meyer and Vaara, 2020), activist ethnographies seek to provide a voice to research participants and engage them in co-constructing knowledge for change (Juris and Khasnabish 2013). The more ‘militant’ (Juris, 2007) political activist ethnography (PAE) is used to ‘investigate methods of organizing for change’ and has the potential to empower activists to decide when to comply with and when to defy ruling regimes by investigating how they work (Hussey, 2012: 3; see also Smith, 1990; Frampton et al., 2006). Such in-depth and prolonged engagement with activist employees might require ‘coat-switching’ between ethnographic observations in the workplace and observations outside of corporate settings (Homan, 1980), mirroring the insider/outsider activities of activists themselves. Rather than advocating any one specific strategy, we would suggest that as micro-CSR researchers we carefully choose tools for the trade that not only fit with the theoretical questions we choose to pursue but also allow us to stand by our own values.

Regardless of the chosen strategy, by participating rather than posing as bystanders or taking a fly on the wall position, we as micro-CSR scholars want to stand in solidarity with those we study by moving toward ‘radical reciprocity’ between the researcher and the researched (Ellis, 2007). This entails re-thinking our relationship with research participants and moving towards more intensive collaboration – ‘from studying ‘them’ to studying ‘us’ (Tillmann-Healy, 2003: 735). Radical reciprocity is not an instrumental strategy to gain better access to the individuals we study. It involves placing relationships with them at the same level of priority as the fieldwork, taking no more than what we as researchers are willing to give, keeping secrets when asked, even where they make for a better story, and supporting them as

an allies (Charon, 2014). Through such active participation, we can overcome the division between the researcher and the researched and engage more fully with the experiences we seek to understand rather than remaining passive onlookers or voyeurs (Collins, 2013: 223).

*Using privilege to include and amplify voices*

Because we as researchers speak and act from privileged positions (Reid et al., 2006), we have a tendency to—often unwittingly—perpetuate existing power relations rather than to use our privilege to diligently select whose voices we include and amplify. In accordance with the tenets of intellectual activism, we propose to commit to inclusiveness and to fostering conjunctive strategies, the building of ‘bridges and synergies with co-researchers, stakeholders and all constituencies’ (Contu, 2020: 746). A key decision made at the outset of any research project is that of empirical setting and focus, and in line with our research directions, we see intellectual activism as starting at the stage of issue and context selection. It is at this point that researchers need to reflect on the implications of engaging with a particular cause, considering whether it fits with or contradicts the corporate CSR narrative and whose interests could be represented and excluded by engaging with this cause in the study. In the same spirit, we need to consider critically the composition of our author teams, including scholars at different stages of their careers, from different backgrounds, in different life situations and geographical locations. This becomes especially important for tackling inequality, ethnocentrism and for understanding which issues are at stake (Brydon-Miller, 2004; Muhammad et al., 2015).

We also recognise that finding activist employees inside organisations is not an easy task. How, then, should scholars who purposefully seek to identify and study activist employees proceed? Researchers who study change agents in companies usually begin their studies by approaching people with relevant roles in a selected company. In contrast to CSR professionals and social intrapreneurs, however, activist employees do not necessarily pose as protagonists. As we have argued above, activist employees may for good reasons choose to

conceal themselves and their activities, and this is especially likely in cases where their ideas directly challenge corporate ideologies or strategies, for example, in the case of environmental activism in oil and gas companies. Identifying social activists may require prolonged and intense engagement with a company in order to understand the dominant ways of thinking about corporate responsibilities in the firm first and over time to develop the networks and sensitivity needed to meet those who differ from the prevailing corporate narrative.

Alternatively, one could reach out to activist employees by approaching a social movement and finding out where its members, volunteers and/or supporters work. Since activist employees often span corporate boundaries by connecting with social movements or activist NGOs, we may connect with them by first connecting with external activists. Employment relations scholars, for instance, have increasingly uncovered patterns of social activism amongst employees by engaging with trade unions (Hyde and Vachon, 2019). Moreover, we may strengthen our relations with those students and alumni who we have experienced in class as caring strongly about social justice. Lessons can also be drawn from other research with hidden and hard-to-reach populations. For example, researchers of conspiracy theorists recruit participants by identifying and participating in the relevant events they might attend (Harambam and Aupers, 2015). If connecting with activists proves difficult in real life, we should consider reaching out to them through online platforms they might use to strategize and implement their campaigns (Briscoe and Gupta, 2016).

Taking inclusivity seriously in participant selection entails seeking out the perspectives of any employee activists who may have been silenced and/or left the organization voluntarily or involuntarily and those whose voices are not prominently heard, particularly in remote subsidiaries. Not unlike whistleblowers, former activist employees can be vocal and could be identified through media coverage, particularly in cases where they have become public advocates for a cause they support (see e.g. Elias, 2020 for an illustration). Relatedly, silenced

employees can turn to online platforms where they can remain anonymous whilst expressing their beliefs and ideologies ‘outside formal organizational boundaries’ through posts on social media accounts or counter-institutional websites (Gossett and Kilker, 2006: 63; see also Thompson et al., 2020). Employees in remote subsidiaries may use such platforms to share their experiences and observations with audiences both at home and abroad, or even take part in virtual walkouts (Newton, 2020) enabling us to identify and connect with those we would not have reached otherwise through online observations and netnographic research (Kozinets, 2007).

### *Embracing discomfort and care*

As researchers, we might often seek out the comfort of a polished and coherent narrative. Yet speaking truth to power requires and nurturing change requires us to embrace also those experiences that are uncomfortable and messy. Indeed, when collecting data, especially in corporate contexts, we always need to remember that a researcher’s presence can urge people to present viable and desirable accounts of themselves (Butler, 2005). Our interviewing might therefore reinforce roles and identities whose performance is deemed legitimate in the corporate context (Tyler, 2020). Instead, we therefore suggest adopting an anti-narrative approach aimed at ‘reflexively undoing’ the coherent stories people have constructed about themselves (Riach et al., 2016). By foregrounding themes that are conventionally downplayed, such as emotions and power dynamics inherent in activist struggles, we can invite more complex, nonlinear and non-coherent accounts of people’s lived experiences and allow alternative ideas and feelings to be expressed (Rumens, 2018). This approach leads us to appreciate what activists leave out and what they think is not relevant for discussion. In doing so, we actively interrogate the norms that constrain participants’ accounts (Gilmore and Kenny 2015) and thus work critically with ‘the conditions of possibility for being and becoming’

(Cabantous et al., 2016: 210). Rather than reproducing viable accounts, anti-narrative research can help us to reflexively undo CSR practices and roles, instead enabling us to co-conceive of and nurture alternatives.

Embracing the uncomfortable and messy lived experiences of employee activism requires us to pay attention to emotions. To evoke them, scholarship on emotions has recently started to embrace visual methods alongside traditional narratives (Creed et al., 2014). Photo-elicitation (Kjellstrand and Vince, 2020) and participatory visual methods (McCarthy and Muthuri, 2018) can help us in accessing participants' feelings when discussing sensitive topics or when it becomes particularly difficult to bridge linguistic and occupational communication barriers. Moreover, in the spirit of radical reciprocity, we must take our own feelings seriously (Blee, 1998; Lerum, 2001). Participating in employee activism is also likely to involve coming face-to-face with a host of uncomfortable truths, including the possibility of encountering dark sides of activism that challenge not only corporate but also our own ideologies, such as right-wing movements (Blee, 1998; Gillan and Pickerill 2012). Conventionally, the success of an empirical study 'implies that the author transcended any troubling feelings, at least by the time the account was written' (Kleinman and Copp, 1993: 17). Yet, such quandaries also challenge us to critically engage with activist concerns around concrete issues, such as facets of human rights, recognising the implications of the focal issue for analysis and reflecting more closely on why activists chose their causes and why we chose to focus on them. As Ashcraft proposes, we may develop 'affective sense-abilities' by nurturing our own lived and embodied experiences, and in so doing become better change agents ourselves, since 'the more we feel what we do, the better we know what we do; and the more we know by feeling what we do, the more we have to offer' (Ashcraft, 2018: 621).

The study of activist employees is always likely to be rife with ethical risks and concerns that need to be considered throughout the research project, including the write-up

stage. Given that such employees often operate from vulnerable positions, regardless of their occupational status, researchers need to find ways of participating that serve to empower activists and not endanger their efforts and livelihoods. One of these risks involves the possibility of unwittingly outing employees' activities to management, thereby jeopardising the jobs and livelihoods of research participants. Another relates to the process of engaging with participants in ways that might inadvertently take them out of their comfort zones by challenging their perspectives and fuelling further tensions between their work and activist agendas. Given that these issues might not always be anticipated at the research design stage, we can only encourage scholars to further explore critical engagement with practice and to keep reflecting on the ethical dilemmas they encounter along the way (Contu, 2018) by following the logic of 'relational ethics of care' (Ellis, 2016). This approach calls for ongoing reflection on the impact of research on individual participants who share their stories and feelings with the scholar, as well as making 'good interpersonal decisions concerning our responsibilities toward those in our studies' (Ellis, 2016: 435). It also entails that we need to take great care in how we present heroes and villains in our studies as we write up our work.

### **Concluding remarks**

In this critical essay we have argued that micro-CSR research in its current form fails to leverage its transformational potential and serve social justice. Rather, it sustains the status quo insofar as it reinforces rather than challenges the hegemony of the business case, the dominance of narrow interests and managerial control over corporate responsibilities. Sketching the contours of an intellectual activist research agenda, we have proposed how we, as micro-CSR researchers can nurture change by uplifting the alternative ideas, voices, and activities found in organizational life but as-yet subdued by the dominant managerial reality. Our agenda illustrates that transforming CSR will probably be difficult, uncomfortable, and fraught with



ethical dilemmas, both for activist employees who challenge the status quo and for us as intellectual activists who consociate in solidarity. Within academia too we struggle with power relations that constitute privileges unequally (Spence, 2016; Stigliani, 2020), and walking our own progressive talk is even more difficult for some than others. Intellectual activism must be a community effort (Contu, 2018; 2020). As feminists know, the more a path is used the more a path is used (Ahmed, 2019). With this essay we hope to have encouraged others to walk this path with us.

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank the feminist scholars on whose powerful work we built for their courage, for their solidarity and for their relentless efforts to embody the ideas of intellectual activism. We thank the editor Olga Tregaskis and three anonymous reviewers for their close and uplifting engagement with our manuscript. We discussed our ideas with colleagues at Loughborough University London, at Copenhagen Business School, and in the CSR community at EGOS. We are grateful for their insights and encouragements.

### **Funding**

There are no funders to report for this submission.

## References

- Acosta P, Acquier A, and Gond JP (2019) Revisiting Politics in Political CSR: How coercive and deliberative dynamics operate through institutional work in a Colombian company. *Organization Studies*. Epub ahead of print 5 September 2019. DOI: 10.1177/0170840619867725
- Aguilera RV, Rupp DE, Williams CA and Ganapathi J (2007) Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 32: 836–63.
- Aguinis H (2011) Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In: Zedeck S (ed.) *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Vol. 3*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 855–79.
- Ahmed S (2019) *What's the Use? On the Uses of Use*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Allen M and Tüselmann HJ (2009) All powerful voice? The need to include “exit”, “loyalty” and “neglect” in empirical studies too. *Employee Relations* 31(5): 538–52.
- Alt E and Craig JB (2016) Selling issues with solutions: Igniting social intrapreneurship in for-profit organizations. *Journal of Management Studies* 53(5): 794–820.
- Amazon Employees for Climate Justice (AMZNforClimate) (2019) *Amazon is still funding climate-denying and climate-delaying politicians and lobbyists. Why are we still funding accomplices to the fossil fuel industry's destruction?* 16 October 2019, 5:04 PM. Tweet. Available at: <https://twitter.com/AMZNforClimate>
- Amis JM, Munir KA, Lawrence TB, Hirsch P and McGahan A (2018) Inequality, institutions and organizations. *Organization Studies* 39(9): 1131-1152.
- Anderson LM and Bateman TS (2000) Individual environmental initiative: Championing natural environmental issues in US business organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(4): 548–70.

- Archer, M. (2020). Stakes and Stakeholders in the Climate Casino. *GeoHumanities* 6(1): 171-87.
- Ashcraft KL (2018) Critical complicity: The feel of difference at work in home and field. *Management Learning* 49(5): 613-623.
- Ashcraft KL, Kuhn TR and Cooren F (2009) Constitutional amendments: “Materializing” organizational communication. *Academy of Management Annals* 3(1): 1–64.
- Ashkanasy NM, Humphrey RH and Huy QN (2017) Integrating emotions and affect in theories of management. *Academy of Management Review* 42(2): 175–89.
- Atal MR (2017) White capital: Corporate social responsibility and the limits of transformation in South Africa. *The Extractive Industries and Society* 4(4): 735–43.
- Bailey C and Madden A (2019) “We’re not scum, we’re human”: Agential responses in the face of meaningless work. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 35(4): 101064.
- Bidwell M, Briscoe F, Fernandez-Mateo I and Sterling A (2013) The employment relationship and inequality: How and why changes in employment practices are reshaping rewards in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals* 7(1): 61–121.
- Binder AJ (2002) *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blee KM (1998) White-knuckle research: Emotional dynamics in fieldwork with racist activists. *Qualitative Sociology* 21(4): 381–99.
- Boiral O (2009) Greening the corporation through organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics* 87(2): 221–36.
- Bondy K (2008) The paradox of power in CSR: A case study on implementation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 82(2): 307–23.
- Boussebaa M (2015) Control in the multinational enterprise: The polycentric case of global professional service firms. *Journal of World Business* 50(4): 696–703.

- Bowen HP (1953) *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. New York: Harper.
- Brès L and Gond JP (2014) The visible hand of consultants in the construction of the markets for virtue: Translating issues, negotiating boundaries and enacting responsive regulations. *Human Relations* 67(11): 1347-82.
- Brès L, Mosonyi S, Gond JP, Muzio D, Mitra R, Werr A and Wickert C (2019) Rethinking professionalization: A generative dialogue on CSR practitioners. *Journal of Professions and Organization* 6(2): 246–64.
- Briscoe F and Gupta A (2016) Social Activism in and Around Organizations. *Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 671–727.
- Briscoe F and Safford S (2008) The Nixon-in-China effect: Activism, imitation, and the institutionalization of contentious practices. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 53(3): 460–91.
- Brydon-Miller M (2004) The terrifying truth: Interrogating systems of power and privilege and choosing to act. In: Brydon-Miller M, Maguire P and McIntyre A (eds.) *Traveling companions: Feminism, teaching, and action research*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 3-19.
- Butler J (2005) *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Cabantous L, Gond JP, Harding N and Learmonth M (2016) Critical essay: Reconsidering critical performativity. *Human Relations* 69(2): 197–213.
- Cardador MT and Caza BB (2012) Relational and identity perspectives on healthy versus unhealthy pursuit of callings. *Journal of Career Assessment* 20(3): 338–53.
- Carollo L and Guerci M (2017) Between continuity and change: CSR managers’ occupational rhetorics. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 30: 632–46.
- Carollo L and Guerci M (2018) ‘Activists in a suit’: Paradoxes and metaphors in sustainability managers’ identity work. *Journal of Business Ethics* 148(2): 249–68.

- Carrington M, Zwick D and Neville B (2019) Activism and abdication on the inside: The effect of everyday practice on corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 160(4): 973–99.
- Casas-Cortés M, Osterweil M and Powell D (2013) Transformations in Engaged Ethnography: Knowledge, Networks, and Social Movements. In: Juris J, Khasnabish A (eds) *Insurgent Encounters*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 199–229.
- Charon R (2014) Narrative reciprocity. *Hastings Center Report* 44(S1): S21–S24.
- Collins PH (2013) *On Intellectual Activism*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Contu A (2008) Decaf resistance: On misbehavior, cynicism, and desire in liberal workplaces. *Management Communication Quarterly* 21(3): 364–79.
- Contu A (2018) ‘... The point is to change it’–Yes, but in what direction and how? Intellectual activism as a way of ‘walking the talk’ of critical work in business schools. *Organization* 25(2): 282–93.
- Contu A (2020) Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference as business schools scholars. *Human Relations* 73(5), 737–57.
- Creed WD (2003) Voice lessons: Tempered radicalism and the use of voice and silence. *Journal of Management Studies* 40(6):1503–36.
- Crenshaw K (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140 (1): 139–67.
- Crooks E (2010) *Shell staff details leaked to campaign groups*. 12 February. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/976a260e-174f-11df-94f6-00144feab49a>
- Dahlmann F and Grosvold J (2017) Environmental managers and institutional work: Reconciling tensions of competing institutional logics. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 27(2): 263–91.

- De Bakker FG, Matten D, Spence LJ and Wickert C (2020) The elephant in the room: The nascent research agenda on corporations, social responsibility, and capitalism. *Business & Society*. Epub ahead of print 19 January 2020. DOI: 10.1177/0007650319898196
- DeCelles KA, Sonenshein S and King BG (2019) Examining anger's immobilizing effect on institutional insiders' action intentions in social movements. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Epub ahead of print 21 October 2019. DOI: 10.1177/0001839219879646
- DeJordy R, Scully M, Ventresca MJ and Creed WD (2020) Inhabited Ecosystems: Propelling Transformative Social Change Between and Through Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Epub ahead of print 7 February 2020. DOI: 10.1177/0001839219899613
- Driscoll D (2020) When Ignoring the News and Going Hiking Can Help You Save the World: Environmental Activist Strategies for Persistence. *Sociological Forum* 35(1): 189-206.
- Delmas MA and Burbano VC (2011) The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review* 54(1): 64-87.
- Dutton JE and Ashford SJ (1993) Selling issues to top management. *Academy of Management Review* 18(3): 397-428.
- Dutton JE, Ashford SJ, O'Neill RM and Lawrence KA (2001) Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal* 44(4): 716-36.
- Ehrnström-Fuentes M (2016) Delinking legitimacies: A pluriversal perspective on political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies* 53(3): 433-62.
- Elias J (2020) Former Google activist Claire Stapleton is starting an advice newsletter for frustrated tech workers. 28 May. Available at: <https://www.cnbc.com/2020/05/28/ex-google-activist-claire-stapleton-starts-advice-newsletter.html>
- Ellis C (2007) Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate

- others. *Qualitative Inquiry* 13(1): 3–29.
- Ellis C (2016) Compassionate research: Interviewing and storytelling from a relational ethics of care. In: Goodson I, Antikainen A, Sikes P, et al. (eds) *The Routledge International Handbook on Narrative and Life History*. New York: Routledge, 431–46.
- Farrell D and Petersen JC (1982) Patterns of political behavior in organization. *Academy of Management Review* 7(3): 403–12.
- Feix A and Philippe D (2020) Unpacking the narrative decontestation of CSR: Aspiration for change or defense of the status quo? *Business & Society* 59(1): 129–74.
- Fleming P and Jones M (2013) *The End of Corporate Social Responsibility: Crisis and Critique*. London: Sage.
- Fleming P and Sewell G (2002) Looking for the good soldier, Švejk: Alternative modalities of resistance in the contemporary workplace. *Sociology* 36(4): 857–73.
- Frampton C, Kinsman G, Thompson AK and Tilleczek K (eds) (2006) *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.
- Frandsen S, Morsing M and Vallentin S (2013) Adopting sustainability in the organization: Managing processes of productive loose coupling towards internal legitimacy. *Journal of Management Development* 32(3): 236–46.
- Furusten S, Werr A, Ardenfors M and Walter S (2013) CSR and the consultancy sector: What is offered, and by whom? In: Jutterström M and Norberg P (eds) *CSR as a Management Idea: Ethics in Action* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 75–93.
- George G, Howard-Grenville J, Joshi A and Tihanyi L (2016) Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal* 59(6): 1880–95.
- Gillan K and Pickerill J (2012) The difficult and hopeful ethics of research on, and with,

- social movements. *Social Movement Studies* 11(2): 133–43.
- Gilmore S and Kenny K (2015) Work-worlds colliding: Self-reflexivity, power and emotion in organizational ethnography. *Human Relations* 68(1): 55–78.
- Girschik V (2020) Shared responsibility for societal problems: The role of internal activists in reframing corporate responsibility. *Business & Society* 59(1): 34–66.
- Glaser A (2019) *Current and ex-employees allege Google drastically rolled back diversity and inclusion programs*. 13 May. Available at: <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/current-ex-employees-allege-google-dramatically-rolled-back-diversity-inclusion-n1206181>
- Gond JP, Cabantous L and Krikorian F (2018) How do things become strategic? ‘Strategifying’ corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Organization* 16(3): 241–72.
- Gond JP, El Akremi A, Swaen V and Babu N (2017) The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 38(2): 225–46.
- Gond JP and Moser C (2019) The reconciliation of fraternal twins: Integrating the psychological and sociological approaches to ‘micro’ corporate social responsibility. *Human Relations*. Epub ahead of print 21 October 2019. DOI: 10.1177/0018726719864407
- Goodwin J, Jasper JM and Polletta F (eds) (2009) *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gossett LM and Kilker J (2006) My job sucks: Examining counterinstitutional web sites as locations for organizational member voice, dissent, and resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly* 20(1): 63–90.
- Gutierrez-Huerter G, Moon J, Gold S and Chapple W (2020). Micro-processes of translation in the transfer of practices from MNE headquarters to foreign subsidiaries: The role of



- subsidiary translators. *Journal of International Business Studies* 51(3): 389-413.
- Haack P, Schoeneborn D and Wickert C (2012) Talking the talk, moral entrapment, creeping commitment? Exploring narrative dynamics in corporate responsibility standardization. *Organization Studies* 33(5-6): 815-45.
- Hafenbrädl S and Waeger D (2017) Ideology and the micro-foundations of CSR: Why executives believe in the business case for CSR and how this affects their CSR engagements. *Academy of Management Journal* 60(4): 1582-606.
- Hahn T, Pinkse J, Preuss L and Figge F (2015) Tensions in corporate sustainability: Towards an integrative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics* 127(2): 297-316.
- Harambam J and Aupers S (2015) Contesting epistemic authority: Conspiracy theories on the boundaries of science. *Public Understanding of Science* 24(4): 466-80.
- Hejjas K, Miller G and Scarles C (2019) "It's like hating puppies!" Employee disengagement and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 157(2): 319-37.
- Hemingway CA (2005) Personal values as a catalyst for corporate social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics* 60(3): 233-49.
- Hirschman AO (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Homan R (1980) The ethics of covert methods. *British Journal of Sociology*: 46-59.
- Hunoldt M, Oertel S and Galander A (2018) Being responsible: How managers aim to implement corporate social responsibility. *Business & Society* 59(7): 1441-1482.
- Hussey I (2012) 'Political activist as ethnographer', revisited. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 37(1): 1-24.
- Hyde A and Vachon TE (2019) Running with or against the treadmill? Labor unions, institutional contexts, and greenhouse gas emissions in a comparative perspective. *Environmental Sociology* 5(3): 269-82.

- Jamali D (2010) The CSR of MNC subsidiaries in developing countries: global, local, substantive or diluted? *Journal of Business Ethics* 93(2): 181-200.
- Jones DA and Rupp DE (2017) Social responsibility in and of organizations: The psychology of corporate social responsibility among organizational members. In: Anderson N, Ones DS, Sinangil HK and Viswesvaran C (eds) *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 333–50.
- Juris JS (2007) Practicing militant ethnography with the movement for global resistance in Barcelona. In: Shukaitis S, Graeber D and Biddle E (eds) *Constituent imagination: Militant investigations/collective theorization*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 164–76.
- Juris JS and Khasnabish A (2013) *Insurgent Encounters: Transnational Activism, Ethnography, and the Political*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kaplan A (1964) *The conduct of inquiry: Methodology for behavioral science*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Kaplan S (2020) Beyond the business case for social responsibility. *Academy of Management Discoveries* 6(1): 1–4.
- Kenny K (2015) Constructing selves: Whistleblowing and the role of time. In: Lewis D and Vandekerckhove W (eds) *Developments in whistleblowing research 2015*. London: International Whistleblowing Research Network, 70–84.
- Kenny K (2018) Censored: Whistleblowers and impossible speech. *Human Relations* 71(8): 1025–48.
- Kenny K, Fotaki M and Vandekerckhove W (2020) Whistleblower subjectivities: Organization and passionate attachment. *Organization Studies* 41(3): 323-43.
- Khan FR, Munir KA and Willmott H (2007) A dark side of institutional entrepreneurship: Soccer balls, child labour and postcolonial impoverishment. *Organization Studies* 28(7): 1055–77.

- Kjellstrand I and Vince R (2020) A trip down memory lane: How photograph insertion methods trigger emotional memory and enhance recall during interviews. *Research Methods in Strategy and Management*.
- Kleinman S and Copp MA (1993) *Emotions and fieldwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kok AM, de Bakker FGA and Groenewegen P (2019) Sustainability struggles: Conflicting cultures and incompatible logics. *Business & Society* 58(8): 1496–1532.
- Kourula A and Delalieux G (2016) The micro-level foundations and dynamics of political corporate social responsibility: Hegemony and passive revolution through civil society. *Journal of Business Ethics* 135(4): 769–85.
- Kozinets RV (2007) Netnography 2.0. In: Belk RW (ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Marketing*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 129–42.
- Langley A, Lindberg K, Mørk BE, Nicolini D, Raviola E and Walter L (2019) Boundary work among groups, occupations, and organizations: From cartography to process. *Academy of Management Annals* 13(2): 704–36.
- LaReau JL (2019) Strike over! UAW workers ratify contract with GM: Here's what's next. *Detroit Free Press*, 25 October. Available at: <https://eu.freep.com/story/money/cars/general-motors/2019/10/25/gm-uaw-strike-contract-ratification-update/4057059002/>
- Lauwo S (2018) Challenging masculinity in CSR disclosures: Silencing of women's voices in Tanzania's mining industry. *Journal of Business Ethics* 149(3): 689–706.
- Lee D (2019). 'Thanksgiving Four' say Google is punishing them. 26 November. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-50554931>
- Lerum K (2001) Subjects of desire: Academic armor, intimate ethnography, and the production of critical knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry* 7(4): 466–83.

- Lounsbury M, Ventresca MJ and Hirsch P (2003) Social movements, field frames and industry emergence: a cultural–political perspective on US recycling. *Socio-Economic Review* 1(1): 71–104.
- McCabe D, Ciuk S and Gilbert M (2020) ‘There is a crack in everything’: An ethnographic study of pragmatic resistance in a manufacturing organization. *Human Relations* 73(7): 953–80.
- McCarthy L (2017) Empowering women through corporate social responsibility: A feminist Foucauldian critique. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 27(4): 603–31.
- McCarthy L and Muthuri JN (2018) Engaging fringe stakeholders in business and society research: Applying visual participatory research methods. *Business & Society* 57(1): 131–73.
- McCarthy L, Soundararajan V and Taylor S (2020) The hegemony of men in global value chains: Why it matters for labour governance. *Human Relations*. Epub ahead of print 24 August 2020. DOI: 0018726720950816.
- McDonnell M-H, King B and Soule S (2015) A dynamic process model of contentious politics: Activist targeting and corporate receptivity to social challenges. *American Sociological Review* 80: 654–78.
- Margolis JD and Walsh JP (2003) Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 48(2): 268–305.
- Meyer RE and Vaara E (2020) Institutions and actorhood as co-constitutive and co-constructed: The argument and areas for future research. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(4): 898–910.
- Meyerson DE (2001) *Tempered Radicals: How People Use Difference to Inspire Change at Work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Meyerson DE (2008) *Rocking the boat: How tempered radicals effect change without making trouble*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

- Meyerson DE and Scully, MA (1995) Crossroads tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organization Science* 6(5): 585–600.
- Meyerson DE and Scully MA (1999) *Tempered Radicalism: Changing the Workplace from Within*. G Insights Report. Boston: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons Graduate School of Management.
- Mitra R and Buzzanell PM (2017) Communicative tensions of meaningful work: The case of sustainability practitioners. *Human Relations* 70(5): 594–616.
- Mitra R and Buzzanell PM (2018). Implementing sustainability in organizations: How practitioners discursively position work. *Management Communication Quarterly* 32(2): 172–201.
- Muhammad M, Wallerstein N, Sussman AL, Avila M, Belone L and Duran B (2015) Reflections on researcher identity and power: The impact of positionality on community based participatory research (CBPR) processes and outcomes. *Critical Sociology* 41(7-8): 1045–63.
- Murphy H (2020) *Starbucks Will Allow Employees to Wear Black Lives Matter Apparel*. 12 June. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/business/starbucks-blm-ban-reversed.html>
- Newton C (2020). *What Facebook doesn't understand about the Facebook walkout*. 1 June. Available at: <https://www.theverge.com/interface/2020/6/1/21276969/facebook-walkout-mark-zuckerberg-audio-trump-disgust-twitter>
- Norton TA, Parker SL, Zacher H and Ashkanasy NM (2015) Employee green behavior: A theoretical framework, multilevel review, and future research agenda. *Organization & Environment* 28(1): 103–25.
- Ones DS and Dilchert S (2012) Environmental sustainability at work: A call to action. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 5(4): 444–66.

- Opoku-Dakwa A, Chen CC and Rupp DE (2018) CSR initiative characteristics and employee engagement: An impact-based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 39(5): 580–93.
- Ozkazanc-Pan B (2019) CSR as gendered neocoloniality in the Global South. *Journal of Business Ethics* 160(4): 851–64.
- Pettinicchio D (2012) Institutional activism: Reconsidering the insider/outsider dichotomy. *Sociology Compass* 6(6): 499–510.
- Porter ME and Kramer MR (2006) Strategy and Society: The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review* 84(12): 78–92.
- Raeburn NC (2004) *Changing corporate America from inside out: Lesbian and gay workplace rights*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ramus CA and Steger U (2000) The roles of supervisory support behaviors and environmental policy in employee “Ecoinitiatives” at leading-edge European companies. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(4): 605–26.
- Reedy PC and King DR (2019) Critical performativity in the field: Methodological principles for activist ethnographers. *Organizational Research Methods* 22(2): 564–89.
- Reid C, Tom A and Frisby W (2006) Finding the ‘action’ in feminist participatory action research. *Action Research* 4(3): 315–32.
- Rhodes C, Munro I, Thanem T and Pullen, A. (2020) Dissensus! Radical Democracy and Business Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Epub ahead of print 3 January 2020. DOI: 0.1007/s10551-019-04405-3
- Riach K, Rumens N and Tyler M (2016) Towards a Butlerian methodology: Undoing organizational performativity through anti-narrative Research. *Human Relations* 69(11): 2069–89.

- Risi D and Wickert C (2017) Reconsidering the ‘symmetry’ between institutionalization and professionalization: The case of corporate social responsibility managers. *Journal of Management Studies* 54(5): 613–46.
- Risi D, Wickert C and Sayah S (2014) Corporate social responsibility managers as internal activists for ethics and sustainability. *Amsterdam Business Research Institute* 2(1): 8–11.
- Rojas, F (2006) Social movement tactics, organizational change and the spread of African-American studies. *Social Forces* 84(4): 2147–66.
- Roth S, Valentinov V, Heidingsfelder M and Pérez-Valls M (2020) CSR beyond economy and society: A post-capitalist approach. *Journal of Business Ethics* 165: 411-423.
- Rothenberg S (2007) Environmental managers as institutional entrepreneurs: The influence of institutional and technical pressures on waste management. *Journal of Business Research* 60(7): 749–57.
- Rumens N (2018) Queered Methodologies for equality, diversity and inclusion researchers. In: Booyesen LAE, Bendl R, Pringle JK (eds) *Handbook of Research Methods in Diversity Management, Equality and Inclusion at Work*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 103–21.
- Rupp DE and Mallory DB (2015) Corporate social responsibility: Psychological, person-centric, and progressing. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 2(1): 211–36.
- Schneider A (2020) Bound to Fail? Exploring the Systemic Pathologies of CSR and Their Implications for CSR Research. *Business & Society* 59(7): 1303-1338.
- Scully M (2015) Social movements and organizations through a Critical Management Studies lens. In: Prasad A, Prasad P, Mills AJ and Mills JH (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*. Oxon, UK: Routledge, 233–47.
- Scully M and Segal A (2002) Passion with an Umbrella: Grassroots activists in the

- workplace. In: Lounsbury M and Ventresca MJ (eds) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Social Structure and Organizations Revisited (Volume 19)*. Emerald Group Publishing, 125–68.
- Sendlhofer T (2019) Decoupling from Moral Responsibility for CSR: Employees' Visionary Procrastination at a SME. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Epub ahead of print 2 May 2019. DOI: 0.1007/s10551-019-04174-z
- Shamir R (2004) The de-radicalization of corporate social responsibility. *Critical Sociology* 30(3): 669–89.
- Sheets K and Schaefer M (2017) *Trump's Tech Opposition*. *Jacobin*. Available at: <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/05/tech-workers-silicon-valley-trump-resistance-startups-unions>.
- Skoglund A and Böhm S (2020) Prefigurative partaking: Employees' environmental activism in an energy utility. *Organization Studies* 41(9): 1257-1283.
- Slack RE, Corlett S and Morris R (2015). Exploring employee engagement with (corporate) social responsibility: A social exchange perspective on organisational participation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 127(3): 537–48.
- Smith DE (2005) *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Smith GW (1990) Political activist as ethnographer. *Social Problems* 37(4): 629–48.
- Smith J (2002) Bridging global divides? Strategic framing and solidarity in transnational social movement organizations. *International Sociology* 17(4): 505-528.
- Soderstrom SB and Weber K (2020) Organizational structure from interaction: Evidence from corporate sustainability efforts. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 65(1): 226–71.
- Sonenshein S (2016) How corporations overcome issue illegitimacy and issue equivocality to address social welfare: The role of the social change agent. *Academy of Management*



*Review* 41(2): 349–66.

Soule SA (2009) *Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY:

Cambridge University Press.

Soule SA (2012) Targeting organizations: Private and contentious politics. In: Courpasson D,

Golsorkhi D and Sallaz JJ (eds) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Rethinking*

*Power in Organizations, Institutions, and Markets (Book 34)*. Emerald Group Publishing

Limited, 34, 261–85.

Spence LJ (2016) The Obfuscation of Gender and Feminism in CSR Research and the

Academic Community: An essay. In: Grosser K, McCarthy L and Kilgour M (eds)

*Gender Equality and Responsible Business: Expanding CSR Horizons*. Sheffield, UK:

Greenleaf Publishing.

Stigliani I (2020) Navigating an Academic Maze: Experiences of an International Female

Scholar. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Epub ahead of print 14 February 2020. DOI:

10.1177/1056492620906984

Storgaard, M, Tienari, J, Piekkari, R, & Michailova, S (2020). Holding on while letting go:

Neocolonialism as organizational identity work in a multinational corporation

*Organization Studies*. Epub ahead of print 7 March 2020. DOI:

10.1177/0170840620902977

Surroca J, Tribó JA and Zahra SA (2013) Stakeholder pressure on MNEs and the transfer of

socially irresponsible practices to subsidiaries. *Academy of Management Journal* 56(2):

549–72.

Taylor K (2019) *Wayfair Furniture Employees Walked Out Over Sales to Migrant Facilities*.

25 June. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/25/us/wayfair-walkout.html>

Tech Workers Coalition (2018, 30 March). *Tech workers, platform workers, and workers'*

*inquiry*. *Notes from Below*. Available at: <https://notesfrombelow.org/article/tech->

[workers-platform-workers-and-workers-inquiry](#)

- Thompson A, Stringfellow L, Maclean M and Nazzal A (2020) Ethical considerations and challenges for using digital ethnography to research vulnerable populations. *Journal of Business Research*. Epub ahead of print 14 March 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.025
- Tillmann-Healy L (2003) Friendship as method. *Qualitative Inquiry* 9(5): 729–49.
- Tüselmann HJ, Allen MM and McDonald F (2015) Vive les différences? Voice in French MNCs' overseas workplaces: a comparative study of voice in French, German and US subsidiaries in the UK. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 26(8): 1152–68.
- Tyler M (2019) *Judith Butler and Organization Theory*. New York NY: Routledge.
- Vaara E, Tienari J, Piekkari R and Sääntti R (2005) Language and the circuits of power in a merging multinational corporation. *Journal of Management Studies* 42(3): 595–623.
- Van Der Voort JM, Glac K and Meijs LC (2009) “Managing” corporate community involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics* 90(3): 311–29.
- Weber K and Waeger D (2017) Organizations as polities: An open systems perspective. *Academy of Management Annals* 11(2): 886–918.
- Wickert C and Schaefer SM (2015) Towards a progressive understanding of performativity in critical management studies. *Human Relations* 68(1): 107–30.
- Wickert C and de Bakker FG (2018) Pitching for social change: Toward a relational approach to selling and buying social issues. *Academy of Management Discoveries* 4(1): 50–73.
- Wright C and Nyberg D (2017) An inconvenient truth: How organizations translate climate change into business as usual. *Academy of Management Journal* 60(5): 1633–61.
- Wright C and Nyberg D (2012) Working with passion: Emotionology, corporate environmentalism and climate change. *Human Relations* 65(12): 1561–87.

Wright C, Nyberg D and Grant D (2012) “Hippies on the third floor”: Climate change, narrative identity and the micro-politics of corporate environmentalism. *Organization Studies*, 33(11): 1451–75.

Zald MN and Berger M A (1978) Social movements in organizations: Coup d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. *American Journal of Sociology* 83(4): 823–61.

## **Biographies**

**Verena Girschik** is Assistant Professor of CSR, Communication and Organization at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. She adopts a communicative institutionalist perspective to understand how companies negotiate their roles and responsibilities, how they perform them, and to what consequences. Her research has been published in *Journal of Management Studies*, *Business & Society* and *critical perspectives on international business*. Empirically, she currently focuses on activism in and around multinational companies and on business-humanitarian collaboration. [Email: vg.msc@cbs.dk]

**Liudmyla Svystunova** is a Lecturer in International Management at Loughborough University London. Her research focuses on the various forms of interaction between business and society, especially in non-western contexts. Her research has been published in *Management International Review*. Her current research focuses on activism in multinational companies and business and human rights. [Email: l.svystunova@lboro.ac.uk]

**Evgenia I. Lysova** is Assistant Professor of Careers and Organizational Behavior at the department of Management and Organization, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. She focuses on studying individuals' experiences of meaningful work and how organizations can provide opportunities for individuals to create meaningfulness in their work. Her research has been published in *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Frontiers in Psychology*, among others. Her current empirical research focuses on studying meaningful work in relation to Corporate Social Responsibility. [Email: e.lysova@vu.nl]

**Table 1: New research directions and exploratory research questions**

New research directions	Possible research questions
<b><i>Beyond the business case: Embracing employee activism</i></b>	
<i>Reviving nonviable identities and ideas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What alternative ideas around their companies’ social responsibilities do activist employees hold? Where do these ideas originate and how do they develop over time?</li> <li>• How are activist employees’ social purposes and ideas shaped by their personal and professional backgrounds?</li> <li>• What are the nonviable ideas that reside in organizational life? How do activist employees find out which ideas are viable? How do they push the boundaries of viability?</li> <li>• How do activist employees maintain their non-viable ideas and identities and sustain their motivation in pursuing them in the face of pressures for conformity in the corporate context?</li> </ul>
<i>Insider/outsider roles</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do activist employees cultivate relations with external social movements and how do these relationships shape their ideas?</li> <li>• How do activist employees use their outsider roles to maintain critical distance from dominant corporate discourses?</li> <li>• How do activist employees protect their ideas and identities from being instrumentalized by management?</li> <li>• How do activist employees keep their professional roles and career development opportunities unharmed by their outsider role?</li> </ul>
<b><i>Beyond narrow interests: Listening to alternative voices</i></b>	
<i>Intersectionality and the uses of privilege</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who voices which social problems in organizations? Whose voices are heard? Why and to what effect?</li> <li>• How do activist employees represent or amplify the voices of others inside and outside their companies? How do their own privileges shape these choices? Whose experiences are buried in representation?</li> <li>• How do different social problems compete? Do they crowd each other out? How do activists deal with moral choices resulting from issue competition, particularly in the context of unequal privilege?</li> <li>• How do the efforts of employee activists leverage or compete with formal organizational CSR frameworks and practices?</li> </ul>

**Table 1 (continued)**

<p><i>Coping with defense mechanisms and sanctions</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What counter-reactions do activist employees experience?</li> <li>• How do activist employees cope with backlashes from management and colleagues?</li> <li>• How do they fight exhaustion, meaninglessness, exclusion, shame, anxiety and fear?</li> <li>• How do activist employees form communities and cultivate solidarity?</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Challenging managerial control: unfolding subversive, confrontational, and covert activities</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Subversive, confrontational, and covert tactics</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do activist employees organize and mobilize support among other employees and outside their companies? How do they do so while keeping their activities covert?</li> <li>• How do activist employees compete and collaborate with other activist movements in and around their companies (e.g. labor movements)?</li> <li>• How do activist employees escape or cope with having to ‘sell their souls’ as they promote their ideas within the dominant managerial reality? Can they avoid issue-selling tactics that leverage the business case? And if so, what are the consequences?</li> <li>• How does organizational and national context shape activist tactics and to what extent do certain settings empower and constrain employee activism and corporate retaliation?</li> </ul>
<p><i>Building and sustaining pressure for change</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do activist employees use powerful external actors to mount external pressure on their organizations?</li> <li>• How do tactics oriented at internal and external stakeholders complement each other? Can attempts at sweet-talking, for instance, undermine more covert attempts at coalition-building with external stakeholders?</li> <li>• How do activist employees ensure participation in their movements across occupational, organizational, and national boundaries? How do they sustain commitment to their causes over time?</li> <li>• How do activist employees resist the temptation to settle for more comfortable positions? What happens when their ideas or initiatives are co-opted into CSR practices?</li> </ul>