

Organisational learning for corporate social responsibility in sport organisations

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>European Sport Management Quarterly</i> |
| Manuscript ID | RESM-2017-0205.R3 |
| Manuscript Type: | Research Paper |
| Keywords: | corporate social responsibility, organisational learning, implementation, sport federations, nonprofit sport organisations |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Dear Editor and Guest Editors of the European Sport Management Quarterly (ESMQ),
4

5 We would like to thank you for this third round of revisions on our paper entitled 'Organisational
6 learning for corporate social responsibility in sport organisations'.
7

8
9 In response to your comments and those of the reviewers, we have revised our work accordingly.
10 We have taken the opportunity to provide a more ambitious future research agenda as
11 recommended by one reviewer.
12

13 Also, we have sent the manuscript to a professional proofreader for writing/grammar check.
14 The marked changes are indicated in blue in the text.
15

16 Once again, we would like to thank the reviewers for their comments, and guidance with respect to
17 the development of the paper during this submission.
18

19
20 Sincerely,
21

22
23 The authors.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Organisational learning for corporate social responsibility in sport organisations

Research question. Although the implementation of corporate social responsibility (CSR) may require changes at the strategic, organisational, and operational levels, studies fall short of investigating the role of organisational learning (OL), which is key to grasp how CSR occurs in organisations. This study fills this gap by exploring the dynamic interaction between different levels of the learning process through which sport organisations implement CSR.

Research methods. Drawing on Crossan et al.'s 4I Framework, we examine the learning sub-processes characterising CSR implementation in a sport federation. This study uses a single-case-study research design and analyses interviews ($n = 18$) and organisational documents ($n = 20$).

Results and Findings. This study reveals that OL for CSR is a critical multilevel and dynamic process that consists of learning subprocesses at the intra-organisational and inter-organisational levels. CSR requires both learning new ways of incorporating CSR practices, as well as embedding into the organisation what has already been learnt. Informal and formal groups were identified as strong repositories of learning, while external stakeholders are essential sources of learning intertwined within the organisation alongside the work of inter-organisational boundary spanners.

Implications. Theoretically, this paper extends the discussion of CSR implementation by highlighting the critical role of. It does so by revealing patterns of learning institutionalisation for CSR in a particular European sport federated setting. These findings highlight that the level of institutionalisation of learning influences the integration and sustainability of the CSR strategy. Practically, managers should consider these learning subprocesses as appropriate platforms on which to instill the CSR construct within their organisation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Keywords: corporate social responsibility; organisational learning; sport organisation; implementation; sport federation.

For Peer Review Only

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 In recent years, sport organisations have increasingly been embracing corporate social
6 responsibility (CSR) principles and practices (Breitbarth, Walzel, Anagnostopoulos, & van
7 Eekeren, 2015). CSR has become an important concern of sport organisations, given their strong
8 connection to the community and the importance of the relationships with stakeholders
9 (Trendafilova, Ziakas, & Sparvero, 2017). Moreover, the social nature of sport (Smith &
10 Westerbeek, 2007) and the European sport context (Breitbarth et al., 2015) compel sport
11 organisations to respond to wider social issues and demonstrate their responsibility to delivery
12 social good both within and outside the sporting sphere (Dowling, Robinson, & Washington, 2013).
13
14

15 However, there is still little understanding of the processes involved and dynamics
16 experienced within sport organisations when implementing CSR (Breitbarth et al., 2015). CSR
17 studies have noted that engaging in CSR is a complex undertaking, because its development may
18 require changes at the strategic, organisational, and operational levels (Maon, Lindgreen, & Swaen,
19 2010). Sport studies also advocate the complexity of integrating CSR within sport organisations
20 (Kolyperas, Morrow, & Spraks, 2015).
21
22

23 To date, despite the growing interest in sport-related CSR studies, the extant literature does
24 not provide sufficient insights to understand the multilevel dynamics of implementing CSR within a
25 sport organisation. Analysis from a multilevel perspective that highlights the interaction between
26 individual, group, organisational and interorganisational levels is missing. Although CSR
27 implementation has attracted a significant body of literature on this very topic, studies have not yet
28 investigated the role of organisational learning (OL) as it relates to CSR at different organisational
29 levels. It is important to develop a better understanding of the process by which CSR knowledge
30 and ideas are acquired and how CSR becomes institutionalized in these organisations.
31
32

33 The present study partially fills this gap by examining CSR implementation from an OL
34 perspective. It is our contention that studying the intersection between CSR and OL is important to
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 grasp the cognitive and strategic microprocesses through which sport organisations progress when
6 implementing CSR. In this respect, OL enables delineation of the dynamic interaction between
7 different levels within and outside the organisation of CSR. Despite the acknowledgement of OL
8 significance in CSR (Fortis, Maon, Frooman, & Reiner, 2016) and, overall, of knowledge creation
9 for any sport organisation (Girginov, Toohey, & Willem, 2015), sport management literature has
10 failed to explicitly address how sport organisations engage in an OL process when implementing
11 CSR.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The purpose of this paper is to analyse the process of OL that occurs in the adoption and
22 implementation of CSR by sport organisations. Accordingly, this study addresses the research
23 question: how does the process of OL operate when sport federations implement CSR in a federated
24 model? We do so by drawing on one regional sport federation that constitutes the empirical setting
25 of the present study. Sport federations are nonprofit organisations (NPOs) responsible for the
26 organisation and regulation of their sport discipline. Scant research has examined CSR-related
27 programmes in this organisational context. Building on the *4I Framework* developed by Crossan,
28 Lane and White (1999) and extended by Jones and Macpherson (2006), we examine the
29 intraorganisational and interorganisational learning processes experienced by these sport
30 organisations when implementing CSR.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Consequently, this study contributes to the current body of knowledge by providing a
45 broader, dynamic, and multilevel perspective of the OL process reported by sport organisations
46 implementing CSR. Analysing such dynamics in the sport setting is central to improvement of
47 understanding the challenges sport organisations face when implementing CSR programmes.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Furthermore, by investigating this sport federated and collaborative learning setting, this
54 study shifts the focus of current sport research on CSR implementation from the individual and
55 organisational levels to the interorganisational level (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013), which
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

appears to be a promising unit of analysis in the general CSR literature (Benn, Edwards, & Angus-Leppan, 2013; Oelze, Hoejmoose, Habisch, & Millington, 2014). To date, despite some exceptions – which only implicitly infer the relationship (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013; Heinze et al., 2014; Kolyperas et al., 2015) and investigate cross-sectoral social partnership implementation both in CSR (Walters & Anagnostopoulos, 2012) and through CSR (Dowling et al., 2013) – studies have fallen short in investigating how sport organisations collaborate within their network to implement CSR. Indeed, the interorganisational level of analysis unveils gaps in our understanding of how the sport structure influences the learning cycle for CSR implementation. Moreover, Babiak, Thibault and Willem (2018) have recently pointed to the lack of interorganisational sport research using OL theory. This present study offers a better understanding of how a network of sport organizations in a federated structure (Sotiriadou, Brouwers, De Bosscher, & Cuskelly, 2017) may have a bearing on CSR implementation.

Theoretical background

Corporate Social Responsibility

In essence, CSR represents one component of the broader social role of sport and refers to “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (European Commission, 2011, p. 6). Over the past decades, CSR has become a taken-for-granted concept or “institution” within Western society (Bondy, Moon, & Matten, 2012), and has subsequently spread outside the classical business spheres. As such, although the word “corporate” has typically been associated with social responsibility and large business organisations, “CSR” as a term is now being used and embraced by organisations of all types and sizes.

Thus far, professional sport organisations such as major professional leagues and clubs have been the dominant research settings within the sporting sphere (Breitbarth et al., 2015).

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 Nevertheless, expecting social involvement solely from such organisations overlooks an important
6
7 role that can be played by NPOs through the application of CSR programmes. Notwithstanding
8
9 their very strong socially responsible nature, NPOs implement CSR programmes beyond their main
10
11 purpose and scope of activities for strategic, altruistic, and institutional logic reasons (Misener &
12
13 Babiak, 2015); research in this domain, however, remains limited.
14
15

16 ***CSR implementation***
17

18
19 Several models of CSR have been developed within the sport context (Walker & Parent,
20
21 2010; Heinze et al., 2014; Kolyperas et al., 2015). For example, Kolyperas and colleagues (2015)
22
23 examined the progressive strategic and cultural organisational change required to embed CSR in
24
25 football clubs. Similarly, Kolyperas, Anagnostopoulos, Chadwick, and Sparks (2016) explained
26
27 how some sport organisations may alter their structure by creating charitable foundations and
28
29 appoint new organisational actors in charge of delivering these initiatives. Eventually, these studies
30
31 have suggested that sport organisations face challenges to define what constitutes meaningful CSR
32
33 (Kihl et al., 2014)
34
35

36
37 Overall, most of this empirical scholarly activity has focused on either an individual or an
38
39 organisational level of analysis. For example, Heinze et al. (2014) examined mechanisms that
40
41 enabled a professional team to manage CSR in a strategic and integrated way. Other individual-
42
43 level studies have documented the decision-making process of CSR in football charitable
44
45 foundations (Anagnostopoulos et al., 2014). However, “the organisational complexity, specifically
46
47 related to CSR, is increasing as is the need to capture elements at both the cross-organisational and
48
49 individual level” (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013, p. 269). To date, sport management research
50
51 in this domain has overlooked an analysis from a multilevel perspective that would reveal the
52
53 dynamic interaction between individual – group – organisational and interorganisational levels. In
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

the next section, we frame the theoretical underpinning, OL, through which we elaborate this first in-depth, multilevel examination of CSR implementation.

OL as a multilevel process

Learning commonly refers to a relatively permanent change in knowledge or skill resulting from experience (Weiss 1990). As such, OL is defined as a process referring to the ways in which organisations as collectives learn through interaction within their internal and external environment (Cybert & March, 1963). Vera and Crossan (2004) posit that OL is a process of change in thought and action, both individual and shared, which is embedded in and affected by the institutions of the organisation. At the heart of OL theories lies the consensual assumption that OL includes individual-, group-, organisation-level processes (Argyris & Schon, 1996; Crossan et al., 1999; Huber, 1991).

To date, OL has been largely underexplored in sport management. Only a handful of studies have examined broader knowledge, knowledge management, and related processes such as knowledge creation and transfer (Girginov et al., 2015; Halbwirth & Toohey, 2001; Parent, MacDonald, & Goulet, 2014). Overall, these studies support that the survival and success of any sport organisation is based on the systematic generation of new information, knowledge, and innovation (Girginov et al., 2015). While Halbwirth and Toohey (2001) noted the importance of a culture of learning, Parent et al. (2014) suggested that learning was connected to the knowledge-management process. A deeper understanding of OL could thus contribute to the existing knowledge literature, because “effective knowledge management and transfer processes and research (...) require both organisational theory and behaviour perspectives” (Parent et al., 2014, p. 215).

Although a variety of theoretical models have been used to analyse OL, Crossan et al. (1999) provide a particularly well-developed comprehensive and multilevel model. Integrating and

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

2
3
4
5 extending previous seminal studies (Argyris & Schon, 1996; Daft & Weick, 1984; Huber, 1991;
6
7 Nonaka, 1994), the *4I Framework* (Crossan et al., 1999) allows for the analysis of complex process
8
9 dynamics. This model identified four interconnected processes of *intuiting*, *interpreting*,
10
11 *integrating*, and *institutionalising* that occur at individual, group and organisational levels (Crossan
12
13 et al., 1999). Accordingly, *intuiting* and *interpreting* take place at the individual level, while
14
15 *integration* occurs at the group level and *institutionalisation* at the organisational level, which
16
17 makes this process multilevel.
18
19

20
21 *Intuiting* is the preconscious recognition of the pattern and/or possibilities inherent to a
22
23 personal stream of experience. Crossan et al. (1999) distinguish between entrepreneurial intuition,
24
25 (which makes novel connections to innovate), and expert intuition, (which draws upon past
26
27 knowledge to recognise familiar patterns). *Interpreting* is the explaining, through verbalisation
28
29 and/or actions, of an insight or idea to oneself and to others. It extends to the group level when
30
31 individuals engage in sensemaking and shape intuitions through conversations, metaphors, and
32
33 imagery. *Integrating* is the process of developing shared understandings along individuals and of
34
35 taking coordinated action through mutual adjustment. *Institutionalising* is the process of ensuring
36
37 that actions are routinised into the institutions of the organisation through systems, structures,
38
39 procedures, and strategy. OL, therefore, occurs when new knowledge is interpreted, distributed, and
40
41 institutionalised in organisational routines.
42
43
44
45

46
47 The *4I Framework* is commonly presented in a sequential form. According to Crossan et al.
48
49 (1999), these four learning processes interact dynamically and are connected through feedforward
50
51 and feedback flows. *Feedforward* refers to the process through which new ideas and actions flow
52
53 from the individual to the group, and to the organisational level. *Feedback* refers to the process
54
55 through which institutionalised learning affects the individual and group learning levels. Key in
56
57 these processes is the interaction between different levels. It is important to understand that learning
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

transcends levels, instead of occurring *within* the levels. The core idea of this is the continuous process of knowledge (rather than a linear process).

Crossan et al. (1999) encouraged other scholars to refine their preliminary framework of OL processes. As such, many studies have shown that learning can occur at a fourth interorganisational level (e.g., Hardy, Phillips, & Lawrence, 2003; Zollo, Reuer, & Singh, 2002). This interorganisational learning focuses on how organisations learn from each other through formal collaborations or from informal communities of practices (Jones & Macpherson, 2006), such as could be the case in a network of sport organisations in a federated model. This collaboration can indeed facilitate creation of new knowledge, knowledge sharing, and transfer of existing knowledge (Hardy et al., 2003; Brown & Duguid, 1991).

Therefore, Jones and Macpherson (2006) suggested an extended version of the *4I Framework* by adding a fourth interorganisational level and the process of intertwining recognising the intersection of learning between organisations and not just within organisational boundaries. They highlight that “external organisations have a significant role to play in institutionalising the feedback processes by which new knowledge and procedures become embedded within the firm” (Jones & Macpherson, 2006, p. 167). In other words, external actors are key in helping acquire and institutionalise learning at the organisational level. Moreover, Jones and Macpherson (2006) identified three types of learning –mimetic (adopting and adapting best practices), coercive (enforced learning), and normative (adopting industry standards).

OL and CSR implementation

The intersection between CSR and OL has recently been subject of both conceptual (e.g., Fortis et al., 2016; Antal & Sobczak, 2014) and empirical studies (e.g., Burchell & Cook, 2008; Oelze et al., 2014). The existing scholarship suggests that OL is central for implementing CSR because it is fundamentally challenging conventional ways of thinking and doing (Antal &

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

2
3
4
5 Sobczak, 2014; Cramer, 2005; Fortis et al, 2016; Maon et al., 2010). Organisations must adapt and
6
7 develop novel attitudes, competences, and ways of working within their organisation and with
8
9 individuals, groups, and organisations that evolve within their network (Burchell & Cook, 2008;
10
11 Fortis et al., 2016). These studies suggest that the changes ascribed to this undertaking call for more
12
13 attention on the role of OL in the implementation of CSR (Fortis et al, 2016; Oelze et al., 2014. In
14
15 other words, CSR and OL should be considered to be interrelated because CSR implementation
16
17 entails substantial learning processes for the organisation and its members in order to successfully
18
19 unfold CSR within the organisation (Fortis et al., 2016).
20
21
22

23
24 Fortis et al. (2016) reviewed the nascent and fragmented body of literature central to CSR
25
26 and OL. In their conceptualisation of OL, learning processes can be found inside the organisation
27
28 (learning from within) (e.g., Antal & Sobczak, 2004), from knowledge located in their external
29
30 environment (learning from others) (e.g., Oelze et al., 2014) and by actively engaging with
31
32 stakeholders through collaboration (learning with others) (e.g., Burchell & Cook, 2008).
33
34

35
36 Fortis and colleagues (2016) encourage additional empirical studies with a focus beyond an
37
38 organisational-centric perspective (i.e., intraorganisational level), and in particular, on the ‘learning
39
40 with others’ process (i.e., interorganisational level). Moreover, the adoption of a multilevel
41
42 perspective was only studied in a fragmented way (i.e., integrating the different unit of analysis of
43
44 OL). Oelze et al. (2014) have demonstrated that the learning processes underlying implementation
45
46 go beyond an intraorganisational focus and comprise external channels through which organisations
47
48 can generate knowledge. This multilevel, dynamic, and integrative gap in the literature is surprising
49
50 considering the interorganisational context that typically characterises CSR development in the
51
52 broader literature (Burchell & Cook, 2008; Rasche, Morsing, & Moon, 2017) and sport
53
54 management literature (Dowling et al., 2013) in particular. Therefore, we contend that more
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

research is required to examine the multilevel process of learning in a network of sport organizations in a federated sport structure.

Method

We conducted a qualitative-oriented study using interviews as the principal data collection technique, with an interpretative single-case-study design. Single-case studies allow the development of a rich theoretical framework enhancing theories' robustness through replication (Yin, 2009). The research was conducted in one sport federation. Case selection was tailored with a purposive sampling approach (Patton, 2002). This involved identifying an NPO that implements CSR programmes that fall within and beyond its social mandate. We selected this case based on established CSR records from extant studies, websites, and official reports. This case is relevant because of the organisation's commitment to CSR, their sport federated network, and their professionalization.

The rationale for the selection is also underpinned by the fact that sport federations remain an under-researched area for CSR. Considering the traditional European sport federated structure (Sotiriadou et al., 2017) and the multilevel context of CSR implementation in the sport context (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013), sport federations, as governing bodies for sport, are centrally positioned in the OL process with their organisational members, their member clubs, their national sport federation, and their external stakeholders.

Empirical Setting

The French Field Hockey Federation (hereafter LFH) was established in 2012 after the regionalisation of hockey and has recently introduced some CSR initiatives. Their CSR strategy is not yet well defined, and it is not formally embedded in their structure. The LFH mainly collaborates within the Belgian hockey network, which is mainly composed of various sport clubs,

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3

4 the national hockey federation (hereafter ARBH), and NPOs within and beyond the sport sector.

5 The LFH has developed three main projects: *Hockey Together*, *Stick to Fair Play*, and *Green*
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Hockey. These projects provide the basis for exploring LFH's OL process. Table 1 briefly outlines these projects.

INSERT TABLE 1

Data collection*Semi-structured interviews*

The lead author conducted 18 interviews from May 2016 to May 2017 either in person or via telephone. Organisational actors from the sport federation and from different stakeholder groups were interviewed through snowball and purposive sampling (Patton, 2002). Interviews stopped when saturation of data in each stakeholder group was reached. The study participants were representatives from the ARBH (2), LFH (6), hockey sport clubs (6), disability sport federation (LHF) (1), NPOS (2), and minister of disability (1). These individuals were presidents (10), treasurer (1), general secretary (2), managers (3), and board members (2). These well-placed informants were selected based on their capacity to oversee CSR strategy, given their organizational position, their experience, and active role played in implementation of these initiatives.

Previous research acknowledged that OL can be difficult to identify because learning takes place both consciously and unconsciously (Crossan et al., 1999; Oelze et al., 2014). At the heart of this challenge lie the dual perspectives of learning: behavioural (i.e., routines, actions, and structures) and cognitive (i.e., cognitive maps, beliefs, and understanding). To overcome the methodological limitations inherent to learning study and qualitative research (Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2011), we conducted our research by posing semi-structured and open questions regarding how the individuals personally experience CSR implementation, thereby approaching both conscious and unconscious learning. This approach opened the way for the informants to express

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

their respective vision on hockey's contribution to society and conception of the process in their own terms and to expand on events that were important to them. Interviews enable an in-depth understanding of the meanings an interviewee may attach to a particular issue (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2008).

Specifically, the interview protocol included a more historical perspective that consisted of asking the informant to give his/her perceptions on the changes the organisation has undergone in the past decade regarding CSR. Informants were asked to reflect on their experience, understanding, and their involvement with the implementation of the CSR projects (see Appendix 1).

The interviews ranged from between 47 to 106 minutes and were recorded and transcribed verbatim. This resulted in a database of more than 310 pages of single-spaced transcribed text and total interview time exceeding 21 hours.

Documentation

Documentation provided background information about the sport federation's social responsibility background, orientation, and actions. This material included strategic programmes, annual reports, strategy notes, meeting reports, presentations, brochures, promotional materials, and press releases. These secondary data were directly provided by some informants or were publicly available organisational documents retrieved from the Internet. In total, 20 documents were collected and triangulated by an examination of the webpages from all organisations.

Data analysis

Consistent with Miles and Huberman (1994), we iteratively analysed the data using both deductive and inductive reasoning. First, the transcripts were read several times, and case reports were established to identify the major CSR development and phases as well as the key features and implementation mechanisms of CSR initiatives. This first-step coding originated from the review of

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3

4 the literature on OL and CSR (Cramer, 2005; Fortis et al., 2016; Maon et al., 2010). In a second
5 step, Crossan et al.'s (1999) model provided a priori categories to analyse the data. As the aim of
6 this study was to examine the learning process, we initially built on the four processes along the
7 three levels identified in the *4I Framework*. These included identifying expert and entrepreneurial
8 patterns as well as the nature and the extent of institutionalisation. In a third step, the refinement of
9 themes occurred, the development of alternate themes appeared and were added to the coding
10 scheme during the analysis.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 For example, interorganisational learning emerged as an important theme. Sport clubs and
21 external stakeholders were identified by informants as external learning sources. New codes also
22 emerged, such as the different formal and informal groups within the intraorganisational level.
23 Analysis of the data was performed with NVivo 11 software. After coding all data according to the
24 themes, these were carefully reviewed and further scrutinised for relationships and linkages.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Consistent with established guidelines on qualitative research quality (Lindgreen Xu, Maon,
33 & Wilcock, 2012; Patton, 2012), this study adopted several methods to improve its validity and
34 reliability. These techniques include data triangulation, standardized interview guide, multiple
35 interviews, data coding protocol, independent coding, and follow-up interviews with key informants
36 from ARBH, LFH, and Hockey Together, to allow feedback on our initial findings.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Results**
46

47 This study examines how CSR-related ideas emerging at the individual, group, interorganisational
48 levels have been embedded into the organisational level. In this section, we report how the LFH has
49 been involved in five feedforward learning subprocesses (i.e., intuiting, integrating, interpreting,
50 institutionalising, and intertwining) throughout the CSR implementation process.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Expert and entrepreneurial intuiting

Key individuals capitalising on both expert and entrepreneurial intuitions could often be identified from the data as the source of the intuitive process. Our findings indicate that these individuals have actively built on their previous experience, educational background, and on their instinct for innovation to bring about change for CSR. They are representatives of the LFH as well as the ARBH and member clubs that can be considered internal stakeholders. These individuals occupied higher-level functions (i.e., strategic) and middle-level functions (i.e., operational) within these organisations. They have initiated a review on hockey's contribution to society through CSR projects.

The results showed that ideas arising from both LFH and ARBH's presidents have significantly influenced the way CSR has been integrated in the LFH. As explained by a manager:

This, I believe, also stems from the personalities, the educational background of the board members who often have responsibilities in other companies, small and large. Social responsibility has become a trending topic, and this is something that they are really trying to instil here. (...) The added value brought by these board members lies in the actual transfer of their models. To our president, this issue has become a real priority and I think that he is really good at managing it. (Informant #1)

The president of the LFH has built on his current professional experience as a CSR manager. "So I am in charge of the social responsibility program at [name of the organisation], and it is clear that organisations, no matter who they are, must now reflect on their social role and question what they can possibly do on a larger scale" (Informant # 2). As illustrated by this quote, this individual wishes to apply his expertise in the implementation of the LFH's CSR strategy. In addition, the ARBH's president has demonstrated entrepreneurial intuition characterised by a specific sensibility to environmental issues, as well as an overall instinct for change.

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

This is something that makes sense to me since I am a child. There are sentences I have remembered: “the earth does not belong to us, we let it to our children”. And it is quite clear to me that I would like everything, and I really mean everything beyond hockey itself, to get better for the next generations, yours and the next ones. (Informant # 4)

In the case of *Stick to Fair Play*, one operational manager primarily initiated the project.

Conversely, *Green Hockey* and *Hockey Together* emerged in a bottom-up approach from the intuition of member clubs. All interviewees reported that there was one key individual behind the disability project. Its founder explains how this started: “Nobody ever told me: act or do something. I just told myself: Look, we have space available now [a new field], so let’s make some room for everybody. So that’s what the idea boils down to.” (Informant #3).

From Individual to Collective Interpreting

Sharing these intuitions with others refers to individuals verbalising their ideas about CSR by engaging in discussion with other organisational members from LFH, ARBH and club members. Interviewees conveyed a message of sport doing good for society. The discussions were therefore mostly about the relevancy and the extent to which LFH should engage or not on these matters. Noticeably, the language used by the individuals did not systematically relate to CSR *per se*, suggesting that the sensemaking mainly occurred about what should be the social responsibility of the LFH and how it should enact this, rather than on the meaning associated with the use of the concept. Therefore, the language was imprecise and related to the specific projects implemented.

Overall, the idea was to build on the existing strong values behind hockey to develop an overall vision for the LFH. The LFH’s president explains this message:

So we have positioned the whole image of sport in a much more general manner to break the old image and then, by drawing from the values, defend the idea that: “moreover, this is a sport in which you are going to do things in a certain way. (Informant #2)

The boundary-spanning nature of the key intuitive individuals has emerged from the

1
2 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
3
4

5 interviews as important to further develop CSR. These individuals communicated with other key
6 entrepreneurial and expert individuals within the hockey network (i.e., from ARBH and LFH's
7 strategic and operational levels and from member clubs).
8
9

10
11 Discussions therefore started among several key change agents on particular CSR projects.
12

13
14 In the case of *Hockey Together*, the founder received important support in the hockey network:
15

16 In 2009, the first move consisted of presenting the initiative to the general assembly
17 (...). I directly obtained a lot of support. (...) So there was an entire group of backers
18 that formed completely informally. So there was no president, no meetings. And we
19 started this together. (Informant #3)
20
21
22

23
24 Using his social network, the ARBH's president built on the expert intuition of a member-
25 club to design *Green Hockey*.
26
27

28 Now, concretely, what I have suggested was based on an initiative from the president of
29 a club, who is board member of a nonprofit organisation, [name of the organisation]. He
30 came to me because he wanted that we compensate the ecological footprint, carbon
31 dioxide footprint of our players in Rio. (Informant #4)
32
33
34
35

36
37 For *Stick to Fair Play*, the manager took the initiative and the lead with other federations'
38 members. He explained that to implement the project:
39

40
41 I consulted. I first called up a meeting with my president of the Board of directors and
42 the three secretary generals [i.e., national and two regionals]. I told them that there was
43 something to do concerning fair play and ethics. (...). Generally, I asked them how they
44 saw things, what were the problem. It was a really open discussion. I took a lot of
45 information, then I structured my project based on this feedback. (Informant #3)
46
47
48
49

50
51 *Integrating and developing a shared understanding of the CSR trajectory*
52

53 The process of developing shared understanding of CSR and taking coherent collective
54 (CSR) actions within a group, occurred through formal and informal groups of both sport
55 federations. Based on the coding of the interview data, we identified two formal groups, namely the
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 board of directors and general assembly, and an NPO and one informal group, namely a coalition of
6
7 change agents.
8

9
10 Overall, the general assemblies and the board of directors of both ARBH and LFH were key
11
12 forums for exchanging views, sharing knowledge and eventually stimulating the design of a
13
14 common vision of CSR strategy, guiding principles and projects. The ARBH's president noted the
15
16 importance of these structures to spread his individual learning within the organisation: "We talk
17
18 increasingly about corporate social responsibility. CSR has become a trending topic. Not that long
19
20 ago, at the extraordinary General Assembly, I introduced two or three projects in this respect."
21
22

23 (Informant #4).
24

25
26 In the case of *Stick to Fair Play* and *Green Hockey*, discussions took place also inside these
27
28 formal structures. Mutual adjustments among the LFH and ARBH's levels were reported. As
29
30 illustrated by the following quotation, the manager in charge of the former project realised that
31
32 changes were required within the board:
33
34

35
36 Some board members indeed said that this may not be their priority as they have bigger
37
38 fish to fry. Actually, they are also club presidents and what they say is: above all, I have
39
40 difficulties finding coaches, dealing with my growth and the infrastructures. So you
41
42 have to prove its impact (...). Now, they are all convinced, and it is awesome.
43

44 (Informant #5)
45

46
47 While board members were sometimes relatively sceptical about the projects, *Stick to Fair*
48
49 *Play* was accepted while *Green Hockey* was dismissed in its initial form. For *Green Hockey*, mutual
50
51 adjustments between the president of the ARBH and the initiating member club finally resulted in
52
53 the decision to collaborate with an external environmental NPO on a one-off project and in the
54
55 member club rather than starting with a broader project.
56

57
58 For the disability project, following the informal support received by the founder of the
59
60 initiative, more individuals within the LFH also took a more active part in the project and

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 participated to the creation of the NPO called *Hockey Together*. As such, it has moved from a very
6 informal to a formal joint collaborative project, with the creation of a new organisational form. A
7 board member explains why the LFH stepped in: “There are often projects which are warmly
8 welcomed because they correspond to our values. Let me take the example: *Hockey Together* (...).
9 We absolutely want this to keep on developing all through the entire field of hockey” (Informant
10 #6).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Additionally, entrepreneurs, experts, managers, and member clubs have informally created a
20 coalition of change agents who attempted to develop some projects and a vision for CSR in the long
21 term, as exemplified in the previous section. In this respect, top managers were essential to guide
22 the participative process and encourage the contribution of all organisational member. LFH and
23 ARBH’s leaders oriented the strategic change of CSR through proactive management. Board
24 volunteers from both sport federations acted as a supportive mechanism to the learning process,
25 convincing other organisational members and engaging in collective interpreting was a challenge.
26 While these individuals have succeeded in developing some sustainable projects through formalised
27 mechanisms, resistance from some board members successfully prevented the implementation of
28 one CSR program.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *Institutionalising learning at the organisational level*
44

45 The interviews showed that although some individuals aimed to bring a sport-adapted notion
46 of CSR *per se* to the agenda, the LFH lacked a consistent overall CSR strategy. As the president of
47 the LFH noted: “I think we are on the right track, but we now have to make it sustainable and there
48 are two ways to do so. One is to design a working group here. [Second] is to appoint someone who
49 will be in charge of that at the federation.” (Informant #2).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 Moreover, the understanding of what CSR means to the individuals remains fuzzy and dispersed
6
7 between separate projects and ideas that coexist. Reaching a common CSR meaning and vision
8
9 within the LFH constitutes a barrier to a higher institutionalisation of CSR.
10

11
12 However, while CSR has not yet been fully developed within the organisation, we found a
13
14 low level of institutionalisation, which corresponds to local institutionalisation through a newly
15
16 formed entity called *Hockey Together* with other strategic and processual forms of
17
18 institutionalisation.
19

20
21 *Hockey Together* has been formally institutionalised within the LFH through its inclusion in
22
23 its communication and in its strategic plan. Such structures resulted in fostering knowledge
24
25 embedment and accelerating the learning process within the LFH. Conversely, the LFH has been
26
27 formally integrated in the decision-making process of *Hockey Together*. Specific strategic and
28
29 communication documents have been published that reinforced the institutionalisation.
30
31

32
33 Moreover, the strategic formalisation of two initiatives in the strategic plan as well as the
34
35 appointment of managers in charge of the CSR-related projects, were critical for institutionalising
36
37 *Stick to Fair Play* and *Hockey Together* as explained by the manager of the former project:
38

39
40 Formalising this project by the board of directors on a real document was needed. The
41
42 fact that this is formalised in the strategic plan, that somebody works on it, that he gets it
43
44 to grips, and structures it well (...) It is really important. (Informant #5).
45

46
47 Ongoing learning procedures exist within the LFH through discussion platforms for the staff
48
49 and the clubs. This interactive platform for the exchange of ideas seeks to define a vision and a
50
51 shared understanding of the CSR-related projects. Yet, no specific CSR learning programs have
52
53 been implemented at the organisational level.
54

55
56 However, *Green Hockey* showed that the overall level of institutionalisation in this case
57
58 remains relatively low, as this resistance by some individuals has threatened the continuity of the
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 broader environmental project. This failure illustrates the need to allow time for learning to filter
6
7 through to the different levels. One informant explained the implementation pace:
8

9 I think what matters is that people claim ownership of the project. I think it came too fast
10 and people were wondering what it was. (...) I think that all this, as coffee, it must
11 percolate [filtering down process] and at a certain time, people in the clubs and in the
12 federations, will say yes, it is evident we have to do it. Presently, we have certainly not
13 reached this level. (Informant #7)
14
15
16
17

18
19 Given the absence of a fully institutionalised inter-organisational learning, the LFH's CSR
20 commitment also relies on its inter-organisational relationships.
21
22

23
24
25 *Intertwining: External sources of learning*
26

27 The results showed that learning across levels of the hockey network was important in CSR
28 implementation by the LFH. The sport federated structure and collaborative setting provided
29 opportunities to engage in learning flows with other organisations, of which sport clubs and the
30 ARBH are direct preferred partners.
31
32
33
34

35 Along with their close collaboration with the ARBH due to their recent effective and
36 cooperative approach to regionalisation, the LFH collaborated with multiple stakeholders. These
37 included specific stakeholders for each project (an NPO responsible for fair play issue, a local NPO
38 partners involved in disability issues, LHF, and an environmental NPO) and established
39 stakeholders (such as the ARBH, member clubs, public authorities, and sponsors).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The results showed that key individuals have built on their social and professional networks
49 to transfer knowledge within the LFH through collaboration. Boundary-spanning individuals
50 actively connected the LFH with these partners. In particular, this facilitated the involvement of
51 sport clubs in collaborating in CSR initiatives. One participant explained just that: "We receive
52 information informally, by discussing with people, because we know many people in the clubs, we
53 move along from left to right, and we hear some things" (Informant #8). This interrelation is also
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

facilitated by the fact that several sport clubs' presidents are also board members of the LFH and/or ARBH. This indeed resulted in the diffusion of local initiatives at the federation level. Moreover, these stakeholders are important sources of learning and knowledge for the LFH, as illustrated by *Hockey Together* and *Green Hockey*.

Public and private stakeholders were important in the development of CSR in hockey through the provision of technical and financial support for the *Hockey Together* and *Stick to Fair Play* projects. For instance, as the general secretary explains: "We obtained very positive feedback because the project itself has been supported by the minister of sport (...). We have received a specific subsidy to develop this project." (Informant #8)

Furthermore, interviewees reported that these interorganisational relationships enabled knowledge exchange, networking, and dialogue among key stakeholders. The LFH collaborates on *Hockey Together* with the LHF to provide support and learning. As the treasurer of this NPO explains:

They are the ones specialising in sport people with disabilities. There are idiosyncrasies that we, we know hockey. (...) They can help us with equipment and financial resources. (Informant #9)

A partnership agreement was signed by the LFH and LHF, which states that: "the valid federation is committed to promoting sport for people with a disabilities-through-awareness campaign in their member clubs. The LHF can, when requested, advise valid clubs in this process." (Partnership Agreement)

Discussion

Beyond presenting a rich description of the different trajectories of OL for CSR, this study provides several original findings. Below, we discuss the implications of these results for the literature on CSR in sport and the role of learning in the implementation of CSR.

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
34
5 *Individuals' profiles and positions*
6

7 By confirming the existence of both *experts and entrepreneurs* (Crossan et al., 1999), our
8 findings reveal that sport organisations go through both exploitation and exploration of learning,
9 which could eventually lead to tensions between pre-existing knowledge and new learning. A major
10 finding is the *group-level* and *interorganisational-level boundary-spanning* profiles identified
11 throughout these overlapping learning processes.
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 *Group-level boundary spanners* have emerged from the case study as important enablers of
19 learning from individual to group level, as well as connectors between individuals' intuitions within
20 the LFH. Furthermore, in this sport-federated setting, these individuals proved to be particularly
21 influential in the informal groups because they coordinate the "coalition of change agents."
22
23

24
25
26
27 *Interorganisational-level boundary-spanners* have been important in embedding CSR more
28 deeply in the LFH through collaboration and learning exchange with external partners. Their
29 relational ties with other organisations facilitated the intertwining process between existing
30 institutionalised learning and external learning. A shortcoming associated with these key
31 organisational actors is that staff or volunteers' departure might induce a change in the relationship
32 and in the feedforward-feedback flow.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Overall, results have shown that CSR implementation required the active involvement and
42 support of all organisational members, for learning flows between levels to occur. These findings
43 confirm previous studies acknowledging the influence of sport federation leadership support in the
44 institutionalisation of a structured approach toward CSR (Hamil & Morrow, 2011; Cramer, 2005).
45 The present study also highlights the importance of operational managers, not only for the work
46 force they represent in coordinating CSR-related programmes (Cramer, 2005), but also for their
47 awareness, personal values, vision, hands-on expertise, and knowledge to induce CSR ideas within
48 the whole organisation. Although these individuals are not CSR managers, their dedication and
49 specialist knowledge have been influential in implementing CSR. Particularly, this finding suggests
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

2
3
4 the importance of attracting high-quality individuals at the strategic and operational levels
5
6 (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013) as well as engaging with learning platforms to define a shared
7
8 understanding of the CSR-related projects. Yet, no specific CSR learning programs that could
9
10 further complement the multiple competences required for CSR (Fortis et al., 2016) have been
11
12 implemented at the organisational level.
13
14

15
16 *Structural repositories of learning*

17
18 Considering Crossan et al.'s (1999) model, the study suggests that formal and informal
19
20 group structures exist in the group learning processes. The choice of informal structures might be
21
22 explained by the recent CSR involvement, the small size of the LFH and the collaborative nature in
23
24 a small federal country such as Belgium (Sotiriadou et al., 2017).
25
26

27
28 However, the LFH has also participated in the creation of a new formal collaborative
29
30 structure to further develop their CSR. While Kolyperas et al. (2015; 2016) highlighted potential
31
32 structural challenges and opportunities of foundations and "in-house" structures for CSR
33
34 implementation, our results reveal that challenges also exist in the creation of these formal
35
36 collaborative structures. This formal group represents an important learning platform because it
37
38 includes key internal and external stakeholders' views and skills and facilitates the flow from the
39
40 learning interpreting and integrating processes. However, we contend that such structures might
41
42 create an isolation trap that could lead to a lack of institutionalisation of OL. As such, although
43
44 creating formal structures may improve CSR integration within the organisation, this could also
45
46 isolate learning at a group level and restrict feedforward towards additional CSR embedment.
47
48

49
50 It became also evident that, in these structures, organisational members engage in defining a
51
52 shared understanding of their organisation's social involvement and taking coherent collective
53
54 (CSR) actions; a testament of a sensemaking process (Benn et al., 2013; Djaballah, Hautbois, &
55
56 Desbordes, 2015; Van der Heijden et al., 2010). Certainly, the capacity of organisational members
57
58 to develop a collective frame of reference is particularly important in driving CSR development
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 (Van der Heijden et al., 2010), in alignment with the shared aspect of OL and sensemaking
6
7 (Crossan & Berdrow, 2003). In turn, this interpreting process leads to a shared vocabulary,
8
9 definition, and ideas (i.e., different boundary objects (Benn et al., 2013)) that are important for
10
11 embedding CSR in the organisation.
12

13
14 *Interorganisational learning*
15

16 Internal and external stakeholders act as knowledge providers, intertwining knowledge to
17
18 support institutionalisation of learning throughout the federation. In other words, interorganisational
19
20 learning influences the learning cycle by interfering with the organisational and the individual and
21
22 group levels through key boundary spanners, informal structures and formal collaborative learning
23
24 platforms. These stakeholders importantly influenced the intuiting process of sport federation's
25
26 individual members in the early beginnings of the CSR projects.
27
28

29
30 While Cramer (2005) suggests that the more an organisation is involved in CSR the more
31
32 open it is to knowledge generated by others, results show that even though CSR is not as embedded
33
34 as in companies outside sport or even in professional sport teams, this sport federation relies heavily
35
36 on interorganisational learning. This study suggests that the sport federation has engaged with
37
38 various stakeholders through interorganisational relationships, knowledge exchange, networking,
39
40 and dialogue, echoing findings of studies in the general CSR literature (Burchell & Cook, 2008;
41
42 Fortis et al., 2016; Oelze et al., 2014). Moreover, this extends sport-related CSR studies that
43
44 consider that collaboration and bottom-up learning from the community facilitates CSR
45
46 implementation (Heinze et al., 2014).
47
48
49

50 Therefore, these results reveal that the *4I Framework* should be complemented by an
51
52 interorganisational level to fit with the sport-federated state model (Sotiriadou et al., 2017). Sport
53
54 federations are centrally positioned in a dense sport network to engage in learning with other
55
56 stakeholders and to draw on mimetic learning (Jones & Macpherson, 2006) from their member
57
58 clubs to implement CSR.
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Our study also highlighted important sources of learning within hockey and the broader sport network. Contrary to findings of previous studies about the fact that learning from external partners depends on prior experience with the partners (Jones & Macpherson, 2006; Zollo et al., 2002), our results show that new partners were also involved in the learning process. The findings suggest that the hockey case has not used all the possible input identified by Jones and Macpherson (2006), which could lead to different outcomes and learning strategies. For instance, a CSR-related community of practices, in which knowledge providers that establish standards and monitoring schemes gravitate, has not been identified yet.

However, results also suggest that integrating external stakeholders should be managed carefully because informants have identified risks of misunderstanding and commitment issues. This could also lead to contradiction between existing learning (feedback) and new learning (feedforward) (Crossan et al., 1999). The findings have revealed that conflicting views within the sport federation between managers and board volunteers on the collaboration with external partners represented an important barrier to the feedforward process.

Organisational learning for CSR in sport organisations

Our findings indicate a low level of institutionalisation of internal learning and some evidence of institutionalisation of external learning. Importantly, the study has shown a dominance of individual and group levels of learning. The ongoing process of institutionalisation of some structures and processes (i.e., formal organisation, strategy, communication, and learning platform) were important features of the learning process.

This confirms what Crossan et al. (1999) argued by saying, “Often, by the nature of their small size, their open communication, and their formation based on common interest and dreams, individual and group learning dominate in young organisations” (p. 529). The interorganisational level of the sport federation, however, affects the learning cycle and provides additional learning pathways through an intertwining process.

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The low institutionalisation of CSR throughout the organisation is partly due to challenges to OL. Feedforward-flow and feedback-loop failures, and misalignment between organisational and interorganisational learning, are significant barriers to OL institutionalisation. For instance, the findings suggest that failure of the environmental project might be due to a lack of flow between individual- and group-level learning. It is likely that the shift from intuiting to interpreting occurred too soon (Crossan et al., 1999) and therefore prevented the opportunity to create a shared vision by a group of individuals, which created resistance (Schilling & Kluge, 2009) and precipitated the failure of the project.

Overall, drawing from the *4I Framework*, findings suggest that implementation of CSR in the case of hockey exploited institutionalised learning and explored new learning opportunities. Therefore, OL for CSR involves both new ways of incorporating CSR awareness and practices in addition to embedding what has already been learnt into the organisation as a whole. More importantly, organisations have to learn internally and externally to develop CSR. That is, CSR requires the intervention of multiple stakeholders within and outside sport organisations. In particular, it is of critical importance for sport federations to maintain a dialogue with sport clubs as well as with the rest of the sports pyramid using the sports collaborative assets for this purpose. Therefore, we understand the learning process for CSR as a complex, multilevel and dynamic process that involves the integration of learning at the intraorganisational and interorganisational levels. Figure 1 depicts the extended *4I Framework*.

INSERT FIGURE 1

Conclusions and future research directions

This paper has revealed how OL occurs when a sport federation implements CSR. This paper has analysed how a sport federation manages to implement CSR through the institutionalisation of learning from individual, group, and interorganisational levels. Three main

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3

4 conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, key individuals capitalising on both expert and
5 entrepreneurial intuitions are influential to impulse CSR. Second, informal and formal structures are
6 strong repositories of group learning. Finally, external stakeholders are essential sources of learning
7 alongside interorganisational boundary spanners, facilitating the integration process. Therefore,
8 institutionalisation of CSR within the organisational setting requires assimilation of learning from
9 organisational members and from interorganisational relationships through formal entities,
10 strategies, collaborative structures, and learning platforms.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The study makes four important contributions to the sport management and CSR literature.
22 First, it expands integrative, dynamic, and process research, responding to recent calls for such
23 scholarly activities in the area of CSR in sport organisations (Anagnostopoulos & Shilbury, 2013;
24 Breitbarth et al., 2015). Second and relatedly, it moves beyond monodimensional approaches by
25 employing a multilevel perspective for the study of CSR implementation through OL, while
26 bringing about the interorganisational level to existing models (Crossan et al., 1999). As a result, it
27 responds to further calls that point out the need to consolidate multilevel process research on OL
28 and CSR (Fortis et al., 2016) Third, in doing so, it moves away from examining CSR *per se* and
29 considers it as a ‘contextual platform’ upon which concepts and processes from organisation theory
30 and behaviour are examined (in our case, OL). Finally, this study draws attention to the neglected
31 field of OL in the sport management field, opening new research opportunities to unpack its
32 influence in contexts other than CSR.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 From a practical perspective, sport managers should be conscious of the unique assets sport
49 federations have as networks and organizations working in a network. Particularly, managers could
50 compensate for the lack of internal knowledge by leveraging external sources of knowledge from
51 their sport discipline and enlarged network, such as learning platforms and professional networks,
52 recruiting individuals with a diversified set of knowledge to complement the multiple competences
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 required for CSR. Managers should also be aware of some conflicting dynamics characterizing
6 these networks that make them complicated to manage and eventually challenge the delivery of
7 CSR programs. Managers' recognition of this network's complexity could facilitate the learning
8 process. For instance, working in a network means overcoming the political resistance both between
9 clubs and federations and with the federations.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 The implications of this study should be tempered by an understanding of its limitations.
17 First, from a methodological perspective, the study of OL is challenging (Crossan et al., 1999). We
18 attempted to address this weakness by adopting a critical approach in the analysis and through our
19 longitudinal data. This allowed us to capture the learning experience from its context and get closer
20 to individuals' experience, knowing the socially constructed and context-specific nature of
21 knowledge and learning. Yet, despite the use of several techniques to ensure the quality of research
22 and strategies to tackle these methodological limitations by employing a semi-structured interview
23 guide with space for openness, this approach remains limited, given the unconscious nature of
24 learning. Investigating the learning from an end-user perspective (Girginov et al., 2015) – how all
25 organisational members learn – would provide significant insights into the present endeavour. In
26 this respect, while OL theory contends that knowledge is developed through interaction and within
27 practice, exploring the contribution of CSR training to learning from an individual perspective
28 could provide complementary insights to the present endeavour. Moreover, further empirical
29 research could examine the CSR-related competencies and skills needed by sport managers to
30 support learning and implement CSR.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Second, it should be noted that the research setting is nonprofit and European, which has
52 unique characteristics regarding CSR (Breitbarth et al., 2015). Future studies in different contexts
53 would provide rich opportunities for cross-cultural and organisational comparisons. For instance,
54 different learning schemes might occur in different structures and in larger sport organisations.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

2
3
4
5 Although no universal applicability of the framework can be claimed, we assume that its
6
7 generalisability to other organisational settings is likely to occur as some microprocesses can be
8
9 seen in other types of nonprofits due to some common characteristics with their sporting
10
11 counterparts. However, these findings acknowledge the importance of the interaction of learning
12
13 between the federation and its member clubs, given the sport federated setting. Further research
14
15 could focus on the relationship between sport federations and clubs. With this in mind, studies may
16
17 investigate how sport member clubs perceive the learning strategies deployed by sport federations
18
19 to encourage and develop good CSR-practices toolkits and training directly for member clubs.
20
21

22
23 Moreover, different learning schemes might occur in different structures and in larger sport
24
25 organisations. Empirical research is therefore needed to generate a more comprehensive
26
27 understanding of how OL system and structure can influence the OL process. Indeed, informal
28
29 structures are increasingly used by sport organisations as networking platforms to gather sport
30
31 professionals and experts, which could be regarded from the perspective of OL. Consequently,
32
33 further research could, for instance, in a network perspective, investigate the role of communities of
34
35 practice (Willem, Girginov, & Toohey, 2018).
36
37

38
39 Insights on the emergence and the impact of CSR consultants on CSR implementation in the
40
41 sport sector could be gained through further empirical research. Future studies should examine how
42
43 sport organisations use these strategies to develop their initiatives and how they contribute to CSR
44
45 implementation.
46
47
48
49
50

51 **List of References**

52 Anagnostopoulos, C., & Shilbury, D. (2013). Implementing corporate social responsibility in
53
54 English football: Towards multi-theoretical integration. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 3(4), 268-284.
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- Anagnostopoulos, C., Byers, T., & Shilbury, D. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in professional team sport organisations: Towards a theory of decision-making. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(3), 259-281.
- Antal, A. & Sobczak, A. (2014). Culturally embedded organizational learning for global responsibility. *Business and Society*, 53, 652-683.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.
- Babiak, K., Thibault, L., & Willem, A. (2018). Mapping Research on Interorganizational Relationships in Sport Management: Current Landscape and Future Research Prospects. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(XX), 1-23.
- Benn, S., Edwards, M. & Angus-Leppan, T. (2013). Organizational learning and the sustainability community of practice: the role of boundary objects. *Organization & Environment*, 26, 184-202.
- Bondy, K., Moon, J., & Matten, D. (2012). An institution of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in multi-national corporations (MNCs): Form and implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(2), 281-299.
- Breitbarth, T., Walzel, S., Anagnostopoulos, C., & van Eeekeren, F. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility And Governance In Sport: “Oh, the things you can find, if you don’t stay behind!”. *Corporate Governance*, 15(2), 254-273.
- Burchell, J. & Cook, J. (2008). Stakeholder dialogue and organisational learning: changing relationships between companies and NGOs. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 17, 35–46.
- Chelladurai, P. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility and Discretionary Social Initiatives in Sport: A Position Paper. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1(1-2): 4-18.
- Cramer, J. (2005). Company learning about corporate social responsibility. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 14, 255–266.
- Crossan, M. M., & Berdrow, I. (2003). Organizational learning and strategic renewal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24 (11), 1087-1105.
- Crossan, M., Lane, H., & White, R. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 522-537.
- Cybert, R.M. & March, J.G. (1963). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- Djaballah, M., Hautbois, C., & Desbordes, M. (2015). Non-mega sporting events' social impacts: a sensemaking approach of local governments' perceptions and strategies. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(1), 48-76.
- Dowling, M., Robinson, L. & Washington, M. (2013), Taking advantage of the London 2012 Olympic games: corporate social responsibility through sport partnerships, *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 3(3), 269-292.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., Jackson, P., & Lowe, A. (2008). *Management research: theory and practice*. Sage Publications Ltd., London, UK.
- Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. A. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.
- Ferkins, L., & Shilbury, D. (2010). Developing board strategic capability in sport organisations: The national–regional governing relationship. *Sport management review*, 13(3), 235-254.
- Fortis, Z., Maon, F., Frooman, J., & Reiner, G. (2016). Unknown Knowns and Known Unknowns: Framing the Role of Organizational Learning in Corporate Social Responsibility Development. *International Journal of Management Reviews*.
- Girginov, V., Toohey, K., & Willem, A. (2015). Creating and leveraging knowledge to promote sport participation: the role of public governing. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 15(5), 555-578.
- Halbwirth, S. & Toohey, K. (2001). The Olympic Games and knowledge management: A case study of the Sydney organising committee of the Olympic Games. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1(2), 91-111.
- Hamil, S., & Morrow, S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility in the Scottish Premier League: Context and motivation. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(2), 143-170.
- Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. B. (2003). Resources, knowledge and influence: The organizational effects of interorganizational collaboration. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(2), 321-347.
- Heinze, K.L., Soderstrom, S., & Zdroik, J. (2014). Towards strategic and authentic corporate social responsibility in professional sport: A case study of the Detroit Lions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(6), 672-686.
- Holmqvist, M. (2003). A dynamic model of intra-and interorganizational learning. *Organization studies*, 24(1), 95-123.

ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: the contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, 2, 88–115.
- Jones, O., & Macpherson, A. (2006). Inter-organizational learning and strategic renewal in SMEs: extending the 4I framework. *Long Range Planning*, 39(2), 155-175.
- Kihl, L., Babiak, K., & Tainsky, S. (2014). Evaluating the implementation of a professional sport team's corporate community involvement initiative. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(3), 324-337.
- Kolyperas, D., Anagnostopoulos, C., Chadwick, S., & Sparks, L. (2016). Applying a communicating vessels framework to CSR value co-creation: empirical evidence from professional team sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(6), 702-719.
- Kolyperas, D., Morrow, S., & Sparks, L. (2015). Developing CSR in professional football clubs: drivers and phases. *Corporate Governance*, 15(2), 177-195.
- Lindgreen, A., Xu, Y., Maon, F., & Wilcock, J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility brand leadership: A multiple case study. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(7/8), 965-993.
- Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Organizational Stages and Cultural Phases: A Critical Review and a Consolidative Model of Corporate Social Responsibility Development. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 20-38.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Misener, K. & Babiak, K. (2015). A new 'arena': Social responsibility through nonprofit community sport. *North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM)*. Ottawa
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37.
- Oelze, N., Hoejmose, S.U., Habisch, A. & Millington, A. (2014). Sustainable development in supply chain management: the role of organizational learning for policy implementation. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 25, 241–260.
- Parent, M. M., MacDonald, D., & Goulet, G. (2014). The theory and practice of knowledge management and transfer: The case of the Olympic Games. *Sport Management Review*, 17(2), 205-218.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4

5 Rasche, A., Morsing, M., & Moon, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Corporate social responsibility: strategy,*
6 *communication, governance.* Cambridge University Press.

8 Schilling, J., & Kluge, A. (2009). Barriers to organizational learning: An integration of theory and
9 research. *International journal of management reviews*, 11(3), 337-360.

11 Smith, A. C., & Westerbeek, H. M. (2007). Sport as a vehicle for deploying corporate social
12 responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 25(1), 43-54.

15 Sotiriadou, P., Brouwers, J., De Bosscher, V., & Cuskelly, G. (2017). The Role of
16 Interorganizational Relationships on Elite Athlete Development Processes. *Journal of Sport*
17 *Management*, 31(1), 61-79.

20 Trendafiova, S., Ziakas, V., & Sparvero, E. (2017). Linking corporate social responsibility in sport
21 with community development: an added source of community value. *Sport in Society*, 20(7),
22 938-956.

25 Van der Heijden, A., Driessen, P. P., & Cramer, J. M. (2010). Making sense of Corporate Social
26 Responsibility: Exploring organizational processes and strategies. *Journal of Cleaner*
27 *Production*, 18(18), 1787-1796.

30 Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of*
31 *Management Review*, 29(2), 222-240.

34 Walker, M., & Parent, M. M. (2010). Toward an integrated framework of corporate social
35 responsibility, responsiveness, and citizenship in sport. *Sport Management Review*, 13(3),
36 198-213.

39 Willem, A., Girginov, V., & Toohey, C. (in press). Governing bodies of sport as knowledge brokers
40 in Sport-for-All communities of practice. *Sport Management Review*.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2018.08.005>

44 Weiss, H.M. (1990). Learning theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In Dunnette,
45 M.D. and Hough, L.E. (eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Palo
46 Alto, CA.

49 Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and Methods*. SAGE publications. Thousand oaks.

51 Zietsma, C., Winn, M., Branzei, O., & Vertinsky, I. (2002). The war of the woods: Facilitators and
52 impediments of organizational learning processes. *British Journal of Management*, 13(S2).

55 Zollo M, Reuer J, Singh H. (2002). Interorganizational routines and performance in strategic
56 alliances. *Organization Science*, 13(6), 701-713.

1 ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | <i>Hockey Together</i> | <i>Stick to Fair Play</i> | <i>Green Hockey</i> |
| <i>Mission</i> | Integration of disabled people through the practice of hockey | Promote the intrinsic values of hockey and fair play | Donations to compensate hockey's ecological imprint |
| <i>Stakeholders targeted</i> | Disabled people | Hockey players and parents | None directly |
| <i>Nature of CSR</i> | Integration | Fair play | Environmental |
| <i>Actions</i> | Training sessions | Awareness campaign | Donation and awareness campaign |
| <i>Background</i> | Bottom-up initiative by one club in 2009 | Top-down initiative by the LFH in 2014 | Bottom-up initiative by one club in 2016 |
| <i>Stakeholders</i> | 9 clubs, LFH and ARBH, Hockey Together, public partners and local stakeholders (i.e., education and health) | ARBH, LFH, Flemish regional federation (VHL) and clubs | ARBH, LFH, VHL, clubs and NPO |

Table 1. Case studies 'characteristics




Figure 1. Extended 4I Framework

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Appendix 1. Semi-structured interview protocol

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 (1) Tell me about the job you do here
- 7 (2) What does corporate social responsibility (CSR) mean to you?
- 8 (3) What does CSR means for your organisation?
- 9 (4) What is your organisation doing in terms of CSR?
- 10 (5) What is your role in the organisation to implement CSR - a CSR-related project in
- 11 particular?
- 12 (6) When and how did this start? How was it decided? Who decided?
- 13 a. Did someone initiate this CSR idea or this project in particular?
- 14 b. What was the role of the staff?
- 15 c. What was the role of the board of directors?
- 16 d. Did you receive support from external stakeholders?
- 17 (7) How did your organisation integrate these objectives into the management (i.e., its
- 18 strategy; operations; communication; *etc.*)? Were changes needed? If so, which ones?
- 19 (8) What was needed in terms of learning? Did you develop specific learning strategies?
- 20 (9) What sources did your organisation use to develop its expertise to implement CSR?
- 21 a. Internally (i.e., learning from its own people and experience)?
- 22 b. Externally (i.e., among partners such as through training session)?
- 23 (10) Why was knowledge needed for your organisation to undertake these projects and
- 24 the related changes?
- 25 (11) What kind of knowledge did you obtain?
- 26 (12) How was this knowledge obtained?
- 27 (13) How was this knowledge used in your organization? By whom?
- 28 (14) Do you share knowledge with any individual or organisation?
- 29 (15) How do you put your knowledge in the service of your organisation or other
- 30 partners?
- 31 (16) What have you personally learned through the development of these CSR projects?
- 32 (17) Why do you think learning is important to implement CSR?
- 33 (18) What has your organisation learned through the implementation of CSR?
- 34 (19) What have you learned from working with these stakeholders?
- 35 (20) What internal challenges do you personally face regarding the implementation of
- 36 CSR? How did you overcome these challenges?
- 37 (21) What are the facilitators and challenges your organisation faced regarding the
- 38 implementation of CSR?
- 39 (22) Is there any other information that should be noted?
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60