Corporate Social Responsibility Influencing on Turnover Intention and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Nak Gulid,
Associate Professor
Faculty of Business Administration for Society, Srinakharinwirot University
Sponsored by Faculty of Business Administration for Society, Srinakharinwirot University

Abstract

The objective of this study is to identify the effect of internal and external corporate social responsibility on turnover intention and organizational citizenship behavior, mediated by job satisfaction and organizational trust, and moderated by gender of Thai employees in both public and private sectors in Bangkok, Thailand. Structural equation modeling was employed with 400 employees in Bangkok, Thailand. The results showed that internal and external CSR had a direct effect on job satisfaction, whereas only external CSR had a direct effect on organizational trust. In addition, external CSR influenced turnover intention and organizational citizenship behavior via job satisfaction and organizational trust. Internal CSR only influenced turnover intention and organizational citizenship behavior via job satisfaction. External CSR identified the stronger effect on the perceptions of employees, in terms of both job satisfaction and organizational trust than internal CSR. Females had a stronger moderating effect than the male groups on hypothesized relationships. The management should stimulate employees' CSR, both internally and externally to participate in the process of CSR program to enhance job satisfaction along with trust to alleviate turnover intention and encourage organizational citizenship behavior. If a high level of management can communicate CSR to non-managerial level, it reduces the problem of high turnover rate and elevates organizational image along with alleviating negative feelings on organization to create working environment.

Keywords: Internal CSR, External CSR, Job satisfaction, Organizational trust, Intention turnover, Organizational citizenship behavior.

Introduction

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) widely received great attention from the public, especially world organizations, such as United Nations (Aggarwal and Singh 2023). Hence, the CSR research area has been studied tremendously. Recently, a trend on CSR research is transited from the shareholder perspective (macro-CSR) such as financial performance, profitability, etc. to stakeholder approach (micro-CSR as individual stakeholders) (George et al., 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). CSR has a strong impact on stakeholders (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006; Aguinis and Glavas 2012; Fonseca et al., 2012; Archimi et al., 2018). Most of the micro-CSR research area is emphasized on external stakeholders (such as customers, investors, communities, etc.), whereas internal stakeholders (such as employees) received more attention in the present time period (Beal and Goyen, 1998; Mohr et al., 2001; Rupp and Mallory, 2015, Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). The reason is that employees are the most precious assets in their organization. Becker (1962) noted that organizational performance is influenced by the utilization of human resources (Phuong and Dong, 2021). If they had negative feelings about their working conditions or environment, it led to a direct impact on organizational performance (Chiaburu et al., 2013; Archimi et al., 2018). The majority of micro-CSR research treated CSR as unidimensional construct (El Akremi et al., 2018; Ahn and Kwon, 2020). Chatzopoulou et al. (2021) noted that only scant research is emphasized on internal and external dimensions (Farooq et al., 2017). Furthermore, empirical research employed only the relationship between CSR and employee outcomes (Glavas, 2016). To fill the gap for understanding the process to identify employee responses to corporate CSR initiatives, it is better off to examine the effect of CSR motive attributions and their effects (De Roeck et al., 2016; Lee and Chen, 2018; George et al., 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021).

There has been a lot of research demonstrating positive employee outcomes for firms that emphasized CSR activities (Carnahan et al., 2017; Gaudencio et al., 2020; Gond and Mazaer, 2021), including increased job satisfaction (Ellemers et al., 2011; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021), enhances organizational trust (Choi and La, 2013; Ahn and Kwon, 2020), increases citizenship behavior (Lin et al., 2010; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023), reduces intention to quit (Vitaliano, 2010; Gaudencio et al., 2020), organizational commitment (Brammer et al., 2007; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). Aggarwal and Singh (2023) stated that the connection between CSR and work behavior was inconclusive and required further study in several dimensions. Therefore, this study emphasized the investigation of the effect of CSR on work behavior in two opposite directions, which are positive work outcomes (organizational citizenship behavior, OCB) and negative outcome (turnover intention, TI). TI stands for an employee's disposition to quit their organization in the near future, whereas lower TI represents intentions to stay with the organization (Ghosh and Gurunathan, 2014). OCB are positive behavioral outcomes and related to voluntary and informal behaviors that can support colleagues and the organization as a whole (Sak, 2006). CSR initiatives increase organizational image, which stimulates employees' willingness to participate with good citizenship organization (De Roeck and Delobbe, 2012; Gaudencio et al., 2020). The motivation of employee work attitudes is a key success factor in management practices (Agarwal et al., 2023). Hence, TI is the major concern and it is related to CSR along with organizational image. Hansen et al. (2011) concluded that turnover led to cost organizations between 50-200% of the annual compensation of all employees who quit the organization (Gaudencio et al., 2020). OCB is also employed to analysis work behavior to promote the effective function of the organization (Organ, 1988; Phuong and Dong, 2021). Several researchers found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment have positively strong impact on organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Phuong and Dong, 2021). For example, Organ et al. (2005) found a strong correlation between satisfaction and OCB (Prasetio et al., 2017; Phuong and Dong, 2021). In addition, Rana et al. (2018) concluded that committed employees has strong effect on OCB (Phuong and Dong, 2021). At the present, employees doubt their leaders along with their ability to support organizations (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Archimi et al., 2018). CSR perception in employees' view is not stimulated organizational image, if they do not trust the organization. Hence, trust is treated as mediating variable to support the relationship between CSR perception and citizenship behavior along with intentions to quit (Archimi et al., 2018; Ahn and Kwon, 2020). In Thailand, CSR is widely studied in many areas such as service industry (Poolthong and Mandhachitara, 2009; Gulid and Yansomboon, 2016). However, there is the scant research to study CSR perception of employees to enhance social relationships, and behaviors, along with organizational outcomes by employing both trust and job satisfaction as the meditating variables in Thailand (Farooq et al., 2014; George et al., 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). To fill the gap, the objective of this study is to examine employee perception on internal and external CSR have effect on TI and OCB via job satisfaction and organizational trust as the mediating variables.

Leroi-Werelds et al. (2014) stated that perception heavily relied on individual demographic characteristics such as gender, age, education level, etc. Several of those studied concluded that gender is the most fundamental characteristic depending on engagement and interaction in specific activities (Thelwall, 2008; Muscanell and Guadagno, 2012; Shi et al., 2016). Gender is self-construal, the tendency to view one's self as either independent or interdependent from others (Cross and Madson, 1997, Peake et al., 2017). Differences in self-construal across gender generates the explanation of gender on motivation along with behavior in organization (Cojuharenco et. al., 2012; Peake et al., 2017). Madson and Trafimow (2001) concluded that women are more likely to be interdependent self-construal, which related to relationships such as attitude to social responsibility. Men are related to independent self-construal, which implies to individual interests (Peake et al., 2017). Hence, difference in gender have impact on motivations and behavior to participate in CSR activities. In this study, researcher employs gender as a moderating variable to test hypothesized relationships.

Theory and Hypotheses

Social exchange theory and social identity theory are employed to identify the effect of CSR on employee-organization relationships, which is considered both internal and external CSR to evaluate employee attitudes and work behavior (Brown and Peterson, 1994; Mathieu and Hamel, 1989; Jones et al., 2019; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Meyer and Allen (1991) stated that employee attitudes represented the loyalty level of employee towards their organization via personal identification, whereas Iverson and Buttigieg (1999) concluded that workplace behavior is emphasized on maintaining citizenship in their organization by personal investment on employees' dimension (time, skills, and resources to their work and organization). Social identification theory explains the share of group member along with relative status of the group (van Zomeren et al., 2008; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). When organization emphasizes on CSR, it enhances organization prestige and attractiveness, which led to stronger commitment on employees to their organization via social identification and citizenship in the organization (Dutton et al., 1994; Smidts et al., 2001; Farooq et al., 2014; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021).

Social identification is used to identify employee's assessment on external CSR (ECSR) such as social responsibility, pollution, etc. (Peterson, 2004; Dogl and Holtbrugge, 2014; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). ECSR is related to CSR activities on external stakeholders (community, natural environment, pollution), whereas internal CSR (ICSR) demonstrates CSR on human capital management practices such as fairness, workplace diversity, training, along with skill development (Mory et al., 2016; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). ECSR is used to increase employee attitudes by viewing their organization as positive social concern, especially on external stakeholders (Maignan and Ferrell, 2001). Social identification via ECSR enhances citizenship by personal investment. Hence, higher ECSR orientation on organization led to stronger behavioral commitment on employee's views (Kim et al., 2010; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). To enhance organizational commitment, it is also necessary to consider reciprocity. It is two-way relationships between employees and business owners (De Roeck and Maon, 2018). Therefore, social exchange theory is employed to identify the effect of ICSR on maintaining citizenship (Farooq et al., 2014; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). When employees have strong positive emotion on organizational ICSR motives, they are likely to reciprocal with attitudinal and behavioral commitment (Brammer et al., 2007; Turker, 2009, Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Sun et al. (2019) noted that there are only few studies emphasized on social responsibility and intention to quit. Therefore, it is necessary to concentrate on the effect of CSR to lower turnover intention in the Asian context.

Valentine and Fleischman (2008) stated that CSR motives have impact on job satisfaction. CSR can contribute to organizational commitment via job satisfaction (Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Several scholars also found the mediating effect of CSR motives and organizational commitment (Williams and Anderson, 1991; Kirkman and Shapiro, 2001; Koh and Boo, 2001; Vlachos et al., 2013; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Koh and Boo (2001) stated that organizational ethics had a positive impact on job satisfaction, which can reduce turnover. Chen et al. (2010) stated that employees with strong positive motives on ICSR show strong effect on reciprocity in emotional dimension via job satisfaction. CSR is the important tool for sense of caring and meaning job career, which enhances job satisfaction and work outcomes (Kim et al., 2017). Furthermore, ECSR motives have strong positive impact on job satisfaction through organizational citizenship behavior such as not leaving the company, etc. (Meyer et al., 2002; Harrison et al., 2006; Brammer et al., 2007; Yun et al., 2007, Lin et al., 2010; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Moreover, organizational justice research found that justice perception (such as fairness or ICSR) is related to organizational outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behavior and a decreased tendency to leave the organization (Colquitt et al. 2006; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). According to the above, the researcher hypothesized the following:

H_1: Employees' ECSR perceptions has direct impact on job satisfaction.

H_2: Employees' ICSR perceptions has direct impact on job satisfaction.

H_3: Job satisfaction has direct impact on organizational citizenship behavior.

H_4: Job satisfaction has direct impact on turnover intention.

Nazir and Islam (2020) concluded that micro-CSR research is strongly emphasized on developed countries. Therefore, it is important to study micro-CSR level on middle income countries, such as Thailand. Zhao et al. (2020) studied the importance of ICSR and ECSR with trust as the mediating effect (Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). CSR perception is not always significant to enhance the positive image of a company if they do not trust their own organization (Archimi et al., 2018). Hence, trust is a mediating variable on the effect of CSR to behavioral outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behavior or lowering turnover intention (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Preston, 2014). Organizational trust is defined as "employee willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of their employer, based on positive expectations about its intentions or behavior" (Mayer et al., 1995; Archimi et al., 2018, p.911). Employees who trust their company will perceive positive CSR in their organization. Trust is an important factor in developing social exchange between employees and organization (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Pivato et al. (2008, p.3) also stated that trust is the first outcome of CSR activities in an organization. Hanks and Mattila (2016) stated that CSR perception led to trust, influencing positive behavior intention in the food industry. Archimi et al. (2018) found that CSR perception are indirectly linked to employee cynicism via organizational trust, whereas Hansen et al. (2011) concluded that CSR perception has impact on decreased turnover intention arising from trust. In addition, Ahn and Kwon (2020) concluded that trust is the mediating effect on the relationship between CSR perception and behavioral outcomes. Trust has strong impact on reducing undesirable behavior such as intention to quit or anxiety (Cook and Wall, 1980). Nowadays, employees work not only for money but also for work meaningfulness or sense of caring (Achor et al., 2018). According to social exchange theory, a social or mutual relationship is encouraged by employing ICSR along with ECSR activities in the organization (Mory et al., 2016; Hur et al., 2019; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). All these positive feeling enhances positive work attitude such as trust, high commitment and job satisfaction, which employees provide positive return by job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and lower turnover intention (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Hansen et al., 2011; Farooq et al., 2017; Ghosh, 2018; Gore, 2018; Bouraoui et al., 2019). Therefore, both ICSR and ECSR enhances employees to motivate, engage, and commit to organization by fulfilling their needs for work meaningfulness (Glavas and Kelley, 2014; Chaudhary and Akhouri, 2019; Wiedemann, 2019; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). According to the above, researcher can hypothesize as follows:

H_5: Employees' ECSR perceptions has direct impact on organizational trust.

H_6: Employees' ICSR perceptions has direct impact on organizational trust.

H_7: Organizational trust has direct impact on organizational citizenship behavior.

H_8: Organizational trust has direct impact on turnover intention.

Gender is the expression for responsibility in the social context and assigned role for men and women in the society (Zeyneloglu and Terzioglu, 2011; Ates, 2021). Men are competent, competitive, assertive, and independent, whereas women are caring, benevolent, and demonstrate compassion and emotion (Brase et al., 2014). Social psychology research indicates that self-construal is an important factor in describing gender differences in motivation along with behavior (Cross and Madson, 1997). Self-construal refers to identify themselves as independent or interdependent (Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Peake et al., 2017). Several studies concludes that women are more likely to have interdependent self-construal (close relationships, connect to groups), whereas men are more likely to have independent self-construal (unique, individual traits) (Madson and Trafimow, 2001). Several studies found that women are more empathic and compassionate, which encourages them to participate in public service involvement more than men (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Mesch et al., 2011). Zhang et al. (2015) stated that men are more concerned on self-congruence and trust, while women are more concentrated on social relationships and commitment (Shi et al., 2016). Venkatesh and Morris (2000) concluded that men are more task-oriented and motivated by achievement goal, whereas Beard (2015) found that women express more impact on CSR engagement (Serdar and Reed, 2022). Therefore, gender difference led to differing motivation and behavior in involving in CSR activities. The hypothesis can be concluded as follows:

H_{9a}: Gender moderates the impact of employees' ECSR perceptions on job satisfaction.

H_{9b}: Gender moderates the impact of employees' ICSR perceptions on job satisfaction.

H_{9c}: Gender moderates the impact of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior.

H_{9d}: Gender moderates the impact of job satisfaction on turnover intention.

H_{9e}: Gender moderates the impact of employees' ECSR perceptions on organizational trust.

H_{9f}: Gender moderates the impact of employees' ICSR perceptions on organizational trust.

H_{9g}: Gender moderates the impact of organizational trust on organizational citizenship behavior.

H_{9h}: Gender moderates the impact of organizational trust on turnover intention.

Methods

Data collection

The population in Thailand is equal to 60,090,475 persons in 2022 (Central Registration Bureau, 2023). Bangkok is the capital city and has the highest number of inhabitants in Thailand and includes 5,494,732 persons. Most of the government office along with business center areas are located in this city. Hence, the researchers used Bangkok as the representative area in this study. To meet the requirement of structural equation modelling (SEM), Pritchard et al. (1999) recommended the sample size ranging from 100 to 200 to avoid the problem of misspecification. In this study, the researcher distributed 400 questionnaires to employees, who work in both government and private sector and familiar with CSR activities in their workplace. The researcher distributed questionnaires in several business center areas around Bangkok to avoid any bias and collected from many sources to receive more accurate responses. The data is collected at least five months to collect data ranging from the beginning of May to mid-November 2023. The results showed that the majority of respondents were female (55.25%), 26 to 33 years old (31.75%), held a Bachelor's degree (61.25%), a salary over THB 40,000 (around 1,100 USD.: 1 USD = THB36.30), worked as government officers (48.25%), were single (59.75%), and a duration of work of less than five years (43%).

Measures

The questionnaires were derived from several previous articles and adjusted according to the pilot study. The researcher employed 40 participants to pretest the initial questionnaire. All items were assessed on a five-point scale on agreement level. Both ICSR and ECSR were measured by using four and five items adapted from Chatzopoulou et al. (2021). Job satisfaction was also adapted from Chatzopoulou et al. (2021) by using five items. Organization trust was measured by using four items adapted from Ahn and Kwon (2020) along with Singhapakdi et al. (2019). OCB and TI were derived from Saks (2006) with evaluated by using four items and three items, respectively. A binary question was employed to measure the moderating effect: male and female.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a theory-testing model as opposed to a theory-generating method like EFA. In this study, only CFA was employed because the questionnaires have been examined by several researchers in different circumstances (Zhang et al., 2015). The result of reliability and validity of all questionnaire items is shown in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1: Reliability and Validity Measures for First-Order Latent Constructs

Construct	Mean	S.D.	Standard Loading	Cronbach's alpha	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Internal Corporate Social Responsibility (ICSR)	**3.84**	**.738**		**.844**	**.751**	**.57**
1.Fairness and equality towards colleagues and business partners are the integral part of evaluation process in my organization.	3.82	.914	.74			
2.Manager in my organization sticks to comply with laws regulating hiring and employee benefits.	3.92	.988	.74			
3.Policy in my organization avoids discrimination in employees' compensation and promotion.	3.54	.745	.79			
4. Top management sticks to comply with the law and regulation in my organization.	4.07	.923	.75			
External Corporate Social Responsibility (ECSR)	**3.75**	**.806**		**.839**	**.808**	**.59**
1.My company always monitors employee's productivity.	3.74	.857	.75			
2.Top management set long-term strategies for business in the organization.	3.83	.971	.72			
3.My company encourages employees to earn additional knowledge and education.	3.85	.954	.80			
4.My company offers tremendous contribution to charities.	3.73	.934	.79			
5.My company supports partnerships with local community and education.	3.60	.809	.77			
Job Satisfaction (JS)	**3.90**	**.869**		**.953**	**.899**	**.71**
1.Overall, I am satisfied with my job.	3.89	.969	.86			
2.I feel comfortable in my work position.	3.85	.936	.89			
3.I am enthusiastic about my work.	4.05	.922	.76			
4.I really enjoy my job.	3.83	.847	.82			
5.I prefer my job compared to the average person.	3.89	.984	.88			
Organizational Trust (T)	**3.85**	**.925**		**.918**	**.882**	**.72**
1.I always trust my company.	3.92	.997	.78			
2.I believe that my company has integrity.	3.89	.944	.88			
3.I definitely trust my company.	3.76	.880	.92			
4.Policy in my company concerns employees and their welfare.	3.84	.930	.82			
Turnover Intention (TI)	**2.46**	**1.289**		**.762**	**.845**	**.72**
1.I always intend to quit my job.	2.48	1.412	.87			
2.I am plAhning to find a new job within the next 12 months.	2.44	1.372	.91			
3.If I had the choice, I will not work in this company.	2.45	1.289	.76			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)	**4.02**	**.778**		**.874**	**.837**	**.66**
1.I am willing to help other functions that are not required but that enhances organizational image.	4.10	.907	.72			
2.I always offer ideas to improve the potential of my company.	3.81	.948	.67			
3.I am willing to protect my company to avoid	4.02	.895	.94			

serious problems.						
4.I am willing to give explanations to others who criticize my company.	4.16	.866	.89			

Table 2: Assessment of Discriminant Validity, Tolerance Value and VIF of All Constructs

Construct	ICSR	ECSR	JB	T	TI	OCB	Tolerance Value	VIF
ICSR	**.755**						.365	2.742
ECSR	.719**	**.768**					.344	2.987
JB	.650**	.679**	**.843**				.371	2.693
T	.670**	.701**	.734**	**.849**			.350	2.867
TI	-.275**	-.269**	-.452**	-.423**	**.849**		-	1.325
OCB	.495**	.572**	.617**	.568**	-.263**	**.812**	-	1.749

Note: Values on the diagonal are square root of AVE values, and those outside the diagonal stands for the correlation. **: statistical significance at .01 level.

Table 1 showed that the Cronbach's alpha of all constructs (.762 - .953) was higher than the required threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2006) to support internal consistency. Composite reliability, average variance extracted along with factor loading of all constructs were examined. Composite reliability (ranging from .751 to .899) and average variance extracted (.57 - .72) of all items were higher than threshold level of 0.7 and 0.5, respectively (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). In addition, the factor loadings of all items (.67 - .92) are above the recommended level of 0.6, which supports convergent validity (Chin et al., 1997).

Discriminant validity was tested in Table 2. The AVE values of all latent variables were higher than the squared correlation among latent variables (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Hence, all constructs were met the threshold level for validity and reliability. Before testing the theoretical model, the collinearity or multicollinearity problem is tested. Variance inflation factor (VIF: less than 10) and tolerance value (more than .10) indicate the multicollinearity problem (Hair et al., 2006). The results on Table 2 showed that multicollinearity problem did not exist in this model. A new dummy variable with random values has been added to the original dataset as a latent variable with a single indicator, and a model has been created where all the studied latent variables will be regressed against the dummy variable. Kock (2015) recommended a full collinearity assessment approach to test common method bias (CMB). When the VIF in the inner model are above 3.3, it identifies collinearity and common method bias in the model. The findings in Table 2 showed that all VIF values (ranging from 1.325 to 2.987) was below 3.3, indicating that the model is lack of common method bias (Kock, 2015).

RESULTS

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed in this research study to examine the theoretical model. The sample size was 400 employees, who work in the private and public sector. In this study, researcher employed Hair et al. (2006) suggestion of 200 sample size to test a model. The model fit employed criteria to examine the feasibility of the model, which included χ^2/ df ≤ 2 or 3, the comparative fit index (CFI) > .9 or .95, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) > .8 or .9, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < .08, and root mean square residual (RMR) < .05 or .08 (Hair et al., 2010; Indarto et al., 2018; Story and Castanheira, 2019; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). The result of hypotheses testing was shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of Direct Effect Model for Hypotheses Testing

H	**From**	**To**	**Direct Effect (Standardized Estimates)**	**t-values**	**Sig.**
H_1	Employees' ECSR Perceptions	Job Satisfaction	.527	5.432	***
H_2	Employees' ICSR Perceptions	Job Satisfaction	.257	2.695	**
H_3	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	.368	4.809	***
H_4	Job Satisfaction	Turnover Intention	-.315	-3.509	***
H_5	Employees' ECSR	Organizational Trust	.733	6.918	***

	Perceptions				
H_6	Employees' ICSR Perceptions	Organizational Trust	.126	1.301	.193
H_7	Organizational Trust	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	.321	4.317	***
H_8	Organizational Trust	Turnover Intention	-.212	-2.458	**
Squared Multiple Correlations		**SMC Values**			
Job Satisfaction		.581			
Organizational Trust		.716			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior		.413			
Turnover Intention		.243			
Model Goodness-of-Fit Statistics					
X^2/df = 1.905		RMR = .040	GFI = .926		RMSEA = .048
Degree of Freedom = 247		SRMR = .0435	AGFI = .902		CFI = .971

Note: Significance for t-values at one-tailed for .05 level (*) = 1.65, for .01 level (**) = 2.33, for .001 level (3.09) (Mahotra, 2004).

The first and second hypotheses on Table 3 demonstrated that ECSR and ICSR had a direct effect on job satisfaction with a statistical significance level of .001 and .01 level (and standardized estimate = .527 and .257, respectively). The findings are consistent with Ellemers et al. (2011), Kim et al. (2017), Singhapakdi et al. (2019) and Chatzopoulou et al. (2021). In addition, ECSR has a stronger direct effect on job satisfaction than ICSR, which supported Chatzopoulou et al.'s finding (2021). For the third hypothesis, job satisfaction has a positive direct effect on organizational citizenship behavior, which standardized estimate was .368 with a statistical significance level of .001 level. The result was supported by Lin et al. (2010) and Chatzopoulou et al. (2021). The findings on the fourth hypothesis showed that job satisfaction has a strong negatively direct effect on turnover intention (-.315) with a statistical significance level of .001 level. This result was consistent with Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), Sun et al. (2019), and Aggarwal and Singh (2023). The results of four hypotheses supported that employee of socially responsible companies stimulates good behaviors at workplace along with lower turnover intention via job satisfaction.

For the fifth hypothesis, ECSR had positively direct effect on organizational trust (.733) with a statistical significance level of .001, which was supported by Farooq et al. (2014), Archimi et al. (2018), and Ahn and Kwon (2020). In contrast, ICSR showed no direct effect on organizational trust at .05 statistically significant level. This finding is consistent with previous studies that ECSR demonstrated positive effect on employees' job attitudes and work behavior, whereas ICSR performed no effect on employees' job attitudes and work behavior (De Roeck and Maon, 2018; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). On the seventh and eighth hypotheses, the results showed that organizational trust had a positively direct effect on organizational citizenship behavior (.321) with a statistical significance level of .001 level, whereas organizational trust had negatively direct effect on turnover intention (-.212) with a statistical significance level of .01 level. These findings are consistent with Hansen et al. (2011), Archimi et al. (2018), Ahn and Kwon (2020), and Aggarwal and Singh (2023) that organization trust performs as mediating variable between perceptions of CSR and positive return by job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and lower turnover intention.

In the next table, the researchers performed direct, indirect, and total effects of independent variables (ECSR, ICSR) and job satisfaction along with organizational trust as a mediating role, and dependent variables (organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention). The results are shown in the following table.

Table 4: Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects

Predictor Variables	**JB**			**T**			**OCB**			**TI**		
	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct	Indirect
ECSR	.527	.527	-	.733	.733	-	.429	-	.429	-.321	-	-.321
ICSR	.257	.257	-	-	-	-	.095	-	.095	-.081	-	-.081
JB							.368	.368	-	-.315	-.315	-
T							.321	.321	-	-.212	-.212	-

As the result from Table 3 and 4, the model demonstrates 58.1% of the variance in job satisfaction and ECSR (.527) performed the stronger direct effect than ICSR (.257). Furthermore, the model showed 71.6% of variance in term of organizational trust, which only ECSR (.733) had a positively direct effect.

The model of organizational citizenship behavior identifies 41.3% of the variance and job satisfaction (.368) showed a stronger direct effect than organizational trust (.321). In addition, ECSR (.429) had a higher indirect effect than ICSR (.095). In terms of turnover intention, the model performs only 24.3% of the variance. Job satisfaction (-.315) also had the stronger negatively direct effect than organizational trust (-.212). Moreover, ECSR (-.321) had the higher negatively indirect effect than ICSR (-.081).

Moderating Analysis

Self-construal identified as the core factor to describe gender differences in motivation and behaviors (Cross and Madson, 1997; Peake et al., 2015) in several social psychology articles. Women tend to rely on interdependent self-construal, in contrast, men tend to be independent self-construal (Madson and Trafinow, 2001). Interdependent self-construal is based on relationship such as groups or emphasized on importance to others' interests, whereas independent self-construal is emphasized on personal interests (Gore and Cross, 2006; Gore et al., 2009; van Horen et al., 2008; Peake et al., 2015). Hence, gender can imply on motivation and behavior in CSR activities. Women are more concentrated on community interests and public service participation than men, whereas men rely more on personal interests (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Mesch et al. 2011; Peake et al., 2015). In this study, 400 respondents were separated into two groups for gender: male and female. The proportion of females and males are quite similar (221 or 55.25% for females and 179 or 44.75% for males).

To test the commonalities and differences between male and female groups, two alternative multiple sample models are evaluated. The first model is an unconstrained model with no constrained across samples on the structural parameters. The second model is constrained model is evaluated. There are eight relationships of male and female to be treated as constrained across samples in both models. The findings are demonstrated on the following table.

Table 5: Moderating Analysis on Gender (Male/Female)

Male/Female Group (Gender)	
Constrained Model	$\chi^2_{540} = 1,431.491$
Unconstrained Model	$\chi^2_{532} = 1,413.177$
Difference	$\Delta \chi^2 = 18.314^* > 15.507$

Note: * stands for the critical value of chi-square table at the degree of freedom of 8 is equal to 15.507 at .05 statistically significant level.

The results in Table 5 supported that the eight relationships are invariant across the two accepted samples. The difference of chi-square value of the tested models is higher than the chi-square value from the table, which identifies that gender has a moderating effect on hypothesized relationships. By comparing across gender groups, unstandardized comparisons were employed to assess instead of standardized comparisons (Ping, 1995; Gulid, 2007). The results of unstandardized parameter estimate to compare between male and female groups are demonstrated on Table 6 as follows:

Table 6: Results of Hypotheses Testing on the Moderating Analysis of Gender

			Female		**Male**	
H	**From**	**To**	**Unstandardized estimate**	**t-values**	**Unstandardized estimate**	**t-values**
H_{9a}	Employees' ECSR Perceptions	Job Satisfaction	.759	6.272***	.568	4.667***
H_{9b}	Employees' ICSR Perceptions	Job Satisfaction	.128	1.037	.151	1.534
H_{9c}	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	.330	6.498***	.313	5.165***
H_{9d}	Job Satisfaction	Turnover Intention	-.451	-4.235***	-.428	-3.686**

H_{9e}	Employees' ECSR Perceptions	Organizational Trust	.934	7.130***	.849	5.078***
H_{9f}	Employees' ICSR Perceptions	Organizational Trust	-.013	-.099	-.057	-.287
H_{9g}	Organizational Trust	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	.197	4.146***	.158	3.366**
H_{9h}	Organizational Trust	Turnover Intention	-.265	-2.549**	-.246	-2.198*
Model Goodness-of-Fit Statistics						
χ^2 = 1,413.177 Degree of Freedom = 532 p-value = .000 GFI = .907 AGFI = .889	RMR = .048 SRMR = .049 TLI = .950	RMSEA = .051 CFI = .962 NFI = .938				

Note: Significance for t-values at one-tailed for .05 level (*) = 1.65, for .01 level (**) = 2.33, for .001 level (3.09) (Mahotra, 2004).

The results of testing the moderating effect of male/female groups demonstrated that only six hypothesized relationships out of eight relationships were at statistically significant levels of .05, .01, and .001 levels. Only two hypothesized relationships are statistically insignificant at any level (ICSR to job satisfaction: H_{9b}, ICSR to organizational trust: H_{9f}). Furthermore, the moderating effect of females had a higher positively magnitude of parameter estimates compared to male group on ECSR to job satisfaction: H_{9a} (b = .759, t-value = 6.272; b =.568, t-value = 4.667), job satisfaction to organizational citizenship behavior: H_{9c} (b = .330, t-value = 6.498; b = .313, t-value = 5.165), ECSR to organizational trust: H_{9e} (b= .934, t-value = 7.130; b = .849, t-value = 5.078), organizational trust to organizational citizenship behavior: H_{9g} (b = .197, t-value = 4.146; b = .158, t-value = 3.336) at a statistically significant at .001 level, which is consistent with several articles that female are more concerned on social relationships and commitment along with CSR engagement (Shi et la., 2016; Gulid and Yansomboon, 2021; Serdar and Reed, 2022). The moderating effect of female still shows the higher magnitude of parameter estimate than men on the negative relationships between job satisfaction to turnover intention; H_{9d} (b = -.451, t-value = -4.235; b = -.428, t-value = -3.686), and between organizational trust to turnover intention: H_{9h} (b = -.265, t-value = -2.549; b = -.246, t-value = -2.198) at statistically significant levels of .001, .01, and .05, respectively. The findings also supported that CSR can reduce turnover intention via satisfaction and trust (Koh and Boo, 2001; Hansen et al., 2011; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). In addition, this study confirmed several social psychology research studies that females emphasized public service involvement and CSR activities than men (Zhang et al., 2015; Shi et al., 2016; Gulid and Yansomboon, 2021; Serdar and Reed, 2022).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

At the present, the trend of CSR approach is transited from macro-level (shareholder perspective) to micro-level (stakeholder perspective). In this study, researchers concentrated on micro-level CSR, which emphasized employee approach. The reason is that human resources is the valuable asset of the organization and have a direct impact on organizational performance (Chatzopoulou et al., 2021; Phuong and Don, 2021; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). In addition, researchers employed social identification theory, which used to identify employee's evaluation on ECSR such as social responsibility, pollution, etc. to enhance organizational commitment, and social exchange theory to identify the effect of ICSR on maintaining citizenship (Kim et al., 2010; Farooq et al., 2014; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021).

Several research studies stated that satisfaction is treated as a mediating effect on CSR and organizational commitment (Valentine and Fleischman, 2008; Vlachos et al., 2013; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). CSR is the key success factor in driving job satisfaction and work outcomes (Kim et al., 2017). In this study, researchers examined the effect of CSR on work outcomes via job satisfaction in two different outcomes. Organizational citizenship behavior performs as positive work outcomes, whereas turnover intention stands for negative outcomes. This research tries to examine the effect ECSR and ICSR on organizational citizenship behavior and lower tendency to quit the organization (Meyer et al., 2002; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Yun et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2017; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). Hence, there are scant studies emphasized social responsibility and turnover intentions, especially in the Asian context (Sun et al., 2019). In terms of employee perspectives, CSR perception is difficult in enhancing a positive image of the company, if employees do not trust their organizations (Archimi et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2020; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). Therefore, trust is also treated as the mediating effect of CSR to work outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention (Hansen et al., 2011; Ahn and Kwon, 2020; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). Gender is treated as the moderating effect in this research. The reason is that self-construal is employed to explain gender differences in motivation and behavior (Cross and Madson, 1997). Females are more likely to more empathy and compassion, which supports to concentrate more on social relationships and involve in CSR activities (Shi et al., 2016; Serdar and Reed, 2022).

The results showed that ECSR and ICSR enhances organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention via job satisfaction, which is consistent with several research studies in different scenarios (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Sun et al., 2019; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). Hence, job satisfaction fully mediated the effect of CSR in work behaviors. The effect of ECSR is stronger than ICSR on job satisfaction, which is also supported several studies (Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). The reason is that employee's perception on ICSR is comply with law and regulation; however, the equality on compensation and promotion should be improved (mean score is less than total mean score on ICSR: 3.54 compared to 3.84). Hence, on social exchange theory, employees tend to reciprocate their organization with behavioral commitment. If they have positive feeling on organization, they tend to reciprocal with strong commitment.

ECSR had the strongest impact on organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention via organizational trust; in contrast, ICSR did not show any effect on organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention via organizational trust. The results are consistent with previous studies (Archimi et al., 2018; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021) that ICSR performed no effect on work behavior. Furthermore, this study found that gender is the moderating effect of CSR to work behavior via job satisfaction and organizational trust. Females showed stronger impact on social participation and CSR activities than men (Shi et la., 2016; Gulid and Yansomboon, 2021; Serdar and Reed, 2022).

Implications

This study is useful for theoretical and practical implications. First, to enhance organizational performance and employee retention, ECSR and ICSR are the important factors in driving work behaviors and lower turnover intention via job satisfaction. However, only ECSR is the driving factor to enhance work behavior and lower turnover intention via organizational trust. These findings support social identity theory that employees seek to participate with reputable organization to enhance their self-image. ICSR did not have any impact on organizational trust (De Roeck and Maon, 2018; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021). In contrast, ICSR still plays the important factor to encourage work behavior via job satisfaction. This study supports that only job satisfaction is the fully mediated the effect of CSR on enhancing work behavior and organizational trust is partially mediated the effect of CSR on driving work behavior. The reason is that employees' perspectives on ICSR is emphasized mainly on law and regulation; however, the discrimination on compensation and promotion should be concerned. Hence, human resource department should highly concern on work evaluation transparency, especially on compensation and career path advancement. In this study, researchers did not study the direct effect of CSR perception on organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention. The reason is that CSR perception does not have a significant direct impact on work behaviors in current study (Ahn and Kwon, 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2021; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023), which implies that CSR itself may not have enough effect on work behaviors.

Second, the findings support previous studies that demographic factors, such as gender still valid as moderating effect on driving work outcomes (Brammer et al., 2007; Turker, 2009; Im et al., 2018; Aggarwal and Singh, 2023). The findings also stated that females emphasized public service involvement and CSR activities more than men (Zhang et al., 2015; Shi et al., 2016; Gulid and Yansomboon, 2021; Serdar and Reed, 2022). In terms of practical implications, human resource management should encourage men to participate more on CSR activities by using social involvement or virtue activities as the part of evaluation on work performance. The reason is that men is more emphasized on personal interests (DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Mesch et al. 2011; Peake et al., 2015).

Finally, this study found that job satisfaction had a stronger effect on organizational citizenship behavior and lower turnover intention than organizational trust. Both ECSR and ICSR are the most important factors driving job satisfaction. Hence, the public and private sectors should more emphasized on ECSR activities to enhance firm reputation and good corporate citizens to support their self-image to gain positive feelings among employees. In practical implications, human resource management should not only be strict to the law and regulations, but also support the transparency in work performance (from recruitment, performance evaluation, compensation, and management development) to enhance social exchange theory. A social exchange relationship is useful when an organization demonstrates caring and empathy on employees by employing ICSR. When employees have strong perception on ICSR, they try to reciprocate on higher commitment, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and lower turnover intention.

Limitations and future studies

Although this study provided contributions to CSR activities to work behaviors via job satisfaction and organizational trust in context of Thailand, which is Asian culture with middle-income country. There are several limitations in this study. First, this study employed cross-sectional design and collected data only at a single point of time. Hence, the respondents do not enable causal relationships, which is appropriate to employ longitudinal design. To gain insight information on CSR to work behaviors, it is necessary to study the same sample over time and employ the same variables. Second, this study is conducted only from employee perspectives. It is better off to consider on the views of other stakeholders such as customers to derive the whole picture of CSR perspectives. However, appropriate research methodology should be employed to gain precise information, such as focus group or in-depth interview. To study other stakeholders' perspectives and achieve more generalization. Finally, this study only collected data in Bangkok, which is also the limitation of this study. In future studies, it is appropriate to collect in other provinces to compare the result with this finding to achieve more generalizability.

Reference

1. Achor, S., Reece, A., Kellerman, G. and Robichaux, A. (2018). 9 Out of 10 people are willing to earn less money to do more meaningful work. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(6): 82-89.
2. Aggarwal, P. and Singh, R. K. (2023). Employee-level consequences of perceived internal and external CSR: Decoding the moderation and mediation paths. *Social Responsibility Journal, 19*(1): 38-78.
3. Aguinis, H. and Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 38*(4): 932-968.
4. Ahn, J. and Kwon, J. (2020). CSR perception and revisit intention: The roles of trust and commitment. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 3*(5): 607-623.
5. Archimi, C. S., Reynaud, E., Yasin, H. M. and Bhatti, Z. A. (2018). How perceived corporate social responsibility affects employee cynicism: The mediating role of organizational trust. *Journal of Business Ethics, 151*: 907-921.
6. Ates, F. B. (2021). Examination of the relationship between fear of negative evaluation, gender role stress, and gender equality of female university students. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 12*(1): 1-17.
7. Beal, D. and Goyen, M. (1998). Putting your money where your mouth is' a profile of ethical Investors. *Financial Services Review, 7*(2): 129-143.
8. Beard, A. (2015). "CEOs with daughters run more socially responsible firms: An interview with Henrik Cronqvist." *Harvard Business Review*, 11.2015.
9. Becker, G. S. (1962). Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Political Economy, 70*(5): 9-94.
10. Bouraoui, K., Bensemmane, S., Ohana, M. and Russo, M. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and employees' affective commitment: a multiple mediation model. *Management Decision, 57*(1): 152-167.
11. Brammer, S., Millington, A. and Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(10): 1701-1719.
12. Brase, G. L., Adair, L. and Monk, L. (2014). Explaining sex differences in reactions to relationship infidelities: Comparisons of the roles of sex, gender, beliefs, attachment, and sociosexual orientation. *Evolutionary Psychology, 12*(1): 73-96.
13. Brow, S. P. and Peterson, R. A. (1994). The effect of effort on sales performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(2): 70-80.
14. Central Registration Bureau. (2023). *Department of Provincial Administration*. Ministry of Interior. https://www.prachachat.net/genera/news-Carnahan, S., Kryscynski, D. and Olson, D. (2017). When does corporate social
15. responsibility reduce employee turnover? Evidence from attorneys before and after 9/11. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*(5): 1-52.
16. Chatzopoulou, E.-C., Manolopoulos, D. and Agapitou, V. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and employee outcomes: Interrelations of external and internal orientations with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 179*: 795-817.
17. Chaudhary, R. and Akhouri, A. (2019). CSR perceptions and employee creativity: Examining serial mediation effects of meaningfulness and work engagement. *Social Responsibility Journal, 15*(1): 61-74.

18. Chen, Z., Zhang, X., Leung, K. and Zhou, F. (2010). Exploring the interactive effect of time control and justice perception on job attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(2): 181-197.
19. Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I., Banks, G. C. and Lomelie, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(2): 181-197.
20. Chin, W. W., Gopal, A. and Salisbury, W. D. (1997). Advancing the theory of adaptive structuration: The development of a scale to measure faithfulness of appropriation. *Information System Research, 8*: 342-367.
21. Choi, B. and La, S. (2013). The impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and customer trust on the restoration of loyalty after service failure and recovery. *Journal of Service Marketing, 27*(3): 223-233.
22. Cojuharenco, I., Shteynberg, G., Gelfand, M. and Schminke, M. (2012). Self-construal and unethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 22*(109): 447-461.
23. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H. and Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425–445.
24. Cook, J. and Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53*(1): 39-52.
25. Cropanzano, R. and Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6): 874-900.
26. Cross, S. E. and Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*(1): 5-37.
27. DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J. and Pandey, S. K. (2006). Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review, 66*(6): 873-887.
28. De Roeck, K. and Delobbe, N. (2012). Do environmental CSR initiatives serve organizations' legitimacy in the oil industry? Exploring employees' reactions through organizational identification theory. *Journal of Business Ethics, 110*(4): 397-412.
29. De Roeck, K., El Akremi, A. and Swaen, V. (2016). Consistency matters! how and when does corporate social responsibility affect employees' organizational identification? *Journal of Management Studies, 53*(7): 1141-1168.
30. De Roeck, K. and Maon, F. (2018). Building the theoretical puzzle of employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: An integrative conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics, 149*: 609-625.
31. Dogl, C. and Holtbrugge, D. (2014). Corporate environmental responsibility, employer reputation and employee commitment: An empirical study in developed and emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(12): 1739-1762.
32. Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. and Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(2): 239-263.
33. EI Akremi, A., Gond, J. P., Swaen, V., De Roeck, K. and Igalens, J. (2018). How do employees perceive corporate responsibility? Development and validation of a
34. multidimensional corporate stakeholder responsibility scale. *Journal of Management, 44*(2): 619-657.
35. Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D. and Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1): 42–51.
36. Ellemers, N., Kingma, L., van de Burgt, J. and Barreto, M. (2011). Corporate social responsibility as a source of organizational morality, employee commitment and satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Moral Psychology, 1*(2): 97-124.
37. Farooq. O., Payaud, M., Merunka, D. and Valette-Florence, P. (2014). The impact of corporate social responsibility on organizational commitment: Exploring multiple mediation mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*: 563-580.
38. Farooq, O., Rupp, D. E. and Farooq, M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifoci outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*(3): 954-985.
39. Fonseca, L., Ramos, A., Rosa, A., Braga, A. C. and Sampaio, P. (2012). Impact of social responsibility programs in stakeholder satisfaction: An empirical study of Portuguese managers' perceptions. *Journal of US-China Public Administration, 9*(5): 586-590.

40. Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(3): 382-388.
41. Gaudencio. P., Coelho, A. and Riberro, N. (2020). The impact of CSR perceptions on workers' turnover intentions: Exploring the supervisor exchange process and the role of perceived external prestige. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 17(4): 543-561.
42. George, N. A., Aboobaker, N. and Edward, M. (2020). Corporate social responsibility, organizational trust and commitment: a moderated mediation model. *Personnel Review*, https://doi.org./10.1108/PR-03-2020-0144
43. Ghosh, K. (2018). How and when do employees identify with their organization? Perceived CSR, first-party (in) justice, and organizational (mis) trust at workplace. *Personnel Review, 47*(5): 1152-1171.
44. Ghosh, D. and Gurunathan, L. (2014). Linking perceived corporate social responsibility and intention to quit: The mediating role of job embeddedness. *The Journal of Business Perspective, 18*(3): 175-183.
45. Glavas, A. and Kelley, K. (2014). The effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on employee attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 24*(2): 165-202.
46. Gond, J. P. and Mozaer, C. (2021). Critical Essay: The reconciliation of fraternal twins: Integrating the psychological and sociological approaches to 'micro' corporate social Responsibility. *Human Relations, 74*(1): 5-40.
47. Gore, J. S. and Cross, S. E. (2006). Pursuing goals for us: Relationally autonomous reasons in long-term goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5): 848-861.
48. Gore, J. S., Cross, S. E. and Kanagawa, C. (2009). Acting in our interests: Relational self-construal and goal motivation across cultures. *Motivation and Emotion, 33*(1): 75-87.
49. Gore, K. M. (2018). *Intra and inter volunteerism: the exploration of the effect of corporate volunteerism on employee satisfaction over two time periods*. Doctoral dissertation, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology.
50. Gulid, N. (2007). *Customer loyalty in the luxury hotel industry: A cross cultural perspective*. Thammasat University, Bangkok.
51. Gulid, N. and Yansomboon, S. (2016). *Influence of social responsibility on business administration students' commitment at Srinakharinwirot University*. Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok.
52. Gulid, N. and Yansomboon, S. (2022). Consumer behavior with single-use plastic bags in a government campaign. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(6), 6134-6148.
53. Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B. and Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
54. Hair, J. F., Jr. Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. Anderson, R. E. and Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. 6th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
55. Hanks, L. and Mattila, A. S. (2016). Consumer response to organic food in restaurants: A serial mediation analysis. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 19*(1): 109-121.
56. Hansen, S. D., Dunford, B. B., Boss, A. D., Boss, R. W. and Angermeier, I. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and the benefits of employee trust: A cross-disciplinary perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*: 29-45.
57. Harrison, D., Newman, D. and Roth, P. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(2): 305-325.
58. Hur, W. M., Moon, T. W. and Tsoi, W. H. (2019). When are internal and external corporate social responsibility initiatives amplified? Employee engagement in corporate social responsibility initiatives on prosocial and proactive behaviors. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(4): 849-858.Im, S., Chung, Y. W. and Yang, J. Y. (2018). The mediating roles of happiness and cohesion In the relationship between employee volunteerism and job performance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15*(2): 2903.
59. Indarto, E. W., Suroso, I., Sudaryanto, and Qomariah, N. (2018). The effect of brand image and product attributes on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. *Journal of Applied Management, 16*(3): 457-466.
60. Iverson, R. D. and Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies, 36*(3): 307-333.
61. Johnson, J. and O'Leary-Kelley, A. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*: 627-647.

62. Jones, D. A., Newman, A., Shao, R. and Cooke, F. L. (2019). Advances in employee-focused micro-level research on corporate social responsibility: Situating new contributions within the current state of the literature. *Journal of Business Ethics, 157*(4): 1-10.
63. Kim, H. R., Lee, M., Lee, H. T. and Kim, N. M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and employee-company identification. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(4): 557-569.
64. Kim, P. B., Lee, G. and Jang, J. (2017). Employee empowerment and its contextual Determinants and outcome for service workers: a cross-national study. *Management Decision, 55*(5): 1022-1041.
65. Kirkman, B. L. and Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-man-aging work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(3): 557-569.
66. Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration, 11*(4): 1-10.
67. Koh, H. and Boo, E. (2001). The link between organizational ethics and job satisfaction: a study of managers in Singapore. *Journal of Business Ethics, 29*(4): 309-324.
68. Lee, L. and Chen, L. F. (2018). Boosting employee retention through CSR: A configurational analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management. 25*(5): 948-960.
69. Leroi-Werelds, S., Streukens, S., Brady, M. K. and Swinnen, G. (2014). Assessing the value of commonly used methods for measuring customer value: A multi-setting empirical study. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 42*(4): 430-451.
70. Lin, C. P., Lyau, N. M., Tsai, Y. H., Chen, W. Y. and Chiu, C. K. (2010). Modeling corporate citizenship and its relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(3): 357-372.
71. Luo, X. and Bhattacharya, C. B. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of Marketing, 70*: 1-18.
72. Madson, L. and Trafimow, D. (2001). Gender comparisons in the private, collective, and allocentric selves. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(4): 551-559.
73. Maignan, I. and Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Antecedents and benefits of corporate citizenship: An investigation of French businesses. *Journal of Business Research, 51*(1): 37-51.
74. Markus, H. R. and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, Emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2): 224-253.
75. Mathieu, J. E. and Hamel, K. (1989). A causal model of the antecedents of organizational commitment among professionals and nonprofessionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34*(3): 299-317.
76. Mayer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1): 61-89.
77. Mayer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1): 20-52.
78. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. and Schoorman, D. F. (1995). An integrated mode of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3): 709-734.
79. Mesch, D. J., Brown, M. S., Moore, Z. I. and Hayat, A. D. (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 16*(4): 342-355.
80. Mohr, L. A., Webb, D. J. and Harris, K. E. (2001). Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The impact of corporate social responsibility on buying behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 35*(1): 45-72.
81. Mory, L., Wirtz, B. and Gottel, V. (2016). Corporate social responsibility strategies and their impact on employees' commitment. *Journal of Strategy and Management, 9*(2): 172-201.
82. Muscanell, N. L. and Guadagno, R. E. (2012). Make new friends or keep the old: Gender and personality differences in social networking use. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(1): 107–112.
83. Nazir, O. and Islam, J. U. (2020). Effect of CSR activities on meaningfulness, compassion and employee engagement: a sense-making theoretical approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 90*: 102630.
84. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Books/DC Heath and Com.

85. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and MacKenzie, S. B. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
86. Peake, J. M., Markworth, J. F., Nosaka, K., Raastad, T., Wadley, G. D. and Coffey, V. G. (2015). Modulating exercise-induced hormesis: does less equal more? *Journal Applied Physiology, 119*(3): 172-189.
87. Peake, W. O., Cooper, D., Fitzgerald, M. A. and Muske, G. (2017). Family business participation in community social responsibility: The moderating effect of gender. *Journal Business Ethics*, *142*: 325-343.
88. Peterson, D. K. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. *Business and Society, 43*(3): 296-319.
89. Phuong, N. N. D. and Dong, L. N. T. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior: Scale development and validation. *HCMCOUJS-Social Sciences, 11*(1): 15-24.
90. Ping, R. A. (1995). A parsimonious estimating technique for interaction and quadratic latent variables. *Journal of Marketing Research, 32*(3): 336-347.
91. Pivato, S., Misani, N. and Tencati, A. (2008). The impact of corporate social responsibility on consumer trust: the case of organic food. *Business Ethics, 17*(1): 3-12.
92. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical
93. literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3): 513-563.Poolthong, Y. and Mandhachitara, R. (2009). Customer expectations of CSR, perceived Service quality and brand effect in Thai retail banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *27*(6): 408-427.
94. Prasetio, A. P., Yuniarsih, T. and Ahman, E. (2017). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in state-owned banking. *Universal Journal of Management*, *5*(1): 32-38.
95. Preston, M. (2014). Business success beyond the short term: CEO perspectives on sustainability. In *17th annual global CEO survey summary: sustainability, CEO survey insights*.
96. Pritchard, M. P., Havitz, M. E. and Howard, D. R. (1999). Analyzing the commitment-loyalty link in service contexts. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, *27*(3): 333-348.
97. Rana, M. S., Iftikhar, U., Abbasi, S. G. and Abbas, M. (2018). The role of organizational justice to develop organizational citizenship behavior: Moderating effect of Islamic work ethics. *Revista Amazonia Investiga, 7*(16): 46-60.
98. Rupp, D. E. and Mallory, D. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: psychological, Person-Centric, and progressing. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *2*(1): 211-236.
99. Sak, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*(7): 600-619.
100. Schaufeli, W. B. and Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(3), 293–315.
101. Serder, G. and Reed, K. K. (2022). The impact of institutional context and gender on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management, 35*(3): 285-304.
102. Shi, S., Chen, Y. and Chow, W. S. (2016). Key values driving continued interaction on brand Pages in social media: An examination across genders. *Computers in Human Behavior, 62*: 578-589.
103. Singhapakdi, A., Lee, Dong-Jin, Sirgy, M. J., Roh, H., Senasu, K. and Yu, G. B. (2019).
104. Effects of perceived organizational CSR value and employee moral identity on job satisfaction: a study of business organizations in Thailand. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics, 8*: 53-72.
105. Smidts, A., Pruyn, A. T. H. and van Riel, C. B. M. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(5): 1051-1062.
106. Story, J. S. P. and Castanheira, F. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and employee performance: Mediation role of job satisfaction and affective commitment. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(6): 1361-1370.
107. Sun, J., Lee, J. W. and Sohn, Y. W. (2019). Work context and turnover intention in social enterprises: the mediating role of meaning of work. *Journal on Managerial Psychology*, *34*(1): 46-60.
108. Thelwall, M. (2008). Social networks, gender, and friending: an analysis of MySpace member profiles. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Techonology, 59*(8): 1321-1330.
109. Turker, D. (2009). How corporate social responsibility influences organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 89*(2): 189-204.

110. Valentine, S. and Fleischman, G. (2008). Ethics programs, perceived corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *77*(2): 159-172.
111. Van Horen, F., Pohlmann, C., Koeppen, K. and Hannover, B. (2008). Importance of personal goals in people with independent versus interdependent selves. *Social Psychology*, *39*(4): 213-221.
112. Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T. and Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio- psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*(4): 504-535.
113. Venkatesh, V. and Morris, M. G. (2000). Why don't men ever stop to ask for directions? Gender, social influence, and their role in technology acceptance and usage behavior. *MIS Quarterly*, *24*(1): 115-139.
114. Vlachos, P. A., Epitropaki, O., Panagopoulos, N. G. and Rapp, A. A. (2013). Causal attributions and employee reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *6*(4): 334-337.
115. Wiedemann, C. S. (2019). *Purpose-driven: Employee engagement from a human flourishing perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University.
116. Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *17*(3): 601-617.
117. Yun, S., Cox, J., Sims, H. and Salam, S. (2007). Leadership and teamwork: The effects of leadership and job Satisfaction on team citizenship. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *2*(3): 171-193.
118. Zeyneloglu, S. and Terzioglu, F. (2011). Development and psychometric properties gender roles attitude scale. *Hacettepe Universitesi Journal of Education*, *40*: 409-420.
119. Zhang, K. Z. K., Benyoucef, M. and Zhao, S. J. (2015). Consumer participation and gender differences on companies' microblogs: a brand attachment process perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *44*(1): 357-368.
120. Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., Jr. and Chen, Q. (2020). The influence of corporate social responsibility on incumbent employees: A meta-analytic investigation of the mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Management*, doi: 10.1177/0149206320946108.