

Corporate Social Responsibility as a Source of Employees' Job Satisfaction in the Hospitality Industry

Petra Jarkovská

Petra Jarkovská, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Department of Management, Studentská 13, 370 05 České Budějovice, e-mail: pjarkovska@hotmail.com

Abstract: The hospitality industry has been continuously struggling with high employee turnover and a significant "within" and "out of industry" labour mobility, regardless of the phase of the business cycle, time or geographical region. Additionally, as in any other service industry, employees' performance is frequently the only way how to differentiate among otherwise almost identical outputs and the only way how to build and attain customers' satisfaction, trust, and loyalty. Thus, employees' motivation plays a significant role in stipulating hospitality industry employees' work performance, where job satisfaction (JS) often plays a mediating role between employee's needs and his or her ultimate work behaviour, such as work performance, organizational commitment or voluntary retention. Unfortunately, scholarly literature gives little room to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) functioning as a motivation factor in relation to employees. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to fill in this gap and to examine the link between CSR and JS of hospitality industry employees using regression analysis. Drawing upon Carroll's four-dimensional concept of CSR, the results of this paper indicate a significant positive causal relationship between the ethical, economic, and legal dimensions of CSR and JS; however, a significant positive causal relationship between philanthropic CSR dimension and JS was not confirmed.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility - Hospitality Industry - Job Satisfaction - Motivation - Work Performance

JEL Classification: M12 - M14

1 Introduction

The hospitality industry has been continuously struggling with high employee turnover and a significant "within" and "out of industry" labour mobility, regardless of the phase of the business cycle, time or geographical region (Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Yao, Qiu & Wei, 2019; CSO, 2019). This could be reasoned by employees historically viewing the offered jobs in the hospitality industry as low paid, with little or no promotion possibilities (Yang, Wan & Fu, 2012; Robinson et al., 2014; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016). In addition, the hospitality industry depends heavily on employees' performance (Kim et al., 2017; Youn, Lee & Lee, 2018). The consequences of high employee turnover represent not only the direct and indirect staff turnover cost but also the inevitable down-fall of overall economic organizational performance (Yang, Wan & Fu, 2012). A higher rate of organizational commitment and retention are key indicators of organizational overall performance (John et al., 2019). In line with the above-mentioned reasoning and empirical research findings (e.g. Kim et al., 2015; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Yao, Qiu & Wei, 2019) we can deduce, that corporate social responsibility (CSR) can play a vital role in stipulating desired hospitality industry employees' attitudes or behaviour, such as work performance (WP), job satisfaction (JS) or organization commitment (OC), and thus lead to sustainable voluntary employees' retention (R).

According to Youn, Lee and Lee (2018) or Yao, Qiu and Wei (2019) the academic literature gives little attention to employees as one of the organization's stakeholders in regards to CSR or offers very fragmented or partial answers when addressing this issue. Moreover, the majority of carried out empirical research has been geographically situated in Asia (Kim et al., 2015; Voegtlin & Greenwood, 2016), and thus the obtained results might be difficult to interpret and adopt in different geographical context. This might be the reason why the hospitality managers do not seem to have a full understanding of the CSR concept, and hence do not use it to its full potential, especially when it comes to employer-employee relations (Všudybíl, 2018). Therefore, this paper deals with increasing hospitality industry employee's WP, OC, and voluntary R by stipulating employees' JS, using the CSR as a motivation driver. The paper is structured as follows: after a brief description of the relationship between CSR as a motivation factor and JS, the used research methods are specified. The next section summarizes the research findings, which are further interpreted and discussed.

1.1 Theoretical Background and the Development of Hypotheses

CSR can be understood as all decisions of an organization that go beyond its economic and technical interests (Carroll, 2015). According to the CSR definition elaborated by the European Commission (2001), organizations are obliged to maximize their profits within the limits of the law with at least minimum ethical responsibility (Zhang, Oo & Lim, 2019). Dahlsrud (2008) collected 37 CSR definitions and thus defined 5 general dimensions of CSR: economic, environmental, social, philanthropic and stakeholder dimension. One of the most used and cited CSR concepts (e.g. Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Farooq, Farooq & Jassimudin, 2014; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Zhang, Oo & Lim, 2019) is the model defined by Carroll (1991, 2015, 2016), who proposed a four-level CSR model that includes the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary (later referred to as philanthropic) CSR level (dimension). An organization must satisfy the needs and desires of different stakeholders, who may vary for each organization. It is widely accepted that employees belong among the organization's key stakeholders. Their interest may be a legal (CSR legal dimension) or moral

claim, such as the employee's ability to express his or her own opinions (CSR ethical dimension) (Carroll, 1991, 2015, 2016).

Such understanding of CSR is undoubtedly in line with motivational theories (e.g. Maslow, 1943; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000, 2008); many scholars confirm the important role of individual CSR components or activities as motivation factors in meeting employees' needs and improving the quality of their working lives, which eventually leads to improving employee WP (e.g. Cycyota, Ferrante & Schroeder, 2016; Kim et al., 2017; Graves, Sarkis & Gold, 2019; John et al., 2019). Motivation affects what employees do, how they do it, and with what effort (Diller, 1999; Mayer, Becker & Vandenberghe, 2004; Kim et al., 2017; Graves, Sarkis & Gold, 2019). Thus, defining employee's JS as "meeting employee's different needs and desires through resources, activities and outcomes from participation in the work process", the CSR activities provide "tangible" care to employees, create desirable working conditions, fulfil employees' desire for their social and aesthetic needs together with the need for respect and self-realization, and hence increase the number of employees with a high JS rate, which in turn leads to increasing employees' loyalty and OC (Bohdanowicz & Zientara, 2009; Jakubczak & Gotowska, 2015; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Kim et al., 2017). Even if CSR activities are not directly focused on employees, they influence JS. In this respect, CSR activities that allow employees to make a meaningful contribution to addressing social issues appear to be the most influential (Cycyota, Ferrante & Schroeder, 2016; Kim et al., 2017).

According to the Self Categorization Theory (SCT), employees seek to integrate and become workers of such organizations that share compatible values, enabling them to satisfy their psychological desires and meaningfully fulfil their existence (John et al., 2019). Social Identity Theory (SIT) argues that if people have positive feelings for a group, they tend to identify themselves with its social status (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Maignan & Ferrell, 2001; Fu, Li & Duan, 2014; Kim et al., 2017). According to SIT, employees associate their own identity with the social identity of the organization they work for (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Maignan & Ferrell, 2001; Kim et al., 2017). Employees working in socially responsible organizations are more likely to be happy and proud to be members of a "reputable" organization. They identify with and feel committed to the organization's goals (Fu et al., 2014). Organizations have shown better economic performance over the long term if more employees show a higher OC rate (Graves, Sarkis & Gold, 2019; John et al., 2019).

This argument can be supported by Social Exchange Theory (SET); if one treats the other amicably, with kindness and appreciation, the other will repay him or her equally. This behaviour is known as "limited" reciprocity (Peterson, 2004). Based on the synergy of the above-described knowledge from the SCT, SIT, SET, and motivational theories (e.g. Maslow, 1943; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000, 2008), we can conclude that organization's involvement in CSR activities can therefore significantly strengthen an employer-employee relationship and lead to JS, WP and employees' OC, which in turn leads to voluntary employee R. Therefore, we can define a causal relationship between CSR (as a motivation factor) and employee behaviour (JS, WP, OC, R), where JS not only explains employee's interest in individual aspects of CSR (e.g. Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Youn, Lee & Lee, 2018; Graves, Sarkis & Gold, 2019) but also functions as a mediator between CSR (as a motivation factor) and other employee's behaviour desired by an organization (WP, OC, R) (Bohdanowicz & Zientara, 2009; Jakubczak & Gotowska, 2015; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Kim et al., 2017).

- CSR → JS
- CSR → WP
- CSR → OC
- CSR → R
- CSR → JS → WP

- CSR → JS → OC
- CSR → OC → R
- CSR → JS → OC → R

Thus, drawing upon Carroll's four-dimensional CSR concept (Carroll, 1991, 2015, 2016), the purpose of this paper is to identify those CSR dimensions (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic) that play a significant role in hospitality industry staff JS, as using the right CSR components or activities might be one of the ways how to attract and retain enthusiastic, skilled, and committed employees who strive for excellence and represent a competitive advantage.

Hence this paper proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): The perceived economic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): The perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): The perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS.

Hypothesis 5 (H5): The perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS.

2 Methods

To analyse the relationship between perceived CSR by hospitality industry staff and their JS, the four-dimension/factor (altogether 31 items) concept of CSR by Carroll (2015, 2016) and JS concept (altogether 11 items) based on Bauman and Skitka (2012) were used. Both concepts/constructs were adjusted for this research and included items on e.g. work-life balance, environmental issues or new technologies. Thus, 42 items were converted into questions/statements like e.g. "The institution, which I work for, has a remuneration system based on performance" (CSR, economic dimension) or "Employer-employee contractual obligations are always honoured by the institution I work for" (CSR, legal dimension) and for the JS construct, e.g. "I am satisfied with my immediate supervisor" or "I am satisfied with my promotion opportunities". Respondents were requested to answer these questions/statements by choosing an adequate level of their agreement on the 7-point Likert scale, ranging from strong disagreement (1 point) to strong agreement (7 points). Apart from questions on CSR and JS, respondents were asked to answer 8 questions on demographics, using the best fitting option from the given alternatives.

As the paper aims to analyse the causal relationship between CSR perceived by hospitality industry employees and their JS; small and medium-size hotels (ranked by 4*) situated in Prague, the Czech Republic were considered as the most suitable, since these accommodation providers need to meet high-quality service standard requirements and challenge the financial disadvantages deriving from their size. Thus, the final list of 24 enterprises was retrieved from the official web pages of the Trivago.cz accommodation search engine (Trivago, 2019).

The data collection process was carried out between the month of August 2019 and December 2019. The paper-based questionnaire was selected as the best option for collecting data and was administered in person to volunteering employees during their shift change after gaining the consensus from the management or owners of the particular enterprise. The approximate

time for questionnaire completion was 20 minutes. Hence, the final sample consists of 411 respondents (N = 411), which was considered satisfactory (Robinson et al., 2014, Hanaysha & Tahir, 2016, Kim et al., 2017).

For the analysis, the IBM SPSS Statistics program was used. First, descriptive statistics were employed to investigate the demographic characteristic of the respondents. Second, factor analysis was applied to factor/dimension reductions. Third, Cronbach's alpha was used to investigate factors' internal consistency reliability. Fourth, regression analysis was used to identify relations between variables and to test the hypotheses. Before conducting the research, the questionnaire and analysis fit was tested on 20 respondents.

3 Results

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of the 411 respondents who comprised the final sample are of the performed questionnaire survey are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Characteristics		N	%
Gender	Male	197	47.9
	Female	214	52.1
Age	25 and less	143	34.8
	25 – 35	112	27.3
	35 – 45	080	19.5
	45 – 55	043	10.5
	55 and above	033	08.0
Marital status	Single/without partner	175	42.6
	Married/with partner	236	57.4
Children	One or more children	175	42.6
	No children	236	57.4
Highest achieved education	Primary	030	07.3
	Secondary	147	35.8
	DIS degree	082	20.0
	Bachelor	099	24.1
Working status	Master	053	12.9
	Full-time	303	73.7
	Part-time	108	26.3
Working position	Managerial position	037	09.0
	Shift managers	061	14.8
	Staff	313	76.2

Working field	Human Resources	021	05.1
	Economic unit	014	03.4
	Marketing	022	05.4
	Food and Beverages	064	15.6
	Restaurant and Bar	067	16.3
	Store	015	03.6
	Customer Service and Reservations	118	28.7
	Housekeeping	015	03.6
	Laundry	016	03.9
	IT	025	06.1
	Maintenance	015	03.6
	Security	010	02.4
	Entertainment and Wellness	009	02.2
Total	411	100	

Source: author's work

3.2 Reliability Test

The factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis) investigated the reliability of 5 factors (4 independent variables, 1 dependent variable), i.e. the economic dimension of CSR (independent variable), the legal dimension of CSR (independent variable), the ethical dimension of CSR (independent variable), the philanthropic dimension of CSR (independent variable), and JS (dependent variable). Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) follow Comrey and Lee (1992) in suggesting using more stringent cut-offs for factor loadings going from 0.32 (*poor*), 0.45 (*fair*), 0.55 (*good*), 0.63 (*very good*) to 0.71 (*excellent*). Thus, the threshold for all factor loadings was set at 0.63. Cronbach's alpha was used to investigate the internal consistency among the items of each factor. Cronbach's alpha for the economic dimension of CSR after excluding 5 items equalled 0.875 (7 items). Cronbach's alpha for the legal dimension of CSR equalled 0.850 (4 items). Cronbach's alpha for the ethical dimension of CSR after excluding 3 items equalled 0.902 (7 items). Cronbach's alpha for the philanthropic dimension of CSR after excluding 2 items equalled 0.891 (2 items). And lastly, Cronbach's alpha for JS after excluding 3 items equalled 0.886 (8 items). In social scientific research, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.600 and higher is admitted as satisfactory (Kim et al., 2015), therefore all the Cronbach's alpha coefficients are well above the minimum requirement and are thus satisfactory. Data suitability assumptions (KMO, Bartlett's test of sphericity, correlation analysis) and linear regression analysis model fit (ANOVA, residuals statistics, correlation analysis, Shapiro-Wilk test of normality) were assessed on the level of significance $p < 0.05$.

3.3 Hypotheses Test

The effect of perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees on their JS:

The effect of the independent variables (economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic dimension of the CSR) upon the dependent variable (JS) has R^2 of .760 with F of 321.99 ($p < .001$) to be significant (Table2). The perceived economic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .193$ ($p < .001$). The perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .149$ ($p < .001$). The perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .626$ ($p < .001$). The perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry

employees has an insignificantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .037$ ($p < .212$) (Table 2, Table 3).

Table 2 Regression analysis for CSR and JS

Regression analysis for dependent variable: JS						
N=411	Independent variables: Economic, Legal, Ethical, Philanthropic dimension					
	β	Partial correlation	Semi part. correlation	Tolerance	t (406)	R ²
Economic	0.193279	0.235413	0.118583	0.376420	4.88060	0.623580
Legal	0.148850	0.202977	0.101483	0.464826	4.17682	0.535174
Ethical	0.625687	0.711565	0.495799	0.627908	20.40593	0.372092
Philanthropic	0.037378	0.061925	0.030375	0.660392	1.25016	0.339608

Source: author's work

Table 3 Partial correlation coefficients of independent variables

Regression analysis for dependent variable: JS						
N=411	Independent variables: Economic, Legal, Ethical, Philanthropic dimension					
	β	Partial correlation	Semi part. correlation	Tolerance	t (406)	R ²
Economic	0.193279	0.235413	0.118583	0.376420	4.88060	0.623580
Legal	0.148850	0.202977	0.101483	0.464826	4.17682	0.535174
Ethical	0.625687	0.711565	0.495799	0.627908	20.40593	0.372092
Philanthropic	0.037378	0.061925	0.030375	0.660392	1.25016	0.339608

Source: author's work

Thus, H 1 "Perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS" has been partially confirmed ($p < .001$).

H2 "Perceived economic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS" has been confirmed ($p < .009$).

H3 "Perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS" has been confirmed ($p < .001$).

H4 "Perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS" has been confirmed ($p < .001$).

H5 "Perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a positive direct influence on their JS" has been rejected ($p < .212$).

3.4 Discussion of the Results

76% of hospitality industry employees' JS is explained by CSR ($R^2 = .7603$, Adjusted $R^2 \% = .7579$, $p < .001$). The majority of the influence could be explained by the ethical dimension of CSR ($\beta = .623$, partial correlation coefficient = $.712$, $p < .001$). This result is in line with current research findings on CSR and employees (e.g. Kim et al., 2017; John et al., 2019; Amrutha & Geetha, 2020). In general, employees like to be treated with fairness and dignity (e.g. transparent performance evaluation or application of antidiscrimination policies), having the opportunity to express themselves freely and take part in the open discussion (e.g. presenting employees with adequate information or two-way symmetrical communication). Likewise, the economic CSR dimension scored high ($\beta = .193$, partial correlation coefficient = $.235$, $p < .001$). Similar results are confirmed by the majority of scholars (e.g. Kim, Song & Lee, 2016; Kim et al., 2017). Therefore, such practices as a remuneration system based on performance, competitive wages, employees' security or promotion opportunities, need to be considered when adopting human resources management policies.

Surprisingly, the philanthropic dimension has an insignificant positive influence on JS ($\beta = .037$, partial correlation coefficient = $.061$, $p < .212$), which is a finding contradicting the results of other service sector management scholars (e.g. Cicyota, Ferrante & Schroeder, 2016; Graves, Sarkis & Gold, 2019). This could be probably explained by the majority of respondents ($N = 255$) representing the first two age categories and thus having the urge to satisfy their economy and security needs before "contributing" to the improvement of the environment or helping the community. Therefore, although contrary to other research findings, the presented results on the philanthropic CSR dimension are in line with motivational theories (e.g. Maslow, 1943). Seemingly it could be reasoned by employee's little or no awareness of philanthropic activities as philanthropic dimension's mean score (4.65) and median score (4.50) represent "I neither agree, nor disagree" answer on the 7-point scale. Accordingly, these findings are supported by the results for item/question on two-way symmetrical communication between the employees and organization (ethical dimension), as the employees scored low on this item (mean = 4.23, median = 5.00, the cumulative percentage for score 1 to 4 = 45.70%). For example, Verčič and Špoljarič (2020) argue that choosing the preferred channel of communication helps to improve the overall internal communication management.

The findings of this paper also claim that the legal dimension of CSR (practices like e.g. organization's compliance with employment-related laws and regulations - safety procedures, health, and social insurance contribution) has a significant positive influence on JS ($\beta = .149$, partial correlation coefficient = $.203$, $p < .001$), which is in line with the results presented by other researchers (e.g. Kim et al., 2017; John et al., 2019). According to motivation theories (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 2000), different groups of employees are motivated by different motivation factors. This paper does not confirm this statement as the results for 8 subgroups of respondents do not show any deviation from the results of 411 respondents in total, which is in line with other academic research findings on CSR and employees (e.g. Kim et al., 2017; John et al., 2019). Likewise, the result relevance is sample, time, industry, and region limited. This provides space for future research - e.g. it would be interesting to see if there is any shift

in CSR as a motivation driver in locations with feature (dis)similarities or in the post "Covid 19" era.

4 Conclusion

This paper discussed the purpose of individual CSR dimensions (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic) as motivation factors in stipulating hospitality industry employees' JS. The findings suggest that the employees' perceptions of ethical, economic, and legal dimensions of CSR are positively related to their JS, and thus indicate that adding these CSR dimensions practices into human resource programmes is likely to overly improve employees' desirable attitudes or behaviour, such as WP, OC, and voluntary R.

Contrary to other research findings, this paper does not give any evidence of a positive causal relationship between the philanthropic dimension of CSR and JS. This could be explained by insufficient promotion and communication of discretionary and philanthropic activities towards employees as the research results also signal a communication "defect" on behalf of the employers. Additionally, in line with motivational theories (e.g. Maslow, 1943), the above-mentioned findings could be explained by the employees' urge to satisfy their tangible needs, as the majority of respondents fall in a "young adult" category.

References

- Amrutha, V. N. & Geetha, S. N. (2020). A systematic review on green human resource management: Implications for social sustainability. *J. of Cleaner Production*, 247, 119131.
- Bauman, Ch. W. & Skitka, L. J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 63-86. doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2012.11.002
- Bohdanowicz, P. & Zientara, P. (2009). Hotel companies' contribution to improving the quality of life of local communities, and the well-being of their employees. *Tourism Hospitality Res.*, 9(2), 147-58. doi: 10.1057/thr.2008.46
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39-48. doi: [10.1016/0007-6813\(91\)90005-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G)
- Carroll, A. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centrepiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44, 87-96. doi: [10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.02.002)
- Carroll, A. B. (2016). Carroll's pyramid of CSR: taking another look. *Int. J. Corp. Soc. Responsibility*, 1(1,3). doi: [10.1186/s40991-016-0004-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-016-0004-6)
- Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cycyota, C. S., Ferrante, C. J. & Schroeder, J. M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee volunteerism: What do the best companies do? *Business Horizons*, 59, 321-329. doi: [10.1016/j.bushor.2016.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2016.01.004)

CSO (2019). Czech Statistical office. [Online], Available: <https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/home> [20 Oct 2019].

Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37 definitions. *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Management*, 15(1), 1-13. doi: [10.1002/csr.132](https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.132)

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. Plenum, New York.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268. doi: [10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canad. Psychology*, 49(3), 182-185. doi: [10.1037/a0012801](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801)

Diller, J. (1999). A social conscience in the global marketplace? *Int. Labour Review*, 138(2), 99-129. doi: [10.1111/j.1564-913X.1999.tb00062.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.1999.tb00062.x)

Farooq, M., Farooq, O. & Jasimuddin, S. M. (2014). Employee's response to corporate social responsibility: exploring the role of employees collectivist orientation. *European Management Journal*, 32, 916-927. doi: [10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.002)

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification, *Adm. Sci. Q.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 239-263.

European Commission (2001). *Green paper: Promoting a European framework for corporate social responsibility*. COM 2001, 366 final, Brussels: European Commission, [Online], Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2001/EN/1-2001-366-EN-1-0.Pdf> [20 Oct 2019].

Farooq, M., Farooq, O. & Jasimuddin, S. M. (2014). Employee's response to corporate social responsibility: exploring the role of employees collectivist orientation. *European Management Journal*, 32, 916-927. doi: [10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.002)

Fu, H., Li, Y. & Duan, Y. (2014). Does employee-perceived reputation contribute to citizenship behavior? The mediating role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(4), 593-609. doi: [10.1108/IJQSS-12-2017-0117](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-12-2017-0117)

Graves, L. M., Sarkis, J. & Gold, N. (2019). Employee pro-environmental behaviour in Russia: The roles of top management commitment, managerial leadership, and employee motives. *Resource, Conservation and Recycling*, 140, 54-64. doi: [10.1108/IJM-07-2019-0347](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-07-2019-0347)

Hanaysha, J. & Tahir, P. R. (2016). Examining the Effects of Employee Empowerment, Teamwork, and Employee Training on Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 272-282.

Jakubczak, A. & Gotowska, M. (2015). The quality of work life and socially responsible actions directed at employees on the example of a service company. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum. Oeconomia*, 14(1), 37-46.

John, A., Qadeer, F., Shahzadi, G. & Jia, F. (2019). Getting paid to be good: How and when employees respond to corporate social responsibility? *Journal of Cleaner production*, 215, 784-795. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.074

Kim, J. J., Eom, T. K., Kim, S. W. & Youn, M. K. (2015). Effects of ethical management on job satisfaction and turnover in the South Korean service industry. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution and Business*, 6(1), 17-26. doi: [10.13106/ijidb.2015.vol6.no1.17](https://doi.org/10.13106/ijidb.2015.vol6.no1.17)

Kim, J., Song, H. J. & Lee, Ch. K. (2016). Effects of corporate social responsibility and internal marketing on organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 25-32. doi: [10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.02.007)

Kim, H. L., Rhou, Y., Uysal, M. & Kwon, N. (2017). An examination of the links between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and its internal consequences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 61, 26-34. doi: [10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.10.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.10.011)

Maignan, I. & Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Corporate citizenship as a marketing instrument Concepts, evidence and research directions. *Eur. J. Marketing*, 35(3/4), 457-484. doi: 10.1177/0092070303258971

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396. doi: [10.1037/h0054346](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346)

Mayer, J. P., Becker, T. E. & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 89(6), 991-1007. doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.991](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.991)

Peterson, D. K. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. *Bus. Soc.*, 43(3), 296-319. doi: [10.1177/0007650304268065](https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650304268065)

Robinson, R. N. S., Kralj, A., Solnet, D. J., Goh, E. & Callan, V. (2014). Thinking job embeddedness not turnover: Towards a better understanding of frontline hotel worker retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 101-109.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. 5th ed. Pearson Education Inc.

Trivago (2019). Trivago.cz. [Online], Available: <https://www.trivago.cz/> [20 Oct 2019].

UN Global Compact (2019). *United Nations Global Compact*, [Online], Available: <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/> [20 Oct 2019].

Verčič, A. T. & Špoljarič, A. (2020). Managing internal communication: How the choice of channels affects internal communication satisfaction. *Public Relations Review*, 46, 101926.

Voegtlin, Ch. & Greenwood, M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and Human Resources management: A systematic review and conceptual analysis. *Human Resources Management Review*, 26, 181-197. doi: [10.1016/j.hrmmr.2015.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmmr.2015.12.003)

Všudybyl (2018). e-vsudybyl. [Online], Available: <https://www.e-vsudybyl.cz/> [20 Oct 2019].

Yang, J. T., Wan, C. S. & Fu, Y. J. (2012). Qualitative examination of employee turnover and retention strategies in international tourist hotels in Taiwan. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 837-848.

Yao, T., Qiu, Q. & Wei, Y. (2019). Retaining hotel employees as internal customers: Effect of organizational commitment on attitudinal and behavioural loyalty of employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 1-8. doi: [10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.03.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.03.018)

Youn, H., Lee, K. & Lee, S. (2018). Effects of corporate social responsibility on employees in the casino industry. *Tourism Management*, 68, 328-335. doi: [10.1016/j.tourman.2018.03.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.03.018)

Zhang, Q., Oo, B. L. & Lim, B. T. H. (2019). Drivers, motivations, and barriers to the implementation of corporate social responsibility practices by construction enterprises: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 210, 563-584. doi: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.050](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.050)