

# Corporate Social Responsibility in a Developing Country

Subjects: [Management](#)

Contributor: Dudung Abdurachman , Rudy M. Ramdhan , Ateng Karsoma , Daniel Kisahwan , Alex Winarno , Deni Hermana

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a strategy to realize sustainability. CSR needs to be understood based on a priority scale and objectives to build a solid organizational structure and ensure sustainable CSR implementation. In this regard, CSR implementation at the micro and macro levels needs further explanation.

[internal CSR](#)[external CSR](#)[micro foundation](#)[performance](#)

## 1. Introduction

CSR has evolved and become a strategy for sustainability ([Huang et al. 2022](#); [Sánchez-Teba et al. 2021](#); [Strand et al. 2015](#); [Wu and Jin 2022](#)), including in developing countries ([Dobers and Halme 2009](#); [Sorour et al. 2020](#); [Stanislavská et al. 2020](#)). CSR as a way of reducing carbon emissions ([Ali et al. 2020](#)) faces social challenges ([Grabner-Kräuter et al. 2023](#)).

However, [Mostepaniuk et al. \(2022\)](#) stated a straightforward implementation of the CSR framework. [Barbu et al. \(2022\)](#) demonstrated the framework in sports institutions; [Siddique et al. \(2023\)](#) demonstrated it in the banking industry. CSR needs to be better planned, according to [Shayan et al. \(2022\)](#), and CSR reporting systems need to be more robust ([Jahid et al. 2023](#)). CSR is a complex process ([Khojastehpour and Jamali 2020](#)). The failure of rearview and practice standards is tricky, and low continuity and dedicated efforts cause CSR to be not optimal ([Ali et al. 2020](#)). Several problems in the implementation of CSR in developing countries hinder the functionalization of CSR ([Gulema and Roba 2021](#); [Ullah and Sun 2021](#)). In addition to a vague understanding of CSR, different views of and interests in CSR still widely exist in developing countries ([Yunis et al. 2018](#)). The legal framework of CSR still needs to be improved ([Lauwo et al. 2016](#)) whereas, at the international level, companies still need formal responsibilities related to CSR ([Buhmann 2006](#)). Judging by the process and results, CSR is less encouraging. The sustainability of CSR's objectives makes it less representative of the process, and the effectiveness of CSR is still being debated ([Arora et al. 2020](#)). A previous study reported that CSR in developing countries entails pragmatic implementation, ineffective mechanisms, and poor achievements and social outcomes ([Jain et al. 2021](#)). CSR is organized based on a narrow view that focuses on what to do with profit rather than how to create profit ([Sharma and Singh 2022](#)). Different European practices focus more on internal aspects to ensure the sustainability of CSR implementation ([Macassa et al. 2021](#)), which shows a long-term orientation. There are different needs for understanding CSR in developing countries ([Nguyen et al. 2021](#)).

In Indonesia, CSR practices are carried out through policies such as those realized by state-owned enterprises. SOEs' roles include providing guidance and assistance to entrepreneurs from economically vulnerable groups, cooperatives, and the community through corporate social responsibility (CSR) following prevailing laws and regulations ([Ramdhan et al. 2022](#)). The legal approach for CSR is a “coercive and binding” effort to solve educational, health, and environmental issues in developing countries like Indonesia. The regulations as standard guidelines on mandatory CSR are contained within a vacuum and are confusing ([Sefriani and Wartini 2017](#)). Companies are more concerned with avoiding legal consequences than guaranteeing balance, as suggested by [Carroll \(2017\)](#). But various parties have interest in CSR rather than it containing neutral essential wisdom ([Juwana 2005](#)). [Van Marrewijk \(2003\)](#) asserted that bias in CSR causes other biases due to specific interests. This situation indicates a conflict of legal and economic interest of CSR implementation. There has been a long-term feud between legal and economic approaches in CSR implementation ([Windsor 2006](#)). CSR implementation still needs to be integrated into community norms and practices such as local beliefs (religion) and government systems despite the cultural challenges ([Ooi et al. 2021](#)). CSR recontextualization is a vital need ([Ibrahim et al. 2023](#)). Furthermore, CSR practices focus more on corporate image, a lack of consistency and limitations, and the selection of CSR activities that need to pay attention to stakeholders' interests.

In addition to regulatory issues, the results of previous studies show that CSR implementation focuses more on the macro and ignores the micro ([Yu et al. 2021](#)). However, as [Kim and Kim \(2021\)](#) argued, the effect of CSR on the internal stakeholder, such as employees, who ultimately determine a company's performance, still needs to be researched. CSR pays little attention to employees' interests ([Jung and Kim 2016](#)). [Deng et al. \(2020\)](#) discussed the negative impact of CSR on employees. Currently, CSR function needs to be understood as an effort to strengthen the company's performance structure while upholding ethical responsibility ([Farooq et al. 2021](#); [Silva et al. 2023](#)). Although other studies have reported a positive relationship between CSR and employees ([Verčič and Čorić 2018](#); [Sheel and Vohra 2016](#)), there is inconsistency in the findings of the effect of CSR implementation on employees. Internal CSR is considered more effective for employees ([Ng et al. 2019](#)). Internal CSR can increase employee satisfaction, which is likely to increase employee performance ([Obeidat et al. 2018](#); [Golob and Podnar 2021](#); [Chatzopoulou et al. 2022](#)). Another contradiction is that CSR does not always provide positive results such as performance and engagement ([Rupp et al. 2018](#)).

Current CSR implementation should be related to profit, the structure of the corporation's performance, and the ability to implement CSR principles, as stated by [Elkington \(1998\)](#)—namely, the triple bottom line. The results of previous studies show that the implementation and concept of CSR need to be clarified with existing problems so that CSR can be optimized. The first gap is the need for clarity in CSR construction included in formulated policies to reduce the function of CSR. Problems with the implementation of CSR begin with the understanding of CSR internally and externally ([Ramdhan et al. 2022](#); [Zhong et al. 2022](#)). The second gap is that CSR implementation is more external. Focusing on internal CSR has not been a priority, even though it is needed to support the foundation of companies, which still needs to be improved ([Ramdhan et al. 2022](#)). Although internal CSR studies are evolving and previous studies have shown a positive relationship between individual psychological aspects and reduced adverse work outcomes, the studies still need to be clarified ([Chen and Liu 2023](#)). There are calls for CSR research that multiplies specific issues at the individual level.

Therefore, it is necessary to study CSR based on several propositions in the micro foundation theory. In this regard, [Chomvilailuk and Butcher \(2023\)](#), [Farooq et al. \(2021\)](#), [Golob and Podnar \(2021\)](#), and [Song and Tao \(2022\)](#) showed the positive impact of internal CSR on employees, deepening the understanding of internal CSR as a future research agenda ([Onkila and Sarna 2022](#)). This study supports the understanding of CSR at the micro level, which is considered still lacking ([Bu and Chen 2023](#); [Carlini and Grace 2021](#); [Giang and Dung 2022](#); [Liu et al. 2023](#); [Yu et al. 2021](#)).

## 2. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

CSR is a set of obligations a community expects a company to perform ([Carroll 2017](#)). The concept of CSR is constantly evolving. CSR could be considered a voluntary and extra-legal obligation ([Amin-Chaudhry 2016](#)). It relates to business ethics, stakeholder management, organizational citizenship behavior, value creation, and social goals ([Carroll and Brown 2018](#)). The concept of CSR has similarities with sustainability ([Barbu et al. 2022](#); [Elkington 1998](#); [Mostepaniuk et al. 2022](#); [Sánchez-Teba et al. 2021](#); [Strand et al. 2015](#); [Wu and Jin 2022](#)). CSR and sustainability are different ([Zhao et al. 2023](#)). CSR construction is at the company level as a strategy ([Fatima and Elbanna 2023](#)). CSR is a long-term maintenance system consistent with economic, social, and environmental considerations ([Alhosani and Nobanee 2023](#)).

CSR includes ethical responsibility towards stakeholders and integrating economic, environmental, social, and ethical aspects into company operations, decision-making, and creating shared value for stakeholders ([Hussain et al. 2023](#); [Siddique et al. 2023](#)). While both internal and external CSR shows the corporation's ethical responsibility, their only difference lies in the state of whether or not the constituent is being directly affected by CSR ([Bolton 2020](#)).

External CSR is conceived based on the orientation of CSR allocations outside of the corporate realm, such as external audiences, customers, suppliers, community, and governments ([Bolton 2020](#); [Ibrahim et al. 2023](#); [Kholaiif and Ming 2022](#); [Silva et al. 2023](#); [Wang et al. 2022](#)).

Internal CSR, as an accountable condition of the corporation ethically and legally, is used to carry out duties and care for the corporate's internal affairs ([Chomvilailuk and Butcher 2023](#); [Manzoor et al. 2019](#); [Kholaiif and Ming 2022](#)). The responsibility toward employees ([Bouraoui et al. 2019](#); [Silva et al. 2023](#); [Jamali et al. 2020](#)) is to develop the corporation's human resources and expand the offering of opportunities for employees in increasing personal benefits for the corporation. [Adu-Gyamfi et al. \(2021\)](#) added that CSR initiatives are intended to satisfy stakeholders, especially employees (leading internal).

Internal and external CSR have different constructions based on the goals and interests viewed from the company's point of view. Internal CSR is an organization's policies and practices for psychological and physiological well-being, including individual development and an inclusive and equitable work environment ([Hameed et al. 2016](#)); developing organizational capabilities and meeting employee expectations are critical resources for organizations ([Hawn and Ioannou 2016](#)). Internal CSR focuses on organizational practices to support

employees' mental and physical well-being ([Hur et al. 2021](#)), while external CSR, according to [Hameed et al. \(2016\)](#), focuses on outside the company, including voluntary, corporate philanthropy, and environmental protection. External CSR is corporate behavior to protect or promote social welfare outside the direct interests of the company and stakeholders outside the company ([Jia et al. 2019](#)). [Waldman et al. \(2006\)](#) and [Farooq et al. \(2021\)](#) emphasized the concept of external CSR based on the focus on community interests and consumers. Both are connected with the idea that financial benefits, social benefits, and attention to the environment are due to business activities and sustainability orientation as a whole.

### 3. Work Engagement

Work engagement was developed by [Kahn \(1990\)](#) in the Job Demand-Resources model ([Parkinson 2023](#); [Schaufeli and Bakker 2004](#); [Tomietto et al. 2019](#)). Work engagement is a condition in which a person has a positive mind to express himself physically, cognitively, and physically in the work place ([Andrulli and Gerards 2023](#); [Aldabbas et al. 2021](#); [Lee et al. 2023](#); [Oberländer and Bipp 2022](#); [Schaufeli and Bakker 2004](#); [Kossyva et al. 2023](#)). Work engagement is a situation related to work that is positive, satisfying, motivated, and effectively prosperous ([Bakker and Leiter 2010](#)). It is reinforced that work-related positive states of mind are characterized by passion, dedication, and absorption ([Albrecht and Andreetta 2011](#); [Han et al. 2021](#); [Lee and Eissenstat 2018](#); [Zhu and Liu 2020](#); [Schaufeli et al. 2017](#); [Shi and Gordon 2020](#); [Wu et al. 2022](#)). [Fu et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Wojtczuk-Turek \(2022\)](#) put forward constructions that were mostly accepted according to JD-R. Employees' positive or negative emotional attachment to work, colleagues, and organizations greatly influences their willingness to learn and perform in workplaces ([Sandhya and Sulphrey 2020](#)). The generally accepted construction of WE comes from the perspective of JD-R.

Work engagement is a trigger for proactive work cycles and for the optimization of work demands ([Bakker et al. 2023](#); [Bakker and de Vries 2021](#)). It assumes a balance of positive (resource) and opposing (job demands) ([Bauer et al. 2014](#); [Juyumaya and Torres 2023](#); [Nagai et al. 2023](#)). Work engagement is the result of various socio-psychological processes ([Bakker 2022](#)) including environmental influences ([Mäkikangas et al. 2022](#)).

### 4. Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction is an individuals' affective responses to their environment, including value achievement at work ([Ali et al. 2023](#); [Çamlı et al. 2022](#)) and enjoyment of work ([Abolnasser et al. 2023](#); [Pang et al. 2023](#)). It also includes satisfaction as quality of work ([Erro-Garcés et al. 2022](#)). Employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction reflects their responses to the perceived degree of conformity between expectations and the actual condition in the workplace. However, satisfaction and dissatisfaction differ ([Dorta-Afonso et al. 2023](#)). Intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence positive or negative judgments, emotional reactions, and attitudes toward work ([Abu-Tineh et al. 2023](#); [Hilton et al. 2023](#); [Scanlan and Still 2019](#)). It is an emotional response to work that may generate pleasure, comfort, self-confidence, appreciation, personal growth, and various positive opportunities, including upward mobility, recognition, and assessments carried out in a pattern of achievement with monetary value as compensation

([Robbins and Judge 2015](#)). [Albalá-Genol et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Skaalvik \(2023\)](#) explain the perspective of JD-R, job satisfaction is the worker's emotional response, given by context and mediated by the personal resources available to the person. Various definitions show that job satisfaction is multidimensional and subjective ([Brendel et al. 2023](#)).

Satisfaction is considered one of the indicators of mental health in the workplace ([Adamopoulos et al. 2023](#); [Caputo et al. 2023](#); [Martí-González et al. 2023](#)). Therefore, along with the importance of an individual's position in the workplace and the positive output of job satisfaction, the construction in this study is that the papacy is an indicator of mental health which is a positive or negative value, emotional reaction, and attitude towards work.

## 5. Job Performance

Job performance is a multidimensional variable comprising job and non-job-related components. Performance consists of task performance and extra roles ([Chaudhary 2018](#)). [Manzoor et al. \(2019\)](#) describe performance as employees' actions and behaviors relevant to the organization's goals. The concept of performance is, among others, related to the ability to adapt to unexpected conditions or situations (adaptive performance) and work activities directly related to the corporate's technical core ([Campbell 1999](#); [Ramdhan et al. 2022](#)). [Miao et al. \(2018\)](#) define task performance as an organizational citizenship behavior. Adaptability is related to discrepancies, discontinuity, and emerging trends. Meanwhile, [Park et al. \(2020\)](#) define job performance as the ability of employees to adjust their behavior to satisfy work demands. [Lee and Lee \(2020\)](#) stated that it meets a job's formal requirements and adequately completes assigned duties. [Ali et al. \(2020\)](#) put forward the concept of performance based on [Janssen and Van Yperen \(2004\)](#) namely on innovation. [Alghamdi \(2018\)](#) defines it as the ability to generate and implement new and valuable ideas. [Davidescu et al. \(2020\)](#) added that the more dynamic the work demands, the higher the flexibility demands that employees face. Job performance is growing along with changes in the environment and orientation of the institution. [Kosec et al. \(2022\)](#) added about performance appraisals that they are overall work skills and behaviors related to colleagues and customers.

## References

1. Huang, Stanley Y.B., Chien Hsiang Huang, and Tai Wei Chang. 2022. A New Concept of Work Engagement Theory in Cognitive Engagement, Emotional Engagement, and Physical Engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12: 663440.
2. Sánchez-Teba, Eva M., María Dolores Benítez-Márquez, Guillermo Bermúdez-González, and María del Mar Luna-Pereira. 2021. Mapping the Knowledge of CSR and Sustainability. *Sustainability* 13: 10106.
3. Strand, Robert, R Edward Freeman, and Kai Hockerts. 2015. Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability in Scandinavia: An Overview. *Journal of Business Ethics* 127: 1–15.

4. Wu, Lijuan, and Shanyue Jin. 2022. Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability: From a Corporate Governance Perspective. *Sustainability* 14: 15457.
5. Dobers, Peter, and Minna Halme. 2009. Corporate Social Responsibility and Developing Countries. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 16: 237–49.
6. Sorour, M. Karim, Philip J. Shrives, Ahmed Ayman El-Sakhawy, and Teerooven Soobaroyen. 2020. Exploring the Evolving Motives Underlying Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Disclosures in Developing Countries: The Case of 'Political CSR' Reporting. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 34: 1051–79.
7. Stanislavská, Lucie Kvasničková, Ladislav Pilař, Klára MargarISOVÁ, and Roman Kvasnička. 2020. Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Media: Comparison between Developing and Developed Countries. *Sustainability* 12: 5255.
8. Ali, Hafiz Yasir, Muhammad Asrar-ul-Haq, Shaheera Amin, Sadaf Noor, Muhammad Haris-ul-Mahasbi, and Muhammad Kashif Aslam. 2020. Corporate social responsibility and employee performance: The mediating role of employee engagement in the manufacturing sector of Pakistan. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 27: 2908–19.
9. Grabner-Kräuter, Sonja, Festim Tafolli, and Robert J. Breiteneker. 2023. Consequences of Public Sector Employees' CSR Perceptions in a Developing Country: Organizational Benefits and Beyond. *Public Performance & Management Review* 46: 472–511.
10. Mostepaniuk, Alla, Elsie Nasr, Razan Ibrahim Awwad, Sameer Hamdan, and Hasan Yousef Aljuhmani. 2022. Managing a Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability* 14: 11203.
11. Barbu, Mihai Constantin Răzvan, Marius Cătălin Popescu, George Bogdan Burcea, Dan Eugen Costin, Marian Gabriel Popa, Leonardo Daniel Păsărin, and Ioan Turcu. 2022. Sustainability and Social Responsibility of Romanian Sport Organizations. *Sustainability* 14: 643.
12. Siddique, Md Nur E. Alam, Shifa Mohd Nor, Zizah Che Senik, and Nor Asiah Omar. 2023. Corporate Social Responsibility as the Pathway to Sustainable Banking: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability* 15: 1807.
13. Shayan, Niloufar Fallah, Nasrin Mohabbati-Kalejahi, Sepideh Alavi, and Mohammad Ali Zahed. 2022. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). *Sustainability* 14: 1222.
14. Jahid, Md Abu, Rizal Yaya, Suryo Pratolo, and Firman Pribodi. 2023. Institutional Factors and CSR Reporting in a Developing Country: Evidence from the Neo-Institutional Perspective. *Cogent Business and Management* 10: 2184227.
15. Khojastehpour, Morteza, and Dima Jamali. 2020. Institutional complexity of host country and corporate social responsibility: Developing vs developed countries. *Social Responsibility Journal*

- 17: 593–612.
16. Gulema, Tolossa Fufa, and Yadessa Tadesse Roba. 2021. Internal and External Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Practices in Multinational Enterprise Subsidiaries in Developing Countries: Evidence from Ethiopia. *Future Business Journal* 7: 7.
  17. Ullah, Subhan, and Di Sun. 2021. Corporate Social Responsibility Corporate Innovation: A Cross-Country Study of Developing Countries. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 28: 1066–77.
  18. Yunis, Mohammad Sohail, Dima Jamali, and Hina Hashim. 2018. Corporate social responsibility of foreign multinationals in a developing country context: Insights from Pakistan. *Sustainability* 10: 3511.
  19. Lauwo, Sarah George, Olatunde Julius Otusanya, and Owolabi Bakre. 2016. Corporate social responsibility reporting in the mining sector of Tanzania: (Lack of) government regulatory controls and NGO activism. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 29: 1038–74.
  20. Buhmann, Karin. 2006. Corporate social responsibility: What role for law? Some aspects of law and CSR. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society* 6: 188–202.
  21. Arora, Bimal, Arno Kourula, and Robert Phillips. 2020. Emerging paradigms of corporate social responsibility, regulation, and governance: Introduction to the thematic symposium. *Journal of Business Ethics* 162: 265–68.
  22. Jain, Ameeta, Monika Kansal, and Mahesh Joshi. 2021. New development: Corporate philanthropy to mandatory corporate social responsibility (CSR)—A new law for India. *Public Money & Management* 41: 276–78.
  23. Sharma, Aashna, and Gurparkash Singh. 2022. Conceptualizing corporate social responsibility practice: An integration of obligation and opportunity. *Social Responsibility Journal* 18: 1393–408.
  24. Macassa, Gloria, Cormac McGrath, Gianpaolo Tomaselli, and Sandra C. Buttigieg. 2021. Corporate Social Responsibility and Internal Stakeholders' Health and Well-Being in Europe: A Systematic Descriptive Review. *Health Promotion International* 36: 866–83.
  25. Nguyen, Thi Lien Huong, Nhat Minh Tran, and Manh Chien Vu. 2021. The Influence of Board Characteristics and State Holding on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure, Evidence from Vietnamese Listed Firms. *Business: Theory and Practice* 22: 190–201.
  26. Ramdhan, Rudy M., Daniel Kisahwan, Alex Winarno, and Deni Hermana. 2022. Internal Corporate Social Responsibility as a Microfoundation of Employee Well-Being and Job Performance. *Sustainability* 14: 9065.
  27. Sefriani, Sefriani, and Sri Wartini. 2017. Model Kebijakan Hukum Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM* 24: 1–28.

28. Carroll, Archie B. 2017. A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility* 4: 37–45.
29. Juwana, Hikmahanto. 2005. Politik Hukum UU Bidang Ekonomi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum* 1.
30. Van Marrewijk, Marcel. 2003. Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics* 44: 95–105.
31. Windsor, D. 2006. Corporate social responsibility: Three key approaches. *Journal of Management Studies* 43: 93–114.
32. Ooi, Chai-Aun, Chee-Wooi Hooy, and Kyoko Nagata. 2021. Corporate social responsibility, firm value and corporate governance code revisions: The Asian evidence. *Asian Economic Journal* 35: 27–56.
33. Ibrahim, Mohamed Nageh, Albert Nsom Kimbu, and Manuel Alector Ribeiro. 2023. Recontextualising the determinants of external CSR in the services industry: A cross-cultural study. *Tourism Management* 95: 104690.
34. Yu, Hua, Muhammad Salman Shabbir, Naveed Ahmad, Antonio Ariza-Montes, Alejandro Vega-Muñoz, Heesup Han, Miklas Scholz, and Muhammad Safdar Sial. 2021. A contemporary issue of micro-foundation of csr, employee pro-environmental behavior and environmental performance toward energy saving, carbon emission reduction and recycling. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18: 5380.
35. Kim, Minseong, and Jihye Kim. 2021. Corporate social responsibility, employee engagement, well-being and the task performance of frontline employees. *Management Decision* 59: 2040–2056.
36. Jung, Heung-Jun, and Dong-One Kim. 2016. Good neighbors but bad employers: Two faces of corporate social responsibility programs. *Journal of Business Ethics* 138: 295–310.
37. Deng, Xinming, Xianyi Long, Douglas A. Schuler, Huan Luo, and Xiaofei Zhao. 2020. External corporate social responsibility and labor productivity: AS-curve relationship and the moderating role of internal CSR and government subsidy. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 27: 393–408.
38. Farooq, Qamar, Peihua Fu, Xuan Liu, and Yunhong Hao. 2021. Basics of macro to microlevel corporate social responsibility and advancement in triple bottom line theory. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 28: 969–979.
39. Silva, Pedro, Antonio Carrizo Moreira, and Jorge Mota. 2023. Employees' perception of corporate social responsibility and performance: The mediating roles of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust. *Journal of Strategy and Management* 16: 92–111.

40. Verčič, Ana Tkalac, and Dubravka Sinčić Ćorić. 2018. The relationship between reputation, employer branding and corporate social responsibility Ana. *Public Relations Review* 44: 444–52.
41. Sheel, Rahul Chandra, and Neharika Vohra. 2016. Relationship between perceptions of corporate social responsibility and organizational cynicism: The role of employee volunteering. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 27: 1373–92.
42. Ng, Thomas WH, Kai Chi Yam, and Herman Aguinis. 2019. Employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility: Effects on pride, embeddedness, and turnover. *Personnel Psychology* 72: 107–37.
43. Obeidat, Dr Bader Yousef, Sura Altheeb, and Ra'ed Masa'deh. 2018. The impact of internal corporate social responsibility on job satisfaction in Jordanian pharmaceutical companies. *Modern Applied Science* 12: 11.
44. Golob, Urša, and Klement Podnar. 2021. Corporate marketing and the role of internal CSR in employees' life satisfaction: Exploring the relationship between work and non-work domains. *Journal of Business Research* 131: 664–72.
45. Chatzopoulou, Erifili Christina, Dimitris Manolopoulos, and Vasia Agapitou. 2022. 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.
46. Rupp, Deborah E., Ruodan Shao, Daniel P. Skarlicki, Elizabeth Layne Paddock, Tae-Yeol Kim, and Thierry Nadisic. 2018. Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: The moderating role of CSR-specific relative autonomy and individualism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 39: 559–79.
47. Elkington, John. 1998. Partnerships from cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business. *Environmental quality management* 8: 37–51.
48. Zhong, Xi, Ge Ren, and XiaoJie Wu. 2022. Not all stakeholders are created equal: Executive vertical pay disparity and firms' choice of internal and external CSR. *Review of Managerial Science* 16: 2495–525.
49. Chen, Rongxin, and Wei Liu. 2023. Managing healthcare employees' burnout through micro aspects of corporate social responsibility: A public health perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health* 10: 1050867.
50. Chomvilailuk, Rojanasak, and Ken Butcher. 2023. Enhancing Employee Advocacy of the Firm's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Activities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*. ahead-of-print.
51. Song, Baobao, and Weiting Tao. 2022. Unpack the relational and behavioral outcomes of internal CSR: Highlighting dialogic communication and managerial facilitation. *Public Relations Review* 48: 102153.

52. Onkila, Tiina, and Bhavesh Sarna. 2022. A Systematic Literature Review on Employee Relations with CSR: State of Art and Future Research Agenda. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 29: 435–47.
53. Bu, Xuelin, and Limin Chen. 2023. From Efficiency to Legitimacy: The Changing Logic of Internal CSR in Emerging Multinationals during Internationalization. *Asian Business and Management* 9: 1–36.
54. Carlini, Joan, and Debra Grace. 2021. The Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Internal Branding Model: Aligning Employees' CSR Awareness, Knowledge, and Experience to Deliver Positive Employee Performance Outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Management* 37: 732–60.
55. Giang, Huynh Thi Thuy, and Luu Tien Dung. 2022. The Effect of Internal Corporate Social Responsibility Practices on Firm Performance: The Mediating Role of Employee Intrapreneurial Behaviour. *Review of Managerial Science* 16: 1035–61.
56. Liu, Yixuan, Xinyan Yang, Yinghui Wu, Yanling Xu, Yiwei Zhong, and Shujuan Yang. 2023. The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Depressive Symptoms among Chinese Adults Aged 35–60 Years: The Mediating Role of Subjective Well-Being and Life Satisfaction. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 2023.
57. Amin-Chaudhry, Anjum. 2016. Corporate social responsibility—from a mere concept to an expected business practice. *Social Responsibility Journal* 12: 190–207.
58. Carroll, Archie B., and Jill A. Brown. 2018. Corporate social responsibility: A review of current concepts, research, and issues. *Corporate Social Responsibility*, 39–69.
59. Zhao, Liming, Miles M. Yang, Zhenyuan Wang, and Grant Michelson. 2023. Trends in the Dynamic Evolution of Corporate Social Responsibility and Leadership: A Literature Review and Bibliometric Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics* 182: 135–57.
60. Fatima, Tahniyath, and Said Elbanna. 2023. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Implementation: A Review and a Research Agenda Towards an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Business Ethics* 183: 105–21.
61. Alhosani, Noora Hasan Ismail, and Haitham Nobanee. 2023. Board gender diversity and corporate social responsibility: A bibliometric analysis. *Heliyon* 9: e12734.
62. Hussain, Nazim, Isabel María García-Sánchez, Sana Akbar Khan, Zaheer Khan, and Jennifer Martínez-Ferrero. 2023. Connecting the Dots: Do Financial Analysts Help Corporate Boards Improve Corporate Social Responsibility? *British Journal of Management* 34: 363–89.
63. Bolton, Brian. 2020. Internal vs. external corporate social responsibility at US banks. *International Journal of Financial Studies* 8: 65.

64. Kholaf, Moustafa Mohamed Nazief Haggag Kotb, and Xiao Ming. 2022. COVID-19's Fear-Uncertainty Effect on Green Supply Chain Management and Sustainability Performances: The Moderate Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 30: 42541–62.
65. Wang, Xu, Changchun Xiang, Liang Meng, Lei Chi, and Songpu Li. 2022. External Corporate Social Responsibility Promotes Employees' Unethical pro-Organizational Behavior: An Attribution Perspective. *Current Psychology*, 1–15.
66. Manzoor, Faiza, Longbao Wei, Mohammad Nurunnabi, Qazi Abdul Subhan, Syed Irshad Ali Shah, and Samaher Fallatah. 2019. The impact of transformational leadership on job performance and CSR as mediator in SMEs. *Sustainability* 11: 436.
67. Bouraoui, Khadija, Sonia Bensemmane, Marc Ohana, and Marcello Russo. 2019. Corporate Social Responsibility and Employees' Affective Commitment: A Multiple Mediation Model. *Management Decision* 57: 152–67.
68. Jamali, Dima, Georges Samara, Lamberto Zollo, and Cristiano Ciappei. 2020. Is Internal CSR Really Less Impactful in Individualist and Masculine Cultures? A Multilevel Approach. *Management Decision* 58: 362–75.
69. Adu-Gyamfi, Mavis, Zheng He, Gabriel Nyame, Seth Boahen, and Michelle Frempong. 2021. Effects of internal csr activities on social performance: The employee perspective. *Sustainability* 13: 6235.
70. Hameed, Imran, Zahid Riaz, Ghulam A. Arain, and Omer Farooq. 2016. How do internal and external CSR affect employees' organizational identification? A perspective from the group engagement model. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7: 788.
71. Hawn, Olga, and Ioannis Ioannou. 2016. Mind the gap: The interplay between external and internal actions in the case of corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Management Journal* 37: 2569–88.
72. Hur, Won-Moo, Tae-Won Moon, and Wook-Hee Choi. 2021. The Role of Job Crafting and Perceived Organizational Support in the Link between Employees' CSR Perceptions and Job Performance: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Current Psychology* 40: 3151–65.
73. Jia, Yu, Jinglu Yan, Tianyuan Liu, and Jun Huang. 2019. How does internal and external CSR affect employees' work engagement? Exploring multiple mediation mechanisms and boundary conditions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 16: 2476.
74. Waldman, David A., Donald S. Siegel, and Mansour Javidan. 2006. Components of CEO transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Studies* 43: 1703–25.

75. Kahn, William A. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal* 33: 692–724.
76. Parkinson, A. 2023. Releasing the Pressure Valve: Workplace Relationships and Engagement in a Context of Disruption. In *Research on Emotion in Organizations*. Bentley: Emerald Publishing Limited, vol. 18.
77. Schaufeli, Wilmar B., and Arnold B. Bakker. 2004. Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25: 293–315.
78. Tomietto, Marco, Eleonora Paro, Riccardo Sartori, Rita Maricchio, Luciano Clarizia, Paola De Lucia, Giuseppe Pedrinelli, Rosanna Finos, and PN Nursing Group. 2019. Work engagement and perceived work ability: An evidence-based model to enhance nurses' well-being. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 75: 1933–42.
79. Andrulli, Rémi, and Ruud Gerards. 2023. How New Ways of Working during COVID-19 Affect Employee Well-Being via Technostress, Need for Recovery, and Work Engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior* 139: 107560.
80. Aldabbas, Hazem, Ashly Pinnington, and Abdelmounaim Lahrech. 2021. The Influence of Perceived Organizational Support on Employee Creativity: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *Current Psychology* 42: 6501–15.
81. Lee, Shinwoo, Taha Hameduddin, and Gyeo Reh Lee. 2023. Organizational Image and Employee Engagement: Exploring the Inter-Relationships Between Construed External Image and Perceived Organizational Identity. *American Review of Public Administration* 53: 82–96.
82. Oberländer, Maren, and Tanja Bipp. 2022. Do digital competencies and social support boost work engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic? *Computers in Human Behavior* 130: 107172.
83. Kossyva, Dorothea, Georgios Theriou, Vassilis Aggelidis, and Lazaros Sarigiannidis. 2023. Retaining Talent in Knowledge-Intensive Services: Enhancing Employee Engagement through Human Resource, Knowledge and Change Management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. ahead-of-print.
84. Bakker, Arnold B., and Michael P. Leiter. 2010. Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research. In *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. London: Psychology Press.
85. Albrecht, Simon L., and Manuela Andreetta. 2011. The influence of empowering leadership, empowerment and engagement on affective commitment and turnover intentions in community health service workers: Test of a model. *Leadership in Health Services* 24: 228–37.
86. Han, Seung-Hyun, Moonju Sung, and Boyung Suh. 2021. Linking meaningfulness to work outcomes through job characteristics and work engagement. *Human Resource Development*

International 24: 3–22.

87. Lee, Yunsoo, and S. H. J. Eissenstat. 2018. An application of work engagement in the job demands–resources model to career development: Assessing gender differences. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 29: 143–61.
88. Zhu, Xudong, and Jing Liu. 2020. Education in and After Covid-19: Immediate Responses and Long-Term Visions. *Postdigital Science and Education* 2: 695–99.
89. Schaufeli, W. B., A. Shimazu, J. Hakanen, M. Salanova, and H. D. Witte. 2017. An Ultra-Short Measure for Work Engagement: The UWES-3 Validation Across Five Countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 35: 1–15.
90. Shi, Xiaolin (Crystal), and Susan Gordon. 2020. Organizational Support versus Supervisor Support: The Impact on Hospitality Managers' Psychological Contract and Work Engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 87: 102374.
91. Wu, Tung Ju, Kuo Shu Yuan, David C. Yen, and Ching Fang Yeh. 2022. The Effects of JDC Model on Burnout and Work Engagement: A Multiple Interaction Analysis. *European Management Journal* 41: 395–403.
92. Fu, Wangqian, Qianqian Pan, Caiyun Zhang, and Li Cheng. 2022. Influencing factors of Chinese special education teacher turnover intention: Understanding the roles of subject well-being, social support, and work engagement. *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities* 68: 342–53.
93. Wojtczuk-Turek, A. 2022. Who needs transformational leadership to craft their job? The role of work engagement and personal values. *Baltic Journal of Management* 17: 654–70.
94. Sandhya, S., and M. M. Sulphey. 2020. Influence of empowerment, psychological contract and employee engagement on voluntary turnover intentions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. ahead-of-print.
95. Bakker, Arnold B., Despoina Xanthopoulou, and Evangelia Demerouti. 2023. How does chronic burnout affect dealing with weekly job demands? A test of central propositions in JD-R and COR-theories. *Applied Psychology* 72: 389–410.
96. Bakker, Arnold B., and Juriena D. de Vries. 2021. Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping* 34: 1–21.
97. Bauer, Georg F., Oliver Hämmig, Wilmar B. Schaufeli, and Toon W. Taris. 2014. A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In *Bridging Occupational, Organizational and Public Health: A Transdisciplinary Approach*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 43–68.
98. Juyumaya, Jesus, and Juan Pablo Torres. 2023. Effects of Transformational Leadership and Work Engagement on Managers' Creative Performance. *Baltic Journal of Management* 18: 34–53.

99. Nagai, Satoko, Yasuko Ogata, Takeshi Yamamoto, Mark Fedyk, and Janice F. Bell. 2023. A Longitudinal Study of the Impact of Personal and Professional Resources on Nurses' Work Engagement: A Comparison of Early-Career and Mid-Later-Career Nurses. *Healthcare* 11: 76.
100. Bakker, Arnold B. 2022. The social psychology of work engagement: State of the field. *Career Development International* 27: 36–53.
101. Mäkikangas, Anne, Soile Juutinen, Jaana-Piia Mäkinen, Kirsi Sjöblom, and Atte Oksanen. 2022. Work engagement and its antecedents in remote work: A person-centered view. *Work and Stress* 36: 392–416.
102. Ali, Amanda D., Lendel K. Narine, Paul A. Hill, and Dominic C. Bria. 2023. Factors Affecting Remote Workers' Job Satisfaction in Utah: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 5736.
103. Çamlı, Ahmet Yavuz, Türker B. Palamutçuoğlu, Nicoleta Bărbuță-Mișu, Selin Çavuşoğlu, Florina Oana Virlanuta, Yaşar Alkan, Sofia David, and Ludmila Daniela Manea. 2022. The Moderator Effect of Communicative Rational Action in the Relationship between Emotional Labor and Job Satisfaction. *Sustainability* 14: 7625.
104. Abolnasser, Magdy Sayed Ahmed, Ahmed Hassan Abdou, Thowayeb H. Hassan, and Amany E. Salem. 2023. Transformational Leadership, Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, and Psychological Well-Being among Hotel Employees after the Height of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Serial Mediation Model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 3609.
105. Pang, Qiwei, Mingjie Fang, Lu Wang, Kena Mi, and Miao Su. 2023. Increasing Couriers' Job Satisfaction through Social-Sustainability Practices: Perceived Fairness and Psychological-Safety Perspectives. *Behavioral Sciences* 13: 125.
106. Erro-Garcés, Amaya, Begoña Urien, Giedrius Čyras, and Vita Marytė Janušauskienė. 2022. Telework in Baltic Countries during the Pandemic: Effects on Wellbeing, Job Satisfaction, and Work-Life Balance. *Sustainability* 14: 5778.
107. Dorta-Afonso, Daniel, Laura Romero-Domínguez, and Claudia Benítez-Núñez. 2023. It's Worth It! High Performance Work Systems for Employee Job Satisfaction: The Mediational Role of Burnout. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 108: 103364.
108. Abu-Tineh, Abdullah M., Michael H. Romanowski, Youmen Chaaban, Hadeel Alkhatib, Norma Ghamrawi, and Yousef M. Alshaboul. 2023. Career Advancement, Job Satisfaction, Career Retention, and Other Related Dimensions for Sustainability: A Perception Study of Qatari Public School Teachers. *Sustainability* 15: 4370.
109. Hilton, Sam Kris, Wonder Madilo, Fred Awaah, and Helen Arkorful. 2023. Dimensions of transformational leadership and organizational performance: The mediating effect of job

- satisfaction. *Management Research Review* 46: 1–19.
110. Scanlan, Justin N., and Megan Still. 2019. Relationships between burnout, turnover intention, job satisfaction, job demands and job resources for mental health personnel in an Australian mental health service. *BMC Health Services Research* 19: 62.
  111. Robbins, Stephen P., and Timothy A. Judge. 2015. *Organizational Behavior*, 17th ed. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Inc.
  112. Albalá-Genol, Jazael, Pedro Antonio Díaz-Fúnez, and Miguel Ángel Mañas-Rodríguez. 2023. Resilience and Job Satisfaction: Effect of Moderated Mediation on the Influence of interpersonal Justice on the Performance of Public Servants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 2957.
  113. Skaalvik, C. 2023. Emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction among Norwegian school principals: Relations with perceived job demands and job resources. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 26: 75–99.
  114. Brendel, Hannah, Maha Yomn Sbaa, Salvatore Zappala, Gabriele Puzzo, and Luca Pietrantonì. 2023. The Impact of Work-Related Barriers on Job Satisfaction of Practitioners Working with Migrants. *Social Sciences* 12: 98.
  115. Adamopoulos, Ioannis, Niki Syrou, Demetris Lamnisis, and George Boustras. 2023. Cross-Sectional Nationwide Study in Occupational Safety & Health: Inspection of Job Risks Context, Burn out Syndrome and Job Satisfaction of Public Health Inspectors in the Period of the COVID-19 Pandemic in Greece. *Safety Science* 158: 105960.
  116. Caputo, Andrea, Paola Gatti, Marco Clari, Giacomo Garzaro, Valerio Dimonte, and Claudio Giovanni Cortese. 2023. Leaders' Role in Shaping Followers' Well-Being: Crossover in a Sample of Nurses. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20: 2386.
  117. Martí-González, Mariacarla, María Lourdes Alcalá-Ibañez, Jose Luis Castán-Esteban, Laura Martín-Bielsa, and Laura O. Gallardo. 2023. COVID-19 in School Teachers: Job Satisfaction and Burnout through the Job Demands Control Model. *Behavioral Sciences* 13: 76.
  118. Chaudhary, R. 2018. Corporate social responsibility and employee performance: A study among indian business executives. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 31: 2761–84.
  119. Campbell, John P. 1999. The definition and measurement of performance in the new age. *The Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation, and Development* 399: 400–28.
  120. Miao, Chao, Ronald H. Humphrey, and Shanshan Qian. 2018. A cross-cultural meta-analysis of how leader emotional intelligence influences subordinate task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of World Business* 53: 463–74.

121. Park, Yoonhee, Doo Hun Lim, Woocheol Kim, and Hana Kang. 2020. Organizational support and adaptive performance: The revolving structural relationships between job crafting, work engagement, and adaptive performance. *Sustainability* 12: 4872.
122. Lee, Seung Yeop, and Sang Woo Lee. 2020. Social media use and job performance in the workplace: The effects of Facebook and KakaoTalk use on job performance in South Korea. *Sustainability* 12: 4052.
123. Janssen, Onne, and Nico W. Van Yperen. 2004. PDF Hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal* 47: 368–84.
124. Alghamdi, Faris. 2018. Ambidextrous Leadership, Ambidextrous Employee, and the Interaction between Ambidextrous Leadership and Employee Innovative Performance. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship* 7: 1.
125. Davidescu, Adriana Ana Maria, Simona Andreea Apostu, Andreea Paul, and Ionut Casuneanu. 2020. Work Flexibility, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance among Romanian Employees- Implications for Sustainable Human Resource Management. *Sustainability* 12: 6086.
126. Kosec, Zinka, Stella Sekulic, Susan Wilson-Gahan, Katja Rostohar, Matej Tusak, and Marta Bon. 2022. Correlation between Employee Performance, Well-Being, Job Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction in Sedentary Jobs in Slovenian Enterprises. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 10427.

---

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/109386>