Corporate social responsibility of small- to medium-size enterprises as a solution to out-migration: an example from the hospitality sector

Petra Jarkovská ¹✉ — Martina Jarkovská ²

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czechia

²Department of Languages, Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Prague - Suchbát, Czechia

✉ pjarkovska@hotmail.com

Abstract

Local and regional authorities are often held responsible for implementing social and economic “population drain reduction” policies but at the same time are constrained with little fiscal power and inability to access resources. Being considered the “backbone” of local economies, it is on small- to medium-size enterprises (SMSEs) to come up with an “out-migration” solution which would be effective; yet at the same time sustainable, and adding social value to the local or regional development. Therefore, using a sample of 24 SMSEs from the hospitality industry environment, this paper empirically examines corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a prerequisite for employees’ affirmative work attitudes, such as job satisfaction (JS), effective organizational commitment (OC), and employees’ voluntary retention (R). Inspired by Carroll’s (2015, 2016) four-dimensional concept of CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension), the findings suggest a significant causal relationship between CSR and the examined employees’ desirable behavior outcomes. However, it is mainly the ethical and legal dimension of CSR that influence all three employees’ affirmative work attitudes - JS, effective OC, and voluntary R. The contribution of this paper also lies in amounting to the body of scholarly literature on CSR in respect to employees. Most works focus on other stakeholders but employees, or are set in different cultural settings or geographical regions, mainly in Asia, and thus their findings might be difficult to implement in the Central European context.

Keywords

Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Retention, Hospitality Sector, Small- to Medium- Size Enterprise, Sustainability

Received:

20 October 2020

Received in revised form:

18 March 2021

Accepted:

06 April 2021

Highlights for public administration, management and planning:

- CSR as a prerequisite for sustainable management of employees’ retention in small- to medium- size enterprises.
- CSR may act as an approach to reduce “out-migration” faced in local and regional development.
- SMSEs adding a social value to local and regional development.

1 Introduction

The tourism industry is one of the major contributors to natural (e.g. biodiversity and ecosystem) and cultural (tangible and intangible) heritage preservation. It influences nearly every part of our society and thus should be working on the premises of sustainability and green growth. Its subsector, hospitality (provider of accommodation and cater-

ing services), is one of the most significant socio-economic drivers of the whole industry (e.g. with the highest revenue rate). Yet, at the same time, it is one of those where energy and waste are most intense (UNWTO 2020). This could be reasoned by using obsolete technologies, lack of financial or human capital resources, or limited awareness of greener activities. Let alone the fact that the backbone of local or regional economies, small- to medium-size enterprises (SMEs) are usually less proactive

about the environment in contrast to larger hospitality sector businesses. According to [UNWTO \(2020\)](#), SMEs can be more competitive in the product and labour market by minimising their environmental footprint. Hence, to foster socio-economic sustainability and green growth, and thereupon mitigate “green” socio-economic impact on a local or regional level (e.g. cutting energy and waste, cooperating with local farmers and producers, improving the employability and lively hood of women, young or ageing employees), SMEs need to foster business-centred sustainability approach ([ILO 2020](#); [UNWTO, 2020](#)), which would call for managers’ and staff awareness, knowledge, affection, and commitment. Unfortunately, the hospitality sector has been continuously struggling with high employee turnover and a significant “within and out of sector” mobility, regardless of the phase of the business cycle, time, or geographical region, which could be the reason for falling short in advancing sustainable solutions ([Kim et al. 2016](#); [Yao et al. 2019](#); [ČSÚ 2020](#); [UNWTO 2020](#)).

Thereupon, increasing employees’ affirmative work attitudes such as job satisfaction (JS), organisational commitment (OC) and reducing employees’ turn over intentions (TI) by using tangible and intangible aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR) seem like a potential solution for the improvement of employees’ work performance and the maintenance of a desirable level of employees’ retention which are both the ultimate prerequisites for organisations’ sustainability and green growth.

1.1 CSR and Employees

CSR could be interpreted as all decisions of an organisation that go beyond its economic and technical interests ([Carroll 2015](#)). The most used and cited concept of CSR (e.g. [Bauman & Skitka 2012](#); [Farooq et al. 2014](#); [Kim et al. 2016](#); [Kim et al. 2017](#); [Zhang et al. 2019](#)) is the model defined for the first time in 1979 by [Carroll \(1991, 2015, 2016\)](#). [Carroll \(1991, 2015, 2016\)](#) proposed a four-level CSR model that includes the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary (later referred to as philanthropic) level (dimension) of social responsibility. CSR’s fundamental level is economic responsibility, which is based on the very nature of the organisation’s existence. In its absence, all the other dimensions of social responsibility become irrelevant. The legal level reflects the societies’ “legalised” ethical rules. By the ethical responsibility, society continually increases demands on the organisation’s behaviour beyond the law’s limits and, at the same time, “pushes” their expansion. The distinguishing feature between ethical and philanthropic responsi-

bility is that society does not expect ethical or moral significance from philanthropic activities. Society wants organisations to contribute their monetary or other resources to humanitarian purposes or projects. According to CSR theory, an organisation must satisfy the needs and desires of different groups of people (stakeholders) who would otherwise stop supporting or could not support the organisation. The stakeholders’ list may vary for each organisation (e.g. customers, suppliers, community, or owners), but it is widely accepted that employees belong among the organisation’s key stakeholders. Well-managed CSR towards employees supports social cohesion, inclusive economic growth, and environmental sustainability ([UNWTO 2020](#)). Hence, the HRM needs to operate under the premise of supporting both the organisation’s sustainable development and the long-term sustainability of HRM practices ([Macke & Genari 2019](#)).

1.2 CSR and Employees’ Job Satisfaction

Defining employee’s JS as “meeting employee’s different needs and desires through resources, activities, and outcomes from participation in the work process”, as supported by motivational theories ([Maslow 1943](#); [Deci & Ryan 1985, 2000, 2008](#)), the CSR activities provide “tangible” and “intangible” care to employees (e.g. fair pay, diversity, family support, fair compensation, and employment security), create desirable working conditions, “fulfil” employees’ desire for their social and aesthetic needs together with the need for respect and self-realisation, and hence increase the number of employees with a high JS rate ([Bohdanowicz & Zientara 2009](#); [Jakubczak & Gotowska 2015](#); [Kim et al. 2016, 2017](#)). Even if CSR activities are not directly focused on employees, they influence employee satisfaction. In particular, the ethical and philanthropic activities of CSR have the potential to meet higher-level employee needs. 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](#)), which is in line with the motivational theories (e.g. [Maslow 1943](#); [Deci & Ryan 1985, 2000, 2008](#)).

1.3 CSR and Employees’ Organisational Commitment

Scholarly literature recognises many forms of employees’ “attachment” to an organisation (e.g. habitual - based on habit and routine, normative - based on obligation, or continuance commitment -

based on employees' assessing "gains and losses" if leaving the organisation) (e.g. [Kuvaas et al. 2018](#); [Yao et al. 2019](#)). According to [Mercurio \(2015\)](#), the most effective, and therefore the most enduring is the "affective bond". Emotionally committed individuals believe in and accept organisational goals and values as theirs and are willing to provide considerable effort on their behalf and remain in their organisations ([Mercurio 2015](#); [John et al. 2019](#)). As claimed by the Self Categorisation Theory (SCT), employees seek to integrate and become workers of such organisations that share compatible values enabling them to satisfy their psychological desires and meaningfully fulfil their existence ([John et al. 2019](#)). Seemingly, according to Social Identity Theory (SIT), employees associate their own identity with the social identity of the organisation they work for ([Maignan & Ferrell 2001](#); [Kim et al. 2017](#)). Employees working in socially responsible organisations are more likely to be happy and proud to be members of a "reputable" organisation. They identify with and feel committed to the organisation's goals ([Fu et al. 2014](#)).

1.4 CSR and Employees' Turnover Intentions

Employees' TI might be defined as employees' intentional plan to leave their current employing organisation voluntarily. Therefore, if hospitality managers want to diminish employees' TI, its "determinants" must be identified. Employees estimation, whether to leave or stay, might be based on organisations' socially responsible behaviour towards employees and other stakeholders (e.g. job security, remuneration system based on performance, competitive wages in the industry, antidiscrimination policies, overconsumption and waste reduction, local farmers support, engaging new technologies and systems) or employees' affirmative work attitudes such as JS and OC. Thus, based on the above-described underlying theories (motivational theories, SIT and SCT) and empirical research findings ([Kim et al. 2016](#); [Cycyota et al. 2016](#); [Kim et al. 2017](#); [Youn, Lee and Lee 2018](#)), we can deduce that CSR influences employees' voluntary retention directly and indirectly.

1.5 Objective of the research

Thus, inspired by Carroll's four-dimensional CSR concept ([Carroll 1991, 2015, 2016](#)), this paper aims to identify those CSR dimensions (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic) which can significantly reinforce hospitality industry employees' JS, affective OC, and TI; as using the right CSR activi-

ties might be the way how to retain zealous, skillful, and devoted employees who seek excellence and represent a competitive yet sustainable advantage.

Hence the authors of his paper propose the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1 (H1): Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct positive influence on their JS.
- Hypothesis 2 (H2): Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct positive influence on their affective OC.
- Hypothesis 3 (H3): Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct negative influence on their TI.

2 Methods

2.1 Data collection

As the paper aims to analyse the causal relationship between CSR perceived by the hospitality industry employees and their work attitudes (JS, OC, and TI), small- and medium-size hotels (ranked by 4*) situated in Prague, Czech Republic (one of the leading tourists' destinations) ([Tripadvisor, 2020](#)), were considered as the most suitable since these accommodation providers need to meet high-quality service standard requirements and challenge the financial and market disadvantages deriving from their size (e.g. access to external finances, competition with chain or large scale units), and hence as such might benefit from the socially responsible approach the most. Moreover, four-star hotels have been continually ranked as accommodation providers with the highest occupancy rate ([ČSÚ 2020](#)). Thus, the final list of 24 enterprises was retrieved from the accommodation search engine ([Trivago 2019](#)).

The data collection process was carried out between August 2019 and December 2019 by this paper's authors. 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 enterprise's management or owners. The approximate time for questionnaire completion was 20 minutes. Hence, the final sample consists of 411 respondents (N = 411), which was considered sat-

isfactory (Robinson et al. 2014, Hanaysha & Tahir 2016; Kim et al. 2017).

2.2 Method of Analysis

To analyse the relationship between perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees and their work attitudes such as JS, OC, and TI, the four-dimension/factor (altogether 31 items) concept of CSR by Carroll (2015, 2016), JS concept (altogether 11 items) based on Bauman and Skitka (2012), effective OC concept (altogether 5 items), and TI concept (6 items) were used. All concepts/constructs were adjusted for this research. They included altogether 53 items converted into questions/statements like e.g. "The organisation, which I work for, has a remuneration system based on performance" (CSR, economic dimension), "Employer-employee contractual obligations are always honoured by the organisation which I work for" (CSR, legal dimension), "The organisation, which I work for, responds to every employee complaint" (CSR, ethical dimension), and "The organisation, which I work for, contributes to the well-being of the local community (society) by cooperating with governmental and/or non-governmental organisations" (CSR, philanthropic dimension). For the JS construct, to respect the hierarchy of employees' needs and work-life balance, items (questions) on economic and security needs, health and safety needs, development needs, social needs and sense of belonging, and the need for meaningful existence were employed, e.g. "I am satisfied with my immediate supervisor", "I am satisfied with my promotion opportunities" or "I feel my job allows me to realise my full potential as a person". The construct on OC contained questions such as "I accept the organisation's future fate as mine" or "I consider the organisation, which I work for, as a workplace for my whole working life". The last construct involved questions on TI, e.g. "I am actively looking for a new job opportunity", "If I were given a job opportunity in another organisation, I would consider the change" or "I would like to leave this organisation and work for another organisation in the same industry". Respondents were asked to answer these questions/statements by choosing an adequate level of agreement on the 7-point Likert scale, ranging from strong disagreement (1 point) to strong agreement (point 7). Apart from questions on CSR, JS, OC, and TI, respondents were asked to answer 9 questions on demographics, using the best fitting option from the given alternatives.

For the analysis, the IBM SPSS Statistics program was used. First, descriptive statistics were em-

ployed to investigate the demographic characteristic of the respondents. Second, factor analysis was applied for 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 hospitality industry employees are presented in Table 1.

3.2 Variability and Reliability Test

The factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis) investigated the variability of 7 factors (composite variables), i.e. the economic dimension of CSR (independent composite variable, 12 items), the legal dimension of CSR (independent composite variable, 4 items), the ethical dimension of CSR (independent composite variable, 11 items), the philanthropic dimension of CSR (independent composite variable, 4 items), JS (dependent composite variable, 11 items), OC (dependent composite variable, 5 items) and TI (dependent composite variable, 6 items). 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 CSR's economic dimension 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 CSR's ethical dimension after excluding 4 items equalled 0.902 (7 items). Cronbach's alpha for CSR's philanthropic dimension after excluding 2 items equalled 0.891 (2 items). Cronbach's alpha for JS after excluding 3 items equalled 0.886 (8 items), while Cronbach's alpha for OC after 2 items' reduction equalled 0.936 (3 items). Lastly, Cronbach's alpha for the 6-item factor TI was 0.903 (with no need for item reduction). In social scientific research, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.600 and higher are admitted as satisfactory (Kim et al. 2015). Therefore all the Cronbach's alpha coef-

ficients are well above the minimum requirement and are thus satisfactory.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of hospitality industry employees

of Employees		Share (N) ^a	Share (%) ^b
Gender	Male	197	47.9
	Female	214	52.1
Age	Less than and 25	143	34.8
	25 - 35	112	27.3
	35 - 45	80	19.5
	45 - 55	43	10.5
	55 and above	33	8
Nationality	Czech	210	51.1
	Slovak	121	29.4
	Other ^c	80	19.5
Marital status	Single/without a 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	30	7.3
	Secondary	147	35.8
	DIS degree	82	20
	Bachelor	99	24.1
	Master	53	12.9
Working status	Full-time	303	73.7
	Part-time	108	26.3
Working position	Managerial position	37	9
	Shift managers	61	14.8
	Staff	313	76.2
Working field	Human Resources	21	5.1
	Economic unit	14	3.4
	Marketing	22	5.4
	Food and Beverages	64	15.6
	Restaurant and Bar	67	16.3
	Store	15	3.6
	Customer Service and Reservations	118	28.7
	Housekeeping	15	3.6
	Laundry	16	3.9
	IT	25	6.1
	Maintenance	15	3.6
	Security	10	2.4
	Entertainment and Wellness	9	2.2
Total		411	100

^a Number out of (N=411); ^b % out of 100 %; ^c Former Soviet Union Republics

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 (Table 2). The perceived economic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their job satisfaction with $\beta = .193$ ($p < .001$). The perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .148$ ($p < .001$). The perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .625$ ($p < .001$). The perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has an insignificantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .037$ ($p < .211$) (Table 2, Table 3).

Thus, H1 "Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct positive influence on their JS" has been partially confirmed ($p < .001$). The effect of perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees on their OC:

The effect of the independent variables (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension of the CSR) upon the dependent variable (OC) has R^2 of .392 with F of 65.476 ($p < .001$) to be significant (Table 4). The perceived economic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has an insignificantly negative influence on their OC with $\beta = -0.025$ ($p < .691$). The perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their OC with $\beta = .220$ ($p < .001$). The perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .356$ ($p < .001$). The perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly positive influence on their JS with $\beta = .238$ ($p < .001$) (Table 4, Table 5).

Thus, H2 "Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct positive influence on their OC" has been partially confirmed ($p < .001$). The effect of perceived CSR by hospitality industry employees on their TI:

The effect of the independent variables (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension of the CSR) upon the dependent variable (TI) has R^2 of .258 with F of 35.392 ($p < .001$) to be significant (Table 6).

Table 2 Regression analysis for CSR and JS

Regression analysis for dependent variable: JS R= .87196563 R ² = .76032406 Adjusted R ² = .75796272 F (4.406) = 321.99 p < .00000 Standard error of estimate: 4.0888						
N=411	β	Standard error of β	b	Standard error of b	t (406)	p-value
Constant			-3.87302	1.475832	-2.6243	0.00901
Economic	0.193279	0.039602	0.2874	0.058886	4.8806	0.000002
Legal	0.14885	0.035637	0.38609	0.092436	4.17682	0.000036
Ethical	0.625687	0.030662	0.67224	0.032943	20.40593	0
Philanthropic	0.037378	0.029898	0.1546	0.123665	1.25016	0.211961

Table 3 Partial correlation coefficients: CSR and JS

Regression analysis for dependent variable: JS Independent variables: Economic, Legal, Ethical, Philanthropic dimension						
N=411	β	Partial correlation	Semi part. correlation	Tolerance	t (406)	R ²
Economic	0.193279	0.235413	0.118583	0.37642	4.8806	0.62358
Economic	0.193279	0.235413	0.118583	0.37642	4.8806	0.62358
Legal	0.14885	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

Table 4 Regression analysis for CSR and OC

Regression analysis for dependent variable: OC R= .62620271 R ² = .39212983 Adjusted R ² = .38614097 F (4.406) = 65.476 p < .00000 Standard error of estimate: 2.9852						
N=411	β	Standard error of β	b	Standard error of b	t (406)	p-value
Constant			-1.78694	1.077498	-1.65842	0.098005
Economic	-0.02511	0.063068	-0.01711	0.042992	-0.3981	0.690768
Legal	0.220332	0.056754	0.262	0.067487	3.88222	0.000121
Ethical	0.356546	0.048831	0.17562	0.024052	7.30166	0
Philanthropic	0.238528	0.047615	0.4523	0.090287	5.00955	0.000001

Table 5 Partial correlation coefficients: CSR and OC

Regression analysis for dependent variable: OC Independent variables: Economic, Legal, Ethical, Philanthropic dimension						
N=411	β	Partial Correlation	Semi part. Correlation	Tolerance	t (406)	R ²
Economic	-0.02511	-0.01975	-0.0154	0.37642	-0.3981	0.62358
Legal	0.220332	0.189192	0.150218	0.464826	3.882224	0.535174
Ethical	0.356546	0.340696	0.282529	0.627908	7.301656	0.372092
Philanthropic	0.238528	0.241275	0.193839	0.660392	5.009547	0.339608

Table 6 Regression analysis for CSR and TI

Regression analysis for dependent variable: TI R= .50847015 R ² = .25854189 Adjusted R ² = .25123689 F (4.406) = 35.392 p< .00000 Standard error of estimate: 6.8627						
N=411	β	Standard error of β	b	Standard error of b	t (406)	p-value
Constant			44.25068	2.47706	17.86419	0
Economic	0.064708	0.069654	0.09182	0.098834	0.929	0.353442
Legal	-0.28746	0.062681	-0.71152	0.155145	-4.58615	0.000006
Ethical	-0.22494	0.05393	-0.23062	0.055293	-4.17085	0.000037
Philanthropic	-0.18685	0.052587	-0.73748	0.207561	-3.55309	0.000425

Table 7 Regression analysis for CSR and TI

Regression analysis for dependent variable: TI Independent variables: Economic, Legal, Ethical, Philanthropic dimension						
N=411	β	Partial Correlation	Semi part. Correlation	Tolerance	t (406)	R ²
Economic	0.064708	0.046057	0.0397	0.37642	0.929	0.62358
Legal	-0.28746	-0.22193	-0.19599	0.464826	-4.58615	0.535174
Ethical	-0.22494	-0.2027	-0.17824	0.627908	-4.17085	0.372092
Philanthropic	-0.18685	-0.17366	-0.15184	0.660392	-3.55309	0.339608

CSR's perceived economic dimension by hospitality industry employees has an insignificantly positive influence on their TI with $\beta = 0.064$ ($p < .353$). The perceived legal dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly negative influence on their TI with $\beta = -0.287$ ($p < .001$). The perceived ethical dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly negative influence on their TI with $\beta = -0.224$ ($p < .001$). The perceived philanthropic dimension of CSR by hospitality industry employees has a significantly negative influence on their TI with $\beta = -0.186$ ($p < .001$) (Table 6, Table 7). Thus, H3 "Perceived CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) by hospitality industry employees has a direct negative influence on their TI" has been partially confirmed ($p < .001$).

4 Discussion

The above-outlined findings indicate a significant positive association of CSR with employees' affirmative attitudes such as JS or affective OC and a negative significant relationship between CSR and TI. However, not all four dimensions of CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic) play the same role

in providing the desirable employees' behaviour outcome:

CSR (ethical, economic, legal) $\rightarrow$ JS (76% influence; $R^2 = .7603$, Adjusted $R^2 = .7579$, $p < .001$, Table 1), CSR (ethical, philanthropic, legal) $\rightarrow$ OC (39% influence; $R^2 = .3921$, Adjusted $R^2 = .3861$, $p < .001$, Table 3),

CSR (legal, ethical, philanthropic) $\rightarrow$ TI (26% influence; $R^2 = .2585$, Adjusted $R^2 = .2512$, $p < .001$, Table 5).

According to the results, the ethical dimension affects all three examined employees' work attitudes (see Tables 2, 4, 6). Moreover, in case of JS, it explains 71% of influence ($\beta = .625$, partial correlation coefficient = .711, $p < .001$, Table 2). This result follows the current research findings on CSR and employees (e.g. Kim et al. 2017; John et al. 2019). In general, employees like to be treated with fairness and dignity, having the opportunity to express themselves freely and take part in open discussions. Thus, employers ought to be fostering equal opportunities in the workplace, closing the gender pay gap, having transparent promotion and remuneration policies, or implementing two-way symmetrical communication into daily practice. Likewise, the findings of this paper claim that the legal dimension, which could be understood as the minimum of moral or ethical adherence expected by the society (Carroll 1991, 2015), has a significant influ-

ence on employees' JS ($\beta = .148$, partial correlation coefficient = .202, $p < .001$, Table 2), effective OC ($\beta = .220$, partial correlation coefficient = .189, $p < .001$, Table 4), and their TI ($\beta = -0.287$, partial correlation coefficient = -0.221, $p < .001$, Table 6). These findings resonate with the results of Duthler and Dhanesh (2018), who claim that it is primarily the ethical and legal dimensions of CSR which have an impact on employees' OC and loyalty. According to SIT and SCT, employees like to relate to trustworthy, lawful, and reputable organisations (Graves et al. 2019; John et al. 2019). Similarly, if the organisation treats its employees with dignity and appreciation, they like to reciprocate likewise (Peterson 2004). Hence, employers pursuing their goals with reverence for honesty have the potency to diminish the staff drain from the industry and the region alike.

Surprisingly, the philanthropic dimension has an insignificant positive influence on JS ($\beta = .037$, partial correlation coefficient = .061, $p < .212$, Table 2), which is a finding contradicting the results of other service sector management scholars (e.g. Cycyota et al. 2016; Graves et al. 2019). This could be probably explained by most respondents ($N = 255/411$) representing the first two age categories and thus having the urge to satisfy their economy and security needs before "contributing" to improving the environment or helping the community. In total, 177 employees ($N = 177/411$) represent respondents with primary and secondary education and might be driven by "extrinsic" rather than "intrinsic" motivation factors. Hence, although contrary to other research findings, the presented results on the philanthropic CSR dimension are in line with motivational theories (e.g. Maslow 1943; Deci & Ryan 1985, 2000, 2008). Seemingly, it could be reasoned by employee's little or no awareness of philanthropic activities as the philanthropic dimension's mean score (4.65) and median score (4.50) represent an "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 organisation (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 %). Thus, to enhance the employees' JS, selection, design, and communication of CSR discretionary initiatives should be considered. For instance, according to Cleveland et al. (2015), practices as volunteering in the community positively reflect on the organisation and fulfil employees' psychological desire for a meaningful existence and provide

a strong foundation for a well-functioning community. The philanthropic dimension of CSR has a significant influence on the two other remaining employees' work attitudes - positive, in case of affective OC ($\beta = .238$, partial correlation coefficient = .241, $p < .001$, Table 4) and negative, in case of employees' TI ($\beta = -0.186$, partial correlation coefficient = -0.173, $p < .001$, Table 6). Thus, this paper proposes to organisations the intentional engagement of meaningful and substantive CSR activities. In contrast, employees' viewing the CSR activities as symbolic, superficial, or insincere (e.g. greenwashing, social washing) leads to no positive or negative individual behaviour outcomes (e.g. low level of OC, high level of TI, shirking behaviour or employee cynicism) (Donia & Tetrault Sirsly 2016). In addition, the results of this paper indicate that the economic dimension of CSR (e.g. tangible benefits, competitive wages or organization's long-term strategy) plays no significant role in employees' emotional bond to organization ($\beta = -0.025$, partial correlation coefficient = -0.019, $p < .691$, Table 4) or in their intentions to resign ($\beta = 0.064$, partial correlation coefficient = 0.046, $p < .353$, Table 6). These findings follow the results of the qualitative examination of employee TI carried out by Yang et al. (2012). Inversely, e.g. remuneration, promotion opportunities, or access to skill development (economic dimension of CSR) fuel the employees' need, e.g. financial and job security or career development, and therefore lead to increasing employees' JS ($\beta = .193$, partial correlation coefficient = .235, $p < .001$, Table 2). Similar results are confirmed by most scholars (e.g. Kim et al. 2016; Kim et al. 2017).

5 Conclusions

The purpose of this paper was to investigate the associations between CSR (economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic dimension) and employees' work attitudes such as JS, OC, and TI. 76% of JS could be explained by CSR (ethical, economic, and legal dimension), and thus using the right mix of CSR activities or practices might function as a strong motivation driver. Consistent with motivational theories, SIT, and SCT, the findings also suggest that it is mainly the ethical and legal dimensions of CSR that play a pivotal role in stimulating employees' desirable behaviour outcomes. However, it is primarily these two dimensions that are frequently omitted by organisations (Carroll 1991, 2016).

The authors of the paper believe that the practitioners may benefit from the acquired research findings and create a thriving, functional, yet sustainable hospitality industry work environment, especially in those locations with similar tourism infrastructure (e.g. Central European landlocked cities, capitals, or locations hosting regional, national or international bodies). By advocating CSR practices or activities that protect and promote the well-being of employees, organisations not only increase their efficiency but also indirectly support and contribute to the welfare of the community within which they operate; as deprived employees, reluctant to remain in their employing organisation, are dependent on the community and its resources (e.g. social support, financial aid or mental and physical health care) (Cleveland et al. 2015).

Hence, in line with these research findings and the above discussed scholarly literature, we propose the following CSR initiatives, both tangible and intangible, which take into consideration the micro, and macro-level environment changes and development:

Transparent remuneration and evaluation system based on performance; transparent promotion system; competitive wages in the industry; job security (e.g. effort to maintain full-time jobs and indefinite duration labour contracts, job maintenance); compliance with labour law and contractual obligations; open communication (e.g. two-way symmetrical communication, communication of strategy and operational plans); transparent allocation of resources and relevant competencies as well as responsibilities; well-developed recruitment and retention policy; philanthropic initiatives focus on different stakeholders (including employees); and employees' potential development (e.g. effort to foster employees' professional and career development).

References

- Bauman CW, Skitka LJ (2012) Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organisational Behavior* 32: 63–86.
- 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 Research* 9(2): 147–158.
- Carroll AB (1991) The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons* 34(4): 39–48.
- Carroll AB (2015) Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics* 44: 87–96.
- Carroll AB (2016) Carroll's pyramid of CSR: taking another look. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility* 1(3).
- Cleveland JN, Byrne ZS, Cavanagh TM (2015) The future of HR is RH: Respect for humanity at work. *Human Resource Management Review* 25: 146–161.
- Comrey AL, Lee HB (1992) *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cycyota CS, Ferrante CJ, Schroeder JM (2016) Corporate social responsibility and employee volunteerism: What do the best companies do? *Business Horizons* 59: 321–329.
- ČSÚ (2020) Český statistický úřad (Czech Statistical Office). Available at: <https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/cestovni_ruch>
- Deci EL, Ryan RM (1985) *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. Plenum, New York.
- Deci EL, Ryan RM (2000) The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry* 11: 227–268.
- Deci EL, Ryan RM (2008) Self-determination theory: macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology* 49(3): 182–185.
- Donia MBL, Tetrault Sirsly CA (2016) Determinants and consequences of employee attributions of corporate social responsibility as substantive or symbolic. *European Management Journal* 34: 232–242.
- Duthler G, Dhanesh GS (2018) The role of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and internal CSR communication in predicting employee engagement: Perspectives from the United Arab Emirates (UAE). *Public Relations Review* 44(4): 453–462.
- Farooq M, Farooq O, Jasimuddin SM (2014) Employee's response to corporate social responsibility: exploring the role of employees' collectivist orientation. *European Management Journal* 32: 916–927.
- Fu H, Li Y, Duan Y (2014) Does employee-perceived reputation contribute to citizenship behavior? The mediating role of organisational commitment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 26(4): 593–609.
- Graves L M, Sarkis J, Gold N (2019) Employee pro-environmental behavior in Russia: The roles of top management commitment, managerial leadership, and employee motives. *Resource, Conservation and Recycling* 140: 54–64.
- Hanaysha J, Tahir PR (2016) Examining the Effects of Employee Empowerment, Teamwork, and Employee Training on Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 219: 272–282.
- ILO (2020) International Labour Organization. Available at: <<https://www.ilo.org/global/lang-en/index.htm>>
- 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.
- Kim JJ, Eom TK, Kim SW, Youn, MK (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.
- Kim J, Song HJ, Lee ChK (2016) Effects of corporate social responsibility and internal marketing on organisational commitment and turnover intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 55: 25–32.

- Kim HL, 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.
- Kuvaas B, Buch R, Weibel A, Dysvik A, Nerstad CGL (2017) Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes? *Journal of Economic Psychology* 61: 244–258.
- Macke, J., Genari, D. (2019) Systematic literature review on sustainable human resources management. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 208: 806–815.
- Maignan I, Ferrell OC (2001) Corporate citizenship as a marketing instrument concepts, evidence and research directions. *European Journal of Marketing* 35(3/4): 457–484.
- Maslow AH (1943) A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review* 50: 370–396.
- Mercurio ZA (2015) Affective Commitment as a Core Essence of Organizational Commitment. An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review* 14(4): 389–414.
- Peterson DK (2004) The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organisational commitment. *Business Society* 43(3): 296–319.
- Robinson RNS, Kralj A, Solnet DJ, 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 BG, Fidell LS (2007) *Using multivariate statistics* (5th edition). Pearson Education Inc.
- Tripadvisor (2020) [Tripadvisor.cz](https://www.tripadvisor.cz). Available at: <https://www.tripadvisor.cz>
- Trivago (2019) [Trivago.cz](https://www.trivago.cz). Available at: <https://www.trivago.cz>
- UNWTO (2020) World Tourism Organization. A United Nations Specialized Agency. Available at: <http://www.unwto.org/new/un-secretary-general-it-is-imperative-that-we-rebuild-the-tourism-sector>
- Yang JT, Wan CS, Fu YJ (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 organisational commitment on attitudinal and behavioral loyalty of employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 76: 1–8.
- Youn H, Lee K, Lee S (2018) Effects of corporate social responsibility on employees in the casino industry. *Tourism Management* 68: 328–335.
- Zhang Q, Oo B L, Lim BTH (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.