



Community-based corporate social responsibility activities and employee job satisfaction in the U.S. hotel industry: An explanatory study

Joseph K. Appiah (Ph.D)

InterContinental Hotel Groups (IHG), Holiday Inn Express Clearwater, 2545 N.E Coachman Road, apt 114, Clearwater, FL 33765, USA



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Corporate social responsibility (CSR)
Employee job satisfaction
Investment in the future (IF)
Involvement in the community (IC)
Protection of the natural environment (PNE)

ABSTRACT

As the hotel industry continues to expand, the leadership of those organizations has concentrated attention on ways to incorporate corporate social responsibility activities into their business operations. However, the notion of how such corporate social responsibility strategies might enhance the level of employee job satisfaction has received limited attention in research. The research problem focused on exploring and discovering information on corporate social responsibility activities and how those undertakings might predict employees' level of job satisfaction. The results indicated a statistically significant positive, predictive relationship between the corporate social responsibility of involvement in the community and employees' level of job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. Further testing through moderation analyses did not provide any evidence for a moderating effect of age or gender, indicating that higher involvement in the community predicted higher employees' job satisfaction regardless of the employee's gender or age. Based on the results, leaders within the hotel industry may benefit from the implementation of a cooperative relationship with their stakeholders when promoting corporate social responsibility activities and employee job satisfaction within a hotel organization.

1. Introduction

For the past two decades, organizational leaders in the hotel industry have recognized the importance of corporate social responsibility (CSR; Holcomb, Upchurch, & Okumus, 2007). Demand from consumers, employees, the legal system, and society continues to increase for comprehensive assessments to indicate that organizations are engaging in CSR initiatives and activities (Kang, Lee, & Huh, 2010). Bowen (1953) identified the concept of CSR and proposed that CSR was a societal obligation and that leaders should adhere to CSR to ensure the organization's survival and to support the external environment. The concept of CSR involves an organization's efforts to enhance the quality of life of its employees and their families, improve business-community relations, address diversity issues and environmental issues (e.g., producing environmentally-friendly products, reducing waste, recycling), and improve product quality (Levy & Park, 2011).

Over the past 15 years, researchers have suggested further investigation regarding organizational leaders in the hotel industry and have called for statistical examination of business performance as a method to explore the influence of unique aspects of CSR (De Grosbois, 2012). In the hotel industry, major hotel organizational leaders (Holcomb et al., 2007), as well as small and independent hotels (Njite, Hancer, & Slevitch, 2011), use CSR activities to drive performance.

Wong and Chan (2010) asserted that caring, concern, and fair and trustworthy actions were among the most influential factors included in CSR activities. Murray and Ayoun (2011) supported that argument and echoed that organizations should become familiar with the impact of CSR activities from the perspective of the employees; this focus is based on the concept that CSR approaches are human resource strategies intended to foster employees' attitudes and commitment to work.

Lee and Park (2009), Peterson (2004), and Wang and Hsieh (2012) found that employees' attitudes toward CSR activities within an organization were influential to organizational performance, particularly when such CSR activities focused on enhancing employees' quality of life and business-community relations (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007). Researchers continued to concentrate on the impact of CSR on employee job satisfaction, commitment, and morale (Aminudin, 2013; Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Bhattacharya, Sen, & Korschun, 2008; Lee, Park, & Lee, 2013). In the same context, employee satisfaction exhibits correlations with all aspects of any organization (Saari & Judge, 2004). As such, leaders should not ignore the importance of employee job satisfaction in an organization. Shabnam and Sarker (2012) proposed that the precise nature of employees' perceived satisfaction depended on the nature of the work, promotion, pay, coworkers, and organizational culture. Consequently, employees showed greater job satisfaction as those needs were satisfied.

E-mail address: shankus20@yahoo.co.uk.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.01.002>

Received 18 December 2017; Received in revised form 14 November 2018; Accepted 10 January 2019

1447-6770/© 2019 CAUTHE - COUNCIL FOR AUSTRALASIAN TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY EDUCATION. Published by Elsevier Ltd All rights reserved.

Employee satisfaction in the hotel industry has also been linked to guest satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002), which is of great importance because guest satisfaction can lead to increased business for the hotel industry. Various researchers investigated CSR initiatives in the hospitality industry (Lee & Heo, 2009; Lee & Park, 2009), but they focused on the relationship between various stakeholder groups, such as investors (Graves & Waddock, 1994) and consumers (Kang et al., 2010; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Other studies concentrated on employee job satisfaction (Wetprasit, 2006; Yang, 2009; Zeffane, Ibrahim, & Mehairi, 2008), but have been limited in terms of findings regarding the hospitality industry on employee job satisfaction (Tian & Pu, 2008). This limitation is particularly true for hotels in the United States.

Raub and Blunschi (2014) acknowledged the existence of a positive relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction in the hotel industry in the United Kingdom. The researchers collected data from two sister hotel chains in the United Kingdom, indicating that geographical factors might be an influence and thus limit generalization of the research results. Despite the depth of research on CSR activities and their relationship to employee satisfaction, no empirical studies have used the CSR Development Survey Scale created by Turker (2009b) and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) created by Spector (1985). Therefore, the investigation of the relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction in the U.S. hotel industry warranted investigation with focus on these specific methods of measurement. The intent of this study was to demonstrate a relationship between CSR activities, such as involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future, and employee job satisfaction. By understanding whether any of the CSR activities available on this scale (i.e., involvement with the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future) predict job satisfaction, stakeholders can understand where to focus efforts when driving employee satisfaction. Stakeholders may use this information to drive job satisfaction to influence a positive response in customer satisfaction.

1.1. Corporate social responsibility (CSR)

The more recent definition of CSR incorporated community involvement and caring for employees and customers (Gupta & Sharma, 2009) and the external environment. Recently, organizational leaders have been more focused on all stakeholders, including employees, as the assumption exists that the types of CSR initiatives chosen could benefit employees and their families (Ali, Rehman, Ali, Yousaf, & Zia, 2010). Organizational leaders continue to exemplify the revised concept of CSR in the external environment. Evidence of such changes included the actions of local and international brands such as Charlie's Produce, Seattle Bank, Microsoft, and Starbucks ("One Reel," 2010).

Community-based CSR activities allow organizations to build an image and appeal to the public because people try to comprehend and perceive the actions of others (including individuals or groups) based on the traits they display and observable behavior (Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965). The charitable donations made by organizations and entrepreneurs allow the public to draw definite conclusions about the inherent moral values and beliefs of the leaders of those organizations (Rokeach, 1979). The public perceives and judges organizations based on their apparent social traits, motives, and intentions, and from those perceptions, the public forms opinions about the organizations' ability to contribute to communities (Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007; Lichtenstein, Drumwright, & Braig, 2004; Maignan & Ferrell, 2004; Sen, Bhattacharya, & Korschun, 2006). Hence, community-based CSR helps influence public opinion in favor of such organizations, which in turn sway the public's willingness to associate with such organizations by way of employment (Haidt, Rosenberg, & Hom, 2003; Leach et al., 2007).

In the current study, CSR is defined specifically by three specific subscales from Turker (2009b) CSR Development Survey Scale. These

included involvement with the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future. The CSR Development Survey Scale consists of 18 items with responses based on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 corresponds with *Strongly Disagree*, and 5 corresponds with *Strongly Agree*. Though the original scale asks participants to respond to statements such as *our company participates in activities which aim to protect and improve the natural environment, or our company cooperates with other private and public entities in social responsibility projects*, Turker granted permission to modify the survey questions to read "my company" rather than "our company," to imply the various corporate-branded hotels in the U.S., which was relevant to this study.

1.2. Current perspectives on corporate social responsibility

Business leaders continue to display creativity with CSR activities and initiatives. Such CSR initiatives include (a) Tide's (2005) Loads of Hope campaign, launched in the wake of Hurricane Katrina to help families from New Orleans devastated by the impact of the hurricane; (b) Cisco's (2013) Global Hunger Relief Campaign; and (c) the viral social media campaigns Giving Tuesday (2012) and the ALS (Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis) Ice Bucket Challenge. The increasing popularity of CSR campaigns along with their rising presence on social media led to the emergence of a new CSR industry that focused on collaborating and merging social causes with corporations. The recognition helped organizational leaders' direct attention to their brands and products by creating an active and socially responsible image and affording the businesses greater credibility, visibility, and profits. Organizational leaders are aware of the importance of CSR to business success and the need for and significance of donating and contributing to charitable organizations as a part of their organizational CSR activities (Peloza & Shang, 2011).

The current community-based CSR trend indicates that organizations with robust and positive images and those that have the reputation of promoting social causes may be more attractive to potential employees than those without (Blackhaus, Stone, & Heiner, 2002; Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007; Garglulo, 2012; Grant, 2008). Business leaders have recognized that companies with a record of contributing to key social causes are those that have a favorable reputation among employees, customers, and consumers. Today, more companies have become proactive and have changed their CSR practices by participating in social and environmental activities in times of crisis (Pohl & Tolhurst, 2011).

However, it has been noted that CSR is correlated with negative corporate behaviors in addition to positive ones. Ormiston and Wong (2013) found that organizations with high CSR are more likely to engage in corporate social irresponsibility, especially in cases where organizations promote their own CSR behaviors. Ormiston and Wong further stipulated that CSR does not cause corporate irresponsibility; rather, organizations with high CSR should be closely monitored to ensure no irresponsible practices are occurring.

1.3. CSR and community participation

CSR practices have included community participation by organizations utilizing social media (Kucukusta, Mark, & Chan, 2013). Most recently, large businesses have been promoting CSR agendas and activities on social media with great success (Kucukusta et al., 2013), such as the campaign launched by Target's Bullseye Gives program. The program received much acclaim as one of the first crowd-sourced *do-good* contests whereby the company capitalized on the power of social media to generate over \$3 million in donations, mostly by its 900,000 followers on its Facebook page (Target Corporation, 2009). Employee involvement is essential to the success of any CSR initiative as employees expect a dynamic workplace environment with strong leadership and the company's ability to contribute to the community.

Environmental causes (e.g., waste reduction efforts, recycling, and the use of environmentally friendly products) rank high on corporate agendas because of the growing awareness of climate change and the significant negative impact of human activity on the natural environment (Levy & Park, 2011; Turker, 2009b). Environmental concerns started to gain momentum in the 18th century (Smith, 1993). Corporate initiatives aimed at protection of the environment helped the leadership of many organizations to realize their long-term goals. Turker (2009b) advised it would be crucial for organizations to divert their CSR strategies toward those involving environmental protection, mainly because various corporate activities tend to harm the natural environment, and such initiatives could help to prevent environmental degradation. Investment in the future by organizational leaders could be one of the most crucial CSR activities (Levy & Park, 2011; Turker, 2009b). Such activities ensure greater employee job satisfaction as they display the organization's ability to care for the welfare of the employees as well as future generations (Lee & Park, 2009; Turker, 2009b).

1.4. Future of corporate social responsibility

The present status and trends concerning CSR and its significance among companies implied that CSR could gain further momentum, with additional companies becoming involved and leaders' initiating various strategies with increased transparency to improved employee and community participation (Tamajón & Aulet, 2013; Turker, 2009b). Organizational leaders might incorporate CSR to minimize exploitation of resources and instead contribute to the sustainable development of the world. Despite years of existence of this concept, CSR is in a continuous state of evolution and continues to undergo transitions with each passing decade.

As organizational leaders continue to explore new markets because of globalization and the opportunity to exploit new markets to increase profitability, the need for CSR is likely to grow. In the future, the varied activities of businesses could increase the acceptance of CSR as a necessary tool for business participation. The future holds opportunities for the leadership of companies to adopt strategies that would enable organizations to be more transparent and gain the trust of employees and consumers. As more companies adopt various CSR strategies, organizational leaders will find it necessary to adopt CSR initiatives to stay competitive.

1.5. Critical aspects of corporate social responsibility

The three key aspects of CSR include community involvement, protection of the natural environment, and future considerations by way of investment. Organizational leadership should support the involvement of employees, consumers, and communities for development and growth. As businesses today are likely to be successful only if the activities are socially acceptable and environmentally sustainable, all stakeholders should be integral components of the primary organization activities. To realize stable growth and a strong competitive advantage in the marketplace, leaders of organizations must present a strong commitment to socioenvironmental causes and demonstrate a willingness to invest in the future growth and sustainable development of the community (Belief, Lines, & Tanzil, 2005; Epstein, 2008; Lowitt, 2013).

1.5.1. Community involvement

The notion of community involvement as one component of the CSR strategy originated in the early 1980s when companies encouraged employees to participate in various activities by volunteering time or making monetary donations (Burke, Logsdon, Mitchell, Reiner, & Vogel, 1986). Within the current study's scope, this aspect of CSR is defined by an organization's activities, such as campaigns and ventures, that promote the welfare of the community (Tamajón & Aulet, 2013; Turker, 2009b). The concept relates to corporations donating to local

charitable organizations and employees volunteering with community organizations (Turker, 2009b).

The fundamental objective of organizations regarding community involvement is to assist in resolving the issues faced by the community and support social issues (Boccalandro, 2009; Tamajón & Aulet, 2013; Turker, 2009b). Community involvement allowed communities to benefit, while the organizations realized improved brand image, credibility, and increased employee satisfaction (Peloza & Shang, 2011; Thompson & Prottas, 2006). To derive a numeric measure for this concept within the scope of the current study, the corresponding scale from Turker's (2009b) CSR Development Survey Scale was selected. This scale consists of responses to items 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, and 18, which allowed responses ranging from (1) *Strongly disagree*, to (5), *Strongly agree*. The same response conventions were used in each of the subscales of the CSR Development Survey Scale used in this research.

1.5.2. Protection of the natural environment

Concern for the environment in relationship to business began in the 18th century (Smith, 1993). Scholars argued that the impact of corporate initiatives on the environment is considerable for the present and the future (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Within the scope of this research, protection of the natural environment represents an organization's participation in activities that aim to preserve and improve the natural environment (Gu, Ryan, Bin, & Wei, 2013; Turker, 2009b), such as training programs and initiatives on environmental sustainability and green initiatives. Turker (2009b) proposed that it is important for organizations to focus attention on preventing environmental harm and find initiatives to protect and improve the natural environment from degradation. Kanter (2011) supported that idea and stated that organizational leaders should be more focused on the welfare of employees and on the protection of the environment in which the business operates rather than on monetary gains. As such, if an organization was involved in environmental initiatives, then stakeholders might be influenced by the actions and consider that the organization's leaders embraced the value of environmental activities (Janney & Gove, 2011). Measurement of this concept results from the mean response to items 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, and 14 from the CSR Development Survey Scale.

1.5.3. Investment in the future

Investment in the future by organizational leaders is one of the most crucial CSR activities (Levy & Park, 2011; Turker, 2009b). This aspect of CSR regards an organization's ability to make investments to promote the well-being of future generations (Turker, 2009b). Investment in the future includes contributing to sustainable growth and supporting future development to protect biodiversity (Turker, 2009b). The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) stated the "concept of CSR entails ensuring optimum fulfillment of our present needs without compromising the ability of our future generations to satisfy theirs" (p. 43). Such activities provided greater employee satisfaction as they displayed the organization's ability to care for the welfare of its employees as well as future generations (Lee & Park, 2009; Turker, 2009b). CSR could be the force to minimize situations such as climate change and degradation of natural resources and to elevate the lives of those global citizens who are facing poverty (Williams, 2014). Measurement of this concept within the scope of the study consists of the mean of two items (i.e., items 15 and 16) on the CSR Development Survey Scale.

1.6. Employee job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a well-researched topic among scholars (Austin, 2011; Engstrom, Boozer, Maddox, & Forte, 2010), and represents a "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Much of the research resulted from the negative behavioral effect of dissatisfied workers (Smedley, 2009; Tsai, 2011). Price (1977) defined employee

satisfaction as a measure of emotions an individual has toward the organization. Employees are more productive and more stable and display a positive perspective of the objectives of the organization when they are satisfied (Aziri, 2011). Brown and Lam (2008) described two approaches to job satisfaction: a global approach and a faceted approach. The global approach perceives job satisfaction to include employees' feelings toward a job, while the facet approach recognizes job satisfaction to include growth, pay, benefits, supervision, coworkers, the work itself, organizational environment, and work conditions (Biggs & Swailes, 2006; Fichter & Cipolla, 2010). As the culture of any organization might impact employee satisfaction, Comm and Mathaisel (2000) and Jackson and Hua (2009) posited that employees' needs should be considered when determining employee satisfaction, because job satisfaction has a significant effect on personal life satisfaction (Heller, Watson, & Ilies, 2006; Pasupuleti, Allen, Lambert, & Cluse-Tolar, 2009).

The hospitality industry is a service industry, which is labor-intensive and people-focused (Guillet & Mattila, 2010; King, Funk, & Wilkins, 2011). As such, employees' perspectives of their organization's CSR programs or activities can potentially affect the relationship between the employees and the organization (Bhattacharya et al., 2008). Despite the many benefits of CSR on employees, such as improved morale, commitment, and satisfaction, the potential predictive nature of the effects of CSR activities (such as involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investing in the future for generations to come) on employee job satisfaction has not been investigated in the context of the hotel industry.

1.7. The present study

This study explored Turker's (2009b) assertion of the importance of community-based CSR activities and the suggestion that organizational leaders should invest in their employees to ensure they realize their desired objectives (Lantos, 2002). The information allowed organizational leaders to recognize the existence of a relationship between CSR activities (involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future) and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. Kang et al. (2010), in a cross-industry study, investigated CSR and performance in the hotel sector, finding financial benefit of CSR activities to an organization, and called for further studies in other areas in the industry.

Stakeholder theory postulates that it is imperative for organizations to implement CSR activities to improve organizational profitability and value (Hartig, Harmeling, & Venkataraman, 2006). Barnett and Salomon (2012) reported that implementing CSR activities within an organization could create positive relationships with stakeholders. Furthermore, the theoretical concept inspired organizational leadership to create collective equilibrium between stakeholders and substantial social benefits it offered to competition, employees, the natural environment, the government, investors, suppliers, and the communities (Carroll, 2004; Culpan & Trussel, 2005).

2. Method

2.1. Population and participants

The target population for this study consisted of employees of corporate-branded hotels within the U.S. hotel industry. Exact data regarding the size of this population were not available. However, according to Smith Travel Research (2013), more than two million hotel employees within the U.S. work in branded or non-branded hotels. Based on that information, STR estimated that approximately 1.6 million employees work in branded hotels.

A third-party online organization recruited potential participants from their audience panel of over 2000 within the U.S. hotel industry. The inclusion criteria ensure that participants were between the ages of

18 and 65 and employed in corporate-branded hotels in the United States. The administrators of QuestionPro.com used a simple random probability sampling approach to meet the stipulations and select a sample of 250 from the sample frame of corporate-branded employees from the population of hotel employees within the U.S. hotel industry (Patten, 2012). QuestionPro.com provided the participants with a hyperlink via e-mail for the survey website. On the website, participants were not asked to identify themselves, thus ensuring the anonymity of the participants for the study. QuestionPro.com also provided minimal incentives in the form of gift cards to the panel of participants who took and completed the survey. Two weeks after distribution of the invitation link, the response rate was 92%, with 150 responses received. No further extension of the survey period was required as the minimum of 116 surveys (participants) had been collected.

2.2. Sampling

The study used the recruiting organization's audience program to obtain a minimum sample size of 116 participants required for the study. The mechanism for identifying the sample frame was membership in the online organization's panel. The study was consistent with a simple random sampling of individuals who met the required characteristics: (a) only employees who work in a corporate-branded hotel within the U.S. hotel industry were considered for the study (b) the study excluded anyone who was not a current employee of a U.S. corporate-branded hotel and was under the age of 18 years.

To ensure the validity of statistical conclusions, the necessary minimum sample size for this study was determined to be 116 participants who were employees of corporate-branded hotels within the U.S. hotel industry. This minimum sample size was determined using G*Power 3.1.7 by Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, and Lang (2009). The respondents for the current study were 116 participants who worked in different corporate-branded hotels within the U.S. hotel industry. Via simple random sampling, QuestionPro.com selected 250 potential participants from a pool of 2000 and invited them to participate in the study. Of those, 215 potential participants visited the survey hosting site; 161 participants responded and acknowledged the informed consent form. Of those, 45 participants submitted incomplete surveys, and 116 participants submitted fully completed surveys. No outliers emerged in the data. Therefore, the final number of surveys statistically analyzed was 116, culminating in a 46.4% return rate.

To obtain a numeric measurement, Spector's (1985) JSS was used, which corresponds with the definition of job satisfaction used in the present study. This scale contains 36 statements that participants are asked to rate in terms of their agreement. Responses can range from (1) for *Strongly disagree* to (5) for *Strongly agree*. Responses represent the degree to which participants agree with statements such as *I like doing the things I do at work* or *My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job*, but also contains reverse worded items such as *I sometimes feel my job is meaningless*. After reverse coding these responses and calculating a mean, this scale was determined to be aligned with the purposes of the study and was deemed an accurate representation of the aspects of job satisfaction germane to the study's research questions.

3. Results

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to address the overall research question, with subsequent *t* tests on each of the predictor variables; these *t* tests address each subquestion. Though the sample only consisted of 116 applicable responses, a power analysis conducted in G*Power 3.1.7 indicated that a minimum sample of 77 would be necessary to detect significance for a medium effect size in the three-predictor model. The independent variables (predictors) in this analysis were the three CSR activities (i.e., involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future). The dependent variable (outcome) in this analysis was job

satisfaction. The standard variable entry method was used, meaning all the independent variables were entered into the multiple linear regression model simultaneously. The final model was expressed by the following multiple linear regression equation:

$$\hat{y} = x_0 + x_1 B_1 + x_2 B_2 + x_3 B_3$$

In this equation, y represents job satisfaction, x_0 represents the y -intercept (constant), x_1 represents involvement in the community, B_1 represents the B coefficient for involvement in the community, x_2 represents protection of the natural environment, B_2 represents the B coefficient for protection of the natural environment, x_3 represents investment in the future, and B_3 represents the B coefficient for investment in the future. Prior to analysis, normality and homoscedasticity assumptions required assessment, and this was accomplished through a normal P-P plot and standardized residuals plot, respectively. Because the normality plot displayed datapoints along the hypothetical perfect normality line, the assumption of normality was met. A reasonable spread of data with no apparent patterning within the residual scatterplot suggested that homoscedasticity was at an acceptable level as well.

Results of the overall regression were significant, where $F(3,112) = 35.54$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.49$, $R_{adj}^2 = 0.47$. Based on these findings, a linear combination of involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future scores from the CSR was useful in predicting job satisfaction. Due to the presence of three predictor variables, the adjusted R^2 was most applicable for interpretation, and indicated that the regression model was predictive of 47% of the variance in job satisfaction, as measured from the JSS. However, examination of the individual t tests for each predictor indicated that only involvement in the community was uniquely predictive of job satisfaction ($t = 4.87$, $p < .001$), where a single unit increase in involvement in the community scores corresponded with a 0.62 unit increase in job satisfaction scores. The first regression in Table 1 displays the results for the individual coefficients in the multiple linear regression model.

As a follow up to this analysis, a series of two moderations analyses were conducted, where gender and age were both considered for moderating effects. The degrees of freedom for these analyses varied slightly as a result of some participants not responding to the age or gender questions. As the regression indicates the likelihood of a relationship between involvement in the community and job satisfaction, the relationship between these two variables was assessed for any such effects through the use of Baron and Kenny's (1986) moderation method. In following this method, interaction terms for gender and age were created to assess whether they exhibited any interaction effects

with involvement in the community on job satisfaction. These interactions terms represented the product of the moderator and the centered involvement in the community variable. The moderator of gender was considered first. Normality and homoscedasticity testing again took place through visual inspection of a normal P-P plot and a residual scatterplot. Residuals were approximately normal, and homoscedasticity was also satisfactory.

Similar to the original regression, this analysis also resulted in a significant model ($F(3,110) = 33.74$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.48$, $R_{adj}^2 = 0.47$) where involvement in the community was a significant predictor ($t = 6.07$, $p < .001$). However, as seen in the second regression in Table 1, the interaction between gender and involvement in the community did not provide any predictive effect beyond that of the original involvement in the community variable ($t = -0.91$, $p = .366$). For this reason, gender could not be determined to moderate this relationship.

Next, age was examined for a possible moderating effect on involvement. Residuals were approximately normal, and homoscedasticity was also satisfactory. Because these assumptions were met, the analysis continued as planned. This analysis also resulted in a significant model ($F(3,107) = 32.37$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.48$, $R_{adj}^2 = 0.46$) where involvement in the community was a significant predictor ($t = 3.22$, $p = .002$). However, through inspection of the third regression in Table 1, it was clear that the interaction between age and involvement in the community did not provide any predictive effect beyond that of the original involvement in the community variable ($t = 0.43$, $p = .671$). Thus, age was also unlikely to moderate the relationship between involvement and job satisfaction.

4. Discussion

Prior to this research study, some researchers pinpointed elements of CSR activities that were related to job satisfaction within the U. S. hotel industry (Aminudin, 2013; Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Kim, Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2010; Lee et al., 2013; Raub & Blunschi, 2014). A limited number of research studies explored the relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the hotel industry (Kim et al., 2010; Raub & Blunschi, 2014). For example, Kim et al. (2010) found a positive association between employees and CSR activities in service, energy, and consumer products businesses, and Raub and Blunschi (2014) acknowledged the existence of a positive relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction in the hotel industry. The findings of the present study supported the literature on CSR and job satisfaction in business, manufacturing, and other service industries, by suggesting that collective

Table 1
Multiple linear regressions predicting job satisfaction.

Source	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
Regression 1: No Moderation					
(Constant)	.91	.30	–	3.06	.003
Involvement in the community	.62	.13	.54	4.87	< .001
Protection of the natural environment	.06	.11	.05	0.51	.614
Investment in the future	.15	.09	.16	1.61	.110
Regression 2: Moderation of Gender					
(Constant)	0.70	0.52	–	1.35	.179
Involvement in the community	0.91	0.15	.80	6.07	< .001
Gender	–0.16	0.14	–.08	–1.20	.232
GenderXInvolvement	–0.16	0.18	–.12	–0.91	.366
Regression 3: Moderation of Age					
(Constant)	1.30	0.81	–	1.61	.111
Involvement in the community	0.70	0.22	.62	3.22	.002
Age	0.01	0.06	.01	0.14	.886
AgeXInvolvement	0.04	0.08	.08	0.43	.671

Note. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale total.

CSR activities, such as involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future, can significantly predict employee job satisfaction. Unlike [Turker \(2009a\)](#) study, which was based on four factors known to be CSR to society, employees, customers, and government, this research study was aimed at only two of these factors. The results of this study did not demonstrate any significant relationship between the CSR activities of protection of the natural environment and investment in the future for future generations, and employee job satisfaction.

While European leaders focus on sustainability with emphasis on social and environmental effect on products, services, and human resources (employee) issues, the attention of leaders in U.S. organizations on sustainability issues continue to be concentrated on long-term profitability. Therefore, international differences on sustainability initiatives on investment in the future with an emphasis on social and environmental may impact products, services, and employee issues. This may explain why participants of this study answered differently than those of [Turker's \(2009b\)](#) study.

A limited number of research studies have explored the relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the hotel industry ([Kim et al., 2010](#); [Raub & Blunschi, 2014](#)). The findings of the present study supported the literature on CSR and job satisfaction in business, manufacturing, and other service industries, by suggesting that collective CSR activities, such as involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future, can significantly predict employee job satisfaction. The results of the present study showed that the overall CSR model was significant, meaning that the set of independent variables collectively statistically significantly predicted job satisfaction. In addition, results revealed that only the CSR activity of involvement in the community positively predicted job satisfaction, while protecting the natural environment and investment in the future did not.

Researchers have applied Herzberg's two-factor theory to hospitality industry workers and hotel employees ([Lundberg, Gudmundson, & Andersson, 2009](#)). The present study supported findings from previous researchers who found that extrinsic factors were associated with increased job satisfaction in hospitality industry workers and hotel employees ([Lundberg et al., 2009](#); [Wong, Siu, & Tsang, 1999](#)). For example, [Lundberg et al. \(2009\)](#) found that Swedish ski resort employees showed higher levels of job satisfaction when their self-fulfillment or intrinsic motivational needs were fulfilled. [Wong et al. \(1999\)](#) found that nonmonetary motivation factors were linked to higher levels job satisfaction among hotel employees, and [Sledge, Miles, and Coppage \(2008\)](#) found that cultural factors played a key role in influencing greater job satisfaction among hotel employees.

The current study adds to the body of knowledge in the academic literature that a statistically significant relationship existed between CSR activities of involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future, and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. The current study expanded the literature knowledge on CSR activities and their relationship to employee job satisfaction by examining connections between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the hotel industry ([Aminudin, 2013](#); [Bauman & Skitka, 2012](#); [Bhattacharya et al., 2008](#); [Kim et al., 2010](#); [Lee et al., 2013](#); [Raub & Blunschi, 2014](#)).

4.1. Interpretation of the findings

The overall model used in predicting job satisfaction was significant ($F(3, 112) = 35.54, p < .001, R^2 = 0.49$). An examination of the research for this study not only extended CSR initiatives literature by examining employees of corporate-branded hotels but also encompassed CSR and job satisfaction theories ([Austin, 2011](#); [Carroll, 1999](#); [Engstrom et al., 2010](#); [Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000](#)). For example, findings from the present study indicated that hygiene or extrinsic factors were related to job satisfaction among hotel industry

employees, which supports the use of Herzberg's two-factor theory for studying job satisfaction among this population.

Specifically, involvement in the community positively predicted statistically significant levels of job satisfaction ($B = 0.62, t = 4.87$, two-tailed $p < .001$). The positive B value indicates that for every one-unit increase in involvement in the community, satisfaction went up by 0.62. An original contribution of this study was that CSR activities, and involvement in the community specifically, are important extrinsic factors of job satisfaction in hotel employees. Consequently, employees may be more satisfied working for and more likely to seek out employment with organizations that participate in CSR activities ([Blackhaus et al., 2002](#); [Brammer et al., 2007](#); [Garglulo, 2012](#); [Grant, 2008](#)).

However, other results of the research study were not able to support the findings of previous literature on CSR activities (protection of the natural environment and investment in the future) regarding the variations in overall employee job satisfaction ([Janney & Gove, 2011](#); [Kanter, 2011](#); [Turker, 2009a](#)). The CSR activities of protection of the natural environment and investing in the future did not explain the variation in overall employee job satisfaction. Protection of the natural environment did not statistically significantly predict job satisfaction ($B = 0.06, t = 0.51$, two-tailed $p = .614$). This result indicates that satisfaction did not significantly increase or decrease for every one unit increase in protection of the natural environment. Likewise, investment in the future did not statistically significantly predict job satisfaction ($B = 0.15, t = 1.61$, two-tailed $p = .110$). The finding indicates that satisfaction did not significantly increase or decrease for every one unit increase in investment in the future. These CSR activities might have been influenced by the way employees perceived job satisfaction within the corporate-branded hotels as compared to other non-branded corporate hotels that other researchers investigated ([Aminudin, 2013](#); [Bauman & Skitka, 2012](#); [Bhattacharya et al., 2008](#); [Kim et al., 2010](#); [Lee et al., 2013](#); [Raub & Blunschi, 2014](#)).

This study focused on the relationship between CSR activities and employees to determine if organizational leaders should focus on CSR activities as a strategy to enhance employee satisfaction. Having a proper understanding of the relationship between CSR activities and employees might help managers and organizational leaders to implement CSR strategies that could enhance employee satisfaction, thereby potentially serving the needs of all the stakeholders. The results illustrated the importance of CSR activities in relation to job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry and suggested that CSR activities might have organizational implications for other industries. Considering the discoveries, organizational leaders and managers might focus on introducing a common set of CSR activities or focus specifically on adding the CSR activity of involvement in the community to help enhance employee job satisfaction.

The implications of the findings might be vital to practitioners, including the importance of understanding the elements that influence CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. In an industry with high employee turnover, researchers identified CRS activities as types of human resource strategies that could influence employees' commitment and subsequent retention ([Brammer et al., 2007](#); [Murray & Ayoun, 2011](#); [STR, 2013](#)). CSR activities also can impact organizations' images and reputations ([Crane, McWilliams, Matten, Moon, & Siegel, 2008](#)), and leaders can use CSR activities to achieve competitive advantage and elevate employees' job satisfaction ([Holcomb et al., 2007](#)). If leaders in the organizations were not aware of the importance of CSR activities on the employees within the hotel industry, this research reinforced the importance of incorporating CSR activities to stimulate employees' job satisfaction within the industry.

The demand for organizations to incorporate CSR activities has increased among various groups of stakeholders, including consumers, employees, legal systems, and society, to encourage organizations to operate in an acceptable manner ([Kang et al., 2010](#)). The increase in awareness for organizations to incorporate CSR activities could have a

negative and profound effect on an organization if leaders ignore such concerns from the various stakeholders in this competitive global environment. Organizational leaders with the focus on such initiatives could potentially increase employee satisfaction to create a more productive work environment.

4.2. Limitations

The purpose of this non-experimental quantitative study was to investigate the relationship between CSR activities (involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future) and overall employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. The results of this study contributed to the existing body of knowledge on CSR activities and the relationship with employee satisfaction within the hotel industry. The study was unique because no previous research study, either within or outside of the U.S. hotel industry, focused on CSR activities and employee job satisfaction. As with most studies, limitations may have impacted the results, and the limitations included the quantitative survey method, research instruments used, online surveying, recruitment process, and the participants. The size of the sample available for research could also be limiting to the ability to detect significance; however, results of a G*Power analysis indicated that a minimum sample size of 77 was required to detect medium strength effects. This suggests that the sample of 116 would allow for detection of medium effects, as well as those slightly weaker than medium. As weak relationships between any of the CSR activities and job satisfaction would not be as useful for stakeholders attempting to drive satisfaction, this limitation is not expected to adversely influence the applicability or usefulness of the study's findings.

5. Recommendations for further research

This study concentrated on CSR activities and employee job satisfaction as presented in a review of the literature and investigated the relationship between variables. The study showed the existence of a relationship between CSR activities (involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future) and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. Based on the analysis and the findings, the study presented several opportunities that scholars might consider for future research within the U.S. hotel industry to improve upon the scholarship surrounding this important contentious subject.

Future studies could incorporate additional demographic elements such as employees' level in the organization and years of employment with the organization to provide more diverse perceptions of research participants on CSR activities. Such knowledge would assist researchers as they examine whether any difference in attitudes exist according to employees' level of the organization and years of employment with the organization and how any of those factors might be related to CSR activities and employee satisfaction within the hotel industry.

Future studies could target the entire population of hotel employees in corporate and non-corporate hotels. Such a diverse population may present a more informed perspective on the differing views of how CSR activities can potentially predict employees' satisfaction within the industry. Also, the current study utilized a registered panel of participants employed in U.S corporate branded hotels; future studies could focus on all employees within the U.S hotel industry regardless of their membership affiliation to a particular online survey company.

The study utilized two survey instruments in their original versions for the collection of data involving CSR activities and job satisfaction. Both instruments were presented in English. Future studies might translate the survey instruments for use in an environment where as many as 80% of employees speak a language other than English (United States Census Bureau, 2011). This recommendation could help eliminate the intentional bias of excluding potential participants because of language barriers.

Multiple linear regression was the statistical approach adopted to analyze the data for this study. With the use of multiple linear regression, no causation can be inferred between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Therefore, future studies might use other approaches, such as experimental or quasi-experimental methods, to examine and assess the causal relationships between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. In addition, the multiple linear regression model results indicated that CSR activities accounted for only 48.8% of the explanation of job satisfaction. Therefore, other variables beyond the scope of the CSR focus of this study could explain the remaining 51.2%. Thus, other variables not necessarily be related to CSR activities could be studied in combination with CSR activities, such as salary, and other benefits to help explore job satisfaction.

Further, a future study to explore employees' perceptions of and experiences with CSR activities within the hotel industry might use a qualitative approach. Trochim (2006a) posited that a phenomenological research approach might examine an individual's personal experiences more effectively. Using a phenomenological research approach, probing research questions might be asked which might inspire participants to share their beliefs, opinions, personal experiences, and feelings about CSR activities within their hotels. Finally, another quantitative approach offering predictive or explanatory statistical analysis with other variables may be ideal.

6. Conclusion

This study emphasized the relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the hotel industry. The primary objective of this study was to examine whether a significant relationship existed between the variables. In this study, the CSR Development Survey Scale developed by Turker (2009b) measured CSR activities (involvement in the community, protection of the natural environment, and investment in the future), while the JSS, developed by Spector (1985), measured job satisfaction. The methodology and the conceptual framework influenced the thoroughness and hardiness of the current study. The theoretical framework for the study was based on stakeholder theory.

This study revealed that CSR activities collectively, and involvement in the community specifically, were important extrinsic factors of job satisfaction in hotel industry employees. Consequently, hospitality industry leaders should be aware of the importance of CSR to employees as part of a growing trend of interest in socially responsible business operations and realize that employees may be more satisfied working for and more likely to seek out employment with organizations dedicated to CSR. Also, the results of this study supported the continued use of Herzberg's two-factor theory in studying job satisfaction in hotel employees.

The overall results of the study identified that a relationship existed between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction within the U.S. hotel industry. The results revealed that a positive relationship existed between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction, specifically within the U.S. hotel industry. Within the scholarship, in-depth concepts supported a positive relationship between CSR activities and employee job satisfaction (Aminudin, 2013; Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2013; Raub & Blunschi, 2014). Studies indicated that organizational leaders who incorporated CSR activities in their operational obligations were likely to influence employees' job satisfaction within the hotel industry (Kim et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2013; Raub & Blunschi, 2014). Therefore, the study contributed to the existing body of literature and presented additional information for leaders specifically within the hotel industry regarding the utilization of CSR activities to potentially predict employees' level of job satisfaction.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.01.002>.

References

Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 836–845. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.25275678>.

Ali, I., Rehman, K. U., Ali, S. I., Yousaf, J., & Zia, M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility influences employee commitment and organizational performance. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(12), 2,796–2,801. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/AJBM/article-full-text-pdf/030BC7224283>.

Aminudin, N. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and employee retention of “green” hotels. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 105, 763–771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.11.079>.

Aras, G., & Crowther, D. (2008). The social obligation of corporations. *Journal of Knowledge Globalization*, 1(1), 43–59. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2086/2050>.

Austin, T. (2011). Relationship between nurse leader emotional intelligence and registered nurse job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest dissertations and theses database UMI No. 893660244.

Azizi, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77–86. Retrieved from <http://mrp.ase.ro/no34/47.pdf>.

Barnett, M. L., & Salomon, R. M. (2012). Does it pay to be really good? Addressing the shape of the relationship between social and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.1980> 1,304–1,320.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.

Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 63–86 10. 1016/j.riob.2012.11.002.

Belief, B., Lines, M., & Tanzil, D. (2005). *Transforming sustainability strategy into action: The chemical industry*. London, England: Wiley.

Winter Bhattacharya, C. B., Sen, S., & Korschun, D. (2008). Using corporate social responsibility to win the war for talent. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(2), 37–44. Retrieved from <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/using-corporate-social-responsibility-to-win-the-war-for-talent/>.

Biggs, D., & Swales, S. (2006). Relations, commitment and satisfaction in agency workers and permanent workers. *Employee Relations*, 28(1/2), 130–143 10. 1108/01425450610639365.

Blackhaus, K., Stone, B. A., & Heiner, K. (2002). Exploring the relationship between corporate social performance and employer attractiveness. *Business & Society*, 41(3), 292–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650302041003003>.

Boccalandro, B. (2009). *Mapping success in employee volunteering: The drivers of effectiveness for employee volunteering and giving programs and Fortune 500 performance*. Boston, MA: Boston College, Center for Corporate Citizenship.

Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701570866> 1,701–1,719.

Brown, S., & Lam, S. (2008). A meta-analysis of relationships linking employee satisfaction to customer responses. *Journal of Retailing*, 84(3), 243–255 10. 1016/j.jretai.2008.06.001.

Burke, L., Logsdon, J. M., Mitchell, W., Reiner, M., & Vogel, D. (1986). Corporate community involvement in the San Francisco Bay area. *California Management Review*, 28(3), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165206>.

Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>.

Carroll, A. B. (2004). Managing ethically with global stakeholders: A present and future challenge. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(2), 114–120. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2004.13836269>.

Cisco (2013). *2013 Cisco corporate social responsibility report: Executive summary*. Retrieved from http://www.cisco.com/assets/csr/pdf/CSR_Report_2013_Exec_Summ.pdf.

Comm, C. L., & Mathaisel, D. F. X. (2000). Assessing employee satisfaction in service firms: An example in higher education. *The Journal of Business and Economic Studies*, 6(1), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540310484922>.

Crane, A., McWilliams, A., Matten, D., Moon, J., & Siegel, D. S. (2008). *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Culpin, R., & Trussell, J. (2005). Applying the agency and stakeholder theories to the Enron debacle: An ethical perspective. *Business and Society Review*, 110(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0045-3609.2005.00004.x>.

De Grosbois, D. (2012). Corporate social responsibility reporting by the global hotel industry: Commitment, initiatives, and performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*.

Engstrom, M. C., Boozer, R. W., Maddox, E. N., & Forte, M. (2010). Psychological type, emotional intelligence, and the work outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 70(11), 123–133.

Epstein, M. J. (2008). *Making sustainability work: Practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental, and economic impacts*. San Francisco, CA: Greenleaf.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Test for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149> 1,149–1,160.

Fichter, C., & Cipolla, J. (2010). Role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and burnout among financial advisors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 15(2), 256–261. Retrieved from <http://www.jaabc.com/jaabcv15n2preview.htm>.

Gargiulo, S. (2012, November 8). *Why everyone wants to work for the “good guys.”* Retrieved from CNN: <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/11/07/business/global-officescr-volunteer/>.

Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259263>.

Giving Tuesday (2012). *What is #GivingTuesday?* Retrieved from <https://givingtuesday.givegab.com/info/donor-faq>.

Grant, T. (2008). *Recruitment and retention: The quest for the right talent*. Thailand: Bangkok (Author).

Graves, S. B., & Waddock, S. A. (1994). Institutional owners and corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), <https://doi.org/10.2307/256611> 1,034–1,046.

GUILLET, B. D., & MATTILA, A. S. (2010). A descriptive examination of corporate governance in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 677–684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.01.004>.

Gupta, S., & Sharma, N. (2009). CSR: A business opportunity. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(3), 396–401. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27768212>.

Gu, H., Ryan, C., Bin, L., & Wei, G. (2013). Political connections, guanxi, and adoption of CSR policies in the Chinese hotel industry: Is there a link? *Tourism Management*, 34, 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.01.017>.

Haidt, J., Rosenberg, E., & Hom, H. (2003). Differentiating diversities: Moral diversity is not like other kinds. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(1), 1–36 10. 1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02071.x.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>.

Hartung, T. R., Harmeling, S. S., & Venkataraman, S. (2006). Innovative stakeholder relations: When “ethics pays” (and when it doesn’t). *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16(1), 43–68. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq20061612>.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Heller, D., Watson, D., & Ilies, R. (2006). The dynamic process of life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 74(5), <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14676494.2006.00415.x> 1,421–1,450.

Holcomb, J. L., Upchurch, R. S., & Okumus, F. (2007). Corporate social responsibility: What are top hotel companies reporting? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9(6), 461–475. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110710775129>.

Jackson, L. A., & Hua, N. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: A snapshot from the lodging and gaming industries. *Journal of Hospitality Financial Management*, 17(1), 463–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10913211.2009.10653871>.

Janney, J. J., & Gove, S. (2011). Reputation and corporate social responsibility aberrations, trends, and hypocrisy: Reactions to firm choices in the stock option backdating scandal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(7), <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00984.x> 1,562–1,585.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 219–266). (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Kang, K., Lee, S., & Huh, C. (2010). Impacts of positive and negative corporate social responsibility activities on company performance in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 72–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.05.006>.

Kanter, R. M. (2011). How great companies think differently. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(11), 65–75. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2011/11/how-great-companies-think-differently>.

Kim, H., Lee, M., Lee, H., & Kim, N. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and employee-company identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(4), 557–569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0440-2>.

King, C., Funk, D. C., & Wilkins, H. (2011). Bridging the gap: An examination of the relative alignment of hospitality research and industry priorities. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.04.009>.

Kucukusta, D., Mark, A., & Chan, X. (2013). Corporate social responsibility practices in four and five-star hotels: Perspectives from Hong Kong visitors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.01.010>.

Lantos, G. P. (2002). The ethicality of altruistic corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(2), 205–230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760210426049>.

Leach, C., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(2), 234–249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/00223514.93.2.234>.

Lee, S., & Heo, C. Y. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and customer satisfaction among U.S. publicly traded hotels and restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 635–637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.02.007>.

Lee, S., & Park, S. (2009). Do socially responsible activities help hotels and casinos achieve their financial goals? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.003>.

Lee, E. M., Park, S. Y., & Lee, H. J. (2013). Employee perception of CSR activities: Its antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.11.008> 1,716–1,724.

Levy, S. E., & Park, S. Y. (2011). An analysis of CSR activities in the lodging industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 147. <https://doi.org/10.1375/jhmt.18.1.147>.

Lichtenstein, D. R., Drumwright, M. E., & Braig, B. M. (2004). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4), 16–32. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.4.16.42726>.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.). *Handbook of industrial organizational psychology*Chicago, IL: Rand McNally 1,297–1,349.

Lowitt, E. (2013). *The collaboration economy: How to meet business, social, and environmental needs and gain competitive advantage*. London, England: Wiley.

Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2009). Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 30, 890–899. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.003>.

Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070303258971>.

Murray, D., & Ayoun, B. (2011). Hospitality student perceptions on the use of sustainable business practices as a means of signaling attractiveness and attracting future employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 10, 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2010.500211>.

Njite, D., Hancer, M., & Slevitch, I. (2011). Exploring corporate social responsibility: A managers' perspective on how and why small independent hotels engage with their communities. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(3), 177–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.20110541833>.

One reel (2010, March 31). *No fireworks over lake union on july 4*. Seattle Times. Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/one-reel-no-fireworks-over-lake-union-on-july-4/>.

Ormiston, M. E., & Wong, E. M. (2013). License to ill: The effects of corporate social responsibility and CEO moral identity on corporate social irresponsibility. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 861–893. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12029>.

Pasupuleti, S., Allen, R. I., Lambert, E. G., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2009). Impact of work stressors on the life satisfaction of social service workers: A preliminary study. *Administration in Social Work*, 33(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03643100902988141>.

Patterson, M. L. (2012). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials* (8th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczac.

Peloza, J., & Shang, J. (2011). How can corporate social responsibility activities create value for stakeholders? A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0213-6>.

Peterson, D. K. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. *Business & Society*, 43(3), 296–319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650304268065>.

Pohl, M., & Tolhurst, N. (2011). *Responsible business: How to manage a CSR strategy successfully*. London, England: Wiley.

Price, J. L. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Raub, S., & Blunschi, S. (2014). The power of meaningful work: How awareness of CSR initiatives foster task significance and positive work outcomes in service employees. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 55(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965513498300>.

Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.). *Understanding human values* (pp. 47–70). New York, NY: Free Press.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resources Management*, 43(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20032>.

Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 225–243. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838>.

Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), 158–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070305284978>.

Shabnam, S., & Sarker, A. R. (2012). Impact of CSR and internal marketing on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A case study from export-oriented SMEs in Bangladesh. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(7), 24–36. Retrieved from <http://wbiasu.org/3.%20Saadia.pdf>.

Sledge, S., Miles, A. K., & Coppage, S. (2008). What role does culture play? A look at motivation and job satisfaction among hotel workers in Brazil. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(9), <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802295157> 1,667–1,682.

Smedley, T. (2009, November 19). It's a completely different dynamic from working in a PLC. *People Management*, 20–23. Retrieved from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2013/01/29/its-a-completely-differentdynamic-from-working-in-a-plc-2009-11.aspx>.

Smith, D. (1993). The Frankenstein syndrome: Corporate responsibility and the environment. In D. Smith (Ed.). *Business and the environment: Implications of the new environmentalism* (pp. 172–189). London, England: Chapman.

Smith Travel Research. (2013). *2013 lodging survey: Lodging service, facilities and trends*. Washington, DC: American Hotel and Lodging Association.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>.

Tamajón, L. G., & Aulet, X. F. (2013). Corporate social responsibility in tourism small and medium enterprises: Evidence from Europe and Latin America. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 7, 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2013.03.002>.

Target Corporation (2009). *Corporate responsibility*. Retrieved from <https://corporate.target.com/corporate-responsibility>.

The World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. England: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2006). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>.

Tian, X. Z., & Pu, Y. J. (2008). An artificial neural network approach to hotel employee satisfaction: The case of China. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(4), 467–482. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2008.36.4.467>.

Tide (2005). *About loads of hope*. Retrieved from <http://tide.com/en-us/you-tide/tips-for-a-better-life/loads-of-hope>.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2006a). *Knowledge based research methods*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>.

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior, and job satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11(1), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-98>.

Turker, D. (2009a). How corporate social responsibility influences organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(2), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9993-8>.

Turker, D. (2009b). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9780-6>.

United States Census Bureau (2011). *The statistical abstract of the United States: 2011*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/11statab/pop.pdf>.

Wang, Y., & Hsieh, H. (2012). Toward a better understanding of the link between ethical climate and job satisfaction: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(4), 535–545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0984-9>.

Wetprasit, P. (2006). *Impacts of work-related determinants on job satisfaction and retention intentions in Thai spa industry* (Doctoral dissertation)Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Pub. No. 3245809.

Williams, O. F. (2014). CSR: Will it change the world? Hope for the future: An emerging logic in business practice. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (53), 9–26 10. 9774/gleaf.4700.2014.ma.00004.

Wong, C. K. A., & Chan, A. (2010). Understanding the leadership perceptions of staff in China's hotel industry: Integrating the macro- and micro-aspects of leadership contexts. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 437–447. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.01.003>.

Wong, S., Siu, V., & Tsang, N. (1999). The impact of demographic factors on Hong Kong hotel employees' choice of job-related motivators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(5), 230–241. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596119910272766>.

Yang, Y. (2009). Investigation of group interaction functioning stimulated by transformational leadership on employee intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction: An extension of the resource-based theory perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(9), <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2009.37.9.1259> 1,259–1,278.

Zeffane, R., Ibrahim, M. E., & Mehairi, R. A. (2008). Exploring the differential impact of job satisfaction on employee attendance and conduct: The case of a utility company in the United Arab Emirates. *Employee Relations*, 30(3), 237–250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450810866514>.