

Impact of CSR on Service Innovation Performance in Hospitality Industry: The Strategic Role of Human Resource Management

Abdul Latif

PHD Scholar,
Department of Business Administration,
Foundation University,
Islamabad, Pakistan.

Dr. Noor-Ul-Hadi

Associate Professor,
Department of Business
Administration,
Foundation University,
Islamabad, Pakistan.

Dr. Ishtiaq Ahmed Malik

Lecturer,
Department of Business
Administration,
Foundation University,
Islamabad, Pakistan.

Abstract

The literature to date on the topic is inconsistent and lacks maturity. Thus, to promote the discipline by establishing mechanisms, the current study shed light on how employer can attract and retain employees through CSR by affecting their affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, which to our understanding leads to hotel service innovation performance. Drawing on Resource-based view and Social Exchange Theory this study analyzed 155 hotel managers' valid responses via PROCESS macro. Findings of the study revealed that CSR do affect service innovation performance. However, this complex relationship is parallel mediated by Strategic Human Resources, as Human Resources in its true sense are rare, valuable, inimitable and non-substitutable. The study advance knowledge in the area of service innovation in hospitality industry. The study concluded that CSR is promising area that generates innovation within the framework of SHRM.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility; Strategic Human Resource Management; Affective Commitment; Organizational Citizenship Behavior; Service Innovation Performance

Introduction

Services are considered as one of the key economic developmental drivers and engines of growth (Morrar, 2014). There are variety of features which distinguish service industry from manufacturing (Eloranta and Turunen, 2015). The developed industrial economies are transforming and shifting their economies from manufacturing sector to services (Hsieh, Chiu, Wei, Rebecca Yen, & Cheng, 2013). Services now dominate the developed economies (Q. Wang, Voss, Zhao, & Wang, 2015) and play a key role in the development of world economy (Storey et al., 2016) as evidenced by its 63.6% share of the world's gross domestic product (Agency, 2019). In USA, service sector contribution to GDP is 80 percent (Agency, 2017). In the European Union, services sector contribute 72 percent in their GDP (UNECE, 2009). In India services sector contribution to GDP is 60.5 percent (Agency, 2017) and in Pakistan services sector contribution in total GDP is 60.23 percent (Survey, 2018). Over the past two decades, global economy has drastically shifted from traditional production of goods to services (Paton and McLaughlin, 2008) and innovation is critical for generating economic activities (Ostrom et al., 2010). Service sector dominates the global economic activity by introducing

new services and enhancement in service innovations. In spite of all this, Business environment is always unstable and competitive and services sector have to keep focus and set the innovation as key point of their competitive strategy (Nieves, Quintana, & Osorio, 2016).

The service sector comprises many diverse activities which determine the nature of innovation in service firms (Sepulveda, 2014). Service innovations play a crucial role in differentiating it from the competitors and this leads to improve firm performance. Service innovation offers new services with improved design and features and development in services delivery mechanism (O' Cass and Viet Ngo, 2011). Specific customers may get customized solutions by the combinations of product and service and it serves the desired outcome for them through service innovation (Damanpour, Walker, & Avellaneda, 2009). Quality service is increasingly critical to success; service innovation is determined to be a major strategy to improve the sustainable competitiveness of firms (Chesbrough, 2011). Internal and external factors interactively and jointly affect the success of service innovation. Internally, firms' resources, capabilities, and activities are important elements in service innovation.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) as an external factor affects the service innovation performance. CSR lead to innovation through social, environmental or sustainability initiatives and create new ways of working with new offerings in new markets (Little, 2006) and due to this factor many companies have redefined their business models. It is allocation of corporate resources for improvement of communities where corporations operates which is a source of attractive relations with key stakeholders (Barnett, 2007) and employees are important stakeholders (Waddock, 2002). CSR possibly be considered as a mechanism through which businesses adjust and accommodate their stakeholder in to a winning state (Snyder et al., 2003). Using CSR initiatives organizations minimize their negative impacts in society and build a positive image (Chan, 2011). Organizations doing CSR not only focus on shareholders and customers but take care of all the stakeholders in the society. Those companies with CSR initiatives become the employer of choice for potential employees (Sheldon and Park, 2011). When the work of a company affects the wellbeing of people and the community, affects the employees understanding of positive contribution in society (Bauman and Skitka, 2012). CSR becomes the source of attraction, motivation, and retention for human assets for any company (Sharma, Sharma, & Devi, 2009) and it create a good image, increase commitment and productivity of employees (Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007; Porter

and Kramer, 2006). It is challenging to attract and retain top performing human resources in the service industry; employee commitment is very important element in company success (Sharma, et al., 2009). Effective CSR practices helps in promoting strong organizational culture and commitment in employees (Sharma, et al., 2009). Different CSR practices differently affects and influence on organizational commitment (Kucukusta, Denizci Guillet, & Chan, 2016; Turker, 2009).

In customer services organizations like hotels where customers' expectations are changing, innovative behaviors are more likely to be expected. Employee creativity and innovation is encouraged by the organizations for better services (Afsar and Badir, 2017). Hotel industry is an emerging industry in developing countries and facing lot of challenges (Kusluvan and Karamustafa, 2001). Potential drivers of service innovation are important to explore in hotel industry but there are limited studies which have considered these factors (Danaei and Iranbakhsh, 2016). Innovation studies have mainly focused on macro level parameters, micro level parameter have been neglected (Camison and Monfort-Mir, 2012). Recently the research has attempted and considers examining micro level perspective (Danaei and Iranbakhsh, 2016). The HR practices of an organization helps to influence employee attitudes and commitment (Jaiswal and Dhar, 2016). Strategic human resource practices nurtures human capital through creating an environment of creativity and innovation (Buller and McEvoy, 2012) and skilling the organization for solving the issues creatively (Marchington, 2015). For employees' innovative performance, service organizations are going to adopt strategic human resource practices as an instrument for their motivation and training (Boon, Paauwe, Boselie, & Den Hartog, 2009). Strategic HRM develops a fit among various organizational objectives and HRM practices for long term organizational competitive advantage (Bowen and Ostroff, 2004).

Employees are most important stakeholders of any organizations and they play pivotal role in success or failure of any organization and in service industry employees interact very closely with customers and other stakeholders. The relationship between employees' perception of CSR and their attitudes and behaviors can be best understood with the help of resource base theory and social exchange theory. Resource Based Theory (Barney, 1991) which implies that HR department strategically deploy resources which are rare, valuable, inimitable and competitive in nature. So employee centric approach may help the organization to adopt and implement all innovative measure and bring service innovation. Organizational

innovation performance can be achieved through the alignment of strategic human resource practices (Grant, 1991). In services, like hotels customers have direct link with employees so employees' behaviors play an important role in better service offerings.

CSR has been studied from various stakeholders perspectives including the study of relationship of CSR with customer (Schuler and Cording, 2006), government (Kim and Park, 2011) and with shareholders (Brammer and Millington, 2008), however, the relationship of CSR with its employees have got less consideration of the researchers (You et al., 2013). Therefore, the current study investigates the effect of CSR on employees' attitudes and behaviors. The current study has presented framework that explore the relationship between HR and CSR and presented a mechanism through which CSR affects service innovation performance of the organization. According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), when organization is socially responsible, as reciprocity employees will be committed and will exhibit citizenship behavior. Perceived CSR towards society and other stakeholders has strong and positive effects on OCB in employees (Newman, Nielsen & Miao, 2015). CSR activities can create a positive reputation and enhance employee commitment, morale, and Productivity (Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007). Current study develops and presents a comprehensive model in which CSR, job attitudes and behavioral consequences have been integrated as mediating variables and examine the moderating role of perceived organizational support on the relationship of affective commitment, OCB and service innovation performance.

Literature Review

Corporate Social Responsibility

Justice and fairness in business has its connection with the older time of the ancient Greeks. CSR practices have roots and origination from 1920 (Bhaduri and Selarka, 2016). Around three decades later, in the 1950s, CSR was first regarded as an area of management studies. Carroll's (1999) CSR pyramid is one of the famous CSR model which depicts responsibilities of the company consisting of four dimensions of economic, legal, ethical and discretionary. This model tells that a business has the responsibility to be profitable, obey the laws and ethics and act as a good corporate citizen. CSR is defined as "the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large" (Development, 1999). CSR is considered as a mechanism through which businesses adjust and accommodate their

stakeholder in to a wining state. These stakeholder may be human resources, consumers, suppliers, government and NGOs, natural environment of the company and those who have investment (Snyder, et al., 2003; Waddock, 2002). In hotel industry, firms are launching green and environment friendly programs by important initiatives and conducting such practices of business which may ensure success of these programs (Lee and Heo, 2009). The green and environment friendly programs have positive impact on the firm role in society and its financial performance (S. Lee and Park, 2009). It was found that CSR has positive impact on different HR related issues of organizations like turnover, employee retention in the organization, employee loyalty and commitment with organization. It has a positive effect on HR practices like recruiting and selecting best employees (Aguilera, et al., 2007; Heslin and Ochoa, 2008), this is the reason that CSR can be used by employers as a tool for employee motivation. CSR has different perspectives from various stakeholders (Cochius, 2006). An integrated approach was presented which focuses the creation of moral values within the reference of the all stakeholders (Longo, Mura, & Bonoli, 2005). CSR is a vast domain (Carroll, 1999) and it encompasses a range of micro and macro, internal and external, policies and initiatives (Farooq, Rupp, & Farooq, 2017). In hotel industry, CSR considers the environment protection, well being of communities, societies, economies and sustainable environment (Kennedy Nyahunzvi, 2013). CSR Positively impacts the competitive advantage for hotel industry (Antoni Serra-Cantallops, 2017).

Service Innovation Performance

Innovation has been considered as a source of strategic competitive advantage and growth of the organization by the Businesses and their stakeholders since 1970 (Salunke et al., 2019). Storey, et al., (2016) and Mennens, et al., (2018) defines "Service innovation performance as the degree of getting strategic competitive advantage and commercial success with respect to service innovation by sharing and managing knowledge on innovation". In service innovations new services are offered with changed and unique design and service are delivered with new improved systems (O'Cass and Ngo, 2011). Customers' requirements are fulfilled by offering services along with products for customized solutions to their problems; innovative service also offers a set of services from single source and reduces the dependency of customers on many vendors (Windahl and Lakemond, 2010). Representatives of the companies establish a dialogue with customers and address their needs and satisfy them. The customers reciprocate and have a trust relationship with the organization which results in improved sales and profit

(Urban, 2004). Therefore, it is argued that there is need of knowledge creation and sharing, organizational competencies and such practices that may shape customer advocacy. More innovations, firms have the ability for better customer advocacy. Service organizations prefer innovation of services (Ostrom, et al., 2010), which shows that the organizations have the approach and inclination for adoption of new and unique ideas for new products and services (Hurley and Hult, 1998). CSR practices including social, environmental and sustainability support innovation and establish new working relationships, improved and new products, services, processes and having new markets (Little, 2006), which has led many organizations in changing their business models.

Service Innovation Performance (SIP) represents two dimensions, which are service innovation behavior (ESIB), and new service development (NSD). More specifically, SIP concept occur service sector for exploration of individual innovation behavior. Innovation involves three stages, in first stage creative idea generated, in second stage support for idea is seek and at third stage innovation model is developed. at each stage involves different activities and need different innovative behavior so this behavior is critical component of innovation (Scott and Bruce, 1994). For any organization to remain long term competitive in the market, innovation is considered as critical factor (Kang and Snell, 2009; Shipton, Fay, West, Patterson, and Birdi, 2005). Employee innovative behavior is an attitudinal variable and is disposed to internal and external factors.

For organizational survival ESIB is considered most important and requisite at workplace (Lee and Hyun, 2016). Innovation and ESIB has gain very importance due to changing business dynamics, globalization and completion, so, the topic has got more consideration of the researchers (Akram et al. 2016). In hotel industry innovative behaviors are more expected as the demand of job expectations due to changing customer need expectations. These organizations are encouraging their employees to be more creative and innovative for improving the service performance (Afsar and Badir, 2017). In order to respond the rapidly changing business environment and for getting competitive advantage innovation and employee innovative behavior are the dire organizational need (Le and Lei, 2019). Hospitality industry is facing a dynamic competitive environment which is going through continuous transformation. (Kale et al., 2019). Hence, for competing in the market, hospitality firms have to focus on their service innovation performance by improving the service and lower the costs (Salunke et al., 2019).

CSR and Service Innovation Performance

CSR helps organizations to improve relationships with stakeholders (Barnett, 2007), develop trust and loyalty (Fatma, Khan, & Rahman, 2018) narrowing and improving communication gap (Woo and Jin, 2016). CSR increases cooperation from stakeholders and helps organizations in acquiring and accumulating knowledge. This exchange of knowledge helps organizations and complements their internal knowledge and triggers innovation (Luo and Du, 2015). Employees take decision on the basis of organizational treatment with them (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). When any organization takes social responsibility for employees related issues, for example by improving the working conditions, raising welfare and benefits, providing training and opportunities for promotion, helps in eliminating employees worries and enhances their innovation capabilities and passion for innovation. Thus employee related CSR helps and motivates employees in acquiring new knowledge and skills and lead toward service innovation with positive behavior. Similarly, environment, community, safety, related CSR also affects employees' improving innovation and innovative behaviors. Community related CSR, for example community welfare activities and charity programs helps organizations in shortening and narrowing the emotional distances and improve the organizational image in the stakeholders (Bian and Qiu, 2000). On the basis of above literature studied following hypothesis is developed.

H1: There is positive relationship between corporate social responsibility and service innovation performance.

CSR and Affective Commitment

CSR and organizational commitment research is gaining consideration of the researchers now a day and is increasing in recent era (Ditlev-Simonsen, 2015). This is important in a way that organizational performance increases due to effects of CSR on OC (Glavas and Kelley, 2014). CSR is an important determinant of job attitudes and behaviors at work (Glavas, 2016) including organizational citizenship behavior (Rupp, Shao, Thornton, & Skarlicki, 2013), innovative behavior (Brammer, He, & Mellahi, 2015) and organizational commitment (Glavas and Kelley, 2014). CSR directly and positively affects affective commitment of employees (Brammer, et al., 2007; Turker, 2009b). Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) is helpful in explaining the mechanism of people's emotional attachment with organizations when they are socially responsible. CSR effect on affective commitment can be easily explained as an underlying mechanism of such relationship (De Roeck and Maon, 2018). When an

organization does CSR, it fulfills the psychological needs of employees. Employees feel proud while working with socially responsible organization which contribute to word the societies where they are operating, taking care of environment, taking proper safety measures. Such acts from organization make people proud for having association. As a norm of reciprocity employees commitment will be increased with their organization and they will be affectively attached with their organization. In the light of literature following hypothesis has been developed.

H2: There is positive relationship between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and affective commitment (AC).

CSR and OCB

Perceived CSR towards society and other stakeholders has strong and positive effects on OCB in employees (Newman, Nielsen, & Miao, 2015). Employees related CSR in the organization strongly impacts their OCB. It has a direct impact on OCB while commitment mediates the relation of CSR and OCB (Newman, Miao, Hofman, & Zhu, 2016). OCB plays a very important role in improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency, and creativity of organizations (Claudia, 2018). OCB mediates the relationship between the effects of organizational support and psychological empowerment and performance of job (Chiang and Hsieh, 2012). Following hypothesis has been developed.

H3: There is positive relationship between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Affective Commitment and Service Innovation Performance

Employee attitudes and behaviors significantly and positively influence organizational performance in the service industry. Affective commitment is the psychological and emotional attachment of an employee to the organization (Cole and Johnson, 2007; Meyer and Allen, 1991) and is associated with behavioral outcomes like performance (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnysky, 2002). Affectively committed employees are much eager to contribute toward organizations performance innovatively (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012) and achieve the set goals. (Thompson and Heron, 2006) in their study found that affectively committed employees believe on knowledge sharing and organization innovation. In his study (Chughtai, 2013) stated that employee's commitment to manager participates in learning, job engagement and innovation. Following hypothesis have

been proposed.

H4: There is positive relationship between affective commitment and service innovation performance.

OCB and Service Innovation Performance

OCB helps in improving organizational performance. (Karambayya, 1990) studied the relationships among group performance, job satisfaction and OCB. Research proved that interpersonal behaviors like harmony, information sharing and helping behaviors portray positive effects on teams' performance (Xin and Zhiming, 2005). OCB is source of inspirations and stimulation for teams for being creative and innovative (Nemeth and Ormiston, 2007), which will finally enhance the organizational innovation. Rational interpersonal behaviors of employees are the source of congenial work environment where employees can establish channels of communications and knowledge sharing which is helpful for innovation (Yuanyuan, 2009). Following hypothesis has been proposed.

H5: There is positive relationship between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and service innovation performance (SIP).

H6: Affective commitment (AC) mediates the relationship between corporate social responsibility and service innovation performance (SIP).

H7: Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) mediates the relationship between corporate social responsibility and service innovation performance (SIP).

Methodology

Simple random has been used in the current study to collect data from 155 managers of two stars and above category hotels situated in Lahore, Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Peshawar, Northern Areas and Karachi, Pakistan. These cities have been selected because most of the tourist areas including religious and historical places are in the north of Pakistan and tourists have to pass through these cities for visiting northern areas and the most sacred religious places of Sikh community are also in north of Punjab, Pakistan, which is the main source of tourism revenue. Karachi is the hub of corporate activities and most of the multinational and national level corporations' headquarters are in Karachi. Available hotel and restaurant directory of the ministry of tourism, government of Pakistan was used for population frames. An updated list of hotels was also obtained from Pakistan hotel association for this purpose. According to this directory, there are 437 hotels situated in these areas. A formal meeting was organized with HR manager of each hotel and after detailed discussion;

questionnaire was distributed through HR department of two stars and above category hotels. Only one Manager was surveyed from one hotel. Male managers were 96 (61.9 %) and female managers were 59 (38.1 %).

Analysis

The current study analyzed the phenomena with the PROCESS macro, a widely used for parallel mediation analysis (Bolin, 2014). The reliability of the scale was tested via alpha. In this research study, corporate social responsibility was measured by 16 item scale of Cowper-Smith & de Grosbois, (2011) and Holcomb et al., (2007). Service innovation performance was adapted from Scott and Bruce (1994) and Matear et al. (2004). Affective commitment was adapted from Meyer and Allen (1997) while organizational citizenship behavior was adapted from Saks (2002) and Lee and Allen (2002).

Results

The study undertaken was quantitative in nature. Accordingly, several tests were applied to test the

hypotheses. A survey based on a 58-item questionnaire was conducted to gather the data. The sample characteristics were made explicit through frequency tables and Cronbach coefficient alpha was used to check the reliability of all the variables. Findings suggest that all the values are greater than 0.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1978). As far as construct validity is concerned, all of the understudied items converged on their underlying factors, ensuring construct validity (Muhammad, Shamsudin, & Hadi, 2016). The Andrew F. Hayes (2012) process was applied to undertake parallel mediation analysis to ascertain the role of the mediators between the independent and dependent variables. In the Table 1 sampling characteristics represent gender, age, qualification, income, marital status and experience of the managers working in hotels. As shown in the (Table 1) 61.9% of the respondents were male, 38.1% were female, whereas 47.1% participants were within the age bracket of 30–40 years and 20.6% were above 40-50 years of age. Many participants having Master (43.9%) and Bachelor (38.7%) degrees.

Table 1
Sampling Characteristics

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	96	61.9
Female	59	38.1
Age		
20-30	43	27.7
Above 30-40	73	47.1
Above 40-50	32	20.6
Above 50	7	4.5
Qualification		
MS/ M.Phil	17	11
Master	68	43.9
Bachelor	60	38.7
Intermediate	8	5.2
Matric	2	1.7
Income		
Rs. 20,000- Rs. 34,999	22	14.2
Rs. 35,000 - Rs. 49,999	65	41.9
Rs 50,000 – Rs.100,000	53	34.2
Above Rs. 100,000	15	9.7
Marital Status		
Single	59	38.1
Married	96	61.9
Experience		
Less than 1 year	10	6.5
1 – 2 years	25	16.1
Above 2 – 5 years	46	29.7
Above 5 – 10 years	47	30.3
Above 10 years	27	17.4

In the Table 2 the reliability of the 16-item scale of CSR was 0.74. Eight items OCB was 0.72 and 14 items service innovation performance reliability was 0.81. Affective commitment had comparatively low reliability which was

0.65. However, according to Camble (1976) (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976), the values of Cronbach' Alpha should be >0.6.

Table 2
Reliability Coefficients

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Corporate Social Responsibility(CSR)	.74	16
Organizational Citizenship Behavior(OCB)	.72	8
Service Innovation Performance(SIP)	.81	14
Affective Commitment(AC)	.65	8

Correlation analysis was conducted to investigate the correlations among our study variables.

demonstrates that CSR has significant correlations with the variables, such as AC, OCB and SIP.

The results have been described in Table 3. The table

Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of Measures

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Gender	1.38	.49	-								
2 Age	2.01	.81	-.068	-							
3 Qualificati on	3.42	.80	-.045	.205*	-						
4 Income	2.39	.85	.012	.073	-	-					
					.215**						
5 Marital Status	1.62	.49	-	.426*	.145	-.044	-				
			.179*	*							
6 Experience	3.36	1.14	-.109	.404*	.174*	.362*	.367**	-			
				*		*					
7 CSR	3.98	.35	-.125	.105	-.110	.112	.218**	.160*	-		
8 AC	3.70	.47	.025	.316*	.121	.150	.123	.250**	.183*	-	
				*							
9 OCB	3.91	.32	.007	.112	-.016	-.080	.201*	.156	.561**	.478*	-
										*	
10 SIP	4.69	.49	.085	-.047	-.065	.242*	.047	.070	.449**	.240*	.283*
						*				*	*

* p< 0.05. ** p< 0.01

Mediation Analysis

Affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior were used as mediators in parallel mediation between corporate social responsibility and service innovation performance to analyze how much these variables mediates the relationship between two variables. In the Table 4 the results without mediation proves our first hypothesis, where the path beta was 0.59 and the p-value was significant at 0.000. The results reinforced the bond between corporate social responsibility and service

innovation performance. The second hypothesis was also supported by the findings, i.e., corporate social responsibility is positively associated with affective commitment. In this result path beta was 0.28 with p- value at significant level of 0.007. Third hypothesis H3 was also accepted with beta 0.52 and p-value at significant level of 0.000. The hypothesis H4 that poses the positive relationship between corporate social responsibility and service innovation performance was also substantiated when the path beta was 0.16 with the p-value significant

shown in the Table 4. Hypothesis H5 that organizational citizenship behavior is positively related to service innovation performance is rejected because beta was 0.043 and insignificant p-value at 0.761.

Mediation analysis results have been shown in Table 4, direct, indirect and total effects have also been shown in this table. Bootstrapping method by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used to run the mediation analysis. 5000 bootstrap re-samples were used for this analysis and the confidence interval was 95%. Total effect explains the relationship between corporate social responsibility, affective commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and service innovation performance, which turned out to be 0.62 with t value at 6.1 and $p < 0.01$. Direct effect represents the impact of corporate social responsibility on service innovation performance which turned out to be

0.59 at t value 4.8 and $p < 0.01$. Indirect effect with mediation of variable affective commitment turned out to be 0.048 and there is no zero between ULCI (0.1285) and LLCI (0.0075). In case of indirect effect with mediation of variable organizational citizenship behavior which was -0.023 and there is zero between ULCI (0.0959) and LLCI (-0.1514). Consistent with Preacher and Hayes (2004), the existence of a non-zero value between the upper and lower boot limits shows a significant relationship and existence of zero between upper and lower boot limit shows insignificant relationship. Based on these results, it is concluded that, affective commitment mediates the said relationship and organizational citizenship behavior do not mediate the relationship, leading to the acceptance of H6 and rejection of H7.

Table 4
Mediation Analysis Service Innovation Performance

Effect	Path	Coefficient	SE	T	P	LLCI	ULCI	Results
IV to Mediator		.28	.10	2.7	.007			Accepted
IV to Mediator	CSR → OCB	.52	.06	8.4	.000			Accepted
Mediator to DV	AC → SIP	.16	.08	2.02	.044			Accepted
Mediator to DV	OCB → SIP	-.043	.14	-.30	.761			Rejected
Total Effect	CSR → SIP	.62	.10	6.1	.000			
Direct Effect	CSR → SIP	.59	.12	4.8	.000			Accepted
Indirect Effect (Mediation)	CSR → SIP	.026	.061			-.0959	.1439	
	AC → SIP	.048	.029			.0075	.1285	Accepted
	OCB → SIP	-.023	.063			-.1514	.0959	Rejected

Discussion

The current study can be explained that incorporation of CSR as value creating element change the philosophy of the companies and according to resource based view (Barney, 1991) when resources and capabilities are rare, valuable inimitable and non-substitutable, they may be a source of competitive advantage for the organization. Human resources are the resource on which an organization can make differences and can take competitive advantage. All other resources may be imitated and replicated but there is no replication in case of HR. For an organizational performance and innovation, employee's commitment is necessary, especially when they are affectively committed, take care of their organization, will put more concentration and will express their creative and innovative ideas. On the basis of this theory, CSR can be source of affective commitment and become inimitable resource for innovation in services. This is important in a way that organizational performance increases due to effects of CSR on organizational commitment (Glavas and Kelley, 2014). CSR is an important determinant of job

attitudes and behaviors at work (Glavas, 2016) including OCB (Rupp, et al., 2013), innovative behavior (Brammer, et al., 2015) and organizational commitment (Glavas and Kelley, 2014). CSR directly and positively affects affective commitment of employees (Turker, 2009b). According to stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) employees are important stakeholders along with other stakeholders. It is evident from literature that socially responsible organizations are source of employees' attraction, satisfaction and commitment (Stites and Michael, 2011). In order to explain the mediating role of affective commitment (AC), OCB in the association between CSR and service innovation performance, social exchange theory (Emerson, 1976) and resource based view (Barney, 1991) are supportive and used in the existing scenario. The main theme of social exchange theory is that, there is expected reward in any exchange relationship between two parties (Blau, 1968). This theory explains the actions and reactions in response from exchange (Blau, 1964), and examines that exchanges are conditional and bilateral (Emerson, 1976). So in current study CSR will

address the employee psychological needs and as result of social exchange he will be committed affectively with the organizations which will result in innovation in services.

The current study shed light on micro perspective of CSR especially employee centric CSR and its impact on strategic human resource management and service innovation performance. Based on the literature studied, the study has proposed a conceptual model of CSR, HRM and service innovation performance. This theoretical framework has been empirically tested by findings of current study. CSR affects both affective commitment and OCB and affective commitment mediates the relationship between CSR and service innovation but OCB has no affect on service innovation performance and do not mediate the relationship between CSR and service innovation performance. CSR is an important field of research which also presents challenges for academicians and researchers for more work on it. One of these challenges is the measurement of CSR because there are inconsistencies in CSR literature and lack of practical maturity (Voegtlin and Greenwood, 2016). Many authors indicated the need to promote the discipline by establishing mechanism that allow the objective and effective evaluation and comparison of the contribution that are made in different areas of the company. So the current study proposed a conceptual model of CSR and service innovation performance through explanatory mechanism of affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The current study has also proposed a research instrument which will be helpful in strengthening the practical maturity of CSR with its outcome variables through micro level explanatory mechanism. The growing imperative for business organizations to pursue socially responsible strategies (Kapstein, 2001) has raised questions about the importance of such strategies on behaviors of internal and external stakeholders. The current study focuses on internal stakeholder and instigates a debate on impact of CSR on service innovation performance through internal stakeholder.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The current study has theoretical implications which are as follows. First, we explored the CSR and its effect from micro perspective which is employee perspective. Most of the prior researches are from external stakeholder perspectives; the current study has focused on effect of CSR on employee attitudes and behaviors. From extensive literature review and with the help of resource base view and social exchange theory we found that corporate social responsibility influence employee's feelings toward the organization and they are affectively committed to their organization. This feeling positively affects perception of

employees about organizational care and responsibility toward all the stakeholders and they feel pride and emotionally attached with that organization. Furthermore, is found that employee's feeling toward their organization lead them to exhibit positive behaviors. In spite of increasing research on the role of CSR and its effect on employee behaviors, relatively less effort have been exerted to explore the explanatory psychological mechanism. Through literature and theoretical support the current study has establish affective commitment as mediation between CSR and employee behavior. Through this mechanism we can explain why and how perceived CSR drive employee positive behavior.

Second, due to lack of research on CSR and service innovation, explanatory mechanism between the two is naturally neglected. Findings of current study enriched scholars' knowledge by revealing the influencing mechanism of CSR on the performance of service innovation. In current study affect of CSR on innovation performance of services is explored. In services employee service innovative behavior and new services developments are important factors. Through the mediating mechanism of AC and OCB, employees by knowledge sharing and supporting each other in their ideas, by creating an environment of self responsibility toward organization, respecting others' initiatives and ideas will bring innovation performance in services. When the employees are affectively committed and exhibiting extra role behaviors, they will exert more effort in bringing innovation their organization.

Third, we contribute to the CSR literature by identifying the performance of service innovation as a business return. The empirical findings reveal that proper adoption of CSR may be a useful strategy to improve the organizational capabilities that are pivotal for sustainable competitive advantages for the organization. Finally, the current study has provided a conceptual framework which is theoretically grounded and supported with empirical findings which explains how corporate social responsibility can be used as a strategic resource and this resource can be used with human resources of the organization and enhance the culture of creativity and innovation and can improve innovation performance in the service organizations. This framework is unique and can be a road map for further empirical studies in service industry. Practically, current study will be helpful for managers and management of hotel services. They should develop more affective commitment for service innovation performance because an affectively committed employee is a strategic asset for any organization. The study can be helpful for managers in their policy development also.

Limitations and Future Research

Current study is limited to the service sector and data were collected from hotel services. In spite of availability of plenty of literature on CSR, limited literature is available on service innovation performance. CSR literature is in macro perspective and external stakeholders' context but we limited our study to micro perspective and internal stakeholders. It is recommended that for future researches internal and external CSR should be separately studied with its dimensions. Internal stakeholder's perspectives particularly focusing employee attitudes and behaviors with other organizational outcomes. The current theoretical framework should be empirically tested in different contextual settings and geographical spread in services and manufacturing sectors for validation and generalization of its results. Cross sectional data were collected from managers of hotels and sample size was small, it is recommended that in future same model should be tested with larger sample size of longitudinal data in same sector as well as other industrial settings. In current study parallel mediation was used in which affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior mediation was tested. OCB being an important variable showed insignificant role between two variables. It is recommended that in future studies sequential mediation should be tested so that more comprehensive understanding should be developed.

References

- Afsar, B., & Badir, Y. (2017). Workplace spirituality, perceived organizational support and innovative work behavior: The mediating effects of person-organization fit. *Journal of workplace Learning*, 29(2), pp. 95-109.
- Agency, C. I. (2017). The World Factbook 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>
- Agency, C. I. (2019). The World Factbook. Retrieved Date from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/fields/214.html>.
- 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), pp. 836-863.
- Akram, T., Lei, S., & Haider, M. J. (2016). The impact of relational leadership on employee innovative work behavior in IT industry of China. *Arab Economic and Business Journal*, 11(2), pp. 153-161.
- Antoni Serra-Cantalops, D. D. P.-M., José Ramón-Cardona, Onofre Martorell-Cunill. (2017). Progress in Research on CSR and the Hotel Industry (2006-2015). *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 59(1), pp. 15-38.
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human relations*, 65(10), pp. 1359-1378.
- Barnett, M. L. (2007). Stakeholder influence capacity and the variability of financial returns to corporate social responsibility. *Academy of management review*, 32(3), pp. 794-816.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resource and Sustained Competitive. *Journal of Management*, 17(1)
- Barney, J. (1991). Special theory forum the resource-based model of the firm: origins, implications, and prospects. *Journal of management*, 17(1), pp. 97-98.
- Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, pp. 63-86.
- Bhaduri, S. N., & Selarka, E. (2016). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility of Indian companies: Springer.
- Bian, Y., & Qiu, H. (2000). The social capital of enterprises and its efficiency. *Social Sciences in China*, 2, pp. 87-99.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Social exchange theory. Retrieved September, 3(2007), p 62.
- Blau, P. M. (1968). Social exchange. *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 7, pp. 452-457.
- Bolin, J. H. (2014). Hayes, Andrew F. (2013). Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression Based Approach. New York, NY: The Guilford Press. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 51(3), pp. 335-337.
- Boon, C., Paauwe, J., Boselie, P., & Den Hartog, D. (2009). Institutional pressures and HRM: developing institutional fit. *Personnel Review*, 38(5), pp. 492-508.
- Bowen, D. E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM's "firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. *Academy of management review*, 29(2), pp. 203-221.
- Brammer, S., He, H., & Mellahi, K. (2015). Corporate social responsibility, employee organizational identification, and creative effort: The moderating impact of corporate ability. *Group & Organization*

- Management, 40(3), pp. 323-352.
- Brammer, S., & Millington, A. (2008). Does it pay to be different? An analysis of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(12), pp. 1325-1343.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(10), pp. 1701-1719.
- Buller, P. F., & McEvoy, G. M. (2012). Strategy, human resource management and performance: Sharpening line of sight. *Human resource management review*, 22(1), pp. 43-56.
- Camison, C., & Monfort-Mir, V. M. (2012). Measuring innovation in tourism from the Schumpeterian and the dynamic-capabilities perspectives. *Tourism management*, 33(4), pp. 776-789.
- Campbell, J. P., & Pritchard, R. D. (1976). Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 63, p 130.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business horizons*, 34(4), pp. 39-48.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), pp. 268-295.
- Chan, E. S. (2011). Implementing environmental management systems in small-and medium-sized hotels: Obstacles. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 35(1), pp. 3-23.
- Chesbrough, H. (2011). Management innovations for the future of innovation. *IVEY Business Journal*, 75
- Chiang, C.-F., & Hsieh, T.-S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), pp. 180-190.
- Choi, J. N. (2007). Change oriented organizational citizenship behavior: effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 28(4), pp. 467-484.
- Chughtai, A. A. (2013). Linking affective commitment to supervisor to work outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(6), pp. 606-627.
- Claudia, M. (2018). The Influence of Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Toward Organizational Citizenship Behavior (a Study of the Permanent Lecturers at University of Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin). *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 33(1), pp. 23-45.
- Cochius, T. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in Dutch SMEs: Motivations and CSR stakeholders. Final thesis Maastricht University Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
- Cole, P. M., & Johnson, K. (2007). An exploration of successful copreneurial relationships postdivorce. *Family Business Review*, 20(3), pp. 185-198.
- Cowper-Smith, A., & de Grosbois, D. (2011). The adoption of corporate social responsibility practices in the airline industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(1), pp. 59-77.
- Damanpour, F., Walker, R. M., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2009). Combinative effects of innovation types and organizational performance: A longitudinal study of service organizations. *Journal of management studies*, 46(4), pp. 650-675.
- Danaei, A., & Iranbakhsh, F. (2016). Key drivers of innovative behavior in hotel industry: evidence from a developing country. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 9(3), pp. 599-625.
- De Roeck, K., & Maon, F. (2018). Building the theoretical puzzle of employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: An integrative conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of business ethics*, 149(3), pp. 609-625.
- Development, W. B. C. f. S. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Meeting changing expectations: World Business Council for Sustainable Development.
- Ditlev-Simonsen, C. D. (2015). The relationship between Norwegian and Swedish employees' perception of corporate social responsibility and affective commitment. *Business & Society*, 54(2), pp. 229-253.
- Eloranta, V., & Turunen, T. (2015). Seeking competitive advantage with service infusion: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Service Management*, 26(3), pp. 394-425.

- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual review of sociology*, 2(1), pp. 335-362.
- Farooq, O., Payaud, M., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2014). The impact of corporate social responsibility on organizational commitment: Exploring multiple mediation mechanisms. *Journal of business ethics*, 125(4), pp. 563-580.
- Farooq, O., Rupp, D. E., & Farooq, M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifoci outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *Academy of management journal*, 60(3), pp. 954-985.
- Fatma, M., Khan, I., & Rahman, Z. (2018). CSR and consumer behavioral responses: the role of customer-company identification. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 30(2), pp. 460-477.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach* (Boston: Pitman, 1984). Jennings, in the article cited above, quotes Freeman and gives additional information concerning the influence of his work
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and organizational psychology: An integrative review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, p 144.
- Glavas, A., & Kelley, K. (2014). The effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on employee attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(2), pp. 165-202.
- Grant, R. M. (1991). The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implications for strategy formulation. *California management review*, 33(3), pp. 114-135.
- Hayes, A. F. (2012). *PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling*: University of Kansas, KS.
- Heslin, P. A., & Ochoa, J. D. (2008). Understanding and developing strategic corporate social responsibility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37, pp. 125-144.
- Holcomb, J. L., Upchurch, R. S., & Okumus, F. (2007). Corporate social responsibility: what are top hotel companies reporting? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19(6), pp. 461-475.
- Hsieh, J.-K., Chiu, H.-C., Wei, C.-P., Rebecca Yen, H., & Cheng, Y.-C. (2013). A practical perspective on the classification of service innovations. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 27(5), pp. 371-384.
- Hurley, R. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: an integration and empirical examination. *Journal of marketing*, 62(3), pp. 42-54.
- Jaiswal, D., & Dhar, R. L. (2016). Impact of perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment and leader member exchange on commitment and its subsequent impact on service quality. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(1), pp. 58-79.
- Kapstein, E. B. (2001). The corporate ethics crusade. *Foreign affairs*, pp. 105-119.
- Karambayya, R. (1990). Contexts for organizational citizenship behavior: Do high performing and satisfying units have better 'citizens'. Unpublished Paper, York University, Ontario
- Kennedy Nyahunzvi, D. (2013). CSR reporting among Zimbabwe's hotel groups: a content analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(4), pp. 595-613.
- Kim, S.-Y., & Park, H. (2011). Corporate social responsibility as an organizational attractiveness for prospective public relations practitioners. *Journal of business ethics*, 103(4), pp. 639-653.
- Kucukusta, D., Denizci Guillet, B., & Chan, H. L. (2016). The effect of CSR practices on employee affective commitment in the airline industry. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, 12(3-4), pp. 451-469.
- Kuslivan, S., & Karamustafa, K. (2001). Multinational hotel development in developing countries: an exploratory analysis of critical policy issues. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(3), pp. 179-197.
- Lee, K.-H., & Hyun, S. S. (2016a). An extended model of employees' service innovation behavior in the airline industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(8), pp. 1622-1648.
- Lee, S., & Heo, C. Y. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and customer satisfaction among US publicly traded hotels and restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), pp. 635-637.
- Lee, S., & Park, S.-Y. (2009). Do socially responsible activities help hotels and casinos achieve their financial goals? *International Journal of Hospitality*

- Management, 28(1), pp. 105-112.
- Little, A. D. (2006). The innovation high ground: Winning tomorrow's customers using sustainability-driven innovation. *Strategic Direction*, 22(1), pp. 35-37.
- Longo, M., Mura, M., & Bonoli, A. (2005). Corporate social responsibility and corporate performance: the case of Italian SMEs. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 5(4), pp. 28-42.
- Luo, X., & Du, S. (2015). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility and firm innovation. *Marketing Letters*, 26(4), pp. 703-714.
- Marchington, M. (2015). Human resource management (HRM): Too busy looking up to see where it is going longer term? *Human resource management review*, 25(2), pp. 176-187.
- Matear, S., Gray, B. J., & Garrett, T. (2004). Market orientation, brand investment, new service development, market position and performance for service organisations. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(3), pp. 284-301.
- Mennens, K., Van Gils, A., Odekerken-Schröder, G., & Letterie, W. (2018). Exploring antecedents of service innovation performance in manufacturing SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 36(5), pp. 500-520.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), pp. 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 61(1), pp. 20-52.
- Morrar, R. (2014). Innovation in services: A literature review. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 4(4)
- Muhammad, I., Shamsudin, M. F., & Hadi, N. U. (2016). How important is customer satisfaction? Quantitative evidence from mobile Telecommunication market. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(6), p 57.
- Nemeth, C. J., & Ormiston, M. (2007). Creative idea generation: Harmony versus stimulation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(3), pp. 524-535.
- Newman, A., Miao, Q., Hofman, P. S., & Zhu, C. J. (2016). The impact of socially responsible human resource management on employees' organizational citizenship behaviour: the mediating role of organizational identification. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(4), pp. 440-455.
- Newman, A., Nielsen, I., & Miao, Q. (2015). The impact of employee perceptions of organizational corporate social responsibility practices on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior: Evidence from the Chinese private sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(9), pp. 1226-1242.
- Nieves, J., Quintana, A., & Osorio, J. (2016). Organizational knowledge, dynamic capabilities and innovation in the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 16(2), pp. 158-171.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* McGraw-Hill New York. The role of university in the development of entrepreneurial vocations: a Spanish study
- O'Cass, A., & Ngo, L. V. (2011). Winning through innovation and marketing: Lessons from Australia and Vietnam. *Industrial marketing management*, 40(8), pp. 1319-1329.
- O'Cass, A., & Viet Ngo, L. (2011). Achieving customer satisfaction in services firms via branding capability and customer empowerment. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(7), pp. 489-496.
- Ostrom, A. L., Bitner, M. J., Brown, S. W., Burkhard, K. A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., . . . Rabinovich, E. (2010). Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service. *Journal of service research*, 13(1), pp. 4-36.
- Paton, R. A., & McLaughlin, S. (2008). Services innovation:: Knowledge transfer and the supply chain. *European Management Journal*, 26(2), pp. 77-83.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard business review*, 84(12), pp. 78-92.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior research methods*, 40(3), pp. 879-891.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature.

- Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), p 698.
- Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Thornton, M. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first party justice perceptions and moral identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), pp. 895-933.
- Schuler, D. A., & Cording, M. (2006). A corporate social performance–corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *Academy of management review*, 31(3), pp. 540-558.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, 37(3), pp. 580-607.
- Sepulveda, F. L. (2014). Does service intangibility affect entrepreneurial orientation? *The service industries journal*, 34(7), pp. 604-629.
- Sharma, S., Sharma, J., & Devi, A. (2009). Corporate social responsibility: the key role of human resource management. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 2(1), pp. 205-213.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Park, S.-Y. (2011). An exploratory study of corporate social responsibility in the US travel industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(4), pp. 392-407.
- Snyder, A. W., Mulcahy, E., Taylor, J. L., Mitchell, D. J., Sachdev, P., & Gandevia, S. C. (2003). Savant-like skills exposed in normal people by suppressing the left fronto-temporal lobe. *Journal of integrative neuroscience*, 2(02), pp. 149-158.
- Stites, J. P., & Michael, J. H. (2011). Organizational commitment in manufacturing employees: Relationships with corporate social performance. *Business & Society*, 50(1), pp. 50-70.
- Storey, C., Cankurtaran, P., Papastathopoulou, P., & Hultink, E. J. (2016). Success factors for service innovation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 33(5), pp. 527-548.
- Survey, P. E. (2018). Growth and Investment Retrieved Date from http://finance.gov.pk/survey/chapters_1/Economic_Survey_2017_18.pdf.
- Thompson, M., & Heron, P. (2006). Relational quality and innovative performance in R&D based science and technology firms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), pp. 28-47.
- Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of business ethics*, 85(4), pp. 411-427.
- Turker, D. (2009b). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of business ethics*, 85(4), pp. 411-427.
- UNECE, O. (2009). Eurostat (2009), *Measuring Sustainable Development: United Nations*, New York and Geneva.
- Urban, G. L. (2004). The emerging era of customer advocacy. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 45(2), p 77.
- Voegtlin, C., & Greenwood, M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and human resource management: A systematic review and conceptual analysis. *Human resource management review*, 26(3), pp. 181-197.
- Waddock, S. A. (2002). *Leading corporate citizens: Vision, values, value-added*: McGraw-Hill/Irwin Boston, MA.
- Wang, Q., Voss, C., Zhao, X., & Wang, Z. (2015). Modes of service innovation: a typology. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 115(7), pp. 1358-1382.
- Windahl, C., & Lakemond, N. (2010). Integrated solutions from a service-centered perspective: Applicability and limitations in the capital goods industry. *Industrial marketing management*, 39(8), pp. 1278-1290.
- Woo, H., & Jin, B. (2016). Apparel firms' corporate social responsibility communications: cases of six firms from an institutional theory perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(1), pp. 37-55.
- Xin, W., & Zhiming, W. (2005). Antecedents and Consequences of Shared Mental Model in Work Teams. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 4
- You, C.-S., Huang, C.-C., Wang, H.-B., Liu, K.-N., Un, C.-H., & Tseng, J.-S. (2013). The relationship between corporate social responsibility, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 5(4), p 65.
- Yuanyuan, B. G. Q. (2009). Extra-role Behavior and Team Innovation Performance: A Multilevel Approach. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 5