THE IMPACT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR, IN FOOD INDUSTRIES IN SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Mohamad Waseem Saad

Researcher, Department of Human Resource Management, Higher Institute of Business Administration (HIBA), Damascus, Syria

Abstract

The study explored the impact of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), the researcher used a questionnaire that was distributed in the food industries sector in Syria, where it was distributed in both (Amana Foods), (New Park), and (High-Quality Food Company), 250 questionnaires were distributed, 215 of which were retrieved at a rate of 86%. Simple and multiple linear regression used to analyze data. The results revealed a significant influence of CSR on OCB and its dimensions. The researcher has developed a set of recommendations based on the results.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Food Industries, Syrian Arab Republic.

Introduction
Over the last few years, there has been a growing awareness among Syrian companies concerning the importance of Corporate Social Responsibility, the importance of establishing a balance between economic and social responsibility increased in recent years, and success of a business is not evaluated only by financial performance, but also by measuring its social performance.

Corporate Social Responsibility becomes commonplace, not only to companies but also to academic literature. Corporate Social Responsibility refers to the concept whereby companies integrate such social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in interaction with their stakeholder on a voluntary basis.

Corporate Social responsibility can be studied from several approaches, it can be studied starting from agency theory, and it can be studied from the side of stakeholders, or from the side of governance.

CSR is the voluntary participation of an organization in the resolution of social problems (Brammer & Pavelin, 2006). CSR has some influence on employees' attitudinal and behavioral outcomes within the organization (Hansen et al., 2016).

Due to the crises and the economic situation in Syria, companies have downsized their employees, which leads to the risk of lack of competencies and manpower in the post-crisis period. This led the researcher to examine the impact of Corporate Social Responsibility into Organizational Citizenship Behavior among workers.

The attention that has been paid to CSR is focusing on the consequences that are associated with CSR activities. The literature discussed that CSR increased employees' commitment to the firm, in addition, perceived CSR influence the employees' organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Cingoz & Akdogan, 2019). This paper highlighted the influence of CSR into OCB in Food Industries Sector, in the Syrian Arab Republic.

For this study, the definition of Corporate Social Responsibility and its related theories are highlighted and discussed, and then Organizational Citizenship Behavior is presented, as following:

1. Corporate Social Responsibility and related Theories

The concept of CSR was the first time coined in Brown's book entitled "Social Responsibilities of Businessmen" published in 1953. In this book, it has been argued that business people must make decisions by taking the values and objectives of the society into consideration, and should not ignore their social objectives in carrying out their economic activities and should carry out activities that will benefit society (Windsor, 2001).

In this part, we will expose the definition of CSR, and then a brief of related theories and approaches of CSR was highlighted.

1.1. Carroll' Pyramid of CSR

Where (Carroll, 1999) CSR should be framed in such a way that the entire range of business responsibilities is embraced. It is suggested here that four kind of social responsibilities constitute total CSR economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic

Carroll (1991) states that there are four types of responsibilities in the CSR Model:

- Economic responsibility,
- Legal responsibility,
- Ethical/moral responsibility,
- Philanthropic responsibility.

According to Carroll, the economic responsibilities of businesses are to produce products and services that society needs and to make profits. Legal responsibility concerns companies with

legal regulations while trying to achieve their economic objectives. The ethical component refers to acting in accordance with moral norms adopted by society, and the most important feature of these norms that they are written by law. Finally, the discretionary component is defined as philanthropy activities that are expected from companies by the community (Carroll A. , 2016).

The perception of CSR will encourage employees' in-role and extra-role behaviors. In-role behaviors are those behaviors that will enable the employee to maintain membership while extra-role behaviors are those that to beyond general expectation to promote the effective operation of the organization or to benefit others in the organizations (Newman et al., 2015). Such extra-role behaviors are considered OCBs (Cingoz & Akdogan, 2019).

1.2.   Corporate Social Responsibility – Stakeholders Approach

When researchers defined CSR, they tend to associate CSR with other relevant themes such as stakeholder theory, business ethics, corporate citizenship, corporate social performance (CSP) and sustainable development.

In accordance to (Khoury, Rostamin, and Turnbull, 1999) the CSR is the overall relationship of the corporation with all of its stakeholders. These include customers, employees, communities, owners/investors, government, suppliers and competitors. (Marrewijk, 2003) Corporate sustainability and CSR refer to company activities-voluntary by definition demonstrating, the inclusion of social and environmental concerns in business operations and in interactions with stakeholders.

(Perrini, 2005) findings reveal that there are eight stakeholders-based categories, namely: (1) human resources; (2) shareholders and financial community; (3) customers; (4) suppliers; (5) financial partners; (6) public authorities; (7) community; (8) environment.

1.3.   Corporate Social Responsibility - Corporate Governance Approach

In accordance with (Mellahi & Frynas & Siegel, 2015) (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016) theories that have become most prominent in explaining CSR behavior are stakeholder's theory, agency theory. These different theories can be classified as either related to explaining external drivers of CSR or related to internal drivers of CSR. Stakeholder's theory is considered as a theory that explains the external driver of CSR, and agency theory is considered a theory that explains the internal driver of CSR.

Broader CG conception: Entails due regard to all stakeholders and ensuring that firms are answerable to all their key stakeholders (Kednall, 1999). A stakeholder approach to CSR: Corporations are the crux of a complex web of stakeholder relationships and have an obligation or responsibility to these different stakeholders (Freeman, 1984).

Narrow CG conception: Ensuring accountability, compliance, and transparency (MacMillan et al., 2004). The internal dimension of CSR: Corporations should accord due diligence to their responsibility to internal stakeholders addressing issues relating to skills and education, workplace safety, working conditions, human rights, equity/equal opportunity, and labor rights (Grosser & Moon, 2005).

2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs)

OCBs are work-related behavior, can be defined as behaviors or activities in a workplace that involves going above and beyond the call of duty and not related to the formal organizational reward system. These behaviors are independent and are not explicit and formalized in work procedures and are not directly reflected in informal systems and organizational rewards.

OCB encompasses both enactments of positive behavior that aids organizational functioning. In order for an organization to function optimally, it is important that employees themselves undertake activities and develop initiatives (e.g. on-the-job training when it is not required, assisting co-workers in their work duties, perfect work attendance, helping the organization as a whole by following codes of conduct, or helping others spontaneously with problems in their work. (Buijs et al., 2019) (Cingoz & Akdogan, 2019).

OCB indicates a willingness with others, volunteering to help out or fill in for co-workers when they are in need, or producing innovative suggestions that will help build overall productivity (Lin et al., 2010).

A five-dimensional model of OCB includes civic virtue, conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship. Citizenship/civic virtue includes the employees' active and voluntary participation in the organization's activities, as well as their responsibility for the livelihood of

the organization. The employees feel responsible for the circumstances affecting the organization, actively participate in the organizational meetings and studies, and strive for acceptance. Responsibility/conscientiousness stands for the employees' discretionary actions beyond the formal requirements such as long working hours, regarding exhibiting such behaviors beyond their minimum role behaviors which are expected of them and obeying attendance to their regular shifts. Selflessness/altruism is voluntary behavior involving the complimentary willingness of the employees to assist another co-worker or employee in the organization contingent upon any other organizational task or problem. Courtesy expresses voluntary behaviors designed to solve problems, to prevent future problems, and to prevent exaggeration of problems that may occur by avoiding negative behaviors. Consequently, sportsmanship is to refrain from the negativities that may create interpersonal tension within the organization (Padsakoff et al., 2000).

Perceptions of employees who are good citizens of the organization should affect their behavior toward being a good citizen in the organization. There are two issues to be considered in determining whether or not the perceived CSR is actually appropriate for promoting OCB: These are social identity and resource allocation. Social identity theory is a prevalent theory that explains when and why individuals act together with social groups (or organizations) and why they adopt common feelings and attitudes within groups (or institutions). Based on social identity theory, corporate citizenship can be expected to contribute positively to the employees' affection, attribution, retention, and motivation since the employees are often identified with positive organizational values more strongly. When employees view their organizations as socially responsible, organizational identification processes will promote both in-role and extra-role behaviors (Newman et al., 2015).

The impact of CSR on OCM: a literature review
Many literatures discussed the impact of the Corporate Social Responsibility into Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. This study explored the impact of corporate social responsibility on employees' attitude and behavior in Financial Service Industry. By using Perceive of CSR policies (CSR Awareness, CSR Fit and CSR Motivation) as independence variable where Organization Citizen Behavior (OCB) used as dependent variable, the result shows the positive effect of CSR into OCB. As a result, corporations should take account of the employee level of participation when engaged in CSR activities. This study contributes a framework to better understand the effect of CSR on employees' attitude and behavior.

The study of (Asif, Ali Nisar, Muhammad Faisal, Khalid, 2017) examine the impact of corporate social responsibility on organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment by concentrating on the mediating role of organizational trust and organizational justice. Findings

revealed that corporate social responsibility have positive and significant impact on organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment.

Study of (Newman, Nielsen, Miao, 2015) examines the impact of employee perceptions of organizational corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices on their job performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), the study revealed that employee perceptions of CSR toward social and non-social stakeholders strongly influenced their OCB.

The study of (Cek, 2019) objective was to provide empirical evidence as to whether teachers' perceptions of their schools' CSR influence their OCB as well as to indicate the mediating role of organizational identification and job satisfaction in this relationship. The results of this study suggested that employees' perceptions of CSR positively influence their OCB when job satisfaction and organizational identification mediate the relationship.

The study of (Gao, He, 2016) was to examine the effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on employee organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), empirical findings demonstrated that CSR had a positive effect on employee OCB, as mediated by supervisors' ethical leadership.

The study of (Mohammed Kunda, Ataman, & Kartaltepe Behram, 2019) to examine the effect of incumbent employees' corporate social responsibility (CSR) perceptions toward multiple stakeholders on their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) within the context of the tourism and hospitality sector in Turkey. It also aims to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction in these relationships. The result of the study showed that two of the four CSR dimensions, namely, CSR toward society and environment and government, had a significant and positive effect on OCB. On the other hand, CSR toward employee was the only variable among the four dimensions of CSR perception that had a significant and positive effect on employee job satisfaction. The finding of the mediation analysis unfortunately failed to support the mediation effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between CSR perceptions and OCB.

3. Research Objective
The objective of this study is to examine the impact of CSR on OCB in the context of food industries sector in Syria.

4. Research Method

4.1 Sample and data collection
Data are obtained from food manufacturing sector in Damascus. The selected companies have social responsibility activities.

A structured questionnaire form was used in this survey. The first section of the questionnaire represent the dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) which are (employees,

customers, society, government, competitors, natural environment, future generation, and NGO) in accordance to (Turker, 2009).

The second section represents the dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) which are (altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue) in accordance to (Tambe & Shanker, 2014). A survey distributed among 250 employees in food factories, 214 cases are retrieved.

4.2 Sample description Analyses
The demographic qualification of the samples is as the following:

Gender	Male	83.6%
	Female	16.4%
Age	Less than 30 years	28.5%
	31 – 40 years	47.7%
	41 – 55 years	22.0%
	56 years and greater	1.9%
Education	High school	37.4%
	Diploma	29.0%
	Higher diploma	5.1%
	University degree	26.2%
	Higher education	2.3%
Education	Less than and up to 5 years	27.4%
	6 – 10 years	23..3%
	11 – 15 years	26.5%
	16 years and greater	22.8%

4.3 Hypotheses and Analyses
The main hypothesis: There is a significant impact of CSR dimensions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB):

H1: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on altruism

H2: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on courtesy

H3: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on sportsmanship

H4: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on conscientiousness

H5: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on civic virtue

H6: There is a significant impact of CSR dimension on OCB

Reliability:

By implementing Cronbach' Alpha on the dimensions of, the results are as the following:

	Cronbach' Alpha
Corporate Social Responsibility	
Employees	.876
Customers	.860
Society	.797
Government	.816
Competitors	.716
Natural Environment	.90
Future Generation	.910
NGO	.698
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)	
Altruism	.784
Courtesy	.867
Sportsmanship	.746
Conscientiousness	.879
Civic Virtue	792

Cronbach's Alpha for all dimensions are satisfactory (>.6)

Hypothesis (H1): The impact of CSR dimensions on altruism

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.492[a]	.242	.239	.48966
2	.543[b]	.295	.288	.47359
3	.566[c]	.321	.311	.46592

a. Predictors: (Constant), society
b. Predictors: (Constant), society, future generation
c. Predictors: (Constant), society, future generation, NGO

The value of R^2 is .242 (Model 1) shows that there are 24.2% changes in response variable altruism, because changes in the independent variable which is CSR towards variable Society.

The value of R2 is .295 (Model 2) shows that there are 29.5% changes in response variable altruism, because changes in combination of two independent variables which are CSR towards society and CSR towards future generation.

The value of R2 is .321 (Model 3) shows that there are 32.1% changes in response variable altruism, because changes in combination of three independent variables which are CSR towards society, CSR towards future generation, and CSR towards NGO.

By comparing models, Model 3 is better fit to data because the higher value of R2 and adjusted R2.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.085	.207		10.085	.000
	Society	.433	.053	.492	8.255	.000
2	(Constant)	1.899	.205		9.246	.000
	Society	.294	.062	.333	4.748	.000
	Future Generation	.203	.051	.278	3.963	.000
3	(Constant)	1.807	.205		8.830	.000
	Society	.230	.065	.261	3.550	.000
	Future Generation	.153	.053	.209	2.854	.005
	NGO	.142	.050	.204	2.835	.005

a. Dependent Variable: altruism

According to Model 1, the standardized coefficients for CSR towards society (β=.433, $p<.05$) is significant. This explained that only CSR towards society is factor to the altruism. While in Model 2 CSR towards society (β=.294, $p<.05$) and CSR towards future generation (β=.203, $p<.05$) are significant. This explained that CSR towards society and CSR towards future generation are factors to altruism. While in Model 3 CSR towards society (β=.230, $p<.05$) CSR towards future generation (β=.153, $p<.05$) CSR towards NGO (β=.142, $p<.05$) are significant. This explained that CSR towards society, CSR towards future generation, and CSR towards NGO are factors to altruism. Model 3 is better model fits to the data.

Hypothesis (H2): The impact of CSR dimensions on the courtesy:

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.422[a]	.178	.174	.46490
2	.456[b]	.208	.200	.45745

a. Predictors: (Constant), government

b. Predictors: (Constant), government, society

The value of R^2 is .178 (Model 1) shows that there are 17.8% changes in response variable courtesy, because changes in the independent controlled variable CSR toward government.

The value of R^2 is .208 (Model 2) shows that there are 17.8% changes in response variable courtesy, because changes in combination of two controlled variables which are CSR towards government and CSR towards society. By comparing models, Model 2 is better fit to data because the higher value of R^2 and adjusted R^2.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.861	.214		13.368	.000
	Government	.370	.054	.422	6.786	.000
2	(Constant)	2.638	.225		11.729	.000
	Government	.251	.068	.286	3.683	.000
	Society	.176	.062	.220	2.828	.005

a. Dependent Variable: courtesy

According to Model 1, the standardized coefficients for CSR towards government (β=.370, p<.05) is significant. This explained that only CSR towards government is factor to the courtesy. While in Model 2 CSR towards government (β=.251, p<.05) and CSR towards society (β=.176, p<.05) are significant. This explained that CSR towards government and CSR towards society are factors to courtesy. Model 2 is better model fits to the data.

Hypothesis (H3): The impact of CSR dimensions on the sportsmanship:

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.388ᵃ	.151	.147	.48762
2	.413ᵇ	.170	.162	.48313

a. Predictors: (Constant), competitors

b. Predictors: (Constant), competitors, government

The value of R^2 is .151 (Model 1) shows that there are 15.1% changes in response variable sportsmanship, because changes in controlled variable CSR towards competitors.

The value of R^2 is .17 (Model 2) shows that there are 17% changes in response variable sportsmanship, because changes in combination of two controlled variables which are CSR towards competitors and CSR towards government. By comparing models, Model 2 is better fit to data because the higher value of R^2 and adjusted R^2.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.583	.233		11.093	.000
	Competitors	.356	.058	.388	6.150	.000
2	(Constant)	2.387	.247		9.672	.000
	Competitors	.236	.078	.258	3.016	.003
	Government	.173	.077	.191	2.231	.027

a. Dependent Variable: sportsmanship

According to Model 1, the standardized coefficients for CSR towards competitors (β=.356, p<.05) is significant. This explained that only CSR towards competitors is factor to the sportsmanship. While in Model 2 CSR towards competitors (β=.236, p<.05) and CSR towards government (β=.173, p<.05) are significant. This explained that CSR towards competitors and CSR towards government are factors to sportsmanship. Model 2 is better model fits to the data.

Hypothesis (H4): The impact of CSR dimensions on the conscientiousness:

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.449[a]	.202	.198	.44900
2	.472[b]	.223	.215	.44419

a. Predictors: (Constant), customers
b. Predictors: (Constant), customers, NGO

The value of R^2 is .202 (Model 1) shows that there are 20.2% changes in response variable conscientiousness, because changes in controlled variable CSR towards customers.

The value of R^2 is .223 (Model 2) shows that there are 22.3% changes in response variable conscientiousness, because changes in combination of two controlled variables which are CSR towards customers and CSR towards NGO. By comparing models, Model 2 is better fit to data because the higher value of R^2 and adjusted R^2.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.384	.269		8.869	.000
	customers	.459	.063	.449	7.343	.000
2	(Constant)	2.262	.271		8.355	.000
	customers	.406	.066	.397	6.172	.000
	NGO	.095	.040	.153	2.374	.018

a. Dependent Variable: conscientiousness

According to Model 1, the standardized coefficients for customers (β=.459, p<.05) is significant. This explained that only CSR towards customer is factor to the conscientiousness. While in Model 2 CSR towards customers (β=.406, p<.05) and CSR towards NGO (β=.095, p<.05) are significant. This explained that CSR towards customers and CSR towards NGO are factors to conscientiousness. Model 2 is better model fits to the data.

Hypothesis (H5): The impact of CSR dimensions on the civic virtue:

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.471[a]	.222	.218	.41405
2	.521[b]	.271	.264	.40170
3	.537[c]	.288	.278	.39789

a. Predictors: (Constant), government
b. Predictors: (Constant), government, customers
c. Predictors: (Constant), government, customers, society

The value of R^2 is .222 (Model 1) shows that there are 22.2% changes in response variable civic virtue, because changes in controlled variable CSR towards government.

The value of R^2 is .271 (Model 2) shows that there are 27.1% changes in response variable civic virtue, because changes in combination of two controlled variables which are CSR towards government and CSR towards customers.

The value of R^2 is .288 (Model 3) shows that there are 28.8% changes in response variable civic virtue, because changes in combination of three controlled variables which are CSR towards government, CSR towards customers, and CSR towards society. By comparing models, Model 3 is better fit to data because the higher value of R^2 and adjusted R^2.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.655	.191		13.927	.000
	Government	.378	.049	.471	7.790	.000
2	(Constant)	1.976	.258		7.664	.000
	Government	.298	.052	.371	5.768	.000
	Customers	.232	.061	.243	3.782	.000
3	(Constant)	1.959	.255		7.670	.000
	Government	.228	.060	.283	3.798	.000
	Customers	.181	.065	.190	2.797	.006
	Society	.130	.058	.177	2.252	.025

a. Dependent Variable: civicvirtue

According to Model 1, the standardized coefficients for CSR towards government (β=.378, p<.05) is significant. This explained that only CSR towards government is factor to the civic virtue. While in Model 2 CSR towards government (β=.298, p<.05) and CSR towards customers (β=.232, p<.05) are significant. This explained that CSR towards government and CSR towards customers are factors to civic virtue. While in Model 3 CSR towards government (β=.228, p<.05) CSR towards customers (β=.181, p<.05) CSR towards society (β=.130, p<.05) are significant. This explained that CSR towards government, CSR towards customers, and CSR towards society are factors to civic virtue. Model 3 is better model fits to the data.

5. Results and Discussion
There is a significant positive influence of CSR towards society, CSR towards future generation, and CSR towards NGO on altruism, while (Bozkurt & Bal, 2012) found that only CSR towards NGO positively influence altruism.

There is a significant positive influence of CSR towards government, and CSR towards society on courtesy, while (Bozkurt & Bal, 2012) found that only CSR towards government positively influence courtesy

There is a significant positive influence of CSR towards competitors, and CSR towards government on sportsmanship, while (Bozkurt & Bal, 2012) found that only CSR towards NGO positively influence sportsmanship

There is a significant positive influence of CSR towards government, CSR towards customers, and CSR towards society on civic virtue, while (Bozkurt & Bal, 2012) found that only CSR towards NGO positively influence civic virtue.

There is a significant positive influence of CSR towards society, CSR towards competitors, and CSR towards NGO on organizational citizenship behavior. This result is similar to results of the study of (SheikMohamed & Anisa, 2014) ,(Bozkurt & Bal, 2012).

6. Recommendation

1. As Corporate Social Responsibility has a significant influence on the Organization Citizenship Behavior, it is necessary to point out the need to raise the level of corporate social responsibility through:

   - The need to increase attention to the needs of employees and work on them.
   - The need to review the fairness of administrative decisions.
   - The need to continue to pay attention to corporate social responsibility by creating a special division for the company that deals with social responsibility, and for this section to have a special budget.
   - Corporate social responsibility should be among the company's strategic plans.

2. Companies can monitor incentives and rewards workers whose citizenship behavior manifests itself with helping others, carrying burdens, and initiatives to help each other. This is what motivates the researcher to make a recommendation in this regard to evaluate the employees' level of citizenship behavior to strengthen it and link it with the company's bonus system.

Bibliography

Asif, M., Ali Nisar, Q., Muhammad Faisal, H., & Khalid, H. (2017). Does Corporate Social Responsibility influence the Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment? Mediating Role of Organizational Trust & Organizational Justice. *researchgate*.

Bozkurt & Bal. (2012). Investigation of the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: a Research. *International Journal of Innovations in Business*, Vol.1, No.1.

Brammer & Pavelin. (2006). Corporate Reputation and Social Performance: The Importance of Fit. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43, No.3.

Buijs et al. (2019). Warrior and Peacekeeper Role Identities: Association with Self-Esteem, Organizational Commitment an Organizationa Citizenship Behvior. *sciendo Military Study*, Vol.3, No.15.

Carroll. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, Vol.34 No.4, pp.39-48.

Carroll. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility: Evoltuion of a Definitional Construct. *Business and Society*, 38(3):268-295.

Carroll, A. (2016). Carroll's Pyramid of CSR: Taking another Look. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, Vol.1, No.3.

Cek, K. (2019). Does teachers' perceived corporate social responsibility lead to organisational citizenship behaviour? The mediating roles of job satisfaction and organisational identification. *South African Journal of Business Management*.

Cingoz & Akdogan. (2019). A Study on Determining the Relationships Among Corporate Social Responsibility, Organizational Citizenship Behvior and Ethical Leadership. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, Vol.17, No.1.

Freeman. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman Publishing.

Frynas & Yamahaki. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility: Review and Roadmap of Theoretical Perspctives. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 25(3), 258-285.

Gao & He. (2017). Corporate Social Responsibilityand Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Roles of Ethcal Leadership and Organizational Justice. *Management Decision*, Vol.55, No.2, pp.294-309.

Gao, Y., & He, W. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee organizational citizenship behavior. *emerald*.

Grosser & Moon. (2005). Gender mainstreaming and CSR: Reporting workspace Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62: 327-340.

Hansen et al. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility, Ethical Leadership, and Trust Propensity: A Multi-Experience Model of Perceived Ethica Climate. *Jouranl of Business Ethics*, No.137, 4:649-662.

Kednall. (1999). Good Corporate Governance. *Accountants' Digest*, Issue 40.

Lin et al. (2010). Modeling Corporate Citizenship and its relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, No.95, pp.357-372.

MacMillan et al. (2004). Giving Your Organization SPIRT: An overview and call to action for directors on issues of corporate governance, corporate reputation and corporate responsibility. *Journal of General Management*, 30: 15-42.

Marrewijk, V. (2003). Concepts and Definisions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Commuion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(2-3):95-105.

Mellahi & Frynas & Siegel. (2015). A Review of the Nonmarket Strategy Literature Toward a Multi-Theoretical Integration. *Journal of Management*.

Mohammed Kunda, M., Ataman, G., & Kartaltepe Behram, N. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and organizational citizenship behavior. *emerald insight*.

Newman et al. (2015). The Impact of Employee Peerceptions of Organizational Corporate Social Responsibility Practicves on Job Performance and Organizational Citizeship Behvior: Evidincec from the Chinese Private Sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.26, No.9, pp.1226-1242.

Newman et al. (2015). The Impact of Employee Perceptions of Organizational Corporate Social Responsibility Practices on Job Performance and Organizational Cititzenship Behvior: Evidence from the Chinese Private Sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.26, No.9, pp.1226-1242.

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. *Human Resource Management*.

Padsakoff et al. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behvaiors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical an Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, Vol.26, No.3, pp.513-563.

Perrini. (2005). Building a European Portrait of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. *European Management Journal*, 23(6):611-627.

SheikMohamed & Anisa. (2014). Establishing the Link of OCB and CSR with Organizational Performance. *Journal of Management Research*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.143-158.

Tambe & Shanker. (2014). A Study of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Its Dimensions: A Litrature Review. *International Research Journal of Business and Management (IRJBM)*, Vol.1, pp.67-73.

Turker, D. (2009). Measuring Corporate Social Responsibility: A Scale Development Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85:411-427.

Wee. (2014). *The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Employees' Attitude and Behaviour.* Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.

Windsor. (2001). The Future of Corporate Social Responsibility. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol.9, No.3, pp.225-256.