

Doing good for other people and the planet and/or obsessed with your career?

Personal value orientations as a predictor for internal CSR preferences of young professionals

Susanne Rank and Jason Palframan

University of Applied Sciences Mainz, Germany & TUS Midlands Midwest University, Ireland

Abstract

In striving for sustainability success in organizations, the proactive behaviour of employees in times of irreversible climate change is of great importance: employees with an awareness of sustainability and their subsequent extra-role work behavior are required. As ambassadors for corporate social responsibility (CSR), they might convince their colleagues of the importance of CSR for business success. Sustainable and Green human resource management (HRM) concepts (e.g. participation in cultural campaigns, green vs social projects and green awareness training) promote this sustainable employee behavior. Our fundamental research question is therefore whether the personal value orientations (PVO) of candidates and/or employees predict internal CSR preferences that later promote sustainable employee behavior. In our integrative literature review, we focus on young, highly qualified job seekers who are facing the grand challenges of the 21st century. Applying Schwartz's personal values framework, empirical studies are reviewed to examine the proposed relationship between Schwartz's personal values framework and employees' internal CSR preferences. Our review yields heterogenous results: Schwartz's self-transcendence values either positively or negatively impacted the internal social and environmental CSR dimensions, but the influence of self-enhancement values on employee focused CSR dimensions was consistent. Future research directions are set out along with practical implications. Finally, we give an outlook on our planned empirical work including hypotheses on a comparative sample of German and Irish students.

Key words: Internal CSR, personal value orientation, Green and sustainable HRM

1. Introduction

As the United Nations' sustainable development goals (SDG, UN, 2021) form the foundation for corporate social responsibility (CSR), CSR is likely to play a central role in the strategy and business model of organizations as they rely on ever-changing, even shrinking resources and help to alleviate the increasing pressures of growing economic, social and environmental issues affecting the world. CSR as a strategy and framework have been discussed for many years and continue to persist in the extant literature (Allen et al., 2016; Pisani et al., 2017; Turner, et al., 2019). In particular, a growing body of literature recognizes the importance of CSR and its contribution towards the triple bottom line (i.e. people, planet and profit) "for a more sustainable biosphere" (Renwick, 2018, p. 8), and to address the "grand challenges" facing our planet (Aust et al., 2020).

CSR as a multi-dimensional concept is based on the stakeholder approach to sustainable business, fulfils an obligation and welfare to internal vs. external stakeholders, impacting our society, our environment and economy (Carroll, 1979; Kolk, 2016). Glavas et al., (2016, p. 2) defines CSR in general as "context specific organizational actions and policies that take into account the stakeholders' expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social and environmental performance." This CSR definition forms the basis for our review whereby CSR is differentiated into internal vs. external CSR. The internal stakeholder approach (i.e. internal CSR) includes an emphasis on employees, while the external stakeholder view (i.e. external CSR) focuses mainly on the marketplace, customers and community (Brammer et al., 2007, 2009). Based on El Akremi et al., (2015) the external perspective could be supplemented by five dimensions such as community, supplier, customer, natural environment and shareholder orientation to a multi-dimensional CSR perspective, leading to increased work engagement and commitment; whereas internal CSR was only defined by one dimension, i.e. employee-oriented CSR, in their seven studies.

Internal CSR, however, includes ethical and transparent action that contributes to the health and welfare of employees by regarding them as citizens of society (ISO 26000, 2010). Mory et al. (2015, 2016, 2017) and Bustamante et al. (2020) identified a number of social preferences covered by internal CSR in relation to the employee vs. organizational dimension: these include work-life balance, social benefits, health & safety, training & development opportunities, diversity/equal opportunities, job security, and labor relations. Internal CSR benefits in attracting future highly qualified candidates, and in developing and retaining employees (Rank & Contreras, 2021). For example, Kim et al. (2010) found that active CSR participation directly

influenced employee identification, which in turn impacted employee commitment in contrast to mere CSR perceptions. Ferreira & de Oliveira (2014) found that employees who were only exposed to internal CSR scenarios were more engaged than those who were only exposed to external CSR scenarios.

Here we focus on internal CSR to examine what CSR preferences employees have in a modern workplace. In order to strengthen and increase the internal CSR activities of organizations, the support and engagement of employees is crucial, especially of young, highly qualified job seekers who have to face the sustainable issues of the 21st century. This allows us to look from the perspective of young, highly qualified job seekers. Due to changing demographics in Europe, young professionals with university degrees are rare and the war for talent (Chambers et al., 1998) is forcing employers to find, recruit, integrate and retain this talent.

Sustainable human resource management (HRM) with its strategies, policies and practices may increase the extra-role behavior of employees, i.e. recruiting candidates with a preference and attitude towards CSR, CSR training and sustainability awareness, and then further rewarding behavior may ultimately contribute to the sustainable performance of the organization (“common good approach”, Aust et al., 2019; Ehnert 2009; and Ehnert et al., 2016). Since Green HRM is part of sustainable HRM (Wagner, 2013; Renwick, 2018; Paulet et al., 2021), which aims to improve green behavior of employees, we believe that the overarching pillars of internal CSR, i.e. the environmental and social pillars, are worth considering in order to contribute to overall sustainability. Thus, the employee could contribute to both pillars of internal CSR with their pro-active behavior.

In particular, by defining internal CSR actions embedded in a sustainable HRM framework, the organization could recruit CSR-motivated job seekers to encourage employee behavior to contribute to sustainable business strategies. Consistent with the person-organization (PO) fit approach (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987; Schneider, et al., 1996), we recognize that personal values are fundamental to every hiring candidate. Personal values predict attitudes, preferences and behavior of individuals as underlying foundations and guide “what is good and worthy”, (Sagiv et al., 2017, p. 1). Drawing together the three research strands mentioned above (i.e., internal CSR, sustainable HRM, personal values), our central research question examines the extent to which personal value orientation predicts internal CSR preferences towards sustainable employee behavior.

The remaining part of the paper proceeds as follows: First, we define internal CSR in relation to sustainable HRM as a key contributor to internal CSR: we argue that sustainable HRM practices could help to develop these altruistically motivated young professionals into CSR ambassadors within the organization and increase the overall sustainability of the organization to a higher level of maturity (Aust et al., 2021). Second, we review the operationalization of the internal CSR construct and its preferences, and note how the construct with dimensions has been applied differentially in studies and identify the need for further validation of the internal CSR preferences (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017; Bustamante et al., 2020; El Alkreimi et al., 2015). Third, we examine whether the personal values orientation (Schwartz, 1992, 2014) of young job seekers predicts internal CSR preferences by reviewing existing literature. Finally, we conclude with an examination of the main directions for future research along with practical implications, responding to the call of Aust et al., (2021) to make HRM more sustainable and to contribute to the growing theoretical base of sustainable HRM.

Internal CSR dimensions and sustainable HRM

Internal CSR includes ethical and transparent action that contributes to the health and welfare of employees as well as to society (ISO 26000, 2010). According to Aust et al., (2020), internal CSR is an integrated part of a sustainable HRM approach by contributing to the overall sustainability of the organization in the current times of climate change. Employees can add value to organizational performance through their sustainable behavior (e.g. Ferreira, et al., 2014; Radwan, 2015; Obeidat et al., 2016; Low et al., 2017; Soni & Mehta, 2020; Turker, 2009; Wang et al., 2020). This extra-role behavior beyond their day-to-day work is commonly referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and has a strong impact on the implementation of sustainable business strategies (e.g., Dumont et al., 2016; Paillé et al., 2014).

Sustainable HRM practices can support environmental and social pillars of internal CSR. For example, sustainable HRM practices can support the recruitment of CSR-motivated job seekers, the setting of sustainable employee performance goals, green awareness training to encourage managerial and employee behavior that contribute to sustainable business strategies (Armutha & Geetha, 2020; Yong et al., 2019). Hence, sustainable HRM is “the adoption of HRM strategies and practices that enable the achievement for financial, social and environment goals, with an impact inside and outside of the organization and over a long-term time horizon while controlling for unintended side effects and negative feedback” (Ehnert et al., 2016, p.20). In short, sustainable HRM can foster an attractive, sustainable, greener and more socially minded

employer than before by creating a positive candidate and employee experience for the social cause (Deloitte, 2017). Thus, internal CSR should be an integrated part of a sustainable HRM approach as suggested by Aust et al., (2020) and Turner et al., (2019).

As the theoretical foundation of our research question, we now discuss three different approaches to examine the value congruence (fit) of employee and employer concerning internal CSR which is fostered by sustainable HRM practices.

First, Jones et al., (2017) elaborated on the interdependencies of three CSR levels in organizations (macro vs. meso vs. micro level). At the macro level, the focus is on the societal impact of CSR, while at the meso level, CSR practices and corporate performance are considered. However, we focus on the third level of Jones et al., (2017), the micro level, which deals with individual beliefs, values and behaviors in the workplace, to explore the relationship between personal values and the internal CSR preferences of employees with regard to sustainable HRM.

Second, Haski-Leventhal et al., (2017) in a recent evidence-based review suggest that the identity of the employer as an organization and the employee should be in congruence. They described this congruence as a dynamic continuum from “low” to “intertwined” CSR. Haski-Leventhal et al., (2017) differentiated CSR into two perspectives of corporate vs. employee social responsibility. The latter covers our definition of internal CSR preferences from employee perceptions, but is not consistent with the previous definitions such as ISO 26000 or Brammer et al., (2007) since this definition makes no difference between the two perspectives. Haski-Leventhal et al., (2017) further elaborated this model in the form of a mediator model. The congruence of corporate and employee social responsibility is the mediator between engagement and organizational outcomes such as environment, social and economic performance. Organizations can influence the level of congruence through sustainable HRM (i.e. recruitment, selection, etc.), which leads to long-term employee engagement. The distinction between corporate vs. employee focus sheds some light on the overall structure of internal CSR, which helps to separate the focus at organizational and individual levels (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017). Consistent with the PO-fit approach (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987; Schneider, et al., 1996), this proposed congruence of the internal CSR fit of employer vs. employee (Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017) could be a key factor for sustainable HRM, e.g. by recruiting candidates with a high congruence to the employer's values, or existing employees

with a high congruence towards internal green projects, or by transforming workplace culture towards transparency and ethical values. However, which specific personal values of the employees could increase the congruence with the CSR values of the organization remains open and should be specified.

Third, Aguinis & Glavas (2019), like Haski-Leventhal et al., (2017), developed a mediator model with an underlying mechanism of “sensemaking” based on employee perception. Derived from empirical findings, sensemaking is defined by the perceived meaningful work of the employees.¹ Aguinis & Glavas (2019) found that CSR operates on three levels: (1) intra-individual level: which concerns work orientation, ecological and community values, moral identity; at the (2) intra-organizational level: in terms of top-down vs. bottom-up CSR measures; and (3) extra-organizational level: culture, external stakeholders. When CSR measures are implemented in companies, then employees assess the meaningfulness of their work and their extra-role behavior, e.g., by getting involved in green organizational projects at these different levels. In line with our focus, Aguinis & Glavas (2019, p. 17) confirmed the importance of our central research question at levels 1 and 2: “Will the positive effect of environmental values on meaningfulness depend on work orientation such that the relationship will be stronger for individuals with a stronger calling orientation” (i.e. belong to meaning of work and altruistic value) “compared to those with a weaker calling orientation?”.

In summary, these theoretical approaches show how the interplay of organizational vs. individual levels might contribute to an ethical work culture as part of internal CSR, sensemaking organizational purpose, sustainable HRM practices and meaningful work. Further, internal CSR with its dimensions might clarify how maturity on the organizational vs. individual level could be enhanced.

Comparison of different internal CSR constructs

In seven studies, El Akremi et al. (2015) validated a general CSR scale including an external vs. internal focus which impacted the organizational commitment mediated by organizational support. From an internal CSR perspective, only the employee-oriented CSR dimension was considered. This has to be viewed critically because the external dimensions focused on five

¹ Meaningful work (MOW) is a multi-dimensional concept about one's experience of the self-concept, personal growth and with a focus on being other-oriented (e.g. helping others and contributing to the greater good, Allan, et al., 2019; Bailey, et al., 2019). In their meta-analysis, Allan et al. (2019) reported that MOW strongly correlates with work engagement, commitment and job satisfaction; moderate with life satisfaction, meaning in life, general health and withdrawal intentions. Thus, MOW might be considered as a potential moderator for internal CSR preferences on organizational commitment.

dimensions (e.g. community-oriented, natural environment-oriented, supplier-oriented, customer-oriented and shareholder-oriented CSR).

According to ISO 26000 mentioned earlier, the social pillar of internal CSR includes the following internal HR practices: (1) work-life balance; (2) health and safety; (3) training and development opportunities; (4) diversity and equal opportunities; (5) job security and labor relations, but are each operationalized differently as preferences in studies (Glavas, 2016; Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017; Wang et al., 2020). Based on Green HRM research (Renwick, 2018, Ren et al., 2018), the environmental pillar should be integrated into the internal CSR framework. The next issue in our review is therefore an overview of existing internal CSR constructs and their dimensions. In our further discussion, we focus on the main studies of Bustamante et al. (2020) and Mory et al. (2015, 2016, 2017) which focus on internal CSR construct and its dimensions (i.e. preferences) specifically examining what they have in common and where they differ.

Bustamante et al. (2020), for example, showed that some preferences belong to the workplace category of internal CSR, while the others are linked to the employee responsibility category of internal CSR (see Figure 1). They argue that some preferences directly affect employees' self-concept and enhance individual self-values (e.g. workplace attractiveness, employee responsibility), whereas other dimensions (like responsibility towards society and environment) are based on the doing good perspective, such as self-transcendence values. This distinction of personal values derives from Schwartz's value approach (Schwartz, 1992, 2003; Schwartz et al., 2012).

In contrast, Mory et al. (2015, 2016, 2017) in several studies identified two independent factors (employee vs. organizational CSR) that form a latent construct of internal CSR (an orthogonal factor with these two dimensions). Furthermore, employees' perceptions of the overall internal CSR factor impacted their assessed affective commitment, which supports sustainable HRM research (e.g. El Akremi et al., 2015). However, the environmental pillar was less represented in the internal CSR dimensions, see Figure 1.

Overall, the internal CSR dimension of Mory et al. (2015, 2016, 2017) differs from that of Bustamante et al. (2020), however, we have sorted these internal CSR dimensions according to similarity in content (see Figure 1). Further empirical validation will be required in future studies to determine which of the internal CSR dimensions contribute to the internal latent CSR construct.

Figure 1: Comparisons of dimensions related to internal CSR

Bustamante et al., (2020)	Mory et al., (2015, 2016, 2017)		
<p>Workplace attractiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary and material wealth • Career opportunities • Work atmosphere • Challenges at work and tasks variety • Participating in decisions • Independence & ownership • Continuing staff education & training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work environment • Capabilities & competencies • Job security • Diversity • Work life balance • Employee involvement • Responsibility in the job 	Employee CSR	Internal CSR
<p>Responsibility towards employees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services to advance security & health • Work-life balance / family-friendly policies • Job security / social services • Fairness and anti-discrimination policies 			
<p>Responsible corporate management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate transparency • Ethical principles • Stakeholders' concerns • Fairness towards partners, suppliers & competitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency • Ethical values • Fairness • Engagement 	Organizational CSR	
<p>Responsibility towards society and environment (i.e. external CSR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social engagement • Volunteer programs • Energy & resource efficiency • Reducing emissions • Eco-friendliness of products • Green and social issues in supply chain • Commitment to sustainability standards 	<p>(Missing the environmental pillar with sustainable and Green HRM, e.g. HR concepts supporting employee green behavior)</p>		

Following the person organizational (PO) fit approach (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987; Schneider et al., 1995), we can learn from internal CSR evidence which aspects of a potential employer can attract highly skilled job seekers as potential candidates so that they increase their intention to apply (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; Haski-Leventhal et al., 2017). From a sustainable HRM perspective, these target groups could fit the CSR values of the employees vs. the organization (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017) and could act as CSR ambassadors for the organization's sustainability projects in the future.

As mentioned earlier, previous research on the impact of CSR on organizational attractiveness operationalized internal CSR heterogeneously (as well as external CSR, Gond et al., 2010; see Glavas, 2016 for a complete review). To show how internal CSR is perceived by young job seekers and impacts their job decision or organizational attractiveness rating, we summarize the most important studies below (for a recent overview, see Rank & Contreras, 2021).

Ng & Burke's (2005) study of MBA job seekers focused on whether internal diversity management programs influence job selection decisions. Women and ethnic minorities rated diversity management as important when accepting job offers. Jones et al., (2014) tested the signal-based mechanisms of CSR on job seekers' interest and found that the value congruence between the candidate and the organization is another facet related to CSR. Gully et al., (2013) examined job seekers as to whether CSR activities in the area of social and environmental responsibility of organizations had an impact on their job choice. The findings suggested that the impact on job choice depended on the intentions of the job seeker and their own desire to have a significant impact on their work. Montgomery & Ramus (2011) showed that MBA students (Millennials) in the US and Europe gave intellectual challenge (internal CSR) the highest priority when asked about job factor preferences. In addition, the organization's reputation for internal care for employees and ethics for products and services played a key role in the choice of employer. Catano & Morrow Hines (2016) conducted an experiment with Canadian students and showed that the effect of CSR activities and psychologically healthy workplaces increased the employer attractiveness; in addition, they found that personal values such as openness moderated this relationship. Finally, Zhang et al. (2020) found that the influence of social CSR on organizational attractiveness is mediated by the cognitive and affective perceptions of employees in China.

In summary, these studies have operationalized dimensions of internal CSR in various ways, but revealed that internal CSR preferences might play a role when choosing a job in an organization. In particular, some preferences of internal CSR (i.e. intellectual challenge, caring about employees, personal development, flexible working hours, diversity/equality) significantly influenced employer attractiveness and their organizational commitment. These preferences can be mapped to the dimensions of employee responsibility and workplace by Bustamante et al. (2020) and on employee CSR and ethical behavior on the organizational CSR dimension by Mory et al. (2015, 2016, 2017). This is consistent with the ISO 26000 standard for internal CSR at an individual micro level (see Jones et al., 2017; Aguinis & Glavas, 2019).

Having presented evidence for internal CSR and the importance of these preferences in establishing modern workplace attractiveness and culture, we now approach our central research question of whether the personal values of potential candidates or current employees could predict their internal CSR preferences.

Personal values as a predictor for internal CSR preferences

Schwartz (1992, 2014) developed a theory of basic values from intercultural research, which comprises 57 values items, and grouped them into ten different types of values that are important for human life: universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security, power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction and divided into four clusters: self-transcendence, conservation, self-enhancement and openness to change. Sagiv et al. (2017, p. 1) argued that these values predict attitudes, preferences and behavior of individuals as underlying foundations and give direction as to “what is good and worthy”, are trans-situational goals, and act as guiding principles.

The connection between these values and sustainable behavior in companies has been tested in a number of studies (see a review by Rickaby et al., 2020). We base our research questions on Schwartz’s value theory and ask ‘to what extent do personal value orientations (PVO) predict internal CSR preferences towards sustainability’; in particular, ‘which personal values are predictors for the different internal CSR preferences’ (compared to figure 1)?

Evidence of the interplay between Schwartz's values and CSR preferences (i.e. mix of general vs. internal vs. external CSR) is mainly provided by studies with students. The evidence is based in particular on the student sample and their willingness to engage in community initiatives. Since the (internal vs. external) CSR preferences were operationalized differently in these studies drawing comparisons are problematic. Therefore, after discussing this evidence, we will transfer these findings to the internal CSR perspective as there may be a research gap for internal CSR and its presumed connection to personal values, which we will address in our conclusion. Consistent with the focus of our research question, universalism and benevolence of Schwartz’s value theory might be important predictors for internal CSR belonging to the ‘self-transcendence’ cluster, as the following studies may support this notion.

Evans & Davis (2012, p.1), for example, conducted an experiment with students in the USA which showed that “perceived corporate citizenship impacted the job applicants’ attraction for those individuals who received prior education regarding CSR and for those who were higher in other-regarding value orientation”.

In another experiment in the USA, Kim & Park (2011), operationalized CSR as a communal program sticking to the social pillar of CSR only and presented a fictitious person-organizational fit and was rated by the students as job seekers. The degree of person-organizational fit mediated between (good vs. poor) CSR reputation and organizational attractiveness or intent to apply.

Lin et al. (2012) found among Taiwanese students that corporate citizenship of real and successful Taiwanese companies impacted the job seekers’ perceived firm attractiveness and, interestingly, potential career success expectations of the students’ job applications. These results contradict the argumentation of Bustamante et al. (2020) that doing good like citizenship is based on self-transcendence values and not on self-enhancement values. But corporate citizenship was operationalized based on the CSR concept of Carroll (1979, economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic citizenship), i.e. specified as the external and not the internal view of CSR.

Wang & Juslin (2011) examined the relationship between value patterns and CSR perceptions of Chinese university students. The results showed that the altruistic values of the Chinese students are negatively associated with CSR perceptions, while their egoistic values are positively associated with the CSR attitudes. Further, the well-known gender effect on CSR attitudes was shown based on earlier studies that show women are more in favour of CSR than men (e.g. Ng & Burke, 2005). For these Chinese students, social and economic responsibility was overall more important than environmental responsibility. Wang & Juslin (2011) conclude that CSR education is culture-specific and needs to be tailored to the target group, as they had less knowledge about CSR at the time of the study.

In a cross-cultural study involving 17 countries, Müller et al., (2012) found that certain cultural dimensions increased the influence of CSR preferences on affective commitment (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017): human orientation was the strongest moderator followed by institutional vs. in-group collectivism, future orientation and low power distance on affective commitment (see

House et al., 2004) The CSR construct was a general scale of some internal vs. external CSR characteristics (i.e. a mixture of CSR characteristics by Bustamante et al., 2020). González-Rodríguez et al., (2015) showed that Spanish social sciences' students with higher ethical values (universalism and benevolence) displayed positive perception of social initiatives; the typical gender effect accompanied this pattern (higher for women).

Rupp et al. (2013), in two experiments with young job applicants, revealed that the impact of CSR (communal and environmental pillar) on organizational citizenship behavior was mediated by distributive justice. Furthermore, the desired moral identity of job seekers e.g. “caring, compassionate, fair, friendly, generous, helpful, hardworking, honest, and kind” (Rupp et al., 2013, p. 907) interacted with the CSR preferences in relation to the intentions of the job search.

Pereira et al. (2015) examined the relationship between Schwartz's values, CSR preferences and work engagement of Portuguese students. The path of CSR's preferences and work engagement has been validated for the workplace and marketplace, but the relationship between personal values and CSR's preferences was negative, however, some employee characteristics (age and seniority) positively predict CSR perception and work engagement. Hameed et al. (2016) examined dual mediating paths (via internal respect vs. external prestige) of internal vs. external CSR on employee identification. In line with Ruginis & Glavas (2019), the calling orientation (part of the meaning of work) moderates both pathways of mediation, giving us some clues to personal values and motivation. However, the interplay of work meaning (Steger et al., 2012) with Schwartz's personal values is another avenue of research (see Ros et al., 1999).

In an international study in 21 countries, Haski-Leventhal et al. (2020) examined the effects of responsible management education on corporate social responsibility (CSR). These effects related to the students' values in self-transcendence, the development of conservation values and a positive attitude towards CSR. CSR attitudes served as mediators for students' CSR behavioral intentions (willingness to sacrifice salary in order to work for a responsible employer). Thus, the values and attitudes of the students played an important, mediating role between the countries. The typical gender effects were evident, but none of age and work experience on the dependent variables.

For young job seekers, Bustamante et al. (2020) argued that the choice of employer depends heavily on the applicant's own well-being, choosing preferences such as flexible working, or

development opportunities, as opposed to the other CSR preferences like employer's environmental or social well-being. Based on their results, the preferences such as workplace attractiveness (see figure 1: highest values for employee responsibility or work environment) are shown as drivers for the choice of employer. In Bustamante et al.'s (2020) study one of Schwartz's self-transcendence values (i.e. universalism) had an effect on internal CSR preferences. In this study, the first part of an assumed mediation model was tested: and doing good values (i.e. self-transcendence in contrast to of self enhancement values) influenced certain CSR preferences (workplace, socio-ecological responsibility and governance & ethics, see figure 1). However, a confirmatory factor analysis should be conducted to examine the proposed latent CSR construct with its dimensions shown in Figure 1. Bustamante et al., (2020) differentiated between non-CSR vs. CSR preferences without reporting evidence as this distinction is inconsistent with previous terminology (Brammer et al., 2007; EU, 2008, 2011; ISO 26000; Mory et al., (2015, 2016, 2017). Furthermore, the influence of the mediators on the intention to apply or the attractiveness of the employer should be tested as dependent variables.

In our discussion, samples of students in different regions (USA, Europe and Asia) were examined focused on the central research question we outlined earlier. We have briefly summarized specific research results on the relationship between personal value orientations and CSR preferences, mostly operationalized heterogeneously with internal vs. external CSR. Thus, different results of positive vs. negative pathways were identified. For this reason, there is a need for further research to examine the relationship between personal value orientations and internal CSR preferences of young job seekers. Moreover, in the focus of the reviewed studies, the following personal values appear to be relevant: self-transcendence vs. self-enhancement of Schwartz's approach (e.g. Bustamante et al., 2020; Haski-Leventhal et al., 2020; Hameed et al., 2016). Thus, our main research question could focus on the extent to which personal values such as self-transcendence vs. self-enhancement of potential candidates or current employees, predict internal CSR preferences, i.e. organizational vs. employee dimension (see figure 1).

Conclusions and directions for future research

In order to precisely determine the relationship between personal value orientations and internal CSR preferences of potential candidates and employees, the following suggestions should be further examined.

First, the operationalization and validation of the internal CSR construct differs. Future research could test the internal, latent CSR construct based on employee vs. organizational factors (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017; Bustamante et al., 2020). After the validation phase, this internal CSR scale could act as a solid analytical tool for companies to assess their degree of internal CSR maturity. Sustainable HRM practices (see Piwovar-Suleij, 2021) could be integrated to foster organizational values for CSR (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017) and increase the internal CSR maturity level. Further, across seven countries, Sargisson et al. (2020) showed that socio-demographics had less influence on personal values (i.e. altruistic vs. egoistic values), only gender was a strong influencing factor. It is therefore important to examine the influence of personal values, for example, on behavioral climate change campaigns by choosing ambassadors with strong personal values (e.g. self-transcendence). Good advice is to follow the congruence model of Haski-Leventhal et al. (2017). For example, a scale could be developed to examine the internal CSR construct assessing the sustainable level of HRM in order to improve the sustainable behavior of employees. In addition, this person-organizational value fit tool could support the search for potential employees for initiatives such as Green campaigns. Should this personal value-internal CSR-path be confirmed by validation in future studies, this value analysis tool could be designed as a cultural matching tool for potential candidates on the organizations website to check the level of the candidate's organizational value fit.

Second, a mediation study design should be conducted to demonstrate the power of values prediction on CSR preferences as mediators on employee outcomes. The mediation model could be extended to include mediators such as meaningful work or sustainable psychological empowerment, resulting in outcomes such as employee social and ecological performance, or work engagement, or intention to stay. However, Purc & Laguna (2019) showed that the values of self-enhancement and openness to change (as opposed to conservation and self-transcendence values) are related to perceived job autonomy in the workplace, acting as mediators between these personal values and their innovative behavior. They conclude that the specific personal value set is of importance based on the specific work situation in which the employee behavior is required. An experimental research design with various fictitious employer descriptions could be a further step to test the influence of the independent variable personal values on internal CSR vs. non-CSR preferences of a fictitious employer.

Third, the cross-cultural perspective should be included, which focuses on samples from different nationalities and cultures (Mueller et al., 2012). Using a cross-cultural perspective, two cultural dimensions like collectivism and human orientation could be drivers for CSR

activities, in the same way as we argued for the impact of personal values (Schwartz, 2014) on internal CSR. However, self-enhancing values could weaken this path. Witte et al. (2020), however, criticized Schwartz (2014) for comparing cultural values within (across) cultures, and for sticking to the distribution instead of the averaging approach. Based on their results on the intercultural comparison of Schwartz's value preferences, they postulated a two-dimensional structure: a) alteration vs. preservation and b) amenability vs. dominance. Schwartz & Rubel (2005) found that the typical gender differences in personal values was moderated by cultural dimensions (e.g. weaken in countries with autonomous, individualistic and richness): in countries with high gender equality (e.g. Finland and Sweden) the gender effect was stronger in contrast to countries with less gender equality (e.g. Israel). Schwartz & Rubel (2005, p. 1023) argued that for countries with less gender equality "increased independence and equality of women in the labor force may encourage them to express distinctive values rather than to accommodate their values to those of their husbands". Whether there is a significant relationship between Schwartz's personal value orientations and cultural dimensions of House et al., (2004) should be tested in future cross-national studies, as applied by Müller et al., (2012). Across seven European countries, Sargisson et al. (2020) identified the typical gender effect rather than an age or country effect on Schwartz's value orientations (i.e. altruistic, biospheric, and egoistic values). Therefore, further research is needed to assess both personal and cultural values and to test whether they are latent, orthogonal sets of values or whether they interact with each other.

Fourth, in addition to student surveys, international organizational samples in different sectors should also be used to test the mediation path of affective commitment in a field study such as Mory et al., (2015, 2016, 2017). Then it might be possible to expand the perspective from the job seekers to the employees and to develop sensemaking internal CSR measures for the organization. This could therefore serve as a guide on how a cultural shift towards sustainability should be addressed and implemented, along with a change in people's mindset and behavior. Finally, based on the different CSR concepts from Agunis & Glavas (2019), Haski-Leventhal et al. (2017) and Stahl et al. (2019), sustainable HRM should be integrated into an overall framework that includes the individual, team, and department level as well as organization and community-wide. What we could learn from these concepts for the implementation of internal CSR measures in organizations is to consider the interaction of organizational, team and individual level for achieving sustainability instead of a greenwashing campaign. For example, Li et al., (2020) showed that transformational leadership increases environmentally conscious

behavior in employees, which was mediated through employees' environmental passion and autonomous motivation.

Outlook on our Research Project

In further empirical work planned for 2022, we will address our central research question arising from our review and the above conclusions, as follows: To what extent do personal value orientations (PVO) (self-transcendence vs. self-enhancement value) predict internal CSR preferences towards sustainability?

Further, following the development of the internal CSR dimensions as an internal CSR construct (see Figure 1), the following two hypotheses are formulated:

1. Schwartz's self-transcendence values positively impact the *organizational CSR* dimensions, in particular responsibility towards society and, environment, and corporate management (Bustamante et al., 2020) and organizational CSR (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017);
2. Schwartz's self-enhancement values positively impact the *employee CSR* dimensions, in particular workplace attractiveness and responsibility towards employees (Bustamante et al., 2020) and employee CSR (Mory et al., 2015, 2016, 2017).

We intend to operationalize our study in two stages:

Stage 1: Validation of the internal CSR construct and predictor test of personal values on internal CSR

We plan to conduct an online survey in 2022 with the following measures by inviting a sample of German and Irish students from our universities. The following measures are derived from previous research:

- Schwartz's (2014) personal values questionnaire (PVQ);
- Development of a new internal CSR construct based on Bustamante et al., (2020), Mory et al., (2015, 2016, 2017) and El Akremi et al., (2015);
- Control variables:
 - Nationality and cultural dimensions of House et al., (2004);
 - Sociodemographic factors such as gender, age, and work experience.

Stage 2 - Experimental design on the impact of internal CSR on job choice

Within an online experiment in 2023, a fictitious employer brand with a high reputation could be varied and manipulated on all internal CSR dimensions (vs. control group). If at stage 1 the impact of personal values on internal CSR was significant (based on hypotheses 1 and 2), an interaction of personal values and internal CSR dimensions is predicted on the dependent variables “intention to apply” (i.e. Kim & Park, 2011) or “employer choice” (i.e. Gully et al., 2013).

In summary, since the clock for climate protection measures is ticking fast so that our next generations can survive on our planet earth, those who advocate sustainable measures, as early adopters, can mobilize the other organizational population (i.e. the early and late majority) to implement the SDG’s in companies and our society. We therefore believe that it is worth investing in our joint study in 2022-2023 to understand more about the relationship between personal values and internal CSR preferences.

References

- Adjei-Bamfo, P., Bempong, B. Osei, J. & Kusi-Sarpong, S. (2019). Green candidate selection for organizational environmental management. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(7), 1081–1096.
- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2019). On Corporate Social Responsibility, Sensemaking, and the Search for Meaningfulness Through Work. *Journal of Management*. 45(3), 1057-1086.
- Allan, B.A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H.M. and Tay, L. (2019), Outcomes of Meaningful Work: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Managerial Studies*, 56, 500-528.
- Allen, M.W., Craig, C.A. (2016). Rethinking corporate social responsibility in the age of climate change: a communication perspective. *International Journal Corporate Social Responsibility*, 1, 1:1.
- Amrutha, V.N. & Geetha, S.N. (2020). A systematic review on green human resource management: implications for social sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 247, 119131.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. & Kalleberg, A. (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay off*. Cornell University Press.
- Aust, I., Matthews, B. & Müller-Camen, M. (2020). Common Good HRM: A paradigm shift in Sustainable HRM? *Human Resource Management Review*, 30 (3), 100705.
- Bailey, C., Yeoman, R., Madden, A., Thompson, M., & Kerridge, G. (2019). A Review of the Empirical Literature on Meaningful Work. Progress and Research Agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*. 18(1), 83-113.

- Brammer, S., Millington, A. & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *International Journal Human Resource Management*, 18, 1701–1719.
- Brammer, S., Pavelin, S. & Porter, L.A. (2009). Corporate charitable giving, multinational companies and countries of concern. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(4), 575-596.
- Bustamante, S., Ehlschleidt, R., Pelzeter, A., Deckmann, A. & Freundenberger, F. (2020). The effect of values on the attractiveness of responsible employers for young job seekers. *Journal of Human Values*, 27(19), 27-48.
- Catano, V. M., & Morrow Hines, H. (2016). The influence of corporate social responsibility, psychologically healthy workplaces, and individual values in attracting millennial job applicants. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 48(2), 142–154.
- Carroll, A.B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4, 497-505.
- Chambers, E. G., Foulon, M., Handfield-Jones, H. & Michaels, E.G. (1998). War for Talents. *The MCKINSEY QUARTERLY*, 3, 44-57.
- Deloitte (2017). *The employee experience: Culture, engagement, and beyond 2017 Global Human Capital Trends*. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/focus/human-capital-trends/2017/improving-the-employee-experience-culture-engagement.html>, 07/06/2021.
- Dumont, J., Shen, J. and Deng, X. (2017). Effects of Green HRM Practices on Employee Workplace Green Behavior: The Role of Psychological Green Climate and Employee Green Values. *Human Resource Management*, 56, 613-627.
- Ehnert, I. (2009). *Sustainable Human Resource Management*. Springer Publisher.
- Ehnert, I., Parsa, S., Roper, I., Wagner, M. & Müller-Camen, M. (2016). Reporting on sustainability and HRM: a cooperative study of sustainability reporting practices by the world largest companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 88-108.
- El Akremi, A., Gond, J-P., Swaen, V., De Roeck, K. & Igalens, J. (2015). How Do Employees Perceive Corporate Responsibility? Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Corporate Stakeholder Responsibility Scale. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 619-657.
- European Commission (2008). *Commission Staff Working Document, A document to the Communication from the Commission on the European Competitiveness Report 2008 (COM (2008) 774 final)*. SEC (2008) 2853, Brussels.

- European Commission (2011). *A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility*. Com. (2011), Brussels.
- Evans, R. W. & Davis, W. D. (2011). An examination of perceived corporate citizenship, job applicant attraction, and CSR work role definition. *Business & Society*, 50(3), 456–48.
- Ferreira, P. & de Oliveira, E.R. (2014). Does corporate social responsibility impact on employee engagement? *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26(3/4), 232-247.
- Glavas, A. (2016) Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Psychology: An Integrative Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(144), 1-13.
- Gond, J-P., El Akremi, A., Igalens, J., Swaen, V. (2010). Corporate social responsibility influence on employees. *ICCSR Research Paper*, 54-2010.
- González-Rodríguez, M. R., Díaz-Fernández, M. C. & Simonetti, B. (2015). The social, economic and environmental dimensions of corporate social responsibility: The role played by consumers and potential entrepreneurs. *International Business Review*, 24(5), 836-848.
- Gully, S.M., Phillips, J.M., Castellano, W.G., Han, K., Kim, A. (2013). A mediated moderation model of recruiting socially and environmentally responsible job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 935–973.
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Pournader, M. & McKinnon, A. (2017). The Role of Gender and Age in Business Students' Values, CSR Attitudes, and Responsible Management Education: Learnings from the PRME International Survey. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146, 219–239.
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Pournader, M. & Leigh, J.S.A. (2020). Responsible Management Education as Socialization: Business Students' Values, Attitudes and Intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04593-3.
- Hameed, I., Riaz, Z., Arain, G.A. & Farooq, O. (2016). How Do Internal and External CSR Affect Employees' Organizational Identification? A Perspective from the Group Engagement Model. *Frontier in Psychology*, 7:788.
- House, R.J, Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- ISO (International Organization for Standardization, 2010). *ISO 26000:2010, Guidance on social responsibility*. Paris. <https://www.iso.org/iso-26000-social-responsibility.html>, 09/27/2020.
- Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Glavas, A. (2017). When corporate social responsibility (CSR) meets organizational psychology: New frontiers in micro-CSR research, and fulfilling a quid pro quo through multilevel insights. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 520.

- Jones D.A., Willness, C.R., Madey, S. (2014). Why are job seekers attracted by corporate social performance? Experimental and field tests of three signal-based mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 383–404.
- Kim, H.R., Lee, M., Lee, H.T. & Kim, N.M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and employee company identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 557–569.
- Kim, S.Y. & Park, H. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility as an Organizational Attractiveness for Prospective Public Relations Practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103, 639–653.
- Kolk, A. (2016). The social responsibility of international business: From ethics and the environment to CSR and sustainable development. *Journal of World Business*, 51 (1), 23-34.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1–49.
- Li, Z., Xue, J., Li, R., Chen, H. & Wang, T. (2020) Environmentally Specific Transformational Leadership and Employee's Pro-environmental Behavior: The Mediating Roles of Environmental Passion and Autonomous Motivation. *Frontier in Psychology*, 11:1408.
- Lin, C.P., Tsai, YH., Joe, SW. & Chiu, C-K. (2012). Modeling the Relationship Among Perceived Corporate Citizenship, Firms' Attractiveness, and Career Success Expectation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105, 83–93.
- Low, MP., Ong, SF., Tan, PM. (2017). Would Internal Corporate Social Responsibility Make a Difference in Professional Service Industry Employees' Turnover Intention? A Two-Stage Approach Using PLS-SEM. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 9(1), 24-41.
- Malik, S.Y., Cao, Y., Mughal, Y.H., Kundi, G.M., Mughal, M.H., & Ramayah, T. (2020). Pathways towards Sustainability in Organizations: Empirical Evidence on the Role of Green Human Resource Management Practices and Green Intellectual Capital. *Sustainability*, 12, 3228.
- Montgomery, D.B. & Ramus, C (2011). Calibrating MBA job preferences for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1), 9-26.
- Mory, L., Wirtz, B.W. & Göttel, V. (2015). Factors of internal corporate social responsibility and the effect on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(139), 1393-1425.
- Mory, L., Wirtz, B.W. & Göttel, V. (2016). Corporate social responsibility strategies and their impact on employees' commitment. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 9(2), 172-201.
- Mory, L., Wirtz, B.W. & Göttel, V. (2017). Corporate social responsibility: the organizational view. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 21(1), 145-179.

- Mueller, K., Hattrup, K., Spiess, S.O. & Lin-Hi, N. (2012). The effects of corporate social responsibility on employees' affective commitment: a cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1186-1200.
- Ng, E.S.W. & Burke, R.J. (2005). Person-organization fit and the war for talent: Does diversity management make a difference? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1195-1210.
- Paillé, P., Chen, Y., Boiral, O., & Jin, J. (2014). The impact of human resource management on environmental performance: An employee-level study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121, 451–466.
- Paulet, R., Holland, P. & Morgan, D. (2021). A meta-review of 10 years of green human resource management: is Green HRM headed towards a roadblock or a revitalization? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resource Management*, 59, 159-183.
- Pereira, A., Duarte, A. & Trindade, G. (2015). The relationship between the employees' perceptions of CSR, work engagement and human values. *Responsibility & Sustainability*, 3(2), 27-35.
- Pisani, N., Kourula, A., Kolk, A., & Meijer, R. (2017). How global is international CSR research? Insights and recommendations from a systematic review. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 591-614.
- Piowar-Sulej, K. (2021). Core functions of Sustainable Human Resource Management. A hybrid literature review with the use of H-Classics methodology. *Sustainable Development*, 29, 671–693.
- Purc, E., & Laguna, M. (2019). Personal Values and Innovative Behavior of Employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 10, 865.
- Obeidat, B.Y. (2016) Exploring the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Engagement, and Organizational Performance: The Case of Jordanian Mobile Telecommunication Companies. *International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences*, 9, 361-386.
- Radwan, H. R. I. (2015). The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Employees in the Hotel Sector. *International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Reviews*, 2(1), 85–96.
- Rank, S., & Contreras, F. (2021). Do Millennials pay attention to Corporate Social Responsibility in comparison to previous generations? Are they motivated to lead in times of transformation? A qualitative review of generations, CSR and work motivation. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 6, 4.
- Ren, S., Tang, G. & E. Jackson, S. (2018). Green human resource management research in emergence: a review and future directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 35(3), 769–803.

- Renwick, D. W. S, Redman, T., & Maguire, S. (2012). Green human resource management: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(1), 1–14.
- Renwick, D.W.S. (2018). Towards an understanding of Green Human Resource Management. In D.W.S Renwick (ed.). *Contemporary Developments in Green Human Resource Management Research: Towards Sustainability in Action?* Routledge.
- Rickaby, M.A., Glass, J. & Fernie, S. (2020). Conceptualizing the Relationship between Personal Values and Sustainability—A TMO Case Study. *Administrative Sciences*, 10(1), 15.
- 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), 895–933.
- Sagiv L, Roccas S, Cieciuch J, Schwartz SH. (2017). Personal values in human life. *Nature Human Behavior*, 1(9), 630-639.
- Sargisson, R.J., De Groot, J.I.M. & Steg, L. (2020). The Relationship Between Sociodemographics and Environmental Values Across Seven European Countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:2253.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 747–773.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advanced Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1–65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2003). *A Proposal for Measuring Value Orientations Across Nations*. Chapter 7 in the Questionnaire Development Report of the European Social Survey. Available online at: <http://www.europeansocialsurvey>. 11/22/21.
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89 (6), 1010–1028.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2014). Rethinking the concept and measurement of societal culture in light of empirical findings. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 45, 5–13.
- Stefanelli, N.O., AA Teixeira, A.A., De Oliveira, D.H., Ferreira, M. & Sehnem, S. (2019). Environmental training: a systematic review of the state of the art of the theme. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 27(7), 2048–2076.

- Soni, D. & Mehta, P. (2020). Manifestation of Internal CSR on Employee Engagement: Mediating Role of Organizational Trust. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 55(3), 441-459.
- Stahl, G.K., Brewster, C.J., Collings, D.G. & Hajro, A. (2019). Enhancing the role of human resource management in corporate sustainability and social responsibility: A multi-stakeholder, multidimensional approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3), 100708.
- Tariq, S., Jan, F.A. & Ahmad, M.S. Green employee empowerment: a systematic literature review on state-of-art in green human resource management. *Quality & Quantity*, 50, 237–269.
- Turker, D. (2009). How Corporate Social Responsibility Influences Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 189–204.
- Turner, M. R., McIntosh, T., Reid, S.W. & Buckley, M. R. (2019). Corporate implementation of socially controversial CSR initiatives: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29 (1), 125-136.
- United Nations (2021). *Sustainable Developmental Goals*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>, 07/01/2021.
- Wagner, M. (2013). ‘Green’ human resource benefits: do they matter as determinants of environmental management system implementation? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 443–456.
- Wang, L. & Juslin, H. (2011). The effects of value on the perception of corporate social responsibility implementation: A study of Chinese youth. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 18, 246-262.
- Wang, Y, Xu, S, Wang, Y. (2020). The consequences of employees’ perceived corporate social responsibility: A meta-analysis. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 29, 471– 496.
- Witte, E.H., Stanciu, A. & Boehnke, K. (2020). A New Empirical Approach to Intercultural Comparisons of Value Preferences Based on Schwartz’s Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:1723.
- Yong, J.Y., Yusliza, M.Y. & Fawehinmi, O. (2019). Green human resource management: a systematic literature review from 2007 to 2019. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 27(7), 2005–2027.
- Zhang, Q., Cao, M., Zhang, F., Liu, J. & Li, X. (2020). Effects of corporate social responsibility on customer satisfaction and organizational attractiveness: A signaling perspective. *Business Ethics: The Environment Responsibility*, 29, 20– 34.