

Hamdani, Abdi; Sule, Ernie Tisnawati; Soemaryani, Imas; Yunizar

Article

Corporate social responsibility as responsible leadership mediator for organizational citizenship behavior

Cogent Business & Management

Provided in Cooperation with:

Taylor & Francis Group

Suggested Citation: Hamdani, Abdi; Sule, Ernie Tisnawati; Soemaryani, Imas; Yunizar (2024) : Corporate social responsibility as responsible leadership mediator for organizational citizenship behavior, Cogent Business & Management, ISSN 2331-1975, Taylor & Francis, Abingdon, Vol. 11, Iss. 1, pp. 1-13,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2336268>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/326201>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Corporate social responsibility as responsible leadership mediator for organizational citizenship behavior

Abdi Hamdani, Ernie Tisnawati Sule, Imas Soemaryani & Yunizar

To cite this article: Abdi Hamdani, Ernie Tisnawati Sule, Imas Soemaryani & Yunizar (2024) Corporate social responsibility as responsible leadership mediator for organizational citizenship behavior, Cogent Business & Management, 11:1, 2336268, DOI: [10.1080/23311975.2024.2336268](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2336268)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2336268>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 18 Apr 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2668



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Corporate social responsibility as responsible leadership mediator for organizational citizenship behavior

Abdi Hamdani, Ernie Tisnawati Sule, Imas Soemaryani and Yunizar

Department of Management, Faculty Economy and Business, Padjajaran University, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) serves as a company strategy to fulfill ethical responsibilities in business. However, CSR requires conceptual support to operationalize this strategy at the individual level. This study aims to analyze the mediating role of CSR in the effect of responsible leadership on organizational citizenship behavior. The research method used in this study was an explanatory survey. A questionnaire was distributed to 230 randomly recruited respondents from the four largest cement companies in Indonesia (196 men and 34 women). The data were analyzed using SEM variance with partial least squares (PLS-SEM) technique. The results showed that responsible leadership affected organizational citizenship behavior directly and indirectly. In this regard, CSR should be organized based on ethical considerations to maintain balance among stakeholders. Conclusion: CSR as a strategy to achieve a balance between mediate some of the influence of responsible leadership on organizational citizenship behavior. Theoretical implications: the need to develop CSR concepts based on stakeholder theory perspectives to maintain the balance of interests of the company's stakeholders. Practical implications: CSR implementation aims to strengthen the internal structure in terms of staffing which ultimately strengthens the organizational structure to realize organizational citizenship behavior.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 9 April 2022
Revised 1 March 2024
Accepted 25 March 2024

KEYWORDS

Corporate social responsibility; organizational citizenship behavior; responsible leadership; stakeholders; ethical responsibilities

REVIEWING EDITOR

Huifen (Helen) Cai,
Middlesex University
Business School, United
Kingdom

SUBJECTS

Corporate Governance;
Corporate Social
Responsibility & Business
Ethics; Human Resource
Management; Leadership

1. Introduction

Understanding of business practices oriented toward ethics can be developed based on the concept of CSR (Trong Tuan, 2012). But, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has long been controversial among business people and academics (Banerjee, 2008; May et al., 2007; Sahoo et al., 2011). The classical economic theory asserts that businesses are responsible for producing goods and services to maximize shareholders' health and profit maximization as the goal of a corporation (Ahluwalia, 2022). It is believed that enterprises are not responsible for solving social, political and environmental problems. Carroll and Brown (2018) It is argued that one of CSR's strongest opponents is the renowned economist Milton Friedman, who posited that social issues are not the concern of business actors but should be addressed by free market mechanisms. Even though the companies are considered accountable for problems arising from their business activities, mainly social and environmental issues (Tang & Zhou, 2012) including cement companies as mentioned (Durastanti & Moretti, 2020; Habert et al., 2020).

Efforts are continuously made by companies to reduce environmental impacts (Ahmad et al., 2021; Mohamadi & Khaleghi Mohammadi, 2023) including optimizing strategies using CSR. CSR serves as a strategy directing corporate activities toward profit goals as well as ethical responsibility toward the environment (Harrison et al., 2020). CSR itself needs to be understood based on its evolution (Carroll, 2021; Khuong et al., 2021). Currently, CSR is known to have internal and external typology based on its orientation. Internal CSR is the company's social responsibility actions toward 'employees', while external CSR is CSR activities oriented toward 'society' and 'the environment' (Bolton, 2020; Chatzopoulou et al., 2022; Onkila & Sarna, 2022).

CONTACT Abdi Hamdani  abdi.hamdani@gmail.com  Department of Management, Faculty Economy and Business, Padjajaran University, Jalan Dipati Ukur No. 46, Bandung 40132, Indonesia

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Studies on external CSR have a long history, whereas studies on internal CSR with an employee orientation have emerged only in recent years (Aggarwal & Singh, 2023).

Studies on external CSR have a long history, while research on internal CSR focusing on employees has only emerged in recent years. Studying CSR from an employee perspective needs to be bail antecedent and outcome from CSR. Employees play vital roles in the company, and CSR needs to pay attention to employees as stakeholders of the company (Onkila & Sarna, 2022). Current literature on the relationship between employees and CSR is less comprehensive. Olanipekun et al. (2021) argues that the increase in CSR turns out to increase the complexity of its reporting system, making CSR practically difficult to trace. Employees' and the company's adequate conceptual and practical understanding of CSR is necessary to understand the role of CSR (Ramdhan, 2022).

Empirically, internal CSR practices in companies, particularly in state-owned enterprises, remain consistent with the study conducted by Ramdhan (2022) in Indonesia. Companies have not yet developed a strategic orientation toward internal CSR. They are more focused on external CSR, such as various societal segments and business sectors, as indicated by the study conducted by Irawan et al. (2022). Rinawiyanti et al. (2023) have provided insights into internal CSR, although it was not specifically discussed in their study. External CSR has become a mandatory practice in state-owned companies in Indonesia. However, there has been limited research specifically on internal CSR, including its influencing factors and impacts, particularly in cement companies in Indonesia.

Previous studies report that CSR drives organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Newman et al., 2015). Internal and external CSRs are known to, directly and indirectly, affects employees' OCB (Kunda et al., 2019). OCB is known to play a pivotal role in determining organizational performance and sustainability (Takeuchi et al., 2015). Hazzi (2018) views that OCB is mainly aimed to promote individuals and organizational well-being, instead of an obligatory, emotionally-expressive behavior aiming at gaining reward. OCB is vital for organizations to thrive while, at the same time, risky for individuals who are likely to critically voice their thought (Fischer et al., 2019). CSR is reported to play mediating role in a company's performance (Kim & Thapa, 2018). In another study, CSR is found to be the predictor of employees' OCB through the mediating role of leadership (Gao & He, 2017). Meanwhile, another study suggests that leadership moderates the effect of CSR on employee behavior (De Roeck & Farooq, 2018).

In general, the CSR function itself requires support from other factors, including leadership. Leadership plays a vital role in the implementation of CSR (Lam & Khare, 2010; Prabhakar et al., 2016; Ramdhan et al., 2021). CSR has been long viewed as the manifestation of leaders' social awareness. Leadership is reported to affect OCB through CSR and organizational trust (Tourigny et al., 2019). In another study, responsible leadership is reported to moderate CSR (Javed et al., 2019). Referring to López-Concepción et al. (2022), leadership that always considers CSR based on broad considerations (corporate stakeholders) tends to cause controversy. The existing literature still indicates an inconsistency regarding the role and position of leadership in CSR.

Further inquiries are necessary to see employees' perspectives on how CSR affects OCB, including its relationship with leadership to obtain a context-appropriate understanding. There is a missing link between CSR and OCB (Malik et al., 2021). An inconsistency regarding the CSR-OCB relationship was also noticed in previous studies (Fu et al., 2014; Youn & Kim, 2022). Velte (2022) adds that heterogeneity in CSR practices and studies has resulted in diverse consequences between one CSR and another. In this regard, analyzing the mediating role of CSR is necessary to extend our existing knowledge of this topic and improve the practices of CSR.

The contribution of this research is to elucidate the concept of CSR to fill the gap regarding the impact of CSR on employees and to demonstrate the role of leadership in CSR. The researcher develops the CSR concept based on Carroll and Brown (2018) in connection with citizenship behavior through the lens of Stakeholder theory. Stakeholder theory acknowledges the obligations and responsibilities of companies toward various stakeholder groups (Freeman & Dmytriiev, 2017; S. Kim, 2023; Sweeney & Coughlan, 2008). However, stakeholder theory is inherently 'controversial' and to date has not reached a consensus on how or why companies consider stakeholders' interests. The research findings serve as a framework for companies to prioritize based on the interests of sustainable stakeholders. In the present study, CSR was scrutinized as the mediating variable between responsible leadership and OCB. To be more specific, the present study aims to analyze the mediating role of CSR in the effect of responsible leadership on

OCB. Thus, the present study is expected to unravel the complex mediating role of CSR and confirms the importance of employees in the implementation of CSR programs.

2. Literature review and hypotheses

2.1. Responsible leadership

Responsible leadership is based on an ideal ethical discourse and is understood as a continuum from a leader who acts rationally instrumental-strategically to an outstanding responsible leader (Waldman & Galvin, 2008). Maak et al. (2016) see responsible leadership as the art and skills that build and maintain relationships with stakeholders inside or outside the organization responsible leadership is constructed mainly by ethics and morality (Luu, 2023). Leadership as the natural growth of people who come together to achieve group goals. Responsible leaders broadly weigh the consequences of decisions and use their influence to include stakeholders in the decision-making process and to solve morally complex situations in consensus among all affected parties. The main difference between responsible leadership and another form of leadership lies in its focus on society and the environment and sustainable value creation (Han et al., 2019; Ur Rehman et al., 2023). De Klerk and Swart (2023) assert two crucial components in RL 'avoiding harm', which refers to compliance with regulatory requirements and 'doing good', which involves activities beyond those mandated by the Law. Construction in this research refers to Waldman et al. (2020) that the general definition of RL is the executive orientation or mindset to meet the needs of corporate stakeholders. Three key RL concepts are at the executive level and are individual-oriented, related to CSR, RL orientation emerges in various forms such as traditional economic orientation, idealistic, opportunity-seeking/strategic and integrator. RL marks a shift from traditional leader-follower interactions to a more inclusive leader-stakeholder interaction model (Wang et al., 2023).

2.2. Corporate social responsibility

The proposed a fairly well-known definition of CSR as an aggregation of corporate obligations expected by the whole community (Carroll, 1979; L. Zhao et al., 2022). Elkington (1998) saw that the concept of modern CSR is based on so-called the triple bottom line principle, namely the balanced relationship between profit, people and the planet. Kotler and Nancy define it as the company's commitment to the community's welfare improvement. Efforts to realize organizational non-profit goals other than profit are positive changes in society through policy actions and actions directed by parties outside the organization (Hansen et al., 2015). CSR is voluntarily in nature and beyond a business entity's (Amin-chaudhry, 2016). Carroll and Brown (2018) propose the concept of CSR related to business ethics, stakeholder management, sustainability, corporate citizenship behavior, shared value creation and business-conscious capitalism driven by social goals. A company should be seen as an ethically and legally accountable entity (Manzoor et al., 2019). Internal CSR is related to CSR beneficiaries who are directly related to the company (eg employees and owners), while external is related to the company's externals, including customers, suppliers and the government, among others (Bolton, 2020; Ranjan & Dash, 2024). As an ethically and legally accountable entity, companies should take care of their employees Ramdhan (2022) states that as an accountable condition of the company both ethically and legally to carry out the task of taking care of its employees, environment and the community to ensure its sustainability. CSR is a strategic decision that may take the form of community development, charity, or philanthropy. However, Li and Chen remind us that CSR involves a more complex behavioral process than just actions by the company across various dimensions of its social responsibility (Athanasiadou et al., 2024).

2.3. Organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) refers to a discretionary behavior that socially and psychologically maintains and improves one's task performance (Organ, 1997). This definition of OCB is widely used in many recent studies (Gerpott et al., 2019; Ghavifekr & Adewale, 2019; Tagliabue et al., 2020). OCB

comes from altruistic motivation and develops in a specific context (Fischer et al., 2019). Hazzi (2018) added the concept of organizational citizenship behavior based on moral and dispositional factors. Organizational Citizenship behavior refers to a series of interactions demonstrating mutual trust, loyalty and commitments (Khan et al., 2019). Individual voluntary behavior, which is not directly or explicitly acknowledged by the formal reward system, and overall supports the efficient operation of the organization (Athanasiadou et al., 2024).

2.4. The effect of responsible leadership on CSR

The leadership determines every activity of the company including directing it to implement ethical responsibility and awareness. Responsible leadership is likely to promote the realization of ethical initiatives in CSR programs (Waldman et al., 2020). Responsible leadership is found to promote CSR (Golja, 2019; Maak et al., 2016; Manzoor et al., 2019; Ramdhan, 2022; Voegtlin et al., 2012). Leaders are faced with organizational legitimacy, different demands from heterogeneous stakeholders from inside and outside the organization, increasingly complex decisions (including moral dilemmas) and acceptable solutions for all parties. CSR represents how responsible leadership is oriented to improvement. Leadership seeks to drive change in organizational values and mobilize subordinates for the social good. Responsible leadership combines leadership style and social responsibility by considering the interests of various stakeholders (including employees) and seeks to integrate economic, social and ecological benefits (Han et al., 2019). The previous study conducted by Athanasiadou et al. (2024) and Liu et al. (2021) also report the effect of responsible leadership on CSR. Responsible leadership pays attention to ethical issues, builds relationships with stakeholders and sets long-term goals. Therefore, it is expected that *H1: Responsible leadership influences CSR*

2.5. The direct effect of responsible leadership on OCB

Leaders-subordinates interaction appears to encourage the subordinates' behavioral change. A leader is a role model and a motivator for employees. The leader-follower interaction influence the employees' view of the leadership positively (Sikand & Saxena, 2022). Responsible leadership is found to directly affect OCB (H. Zhao & Zhou, 2019). Organizational citizenship behavior requires employees' higher cognitive resources and control regarding the risk of their actions. Interaction with the leader and the leader's attention to subordinates becomes a strong impulse for coworkers to issue discretion. Han et al. (2019) confirmed that the influence occurred based on the interaction both of them. Based on the description above, it is hypothesized that *H2: Responsible leadership influences OCB*.

2.6. The mediating role of CSR in the effect of responsible leadership on OCB

A leader can promote employees' OCB directly or indirectly through CSR. The leadership is responsible for influencing the implementation of CSR (Maak et al., 2016; Voegtlin et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2023). Previous studies have reported that CSR affects OCB (De Roeck & Farooq, 2018; Newman et al., 2015). CSR may improve employees' pride and normative identity and eventually triggers them to act (Youn & Kim, 2022). There are value attributes such as fairness in CSR identified by employees that encourage them to demonstrate OCB. There is a perception of fairness and support for workload that enables employees to reduce actions that are inconsistent with organizational demands (Ranjan & Dash, 2024). Leaders represent ethical orientation through CSR as a form of responsibility to employees. Employees perceiving leaders' care and understanding are likely to exhibit behaviors expected by their leaders in return. CSR may mediate the effect of leadership on employees' behavior (Manzoor et al., 2019; Ramdhan, 2022). Golja (2019) emphasized that leadership brings changes at the personal level related to the internal environment (employees) through CSR activities. Zhao and Zhou (2019) demonstrate a responsible leadership role toward OCB reinforced by CSR. CSR and its social interactions with leaders help employees develop normative definitions that serve as guidelines for their behavior based on justice felt by employees. CSR and responsible leadership drive changes in positive employee behavior. CSR serves as one of the relevant mediating pathways for leaders to shape OCB (Sikand & Saxena, 2022). Responsible



Figure 1. Proposed model.

leadership influences OCB where CSR is used as a mediator to demonstrate ethical behavior and social responsibility. Thus, it is proposed that *H3: CSR mediates the influence of responsible leadership on OCB*

The proposed model in this study is as follows (see Figure 1).

3. Method

3.1. Research method

This explanatory survey study involved 230 employees from four Indonesian cement companies (ie Semen Tiga Roda, Semen Baturaja, Solusi Bangun Indonesia and Semen Gresik).

3.2. Sampel and procedure

Sample selection used inclusion criteria, namely employees willing to participate as respondents who have worked for a minimum of three years in the company and are not within six months of retirement. The sampling technique employed proportional cluster random sampling. The respondents were recruited proportionally across companies. All respondents in this study had at least three-years of experience.

The survey results indicate that most of the respondents were males (85.2%, $n=196$), with only 34 female respondents (14.8%). Most of them held bachelor's degree (54%, $n=125$), while 28.3% of them was vocational high school graduates ($n=65$), and only 17.4% of them held master's degree ($n=40$). The respondents were divided into six categories based on their tenure: 3–5 years (6.9%, $n=16$), 5–10 years (26.5%, $n=61$), 10–15 years (17%, $n=39$), 15–20 years (15.7%, $n=36$), 20–25 years (19.1%, $n=44$) and 25 years (14.8%, $n=34$).

The research began after receiving official permission from the authorities of 4 companies, (ie Semen Tiga Roda, Semen Baturaja, Solusi Bangun Indonesia and Semen Gresik). To approach the target sample, the nature and purpose of the research were discussed. After obtaining permission from higher authorities, researchers collected the data from four companies online for two weeks. The company's HR managers were involved to validate the respondents' characteristics.

3.3. Measurement

Responsible leadership was measured using five statements designed by Voegtlin et al. (2012). One of the statements reads 'My Leader shows awareness of relevant stakeholder claims'. CSR was measured based on Manzoor et al. (2019) proposed indicators, including the company's comprehensive ethic code, sponsorship of local organizations and school events and priority on environment-related events. Organizational citizenship behavior was measured based on the concept proposed in Podsakoff et al. (2000) and Singh and Singh (2018) study, consisting of five, six and three statements measuring altruism, conscientiousness and civic virtue, respectively. The self-reported scale utilized a 5 Self-report measurement scale with a scale of five-point Likert scale, ranging between 5 (strongly agree) and 1 (strongly disagree). The data from 230 questionnaire responses were analyzed using SEM-PLS. SEM PLS is more flexible in handling complex models and data that do not meet normality assumptions. There is an option to use bootstrapping techniques to provide confidence interval estimates and address potential distributional assumptions violations.

4. Result

This section presents the descriptive statistics, t-test and partial least squares (PLS) to depict the relationships among the variables being investigated. The reliability of the instruments in this study was tested using Cronbach's alpha.

As displayed in Table 1, OCB, responsible leadership and CSR exhibited acceptable alpha reliability values for scale and subscale. The outer model in SEM is part of the model that describes the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. The outer model is known as the measurement model. This model reveals equations that have a connection between latent variables and indicators. The first step in assessing reflective measurement models involves checking the indicators' weight. Loading factors higher than 0.70 are recommended, as they indicate that the construct explains more than 50% of the indicator variance, thus providing acceptable reliability of the item.

Based on Table 2, the result of the study indicates that each loading factor was acceptable to account for the latent variable. Responsible leadership has five items with a factor loading between 0.71 and 0.81, CSR has sixteen items with a factor loading between 0.82 and 0.87, while OCB has 13 items with a factor loading between 0.72 and 0.83. Regarding the internal consistency reliability, composite reliability was applied (Jöreskog, 1988). Higher values usually indicate higher reliability, yet the value of 0.95 and higher are problematic as they indicate redundancy, thereby reducing the validity of the construct (Diamantopoulos et al., 2012; Drolet & Morrison, 2001). Each variable was generally accepted and no issue of construct validity was noticed. The test results of internal consistency using composite reliability and AVE are presented in Table 3.

Table 1. Alpha reliability (n=230).

Variable	Cronbach's alpha
Responsible leadership	0.835
CSR	0.971
Organizational citizenship behavior	0.951

Source: researcher processed data.

Table 2. Outside loading results (n=230).

Variable	Code	Loading factor	T-test
Responsible leadership	RL1	0.71	15.6
	RL2	0.81	22.3
	RL3	0.77	22.4
	RL4	0.77	17.7
	RL5	0.81	21.9
CSR	CSR1	0.83	18.1
	CSR2	0.83	17.7
	CSR3	0.83	19.7
	CSR4	0.82	20.1
	CSR5	0.87	31.4
	CSR6	0.85	27.2
	CSR7	0.82	21.7
	CSR8	0.87	26.5
	CSR9	0.83	20.0
	CSR10	0.82	22.6
	CSR11	0.85	25.4
	CSR12	0.83	21.2
	CSR13	0.83	21.7
	CSR14	0.86	22.3
	CSR15	0.82	21.9
	CSR 16	0.78	19.0
OCB	OCB1	0.83	24.5
	OCB2	0.83	21.7
	OCB3	0.81	23.4
	OCB4	0.81	24.2
	OCB5	0.81	24.7
	OCB6	0.73	14.1
	OCB7	0.72	13.1
	OCB8	0.77	15.7
	OCB9	0.77	19.3
	OCB10	0.79	19.1
	OCB11	0.80	24.3
	OCB12	0.8	18.2
	OCB13	0.81	24.3

Source: researcher processed data.

As displayed in Table 3, the composite reliability of responsible leadership, CSR and OCB were higher than 0.70. This indicates that each variable meets composite reliability requirements. Convergent validity is the extent to which constructs converge to explain the variance of their items. The metric used to evaluate the convergent validity of constructs is the average extracted variance (AVE) for items on each construct. The acceptable AVE is 0.50 or higher, indicating that the construct explains at least 50% of the item variance (Hair et al., 2019). In this study, responsible leadership, CSR and OCB exhibit good discriminant reliability, as their AVE scores were higher than 0.5. The value of all the roots of the AVE (Fornell-Larcker criterion) of each construct is more significant than its correlation with other variables as in the following Table 4.

The next step is to test the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), the average value of the correlation of items across constructions relative to the average (geometric) correlation for items measuring the same construct. The threshold value for district construction (as this study suggests) is 0.85, higher than which indicates that discriminant validity does not exist (Henseler et al., 2015). Table 5 shows that all HTMT results are lower than 0.85. Thus, it is very different.

This means that there is adequate discriminant validity. The constructs in the model are sufficiently different from each other. Each observed variable can distinguish its respective latent variable construct.

4.1. The direct effect

The test results show that $HTMT < 0.9$, indicating that all constructs have been valid for discriminant validity based on HTMT calculations. The results of the hypothesis tests are displayed in Table 6.

Models on PLS are evaluated with a value of t-statistical significance on each path. The results of Table 6 describe the relationship between responsible leadership, CSR and OCB. The test results showed a significant influence of responsible leadership with CSR with a pathway coefficient (0.732). t-statistics: t-table $13.99 > 1.960$ and p value.000. It can be concluded that responsible leadership has a significant effect on CSR. Responsible leadership has no significant influence on the OCB with a path coefficient (0.273). t-statistics: t-table $1.95 < 1.960$ and p value.052. CSR has a significant influence on OCB with a path coefficient value (0.317). t-statistic: t-table $2.048 > 1.960$ and p value.041.

Table 3. Composite reliability and AVE values (n=230).

Variable	Composite reliability	AVE
Responsible leadership	0.91	0.60
CSR	0.89	0.69
OCB	0.87	0.63

Source: researcher processed data.

Table 4. Fornell-Larcker criterion.

Latent variables	Responsible leadership	CSR	OCB
Responsible leadership	0.83		
CSR	0.73	0.76	
OCB	0.52	0.51	0.79

Source: researcher processed data.

Table 5. HTMT assessment results (n=230).

Latent variables	Responsible leadership	CSR	OCB
Responsible leadership	–		
CSR	0.80	–	
OCB	0.55	0.53	–

Source: researcher processed data.

Table 6. Mean, STDEV, T-value, *p* value (n=230).

	The beta coefficient	Mean	STDEV	Statistics T	<i>p</i> Value
Responsible leadership --> CSR	0.732	0.271	0.053	13.99	.000
Responsible leadership --> OCB	0.273	0.271	0.133	1.95	.052
CSR -- > OCB	0.327	0.313	0.093	2.048	.041

Source: researcher processed data.

4.2. The mediating effect of CSR

Sobel test was applied to verify CSR's mediating role. The test results showed that the calculated Z-value was in the acceptance area of the hypothesis. The Z-value falls within the region of accepting the hypothesis, which is (3.309). This means that CSR mediates the effect of responsible leadership on OCB.

5. Discussion

Essentially, the development of CSR based on typologies, namely internal and external as proposed in previous studies, is conducted to facilitate the prioritization scale in implementation according to the context and issues at hand. This indicates that CSR not only serves a strategic function but also plays a functional role in strengthening the microstructure of companies, as observed in the study by Ramdhan (2022). Focusing on employees as internal stakeholders of the company in line with stakeholder theory does not imply neglecting external stakeholders. Companies in Indonesia, including cement companies, have an obligation to contribute to education, health and entrepreneurship through CSR. This means that understanding typologies directs companies to build prioritization scales while still considering the microstructure of the company, as reflected in employees' OCB behaviors that align with company expectations. Consistent with Kim (2023), this implies that with stakeholder theory, companies are better able to define the goals of CSR and take a strategic approach to CSR activities to meet stakeholders' expectations. CSR facilitates the strategic orientation of the company to support sustainability while still placing employees as an integral part that forms the foundation of the company and ensures the sustainability of CSR. Focusing on employees addresses the controversy within stakeholder theory as proposed by Tao et al. (2023). The research findings explain how or why companies consider employees' interests in CSR. Companies ensure interests through CSR while simultaneously securing the interests of all stakeholders. The focus of CSR on employees encourages the fulfillment of sustainable strategic goals. The microfoundation of the company ensures the sustainability of CSR programs and the company's performance (Ramdhan, 2022).

The results showed the role of CSR in mediating the effect of responsible leadership. CSR is intended for the community and the company itself. It serves as a moral obligation (Carroll, 1979) and commitment to realize positive changes in society (Amin-chaudhry, 2016; Hansen et al., 2015) which posits as a social obligation, voluntary and even sustainable ethics of business activity (Carroll & Brown, 2018).

CSR's voluntary nature and comprehensive orientation, however, require leadership support. Responsible leadership represents the value of leadership that considers the company's stakeholders. In line with the concept put forward by Elkington (1998) about balance. Responsible leaders are oriented toward the interests of the company's stakeholders with the principles of profit, people and the planet for CSR implementation. A value orientation that demonstrates responsibility and ethics is expressed in CSR driven by responsible leaders. CSR is not only intended for employees but for the sustainability of stakeholders.

The result of the present study supports previous studies on the role of responsible leadership in the implementation of CSR (Golja, 2019; Maak et al., 2016; Manzoor et al., 2019; Ramdhan, 2022; Voegtlin et al., 2012). This shows that CSR is a representation of the values of responsible leadership. Therefore, the mechanism built by the company to improve CSR through responsible leadership shows the existence of various leadership responsibilities toward the company's stakeholders.

This can be seen from the series of consequences of CSR for internal employees. The results showed that improvements in CSR driven by leaders could increase OCB. This finding is in line with previous studies on the role of responsible leadership toward OCB (Hazzi, 2018; H. Zhao & Zhou, 2019) as well as the position of CSR as a predictor of OCB (Maak et al., 2016; Voegtlin et al., 2012). CSR is found to affect OCB, as Newman et al. (2015) reports.

Responsible leadership and CSR provide an accurate picture of the normative definition of values on which employees' discretionary behavior is based. The interaction of employees both as a social learning process leads employees to understand their responsibilities, normative obligations and social orientation on sustainability. Responsible leadership and CSR serve as dynamic mechanisms within the company to ensure the fulfillment of stakeholders' interests. In line with Wang et al. (2023), this means that the shift from traditional interactions to a more inclusive leader-stakeholder interaction model promotes sustainability within the company, including accommodating various interests. Although leadership is individual-oriented and at the executive level as proposed by Wang et al. (2023), the existence of CSR as a strategy to reach out to company stakeholders and safeguard their interests.

6. Conclusion

Responsible leadership is found to positively and significantly affect CSR and OCB; Responsible leadership improves individual citizenship behavior. Therefore, the company emphasizes the moral aspects of leadership as an important predictor of CSR and OCB. Employees not only identify leaders but also learn to see leaders as role models. Employees accept the norms and values of leaders and identify themselves according to the leadership values and then learn to apply these values in the organization's life based on leadership as role models. The results explain the consequences of CSR's mediating role in encouraging OCB based on its tri-bottom line principle shown by the leadership. Responsible leadership can ensure the fulfillment of company stakeholders' interests by strategizing to optimize the functions of CSR. The focus on constructing a CSR framework that places employees as a priority will influence the level of OCB while also ensuring the fulfillment of stakeholders' interests.

6.1. Theoretical implications

From the theoretical point of view, the research result explains the position of responsible leadership as OCB antecedents both directly and indirectly and explains its construction based on pathways. The main contribution of this research lies in the development of the concept of Responsible Leadership based on the perspective of stakeholder theory and CSR related to OCB behavior from the employees' perspective. The study addresses knowledge gaps regarding how and why responsible leadership utilizes CSR to influence employees and meet stakeholders' interests. The research expands insights in the RL and CSR literature on the importance of understanding the role of RL and CSR Typology (Internal and external) considering the key role of responsible leadership toward various stakeholders. The research findings demonstrate the crucial role of RL, CSR for OCB in ensuring stakeholders' interests.

6.2. Practical implications

Leaders are responsible for making decisions by taking company stakeholders (including employees) into account. Several aspects need to be considered in developing leadership functions and CSR based on employees' perspectives to continue meeting stakeholders' interests. Leadership practices can utilize the concept of Responsible Leadership (RL) and focus on its impact on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). RL is not only about ethical policies but also involves considerations of various stakeholders and the use of CSR as a tool to influence OCB behavior. Companies can integrate CSR strategies in a way that utilizes CSR typology to identify how to optimize the role of RL and CSR for stakeholders' interests.

6.3. Limitations and suggestions for future research

The research on responsible leadership is relatively new, and in this study, it is limited to government-owned cement companies. There is a need for contextual validation of the concept to distinguish it from other leadership concepts, especially concerning the crucial points of responsible leadership that reflect the executive status of individuals within the formal organizational structure, with diverse samples and different companies. The measurement of variables is based on self-reports from employees, which may

introduce bias. There is potential to develop research methods such as mix-methods to ensure better data support in the research.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Padjadjaran University for Research Center, Bandung, Indonesia, for supporting this research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

About the authors

Abdi Hamdani is a doctoral student in the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Padjadjaran, Indonesia. His research interests are organizational behavior, CSR, leadership, and HR management.

Ernie Tisnawati Sule is a professor of Management at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Padjadjaran, Indonesia. Her research interests are strategic management and HR management.

Imas Soemaryani is a senior faculty member at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Padjadjaran, Indonesia. Her research interests are HRM, micro-business management, and HR competencies.

Yunizar is a lecturer at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Padjadjaran, Indonesia. His research interests are leadership, organization management, and HR management.

Funding

The authors received no direct funding for this research.

References

- Aggarwal, P., & Singh, R. K. (2023). Employee-level consequences of perceived internal and external CSR: decoding the moderation and mediation paths. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 19(1), 38–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-02-2021-0053>
- Ahluwalia, S. (2022). A critique of corporate social responsibility in light of classical economics. *AMS Review*, 12(1–2), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-022-00224-4>
- Ahmad, M., Ahmed, Z., Majeed, A., & Huang, B. (2021). An environmental impact assessment of economic complexity and energy consumption: Does institutional quality make a difference? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 89, 106603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2021.106603>
- Amin-Chaudhry, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility – From a mere concept to an expected business practice. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 12(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-02-2015-0033>
- Athanasiadou, C., Theriou, G., & Chatzoudes, D. (2024). Flying responsibly: effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on attitudes and behaviors of employees in the European aviation industry. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-01-2023-0018>
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Critical Sociology*, 34(1), 51–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920507084623>
- Bolton, B. (2020). Internal vs. external corporate social responsibility at U.S. banks. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 8(4), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs8040065>
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257850>
- Carroll, A. B. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Perspectives on the CSR construct's development and future. *Business & Society*, 60(6), 1258–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503211001765>
- Carroll, A. B., & Brown, J. A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility: A review of current concepts, research, and issues. *Corporate Social Responsibility (Business and Society)*, 360(2), 39–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2514-175920180000002002>
- Chatzopoulou, E. C., Manolopoulos, D., & Agapitou, V. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and employee outcomes: Interrelations of external and internal orientations with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 179(3), 795–817. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04872-7>
- De Klerk, J., & Swart, B. (2023). Paradoxes and dilemmas of responsible leadership in the mining industries of emerging economies—It is complex. *Emerald Open Research*, 1(11). <https://doi.org/10.1108/EOR-11-2023-0001>

- De Roeck, K., & Farooq, O. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and ethical leadership: Investigating their interactive effect on employees' socially responsible behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 923–939. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3656-6>
- Diamantopoulos, A., Sarstedt, M., Fuchs, C., Wilczynski, P., & Kaiser, S. (2012). Guidelines for choosing between multi-item and single-item scales for construct measurement: a predictive validity perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(3), 434–449.
- Drolet, A. L., & Morrison, D. (2001). Do we really need multiple-item measures in service research? *Journal of Service Research*, 3(3), 196–204.
- Durastanti, C., & Moretti, L. (2020). Environmental impacts of cement production: A statistical analysis. *Applied Sciences*, 10(22), 8212. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10228212>
- Elkington, J. (1998). Partnerships from cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business. *Environmental Quality Management*, 8(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tqem.3310080106>
- Fischer, R., Ferreira, M. C., Van Meurs, N., Gok, K., Jiang, D. Y., Fontaine, J. R. J., Harb, C., Ciecuch, J., Achoui, M., Mendoza, M. S. D., Hassan, A., Achmadi, D., Mogaji, A. A., & Abubakar, A. (2019). Does organizational formalization facilitate voice and help organizational citizenship behaviors? It depends on (national) uncertainty norms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50(1), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-017-0132-6>
- Freeman, R. E., & Dmytryiev, S. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and stakeholder theory: Learning from each other. *Symphonya. Emerging Issues in Management*, (1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.4468/2017.1.02freeman.dmytryiev>
- Fu, H., Li, Y., & Duan, Y. (2014). Does employee-perceived reputation contribute to citizenship behavior?: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(4), 593–609. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2013-0082>
- Gao, Y., & He, W. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and employee organizational citizenship behavior: The pivotal roles of ethical leadership and organizational justice. *Management Decision*, 55(2), 294–309. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-05-2016-0284>
- Gerpott, F. H., Van Quaquebeke, N., Schlamp, S., & Voelpel, S. C. (2019). An identity perspective on ethical leadership to explain organizational citizenship behavior: The interplay of follower moral identity and leader group prototypicality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 1063–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3625-0>
- Ghavifekr, S., & Adewale, A. S. (2019). Can change leadership impact staff organizational citizenship behavior? A scenario from Malaysia. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 13(2), 65–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HEED-08-2019-0040>
- Golja, T. (2019). Impacts of transformational leadership on effective implementation of CSR 2.0 – The case of Croatia. *E-Journal of Tourism*, 6(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.24922/eot.v6i1.47473>
- Habert, G., Miller, S. A., John, V. M., Provis, J. L., Favier, A., Horvath, A., & Scrivener, K. L. (2020). Environmental impacts and decarbonization strategies in the cement and concrete industries. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1(11), 559–573. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0093-3>
- Han, Z., Wang, Q., & Yan, X. (2019). How responsible leadership predicts organizational citizenship behavior for the environment in China. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(3), 305–318. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2018-0256>
- Harrison, D. E., Ferrell, O. C., Ferrell, L., & Hair, J. F. Jr. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and business ethics: conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 29(4), 431–439. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-11-2018-2113>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Hansen, D. S., Dunford, B. B., Alge, B. J., & Jackson, C. L. (2015). Corporate social responsibility, ethical leadership, and trust propensity: A multi-experience model of perceived ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(4), 649–662. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2745-7>
- Hazzi, O. A. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: A holistic review. In *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance* (pp. 1–12). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3677-1
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). Kriteria baru untuk menilai validitas diskriminan dalam pemodelan persamaan struktural berbasis varians. *Jurnal Akademi Ilmu Pemasaran*, 43(1), 115–135.
- Irawan, E. J., Yunanto, A., & Kurniasih, R. (2022). *The influence of corporate social responsibility and institutional ownership on profitability and firm value* [Paper presentation]. Proceeding of International Conference Sustainable Competitive Advantage (Vol. 3).
- Javed, M., Rashid, M. A., Hussain, G., & Ali, H. Y. (2019). The effects of corporate social responsibility on corporate reputation and firm financial performance: Moderating role of responsible leadership. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(3), 1395–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1892>
- Jöreskog, K. G. (1988). Analysis of covariance structures. In: Nesselroade, J. R., Cattell, R. B. (eds.), *Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology* (pp. 207–230). US: Springer.
- Khan, N. A., Khan, A. N., & Gul, S. (2019). Relationship between perception of organizational politics and organizational citizenship behavior: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Asian Business & Management*, 18(2), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-018-00057-9>
- Khuong, M. N., Truong An, N. K., & Thanh Hang, T. T. (2021). Stakeholders and corporate social responsibility (CSR) programme as key sustainable development strategies to promote corporate reputation—Evidence from Vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1917333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1917333>

- Kim, S. (2023). The COVID-19 pandemic and corporate social responsibility of Korean global firms: From the perspective of stakeholder theory. *Emerald Open Research*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/EOR-04-2023-0013>
- Kim, M. S., & Thapa, B. (2018). Relationship of ethical leadership, corporate social responsibility, and organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 10(2), 447–463. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020447>
- Kunda, M. M., Ataman, G., & Kartaltepe, B. N. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 10(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-06-2018-0018>
- Lam, H., & Khare, A. (2010). HR's crucial role for successful CSR. *Journal of International Business Ethics*, 3(2), 3–15.
- Liu, W., Wei, W., Choi, T.-M., & Yan, X. (2021). Impacts of leadership on corporate social responsibility management in multi-tier supply chains. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 299(2), 483–496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.06.042>
- López-Concepción, A., Gil-Lacruz, A. I., & Saz-Gil, I. (2022). Stakeholder engagement, CSR development and Sdgs compliance: A systematic review from 2015 to 2021. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2170>
- Luu, T. T. (2023). Reducing unethical pro-organizational behavior in the hospitality sector through socially responsible human resource practices and responsible leadership. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(3), 706–734. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.2000994>
- Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Voegtlin, C. (2016). Business statesman or shareholder advocate? CEO responsible leadership styles and the micro-foundations of political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 463–493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12195>
- Malik, S. Y., Mughal, Y. H., Azam, T., Cao, Y., Wan, Z., Zhu, H., & Thurasamy, R. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, green human resources management, and sustainable performance: Is organizational citizenship behavior towards the environment the missing link? *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1044. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031044>
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Nurunnabi, M., Subhan, Q. A., Shah, S. I. A., & Fallatah, S. (2019). The impact of transformational leadership on job performance and CSR as a mediator in SMEs. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 436–452. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020436>
- May, S. K., Cheney, G., & Roper, J. (Eds.). (2007). *The debate over corporate social responsibility*. Oxford University Press.
- Mohamadi, M., & Khaleghi Mohammadi, S. (2023). The role of ownership structure in moderating the relationship between tax avoidance, corporate social responsibility disclosure and firm value. *Journal of Accounting and Management Vision*, 6(84), 141–166.
- Newman, A., Nielsen, I., & Miao, Q. (2015). The impact of employee perceptions of organizational corporate social responsibility practices on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior: Evidence from the Chinese private sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(9), 1226–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.934892>
- Olanipekun, A. O., Omotayo, T., & Saka, N. (2021). Review of the use of corporate social responsibility (CSR) tools. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 27, 425–435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.11.012>
- Onkila, T., & Sarna, B. (2022). A systematic literature review on employee relations with CSR: State of art and future research agenda. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(2), 435–447. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2210>
- Organ, D. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior_ It_s constructs clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.
- Prabhakar, D. G. V., Diab, W., & Bhargavi, D. S. (2016). Transformational leadership and corporate social responsibility: The UAE experience. *Review of Contemporary Business Research*, 5(1), 108–114. <https://doi.org/10.15640/rcbr.v5n1a8>
- Ramdhan, R. M., Kisahwan, D., Winarno, A., & Hermana, D. (2021). Ethical climate as foundation for internal corporate social responsibility and employee performance in Indonesian context during COVID-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Pemasaran Jasa*, 14(2), 213–230. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jmpj.v14i2.9293>
- Ramdhan, R. M. (2022). *The role of transformational leadership and ethical climate in improving the job performance of employees of strategic industrial state-owned enterprises mediated by corporate social responsibility* [Unpublished dissertation]. Trisakti University.
- Ranjan, S., & Dash, S. (2024). Impact of internal corporate social responsibility: A parallel mediation analysis. *Personnel Review*, 53(1), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-05-2020-0354>
- Rinawiyanti, E. D., Xueli, H., & As-Saber, S. N. (2023). Integrating corporate social responsibility into business functions and its impact on company performance: Evidence from the Indonesian manufacturing industry. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 19(7), 1233–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-05-2021-0193>
- Sahoo, C., Freeman, R., & Liedtka, J. (2011). Corporate social responsibility: Issues and controversies. *Journal of Business and Management*, 3(2), 2222–1905.
- Sikand, R., & Saxena, S. (2022). Sustainable leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour: Exploring mediating effect of corporate social responsibility. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 097226292210873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221087370>

- Singh, S. K., & Singh, A. P. (2018). Interplay of organizational justice, psychological empowerment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction in the context of circular economy. *Management Decision*, 57(4), 937–952. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2018-0966>
- Sweeney, L., & Coughlan, J. (2008). Do different industries report corporate social responsibility differently? An investigation through the lens of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527260701856657>
- Tang, C. S., & Zhou, S. (2012). Research advances in environmentally and socially sustainable operations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 223(3), 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2012.07.030>
- Tao, R., Wu, J., & Zhao, H. (2023). Do corporate customers prefer socially responsible suppliers? An instrumental stakeholder theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 185(3), 689–712. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05171-5>
- Tourigny, L., Han, J., Baba, V. V., & Pan, P. (2019). Ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility in China: A multilevel study of their effects on trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(2), 427–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3745-6>
- Trong Tuan, L. (2012). Corporate social responsibility, ethics, and corporate governance. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 8(4), 547–560. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17471111211272110>
- Tagliabue, M., Sigurjonsdottir, S. S., & Sandaker, I. (2020). The effects of performance feedback on organizational citizenship behavior: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(6), 841–861. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1796647>
- Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C., & Lin, C. C. (2015). Too many motives? the interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1239–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000001>
- Ur Rehman, Z., Shafique, I., Khawaja, K. F., Saeed, M., & Kalyar, M. N. (2023). Linking responsible leadership with financial and environmental performance: Determining mediation and moderation. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(1), 24–46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-12-2020-0626>
- Velte, P. (2021). Meta-analyses on corporate social responsibility (CSR): A literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 72(3), 627–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-021-00211-2>
- Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0952-4>
- Waldman, D. A., & Galvin, B. M. (2008). Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37(4), 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2008.07.001>
- Waldman, D. A., Siegel, D. S., & Stahl, G. K. (2020). Defining the socially responsible leader: Revisiting issues in responsible leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819872201>
- Wang, Z., Ye, Y., & Liu, X. (2023). How CEO responsible leadership shapes corporate social responsibility and organization performance: the roles of organizational climates and CEO founder status. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2022-1498>
- Youn, H., & Kim, J.-H. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and hotel employees' organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of organizational pride and meaningfulness of work. *Sustainability*, 14(4), 2428–2443. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042428>
- Zhao, H., & Zhou, Q. (2019). Exploring the impact of responsible leadership on organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: A leadership identity perspective. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 944–959. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11040944>
- Zhao, X., Wu, C., Chen, C. C., & Zhou, Z. (2022). The influence of corporate social responsibility on incumbent employees: A meta-analytic investigation of the mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Management*, 48(1), 114–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320946108>