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Abstract: Corporate social responsibility (CSR) at the macro-level has been explored quite extensively, but how it affects employee-level outcomes was only recently researched. This paper draws on insights from the micro-foundation of CSR in explaining the effect of employees’ CSR perceptions on their career satisfaction. Moreover, the mediating role of psychological capital and the moderating role of moral identity are also explored. Data were collected from a cross-industry sample of 383 employees in Saudi Arabia. Structural equation modeling was used to test the hypotheses. The results show that CSR perceptions positively affected career satisfaction, and psychological capital mediated the effect of CSR perceptions on career satisfaction. Both factors of moral identity (internalized and symbolic) positively moderated the link between CSR perceptions and psychological capital. Finally, the indirect effect of CSR perceptions on career satisfaction via psychological capital was moderated by internalized moral identity and symbolic moral identity. Organizations can enhance career satisfaction by communicating to employees about CSR programs, initiatives, and actions. Moreover, employees should be provided with a working environment that provides them with the most resources so that they can feel confident, hopeful, resilient, and optimistic.
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1. Introduction

CSR is one of the most important concepts of today’s world due to the increasing emphasis on sustainability. Recently, CSR outcomes at the employee level are receiving increasing attention [1]. The micro-level CSR studies at the employee level have mainly examined how employees make sense of their organization’s CSR activities (CSR perceptions) and what impact CSR sense-making has on their workplace attitudes and behaviors [2–4]. CSR perceptions (CSRP) affect employee outcomes, such as organizational commitment [5], job performance, task performance, organizational citizenship behavior [6], creativity [7], employee engagement [2], turnover, pride, job embeddedness [8,9], task performance, psychological safety [10], and pro-environmental behavior [11]. Although CSRP positively affects job performance and satisfaction [12], the relationship between CSRP and Career Satisfaction (CSAT) is still not explored. This is quite surprising as job satisfaction and CSAT are closely related concepts [13,14].

There is a rising interest among scholars to examine antecedents of CSAT [15,16]. Through CSAT, individual and organizational performance can be enhanced [15]. Managers are eagerly concerned about the causes of CSAT because organizational success, in the long run, is dependent on how satisfied its members are with their overall careers. Despite having so many benefits, minimal research into antecedents of CSAT is found in the current
literature, and more research in this regard is needed [17]. There are two important gaps in the current literature that this study intends to fill. The first gap is that although employees’ perceptions about their organizations’ CSR positively affect their work outcomes, such as well-being, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and work engagement [1,18], how CSRP relates to CSAT (gratification that one gets from the career in terms of extrinsic as well as intrinsic aspects) is still something that has not been examined empirically in the extant literature. The CSR–CSAT link is worth investigating because how an individual perceives organizational policies related to CSR would influence their long-term orientation towards the career. The second gap is that empirical studies on the effect of perceived CSR on employee behaviors were unable to comprehensively explain the underlying mechanisms and boundary conditions [9,19]. Perceptions can cause positive outcomes when employees have cognitive and psychological resources that can help them to maintain positivity. Psychological capital (PsyCap) provides necessary psychological support to an employee that is required to keep them satisfied in their job, career, and life [20]. A career is usually based on a long-term manifestation of one’s working environment, job, and meaningfulness. There can be ups and downs during a career, and PsyCap would help an employee to remain hopeful, confident, resilient, and optimistic during hard and challenging moments. This is especially relevant in situations where perceptions about organizational actions, policies, and strategies are to be considered. Research has found that an employee’s concept of morality does act as a crucial boundary condition in understanding the impact of their perceptions about organizational policies on behavioral outcomes [21]. Therefore, this study intends to examine the roles of PsyCap and moral identity in order to better understand the relationship between CSRP and CSAT.

PsyCap refers to a person’s positive psychological state of development. This study contends that the CSR–CSAT link is contingent upon an employee’s cognitive and psychological resources. Having a positive perception that an organization is socially responsible and is contributing genuinely to protecting the environment and uplifting the society promotes a feeling of pride and meaningfulness that one gets from the job and work environment [22]. It also increases intrinsic motivational and psychological resources to engage in prosocial and extra-role behaviors [23] and enhances organizational commitment, loyalty, morale, and organizational identification [24]. Perceived CSR positively influences employees’ psychological and cognitive resources [20,25]. A higher level of optimism develops when there is a perception that the organization is ethical and it will defend its employees during an economic crisis or will act reasonably and responsibly in the worst situations. The hope of individuals also increases when they feel that the organization will provide all necessary resources and create a supportive environment to reach personal and organizational goals. Positive CSRP makes employees trust the organization, and they feel psychologically safe [25] to invest more energy and effort in pursuit of their goals, consequently increasing their motivation, cognitive abilities, and self-efficacy [26]. Ngo et al. [27] suggested that employees utilize their PsyCap to attain career success in objective as well as subjective terms. Having positive perceptions of CSR might help an employee to accumulate positive psychological resources such as hope, optimism, self-efficacy, and resilience. This, in turn, helps them to attain fulfillment in the career. Therefore, we can suggest that CSRP has an impact on CSAT and that one possible mediator of this relationship is PsyCap.

Another objective of our study is to investigate the moderating role of moral identity in the formation process between CSRP, PsyCap, and CSAT. Reactions to CSR can vary based on employees’ morality. Moral identity (MI) refers to the self-concept that one has about values, morality, ethics, and other moral traits [28]). The moral behavior of an individual depends on how they think about morality, their self-concept about moral values, and the importance that they ascribe to different moral situations. There are differences in the moral identities of individuals. MI is comprised of two dimensions [28]. The first dimension is Internalized Moral Identity (IMI) which refers to the self-concept that arrays moral traits as private, personal, ideal, internal, and actual self. Symbolic Moral Identity (SMI; self-concept that arrays moral values and traits as public, external, social, and open self) is the second dimension of MI.
There is a high level of compatibility between internalized and symbolic dimensions of MI. MI perspective is especially relevant in the context of how an individual perceives organizational policies. For instance, CSR initiatives such as planting trees, arranging seminars to promote environmental awareness, and giving charity to poor people can create positive as well as negative perceptions depending on whether an employee’s MI validates and reinforces these initiatives. If they think that these are real, genuine, and actual efforts to protect the environment and contribute to the betterment of society, the effect of CSR on psychological resources and other outcomes is likely to amplify. MI moderates the effect of perceived CSR on employee behaviors such as job satisfaction and organizational identification [29], helping behavior [21], and organizational citizenship behavior [30]. PsyCap refers to a person’s positive psychological resources embedded in cognitive and emotional states, and it is viewed as dependent on one’s self-concept of moral traits. Therefore, the combination of MI and CSRP tends to increase an employee’s positive psychological resources, i.e., PsyCap. Drawing on social identity theory [31], we suggest that CSRP and MI (internalized and symbolic) affect PsyCap, and in turn, the CSAT. More specifically, this study suggests that MI (internalized and symbolic) moderates the mediated effect of PsyCap on the CSRP–CSAT link. Figure 1 presents the research model of this study.
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**Figure 1.** Research model.

### 2. Literature Review

#### 2.1. CSRP and CSAT

CSR refers to initiatives, practices, policies, and programs an organization implements within its business operations to address societal and environmental responsibilities that significantly affect society [19]. CSR is being implemented by a large number of organizations because of its advantages in meeting business objectives. The research has found that CSR is not only beneficial for organizational success and stakeholders’ satisfaction but also contributes toward employees’ positive outcomes [32–34]. One of the most important stakeholders that organizations focus on is their employees. Despite the fact that micro-level CSR has value for the organization, and more specifically, studies at the employee level are critical, the current literature is scarce in this regard.

CSRP influences the employees’ attitudinal, behavioral, and psychological outcomes [3]. The employees’ perceptions of CSR refer to the degree of belief that CSR programs, actions, policies, and initiatives are effective, genuine, and real in terms of environmental responsibility, the welfare of the society, and reputation for contributing towards social and environmental
progression [14]. Previous studies have highlighted in depth that CSRP at the employee level plays an important role in defining the success or failure of CSR implementation [9,11].

CSR as a concept has developed over the years; it was only profit that companies used to think about but gradually, taking care of other stakeholders such as customers, legal bodies, society, environmental agencies, and governments was also considered important. CSR was adopted in developed countries, but soon developing countries also started to recognize the importance of CSR implementation. In recent years, it is being implemented by almost all industries and contexts. This is mainly due to the fact that pressure from various regulatory bodies, international agencies (such as World Trade Organization, European Union, etc.), and governments have made CSR compulsory for organizations to trade and conduct business. Organizations understand that in order to succeed, they have to implement CSR as a strategy [19]. Companies should strive for more than just profit; they should also strive for societal improvement, environment protection and preservation, legal compliance, and stakeholders’ interests [12]. Employees are extremely important in the organizational setup, and being internal stakeholders, they observe, contribute, and respond to organizational activities and programs. Employees evaluate the CSR initiatives on day to day basis, and consequently, they engage in different behaviors depending on how they perceive the overall CSR.

CSR programs tend to concentrate on the development of intangible resources such as being socially responsive, promoting humanistic values, thinking about nature and helping to protect it, enhancing pride, attractiveness, loyalty, and identification with the organization. Employees who find effective CSR programs in their organizations find such places attractive and proudly desire to remain there for a longer period of time [35]. Organizational values associated with CSR are considered to be in congruence with the values and beliefs of its members, who are looking for meaningfulness, purpose, and a sense of pride. Hence, the greater level of compatibility between organizational values due to CSR and individual values motivates such employees to pursue their careers and remain committed to working with pride and loyalty. This argument resonates with social exchange theory (SET) because the norm of reciprocity suggests that a socially responsible company fosters positive relationships with its employees, and employees tend to reciprocate in the form of greater commitment to such a workplace [36]. If an organization is perceived to be genuinely trying to take care of society and the environment through its CSR programs, feelings of pride, attractiveness, and identification are expected in return from its employees. As such, employees become more loyal to work for such companies, and in turn, their inclination to work and stay in the organization also might increase. The intrinsic benefits that an employee might obtain due to positive sense-making of CSR are feelings of pride, a positive image of the organization in front of other stakeholders, a sense of responsibility as a core value, organizational attractiveness, humanistic values, person–organization fit, and organizational identification. Since CSR is about taking care of employees, the extrinsic benefits associated can be that the employees’ needs and wants are satisfied to a greater level. Employees think that the organization would do everything possible to develop them, enhance their abilities and skills, advance their careers, achieve personal growth, and care for their family needs. Having both intrinsic and extrinsic benefits satisfied, an employee sees greater prospects in terms of their career in such an organization. Ilkhanizadeh and Karatepe [17] found CSRP to relate positively with flight attendants’ CSAT. Moreover, Rupp et al. [37] and Zhu, Yin, Liu, and Lai [38] found positive sense-making of CSR to positively influence life satisfaction, job satisfaction, well-being, and loyalty. Therefore:

Hypothesis 1. CSRP is positively associated with CSAT.
2.2. CSRP and PsyCap

According to Luthans et al. [26], PsyCap comprises of four key dimensions: self-efficacy (one’s level of self-belief and confidence to take up challenges and succeed in performing those challenges), optimism (believing that one would succeed not only in the current situation but also in future endeavors despite difficulties), hope (trying hard to pursue goals and in doing so, if the need arises to change the course of action, one does it but the focus on success remains undeterred), and resilience (facing obstacles, adversities, and unforeseen negative situations with the belief that one can always bounce back from these tough situations and succeed ultimately). PsyCap is based on positive emotions and motivational tendencies, as it is positive psychological resources that an individual has due to states rather than traits [39]. Employees become confident and optimistic that their organizations would support them in personally developing them [40]. CSR actions directed towards employees are thought to increase their mastery experiences and through vicarious learning. The self-efficacy to perform duties and responsibilities of those employees increases substantially that view their organizations as responsible for developing them and providing all necessary resources to carry out tasks.

Success experiences become readily available in organizations that implement CSR effectively. For instance, protecting the environment, greening the planet, increasing environmental awareness, taking care of society, donating actively, engaging in philanthropic services, considering ethics and morality in decision-making, and keeping economic viability are some of the experiences that can make employees more resilient [39]. CSR programs promote career advancement by providing opportunities for skill development, competence building, and training also help to decrease stress and keep employees hopeful in difficult times [41]. CSR has an important dimension to maintain economic viability, and in crises, employees do not lose hope and resilience because they believe that their organization has enough resources to deal with these tough moments. Therefore, employees respond to setbacks with rationality and resilience. CSR is about taking care of all stakeholders, and employees are kept at the top by involving them in decision making, providing necessary, active, and relevant training opportunities, and developing their skills and careers. These actions help in development of waypower through pathways and willpower through agency; both would help in the development of hope. Perceiving that one works for an organization that fulfills legal responsibility, takes care of environment and society, manages the economic side of the business in an effective and efficient manner, and invests in employees’ development, result in a prevailing greater sense of agency as well as control over personal and occupational lives [39]. Hope increases because of enhanced work–family balance and understanding that the organization would do whatever is possible to protect one’s interests. Optimism among employees with positive sense-making of an organization’s CSR is developed because they think that past failures, hurdles, and setbacks were restrained due to the current decisions, actions, and programs related to social responsibility. Employees perceive that the organization will handle any unforeseen problems that occur in the future because it behaves on moral principles with ethicality and legality as the underlying mechanism, and it has necessary financial as well as non-financial resources to resolve problems in the most impeccable way.

Employees experience thankfulness, pride, and contentment and start to appreciate the present in organizations that they perceive as economically viable, besides fulfilling legal, environmental, social, and ethical responsibilities [42]. Individuals strive for resource accumulation to deal with challenging situations. Nowadays, work environments have become tough as employees face increasing pressure to perform well, meet deadlines, generate new ideas, remain proactive, and update knowledge and skills. Support from an organization in the form of CSR might help individuals to gain resources in a psychological sense. For example, engaging in activities such as donating to the poor, taking care of the needy, supporting disease eradication programs, contributing to the environmental cause, effectively managing waste disposal, helping employees to feel pride, cognitive and motivational energy, and positive psychological drive. CSR, when perceived positively,
holds a future for employees. They think that there are a lot of opportunities in the future, and organizations would provide every possible resource to explore those opportunities. Based on these arguments, it is reasonable to expect that positive sense-making of an organization’s CSR develops psychological resources of an employee who thinks that the organization has all required resources to give them hope, resilience, optimism, and self-belief. Therefore:

**Hypothesis 2.** CSRPs positively affect employees’ PsyCap.

### 2.3. PsyCap and CSAT

PsyCap positively predicted many employee-level favorable outcomes, such as organization citizenship behavior [43,44], organizational identification and commitment [45], well-being [46], performance, job satisfaction [47], creativity, morale, trust, work engagement [48,49], subjective wellbeing, burnout [50], and career commitment [51]. People in organizations want to enjoy a quality life where they can achieve balance in their work and family commitments and plan their careers despite the unpredictability associated with the work environment [52,53]. Employees attempt to cherish meaningful life and work and remain focused on their careers that might be full of challenges [52]. Through tangible and intangible personal resources, an individual tries to find meaning in work-life and career [54]. Achieving satisfaction in one’s career is related to how a person adapts to new job roles, addresses the organization’s demands, works on personal development to prepare effectively for the change, and meets the expectations of others. Individual agency and personal resources are critical in achieving CSAT.

To deal with uncertainties, changing work environments, fast technological innovations, and ever-increasing pressure to perform well, finding meaning and peace of mind require various personal resources [54]. PsyCap serves as a positive agent that helps people to evaluate situations positively [49]. PsyCap generates positive states, and emotional mechanisms that arise due to these states expand the repertoire of thoughts. PsyCap generates physical, social, and psychological resources needed to maintain satisfaction and well-being through the course of life in general and work environments in particular. Hope generates a feeling that there is always light at the end of the tunnel, and one has to keep on moving forward despite difficult and challenging situations. Hope gives a sense of purpose. People with hope consider long-term prospects of life, and they do take challenges, hurdles, and difficulties as temporary [44]. PsyCap can help to mitigate the negative effects of burnout that could result due to unrealistic goals, unfulfilled expectations, and challenging situations at the workplace. PsyCap is positively associated with employees’ well-being [42]. PsyCap pushes one to remain dedicated and satisfied by pursuing goals and maintaining happiness, meaningfulness, and well-being even in the presence of setbacks.

Without positive psychological resources, an individual cannot cope with these challenges, setbacks, and stresses. PsyCap helps to manage careers and keep going with the challenges and unpleasant situations with calmness and focus [54]. PsyCap assesses the situations with optimism, hope, resilience, and self-efficacy. No matter how difficult the situation is, optimists do not let negativity prevail. They think that careers have ups and downs; therefore, one has to remain positive during stressful moments. Resilience is about recovering from setbacks. Few examples of difficult and tough times might be failing in meeting a deadline causing loss to the organization’s profits, unsuccessful ideas, conflict with co-workers or supervisors, abusive behavior, poor performance appraisal, and inability to meet organizational goals. If one is unable to recover quickly from setbacks, the negativity surrounding the individual would stress them out. The cognitive mechanisms associated with PsyCap help people interpret situations and challenges as opportunities to succeed [50]. Such positive assessments increase motivation, morale, commitment, and perseverance. When employees think of their careers, they understand that obstacles, negative situations, problems, crises, and unforeseen difficulties would come along the way. However, if they possess positive psychological resources such as optimism, hope,
resilience, and self-efficacy, they would not lose the meaningfulness and purpose of their careers. They positively interpret situations that help them to remain committed to the career and find satisfaction with the overall career. Henceforth:

Hypothesis 3. PsyCap positively influences CSAT.

2.4. PsyCap as a Mediator

In order to better understand how perceived CSR affects employee behaviors, studies suggest that personal psychological states could indirectly explain the relationship between CSRP and employee behaviors [11,19]. This study proposes that an employee’s PsyCap is an important individual-level psychological variable that could explain the influence of CSRP on CSAT. CSR is a means to develop employees and cater for their needs. It provides them with the resources that are needed to remain committed and engaged in work. It also helps employees to accumulate psychological resources to perform tasks and remain resilient and hopeful even during tough times. They become more professional and view their careers as a way to satisfy their needs of well-being and meaningfulness [17]. Utilizing conservation of resources theory (CoR), we suggest that employees’ CSRP develop more positive psychological resource conservation, which may motivate people to maintain and protect their PsyCap, subsequently enhancing CSAT. CoR postulates that employees try to obtain, protect, and increase positive resources, and simultaneously, they also tend to avoid losing resources that they value [55]. Organizations can influence the positive psychological resources of their employees by devising policies and practices that they value. That is, if an employee perceives these policies to be of value, it would help in conserving, protecting, and retaining the psychological resources and avoiding resource loss [56]. Costa and Neves [57] argue that the initiatives taken by the organization significantly affect the psychological resources of employees, and conservation of resources consequently leads to better work-related outcomes. Thus, it is expected that the CSRP and CSAT link is mediated by PsyCap.

PsyCap is a psychological mechanism that creates feelings of ownership for organizational policies, and as such, workplaces are seen as more desirable [54]. People in organizations want to enjoy a quality life where they can achieve balance in their work and family commitments and plan their careers despite the unpredictability associated with the work environment. Employees attempt to cherish meaningful life and work and remain focused on their careers that might be full of challenges [52]. Through tangible and intangible personal resources, an individual tries to find meaning in their career [54]. CSAT is related to how a person adapts to new job roles, addresses the organization’s demands, works on personal development to prepare effectively for the change, and meets the expectations of others. Individual agency and personal resources are critical in achieving CSAT. To deal with uncertainties, changing work environments, fast technological advancements, tight deadlines, and ever-increasing pressure to perform well, finding meaning and purpose in a job and life requires various personal resources [54]. PsyCap serves as a positive agent that helps people to think, evaluate, and act positively in difficult as well as normal situations [44]. PsyCap generates positive states, and emotional mechanisms that arise from these states expand the repertoire of thoughts such that these thoughts then help one to remain calm, composed, hopeful, and resilient even in extremely tough scenarios. PsyCap generates physical, social, and psychological resources that are needed to maintain satisfaction and well-being through the course of life in general and workplace in particular. Hope generates a feeling that there is always light at the end of the tunnel and one has to keep on moving forward despite obstacles, adversities, and crises. Hope gives a sense of purpose that one has to even learn from negative experiences. Ilkhanizadeh and Karatepe [17] argued that perceived CSR enhances CSAT, and work engagement partially mediates this relationship. They suggested that other possible mediators could also be explored to better understand how CSR affects CSAT.
CSRP might create positive sense-making through other positive psychological resources such as PsyCap that in turn leads to CSAT. Luthans et al. [26] found the mediating role of PsyCap in organizational climate–employee performance link. The performance of individuals is affected by organizational climate, but this effect is dependent on psychological resources. If the climate is seen as favorable, accommodative, and innovative, the employees’ hope, resilience, self-efficacy, and confidence increase, which in turn enhance their performance. Al-Ghazali and Sohail [20] examined the mediating role of PsyCap on the perceived CSR and CSAT link in the Saudi context. They found that PsyCap mediates the effect of CSR on CSAT. Previous studies also confirm the mediating role of PsyCap while examining employee-level behaviors and outcomes [58–62]. Through PsyCap, gender role orientation influenced subjective career success [27].

When employees perceive CSR to be positive, encouraging, and in line with their own values, their feelings of pride and identification increase. The employees believe that CSR is conveying a positive image of the organization in front of others. Hence, the positivity associated with CSR helps employees to develop their own PsyCap [62]. Positive CSRP makes employees feel psychological safety because they think that whatever obstacles, pressures, and negative situations come, organizations would always support their employees by creating a caring and economically viable environment so that tasks can be performed well [61]. One’s career is surrounded by challenges, unforeseen circumstances, and difficulties. PsyCap can help in dealing with the setbacks that an employee might face during their career. While CSRP can increase CSAT, this relationship is contingent upon an individual’s psychological state of mind. Hope, resilience, self-efficacy, and optimism are those states that can help in remaining steadfast and committed despite challenges and obstacles in careers. PsyCap creates positivity that in turn increases satisfaction that can be derived during a career [59]. Therefore:

**Hypothesis 4. CSRP and CSAT link is mediated by PsyCap.**

2.5. MI as a Moderator

Individual differences in personality, values, self-concept, personal traits, and ethical orientations were found to act as boundary conditions while explaining the impact of perceived CSR. For example, personality [63], emotional intelligence [64], cognitive style [65], and MI [21] moderate the impact of CSRP on employees’ work-related outcomes. When MI is high, the relationship between CSRP and organizational identification strengthens [21]. MI interacts with organizational CSR, and this interaction is found to strongly relate to how employees identify with their organizations and then behave accordingly. MI strengthens the impact of perceived CSR on organizational citizenship behavior [30]. MI differs from person to person. It can also vary within the same individual depending upon the situation. It provides intrinsic motivation to an individual, and they behave keeping in view their self-conception, moral schemas, and morality-based knowledge. People with a lower degree of IMI are unable to attach moral values with their self-conception. Their representation of moral traits is not strongly related to how they think about moral issues and values. They tend to be careless in associating morality with situations. Their moral principles seem to be less influential when they decide how to act and behave [21]. When an employee has IMI, CSRP and their self-conception of moral values interact and as a consequence, positive work outcomes may be expected. For example, moral traits such as honesty, generosity, and ethicality are considered virtues of one’s centrality, and if there is a perception that the organization acts in socially responsible ways, the combined effect of perceptions and moral values would help individuals to accumulate greater positive psychological resources. Employees think that it is the internal moral responsibility of the organization to engage in CSR activities when their IMI is central. The positivity that stems from organizational CSR and the moral traits and schemas that are central would further enhance one’s psychological state of hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience.
When people have a stronger sense of MI, their moral schemas become primed, and they can easily access these available traits to process information [66]. IMI is the degree to which the individual considers himself to be moral, the comparison of moral characteristics with other characteristics, and the degree to which a set of moral traits becomes central to how one’s self-concept is defined [28]. It is rooted in the very core of one’s being. SMI is defined as the public self-concept that one has about moral issues and the degree to which individual actions and reactions are expressed publicly by being true to oneself. SMI is found to strengthen the relationship between perceived CSR and job satisfaction [29].

When an employee thinks that CSR creates a public image of the organization, it resonates with their conception of moral traits as social or external, and as a result, greater satisfaction with the job and life take place. For example, SMI views organizational CSR as an effort to satisfy external stakeholders such as regulatory bodies, governments, competitors, suppliers, society, and environmental agencies. CSR actions would create a public image of the organization, and people with a high level of SMI consider the public orientation of moral values as central. High SMI views CSR as a public responsibility. Companies have to engage in CSR programs because competitors are doing them, and the external image of the organization demands it to implement CSR. Thus, the interaction of CSRP and SMI would bring in positive psychological resources and more enthusiasm to work effectively. Both dimensions of MI are important in explaining self-awareness (it combines one’s personal, introspective, internal, and inner feelings with public, social, and external feelings or schemas). MI helps employees to process and link moral information embodied in CSR acts with their moral values.

Individual morality-related traits such as MI serve as important boundary conditions in explaining how CSRP influences employee attitudes and behaviors [21]. The nature of CSR is value and moral-driven. Hence, the impact of positive sense-making of CSR on PsyCap is likely to increase when people have greater IMI and SMI. Employees with a strong MI are capable of meeting their psychological needs for recognition, purposefulness, and meaningfulness [67]. They identify more strongly with groups and organizations where CSR actions take place regularly. Moreover, the psychological needs satisfied through MI provide greater positivity in psychological resources, and since the self-concept of moral traits matches with the organization’s CSR [20], a high MI individual feels more hopeful, optimistic, confident, and resilient, and his PsyCap increases. When CSR is perceived as positive and beneficial for society and the environment, an individual with high MI thinks that these organizational initiatives are in line with their moral schemas, and thus, they might accumulate a greater level of positivity in psychological resources. Moreover, high MI reflects the compatibility that an individual attains because what the organization offers in the form of CSR and what an individual possesses in the form of moral values match to the extent that the prospects of staying and working for such an organization increase substantially. When an employee wants to stay and work for an organization, their CSAT enhances. Extending on these arguments, it is reasonable to suggest that MI moderates the mediated effect of PsyCap on the CSRP–CSAT link.

The effect of CSRP on PsyCap is likely to be higher for individuals with greater IMI. This may occur for two reasons. First, high IMI is based on moral reasoning. Employees with high IMI always act morally, and they are likely to experience a sense of “moral elevation” [21]. They might think that it is the responsibility of the organizations to respond to the deteriorating natural environment and worsened social situation. Since organizations are a major source of pollution, climate change, global warming, and other environmental problems, they are morally responsible for taking care of the planet and contribute to environmental protection. In the same vein, organizations earn profits and maximize their wealth, but in doing so, they have to think about society by engaging more and more in charitable programs. When employees find that their organizations are participating in CSR initiatives, they experience trust, loyalty, emotions of affection, and admiration for the organization [20]. As such, high IMI amplifies the influence of CSRP on PsyCap. Second, the self-concept of people with IMI is based on generosity,
philanthropy, volunteerism, and ethicality. As CSR also reflects the values of philanthropy, ethical stance, social service, charities and donations, and volunteering, IMI is likely to help in the accumulation of psychological resources of positivity [21]. Therefore, we propose:

**Hypothesis 5.** The effect of CSRP on PsyCap would strengthen when an employee has a greater level of IMI (H5a) and SMI (5b).

### 2.6. The Moderated Mediation Model

This study also proposes that MI moderates the mediated impact of PsyCap on the CSRP–CSAT link. Although there is a positive impact of CSRP on employee outcomes [30], the impact is realized only when individual perceptions interact with other individual factors such as MI, self-concept, emotional intelligence, cognitive appraisals, and consciousness [21]. When CSR is perceived as positive for society and the environment, an individual with high MI thinks that these organizational initiatives are in line with their moral schemas, and thus, they might accumulate a greater level of positivity in psychological resources. Moreover, high MI reflects the compatibility that an individual attains because what the organization offers in the form of CSR and what an individual possesses in the form of moral values match to the extent that the prospects of staying and working for such an organization increase substantially. When an employee wants to stay and work for an organization, their CSAT enhances. Employees with high MI are likely to view CSR actions as resonant with their moral values, and in the presence of positive psychological resources, they become happier with their jobs. Moreover, employees with stronger PsyCap exhibit greater CSAT [54]. Hence, we propose:

**Hypothesis 6.** The indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT via PsyCap depends on IMI.

**Hypothesis 7.** The indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT via PsyCap depends on SMI.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Data Collection

The sample unit used in this study was employees working across a wide range of industries in Saudi Arabia. Three hundred and fifty companies from various sectors were selected. As the world is currently facing a COVID outbreak, a self-administered survey is challenging because of the lockdown, restricted movements, and work from home policies. That is why we contacted our participants via online platforms. The managers of 208 organizations out of 350 agreed to provide us with the contact information for their employees. Then, using various online channels, a total of 1200 employees were contacted. They were given access to the online survey, and 279 questionnaires were returned. We continued to send reminders to participants and sought additional participants via online social networks. The purpose of the study was conveyed to the participants. We also ensured them that their names would remain confidential and that the sole purpose of this study is for academic purposes. The survey consisted of demographic details at the start, followed by questions about each of the study variables. On average, 10 min were required to complete the survey. The survey was made available in both English as well as Arabic languages. The participant could select any of the languages depending upon their ease. We received 104 more valid responses, ending with a total of 383.

The demographic characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1. The sample consisted of 67.6% males, with the age group 31–40 years being the largest (50.1%). Of the sample, 44.9% had a bachelor’s degree, 32.4% had a master’s degree, 51.4% of the employees were from public limited companies, and 25.8% were Saudis. The respondents came from a variety of industries: oil and gas (11.7%), agriculture (12.3%), mining (15.4%), hospitality (10.2%), construction (16.7%), transportation (18%), and healthcare (16%). Out of the respondents, 38.1% have 10 to 15 years of experience, and 32.9% of them hold middle-level managerial positions.
Table 1. Sample characteristics.

| Variable                  | N = 383           |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Gender                    |                   |
| Male                      | 259 (67.6%)       |
| Female                    | 124 (32.4%)       |
| Age                       |                   |
| 20–30 years               | 49 (12.8%)        |
| 31–40 years               | 192 (50.1%)       |
| 41–50 years               | 105 (27.4%)       |
| Above 50 years            | 37 (9.7%)         |
| Education                 |                   |
| Secondary                 | 16 (4.2%)         |
| Certification/Diploma     | 59 (15.4%)        |
| Bachelor’s degree          | 172 (44.9%)       |
| Master’s degree            | 124 (32.4%)       |
| Doctorate degree           | 12 (3.1%)         |
| Type of organization      |                   |
| Public                    | 197 (51.4%)       |
| Private                   | 186 (48.6%)       |
| Types of industry         |                   |
| Oil and Gas               | 45 (11.7%)        |
| Agriculture               | 47 (12.3%)        |
| Mining                    | 59 (15.4%)        |
| Hospitality               | 39 (10.2%)        |
| Construction              | 64 (16.7%)        |
| Transportation            | 69 (18%)          |
| Healthcare                | 60 (15.7%)        |
| Nationality               |                   |
| Saudi                     | 99 (25.8%)        |
| Non-Saudi                 | 284 (74.2%)       |
| Total experience          |                   |
| 5–10 years                | 87 (22.7%)        |
| 10–15 years               | 146 (38.1%)       |
| 15–20 years               | 104 (27.2%)       |
| Above 20 years            | 46 (12%)          |
| Experience in current organization |         |
| Less than a year          | 11 (2.9%)         |
| 1–5 years                 | 32 (8.4%)         |
| 5–10 years                | 91 (23.7%)        |
| 10–15 years               | 162 (42.3%)       |
| Above 15 years            | 87 (22.7%)        |
| Job position              |                   |
| Top management            | 79 (20.6%)        |
| Middle management         | 126 (32.9%)       |
| First line management     | 112 (29.2%)       |
| Non-management            | 40 (10.5%)        |
| Technical                 | 15 (3.9%)         |
| Other                     | 11 (2.9%)         |

3.2. Instrument Development

The questionnaire of the current study started with collecting information about the respondents’ demographics such as gender, nationality, marital status, age, education level, type of industry, total work experience, managerial position, etc. This was followed by recording respondents’ opinions about the study variables (CSRP, PsyCap, CSAT, and MI). All items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale. To measure employees’ perceptions of CSR, we adapted a 17-item scale developed by Turker [68]. To measure MI, Aquino and Reed [28] developed a ten-item scale which was used in this study. Five items were used to measure IMI and five items for SMI by using the scale of Wang et al. [21]. For CSAT, a five-item scale of Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley [69] was used. Finally, PsyCap was measured by 12 items developed by Lorenz et al. [70]. The survey was translated into Arabic as well. As Brislin [71] specified, the survey was translated into Arabic through reverse translation by a research worker fluent in both languages.
3.3. Data Analysis

This study used the PROCESS macro [72] with a bias-corrected bootstrapping method based on 2000 samples to examine the indirect effect of PsyCap in linking CSRP and CSAT. The moderated mediation analysis was performed using PROCESS (Model 14). Kurtosis and skewness values were 2.721 (less than 3) and 1.053 (less than 2); the data set had a normal distribution. A common method variance (CMV) might occur when respondents’ perceptual judgment is used to measure all variables. Therefore, to reduce the possibility of common method bias (CMB), this study used existing well-established, validated, and reliable scales. Furthermore, CMB is less likely to be an issue when there is a moderated mediation model. To test CMV, Harman’s single-factor test was used. Since not a single factor accounts for more than 50% of the variance, there is no threat of CMV.

3.4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on variables to verify their factor structure and construct validity. As shown in Table 2, the hypothesized 5-factor model provided an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 595.93$, df = 276, GFI = 0.978, CFI = 0.963, NFI = 0.961; TLI = 0.984, SRMR = 0.047, and RMSEA = 0.052). All factor loadings were significant and exceeded the threshold of 0.5, ranging from 0.76 to 0.92 for CSRP, 0.85 to 0.91 for PsyCap, 0.71 to 0.84 for MI, and 0.79 to 0.89 for CSAT (Table 3). CCR values exceeded the recommended value of 0.7, ranging from 0.756 to 0.939. The AVE values (ranging from 0.649 to 0.792) also exceeded the recommended value of 0.5. The internal consistency of all variables (ranging from 0.784 to 0.903) were greater than 0.7.

| Models | $\chi^2$ | df | $\Delta$df | $\chi^2$/df | GFI | CFI | NFI | TLI | SRMR | RMSEA |
|--------|--------|----|-------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|
| Five-factor model (The hypothesized model) | 595.93 | 276 | 2.16 | 0.978 | 0.963 | 0.961 | 0.984 | 0.047 | 0.052 |
| Four-factor model (CSRP, MI, PsyCap, CSAT) | 951.85 | 281 | 5 | 3.38 | 0.821 | 0.749 | 0.719 | 0.792 | 0.094 | 0.072 |
| Three-factor model (CSRP + PsyCap, MI dimensions, CSAT) | 1396.05 | 284 | 3 | 4.88 | 0.712 | 0.727 | 0.708 | 0.732 | 0.118 | 0.109 |
| Two-factor model (CSRP + PsyCap + MI dimensions, CSAT) | 1982.84 | 286 | 2 | 6.93 | 0.432 | 0.491 | 0.554 | 0.569 | 0.239 | 0.194 |
| One-factor model (All five constructs combined) | 2749.48 | 288 | 2 | 9.55 | 0.418 | 0.415 | 0.517 | 0.325 | 0.275 | 0.219 |
### Table 3. Survey measures and their estimates.

| Variable | Measure Items                                                                 | AVE  | CCR  | CA   | MSV  | ASV  | Factor Loadings |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|
| CSRP     | My organization participates in activities that aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment. | 0.723| 0.869| 0.842| 0.306| 0.414| 0.758           |
|          | My organization makes investments to create a better life for future generations. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.853           |
|          | My organization encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.740           |
|          | My organization contributes to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of society. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.806           |
|          | My organization supports nongovernmental organizations working in problematic areas. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.796           |
|          | My organization targets sustainable growth that considers future generations. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.792           |
|          | My organization implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.696           |
|          | My organization’s policies encourage employees to develop their skills and careers. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.747           |
|          | My organization supports employees who want to acquire additional education. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.682           |
|          | My organization implements flexible policies to provide a good work–life balance for its employees. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.847           |
|          | The managerial decisions related to employees are usually fair. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.743           |
|          | The management of my organization is primarily concerned with employees’ needs and wants. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.749           |
|          | My organization respects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.698           |
|          | Customer satisfaction is highly important for my organization. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.784           |
|          | My organization provides full and accurate information about its products or services to its customers. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.793           |
|          | My organization always pays its taxes—if any—and any other fees and tariffs on a regular and continuing basis. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.799           |
|          | My organization complies with legal regulations completely and promptly. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.712           |
| PsyCap   | If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it. | 0.748| 0.914| 0.895| 0.295| 0.374| 0.814           |
|          | Right now, I see myself as being pretty successful at work. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.967           |
|          | I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.932           |
|          | I am looking forward to the life ahead of me. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.793           |
|          | Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.728           |
|          | Sometimes I make myself do things whether I want to or not. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.986           |
|          | When I am in a difficult situation, I can usually find my way out of it. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.827           |
|          | It is okay if there are people who do not like me. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.729           |
|          | I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.917           |
|          | I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.886           |
|          | I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.834           |
|          | The future holds a lot of good for me. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.718           |
| IMI      | It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics. | 0.772| 0.886| 0.876| 0.337| 0.429| 0.805           |
|          | Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.829           |
|          | I would be ashamed to be a person who had these characteristics. (reverse coded) |      |      |      |      |      | 0.716           |
|          | Having these characteristics is not really important to me. (reverse coded) |      |      |      |      |      | 0.815           |
|          | I strongly desire to have these characteristics. |      |      |      |      |      | 0.825           |
Table 3. Conts.

| Variable          | Measure Items                                                                 | AVE   | CCR   | CA    | MSV    | ASV    | Factor Loadings |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| SMI               | I often wear clothes that identify me as having these characteristics.        | 0.649 | 0.756 | 0.784 | 0.389  | 0.478  | 0.831           |
|                   | The types of things I do in my spare time (e.g., hobbies) clearly identify me as having these characteristics. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.932           |
|                   | The fact that I have these characteristics is communicated to others by my membership in certain organizations. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.905           |
|                   | I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.601           |
|                   | The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.858           |

| Career satisfaction | I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career. | 0.792 | 0.939 | 0.903 | 0.329  | 0.458  | 0.764           |
|                    | I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.896           |
|                    | I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.793           |
|                    | I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.781           |
|                    | I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills. |       |       |       |        |        | 0.799           |

Notes: AVE, average variance extracted; CCR, composite construct reliability; CA, Cronbach’s α; MSV, maximum shared variance; ASV, average shared variance.
4. Results

Table 4 provides the means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients of the constructs. As expected, CSRP were found to be positively correlated with CSAT (r = 0.581, p < 0.001), and PsyCap (r = 0.434, p < 0.01). Furthermore, PsyCap was found to be positively correlated with CSAT (r = 0.487, p < 0.01).

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and correlations.

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Age   | 33.78 | 0.68 | 4.72 | 14.34 | 4.12 | 3.97 | 3.52 | 3.88 | 4.19 |
| 2. Gender| −0.04 | 1 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.244 * | 0.238 * | 1 | 1 |
| 3. Industry type | 0.01 | 0.03 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.434 ** | 1 | | |
| 4. Tenure | 0.62 * | −0.06 | 0.05 | 1 | | | | | |
| 5. PsyCap | 0.17 * | 0.04 | 0.02 | 1 | 0.13 * | 1 | | | |
| 6. CSRP | −0.08 | −0.02 | 0.05 | 0.19 * | 0.434 ** | 1 | | | |
| 7. IMI | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.244 * | 0.238 * | 1 | | |
| 8. SMI | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.03 | −0.04 | 0.186 *** | 0.153 * | 0.124 * | 1 | |
| 9. CSAT | 0.12 * | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.09 * | 0.487 ** | 0.581 *** | 0.165 * | 0.219 * | 1 |
| Mean    | 33.78 | 0.68 | 4.72 | 14.34 | 4.12 | 3.97 | 3.52 | 3.88 | 4.19 |
| SD      | 5.79 | 0.39 | 1.08 | 7.94 | 0.37 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.34 |

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

4.1. Direct and Mediation Effect

A three-step approach of Preacher and Hayes [73] was used to examine the direct and mediation effects. As shown in Table 5, the estimate of the direct causal paths from CSRP to CSAT (β = 0.56, p < 0.001), from CSRP and PsyCap (β = 0.51, p < 0.01), and from PsyCap and CSAT (β = 0.23, p < 0.01) are significant, supporting Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, and Hypothesis 3, respectively. When controlling for PsyCap, the indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT is weakened but still significant (β = 0.16, p < 0.01), indicating partial mediation.

Table 5. SEM and bootstrap analysis.

| Path                  | Standardized Coefficient | Confidence Intervals |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| CSRP → PsyCap → CSAT | Direct effect            | Indirect effect      | Total effect |
|                       | 0.56 ***                 | 0.16 **              | 0.72 **     |
|                       | R²                       | 0.49                 | lower       | upper       |
|                       | 0.16                     | 0.31                 |

*p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

This study also used a bootstrapping procedure with 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. Table 5 shows that the indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT through PsyCap (CI = 0.16 to 0.31, p < 0.001) does not include zero, confirming mediation effect. Table 6 shows that when PsyCap was introduced as a mediator, the CSRP–CSAT link weakened but it was still significant (without PsyCap, β = 0.53, p < 0.01; with PsyCap, β = 0.44, p < 0.01). Thus, Hypothesis 4 is partially supported.

Table 6. Regression analysis.

| Variables | PsyCap | CSAT |
|-----------|--------|------|
|           | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 |
| Age       | β      | t      | β      | t      | β      | t      | β      | t      | β      | t      |
| Gender    | −0.05  | −2.29 * | −0.04  | −2.12 * | 0.03   | 0.77   | 0.03   | 0.92   | 0.04   | 1.21   |
| Industry type | 0.04 | 0.57   | −0.03  | 0.36   | 0.01   | 0.34   | 0.01   | 0.37   | 0.01   | 0.35   |
| Tenure    | 0.08   | 3.39 * | 0.08   | 3.37 * | −0.03  | −0.16  | −0.03  | −0.12  | −0.03  | −0.27  |
| CSRP      | 0.44   | 14.94 ** | 0.44   | 15.48 ** | 0.53   | 20.38 ** | 0.53   | 20.51 ** | 0.44   | 15.45 ** |
| IMI       | 0.16   | 4.93 ** | 0.17   | 5.06 ** | 0.10   | 2.27 * | 0.09   | 2.24 * | 0.07   | 2.16 * |
| SMI       | 0.17   | 5.57 *** | 0.18   | 5.65 *** | 0.18   | 6.33 ** | 0.19   | 6.38 ** | 0.16   | 5.31 ** |
Table 6. Conts.

|                  | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| CSRP × IMI       | −0.05  | −2.15 **| −0.04  | −2.08 *| −0.01  |
| CSRP × SMI       | 0.04   | 2.02 **| 0.03   | 1.56   | 0.02   |
| PsyCap           |        |        |        | 0.01   | 0.01   |
|                  | R²     | 0.573  | 0.596  | 0.39   | 0.41   |
|                  | ΔR²    | 0.023  | 0.023  | 0.02   | 0.04   |
|                  | F-value| 85.37 **| 59.93 **| 93.48 ***| 74.88 ***| 72.18 ***|

*p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001.

4.2. Moderating Effects

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the moderating effects of IMI and SMI on the relationship between CSRP and PsyCap. Table 6 reveals that the interaction terms for CSRP with internalized and SMI were significant in predicting PsyCap (β = −0.05 and β = 0.04, p < 0.01, respectively), supporting Hypothesis 5a and Hypothesis 5b. Moreover, in order to further confirm the moderating roles, a simple slope analysis was performed. Figure 2 shows that the positive relationship between CSRP and PsyCap was stronger when IMI was high (simple slope = 0.39, t = 4.59, p > 0.001) than when it was low (simple slope = 0.21, t = 2.86, p > 0.01), as well as when the level of SMI was high (simple slope = 0.31, t = 3.27, p > 0.001) than when it was low (simple slope = 0.16, t = 2.28, p > 0.01), supporting Hypothesis 5a and Hypothesis 5b. Figure 3 shows the interactive effect of CSRP and SMI on PsyCap.
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*Figure 2. Interactive effects of CSRP and IMI on PsyCap.*
Figure 3. Interactive effects of CSRP and SMI on PsyCap.

4.3. The Conditional Indirect Effects

Table 6 shows that the interaction term for CSRP with IMI was significant in predicting PsyCap and CSAT ($\beta = -0.05, p < 0.01$ and $\beta = -0.04, p < 0.05$, respectively). By adding PsyCap, the effect on CSAT was insignificant ($\beta = -0.01, p = 0.39$). Table 7 shows that the index of moderated mediation regarding the degree of IMI was significant ($\beta = -0.017$, Boot SE = 0.008, CI = -0.028 to -0.006), confirming the moderating effect of IMI on the indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT via PsyCap. Hence, Hypothesis 6 was supported.

Table 7. Moderated mediation analyses.

| IMI (Moderator) | Effect | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UL (95% CI) |
|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| −1SD (−2.38)    | 0.13   | 0.021   | 0.12            | 0.18            |
| Mean (0.00)     | 0.12   | 0.018   | 0.09            | 0.15            |
| +1SD (2.38)     | 0.11   | 0.015   | 0.07            | 0.13            |
| Index of moderated mediation | $-0.017$ | 0.008 | $-0.028$ | $-0.006$ |

| SMI (moderator) | Effect | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UL (95% CI) |
|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| −1SD (−2.38)    | 0.09   | 0.016   | 0.07            | 0.12            |
| Mean (0.00)     | 0.11   | 0.018   | 0.07            | 0.12            |
| +1SD (2.38)     | 0.03   | 0.008   | 0.03            | 0.06            |
| Index of moderated mediation | 0.009 | 0.007 | $-0.013$ | $-0.002$ |

Notes: Bootstrap sample size = 20,000; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; LL = lower limit; SD = standard deviation.

Similarly, the index of moderated mediation regarding the degree of SMI was significant ($B = 0.009$, Boot SE = 0.007, CI = −0.013 to −0.002), confirming the moderating effect of SMI on the indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT via PsyCap. Hence, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

5. Discussion

The primary goal of the current study is to investigate the relationships among CSRP, PsyCap, internalized and SMI, and CSAT. There has been an increasing interest in understanding the effect of employees’ CSRP on various behaviors, attitudes, and outcomes at the individual level [20,21]. This study addresses the call to examine the effect of individual psychological resources in the CSR-employee-focused outcomes literature [74]. There are six major findings to report. First, we found that CSRP positively affects employees’ CSAT. Ilkhanizadeh and Karatepe [17] found that employees of socially responsible airline com-
panies made positive sense-making of CSR programs, and hence they were more satisfied with their careers. Second, the results show that CSRP increases employees’ PsyCap.

This finding is in line with Mao et al.’s [40] finding that perceived CSR increases the psychological safety, hope, confidence, and resilience of employees. The third finding is that increase in PsyCap would enhance CSAT. Having positive psychological resources make employees satisfied with their lives, and their work-family conflicts and turnover intentions also reduce considerably [75]. It is also found in previous studies that PsyCap increases subjective well-being and job satisfaction [40].

The fourth finding is that PsyCap mediated the effect of CSRP on CSAT. It implies that positive sense-making about an organization’s CSR practices enhances positive psychological resources by giving them more hope, resilience, self-efficacy, and optimism, and these psychological states provide CSAT. As our findings show partial mediation by PsyCap, it suggests that some of the variances in the effect of CSRP on CSAT are explained through PsyCap. Fifth, this study found that internalized and SMI serve as a boundary condition in the CSRP–PsyCap link. The findings indicate that employees who have high levels of IMI and SMI strengthen the relationship between CSRP and PsyCap. It implies that the highest level of PsyCap can be observed among employees who perceive their organizations’ CSR programs as beneficial to the stakeholders and when they have high IMI and SMI. However, when employees have low levels of IMI and SMI, CSRP seems to be more important for enhancing PsyCap. Prior studies [10,76] found moderating roles of MI and personality traits on the perceived CSR and PsyCap link. Finally, our findings show that MI moderated the mediated effect of PsyCap on the CSRP–CSAT link. If employees have high IMI and SMI, PsyCap mediates the effect of CSRP on CSAT. Positive sense-making about CSR programs tends to help such employees having more positive psychological resources (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience) and inducing them to be more satisfied with their careers. This finding is in line with Wang et al.’s [21] results that confirmed the moderated mediation of MI on the links between perceived CSR, organizational identification, and employee attitudes and behaviors (turnover intentions, in-role performance, and helping behavior).

5.1. Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to theory in the following ways. First, there is a dearth of research on perceived CSR and employee outcomes through intervening psychological mechanisms [21]. Singhapakdi et al. [29] suggested that MI of an employee might serve as a boundary condition, and future research should look into the effect of CSRP on employee outcomes. This study filled the gap identified by Singhapakdi et al. [29] by explaining the moderating role of MI on the CSRP–PsyCap–CSAT links. Second, research into the underlying mechanisms that could explore the micro-CSR literature and psychology of CSR at the employee level is still scarce [1,20].

This study contributes to theory in the following ways. First, there is a dearth of research on perceived CSR and employee outcomes through intervening psychological mechanisms [21]. MI is expected to moderate the relationship between perceived CSR and employee-level attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes [29]. This study found the moderating role of MI on the CSRP and PsyCap link and hence contributes to the body of knowledge by integrating MI, CSR, and the career literatures. Second, research into the underlying mechanisms that could explore the micro-CSR literature and psychology of CSR at the employee level is still scarce [1,20]. This research adds to the CSR literature by investigating the effect of PsyCap and MI. Third, we address the call to further examine the antecedents of CSAT by Jung and Takeuchi [15], and Ngo and Hui [16]. Understanding what causes employees to become satisfied with their careers is crucial for HR managers because retaining employees help to achieve success. This study found that when organizational CSR is communicated effectively to employees, positive sense-making might prevail, which in turn motivates employees to stay longer in such organizations and remain committed to their careers. Fourth, the mediating role of PsyCap adds a new mediator in CSR–outcomes relationships. Ilkhanizadeh and Karatepe [17] tested the mediation of organizational identification in the CSR–CSAT
link and suggested that other psychological, motivational, and personality factors could be looked at in future studies. This study contributes to the existing literature by finding that PsyCap mediates the relationship between CSRP and CSAT. Finally, we suggested MI (internalized and symbolic) as individual personal variables to moderate the relationships between employees’ CSRP, PsyCap, and CSAT. Hence, this study contributes to MI research in organizations, which is still in its infancy [21,67].

5.2. Practical Implications

Some practical implications that this study offers are as follows. In order to enhance CSAT among employees, organizations should try to initiate CSR programs and communicate these initiatives to their employees. By publicizing CSR actions and programs, the positive sense-making of CSR value among internal stakeholders might increase considerably. To improve MI dimensions, organizations should train employees by frequently communicating statement of values as well as CSR values such as addressing social issues, taking care of social needs, protecting the environment, promoting green behaviors, believing in ethical practices, and promoting honesty, generosity, fairness, and kindness. By doing so, employees would be sensitized to understand the importance of CSR, morality, ethicality, superior values, and honesty. They may try to associate themselves with these values and incorporate them into their self-concepts. Moreover, the PsyCap of employees can be enhanced by introducing interventions. For example, hope can be built by improving goal-setting by breaking complex goals into manageable sizes and celebrating small achievements. To build optimism, organizations should focus on understanding when to tone down employees’ expectations and assist them with more effective goal-setting strategies. Clear planning for tasks and having detailed research might also prove beneficial as employees become confident and can foresee possible outcomes and future. CSR implementation and effective communication, PsyCap interventions, and salient MI training sessions are going to give meaningfulness to employees, and they become more satisfied with their careers.

5.3. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

There are few limitations of the current study. First, the data are cross-sectional. CSRP, MI, PsyCap, and CSAT are subject to change over time. Therefore, future studies should longitudinally collect data on CSRP and PsyCap in particular. Second, data from an Asian country might limit the generalizability of the findings, especially in Western countries. Third, the effect of CSRP on other career-related outcomes should also be investigated in future research. For example, how CSRP affects career adaptability and career development should also be considered. Last, this study did not compare different industries to find out the similarities and differences across the industry in terms of effect sizes. For example, it is likely that employees who are working in the oil and gas sector might attribute different moral reasons to CSR actions than employees working in the hotel industry. Future studies should therefore look for the differences among industries.

5.4. Conclusions

Understanding how employees perceive CSR policies and what effects perceptions create on their CSAT are intriguing for academicians and practitioners. The primary aim of this study was to identify how CSRP influenced CSAT through PsyCap and MI. The data for this study were collected from Saudi Arabia. We found that CSRP positively affected the CSAT and PsyCap mediated CSRP–CSAT relationship. Both dimensions of MI (internalized and symbolic) positively moderated the link between CSRP and PsyCap. The indirect effect of CSRP on CSAT via PsyCap was moderated by IMI and SMI. CSR implementation and effective communication, PsyCap interventions, and salient MI training sessions are going to give meaningfulness to employees, and they become more satisfied with their careers.
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