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Abstract

The purpose of this study was the identification of the interconnectedness of corporate social responsibility (CSR) with human resource management. This is an issue that was studied, through literature review and through primary quantitative research. Through literature review, secondary data were collected. They are information that were presented by other researchers, scholars or academics. The primary quantitative research was based on a structured questionnaire which was distributed to Greek companies. The research sample consists of 200 Greek people that are occupied in a variety of job positions, of Greek companies. Through the questionnaire, the researcher collected data about four dimensions of CSR, of employees’ organizational commitment and of their job satisfaction. Research results showed that CSR is moderately implemented by Greek companies and also moderate are the levels of employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. All the dimensions of CSR showed significant correlation with organizational commitment. In general, CSR is related with job satisfaction, but its two dimensions that were statistically significant correlated with all the dimensions of job satisfaction were CSR to social and non-social stakeholders and to employees. These two dimensions were the less implemented ones by Greek companies. The most implemented dimension of CSR was the one to government, which means that Greek companies are typical according to their obligations to the Greek state. Thus, they have to further emphasize on increasing the implementation of the other three dimensions of CSR, i.e., the CSR to social and non-social stakeholders, to customers and to employees.
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1. Introduction

CSR has always been an interesting and much-discussed field of research, in terms of its practical and theoretical approach (Kim & Han, 2019). Based on the Green Paper of the European Commission (2001), CSR is described as the concept, by which companies voluntarily incorporate social and environmental concerns into their business and they contact with other stakeholders.
A key feature of CSR is the study and implementation by companies, through two dimensions, internal and external, as it is also mentioned by the Green Paper of the European Commission (2001). Nowadays, the adoption of voluntary practices is characterized as the new trend of the time, with companies of all kinds investing more and more in actions of CSR, with the ultimate goal of boosting their reputation and increasing their long-term profits. Extending the above position, the current paper focuses on exploring the level of the implementation of CSR, as well as the impact that the human resources of the modern Greek business entities receive from its practices. Human resources are considered a key foundation in building the success of an organization, as the performance of existing determines the financial well-being and reputation of a company (Meena & Dangayach, 2012). However, pointing out the crucial role of human resources and the necessary use of CSR practices, we consider the main purpose of this study as significant and necessarily further investigated.

Taking into account the existing perceptions, it is considered necessary to investigate CSR, since its practices bring positive results in the internal environment and in the performance of the human resources of an organization, regardless the sector it is operating to. Past reports suggest that voluntary activities positively enhance employee attitudes and behavior (Kim & Han, 2019; Chiang & Hsieh, 2012). At the same time, they increase their commitment, morale and retention rates in the organization, to which they are occupied, and bring indirect long-term profits to it (Aguinis & Glavas, 2017).

Summarizing all the above positions, the adoption of CSR practices is considered necessary to create sustainable conditions in the workplace, to every professional sector. Therefore, the current paper explores the positive influences that the human resources of an organization receive from these voluntary practices. To accomplish the above purpose, two dependent variables were selected, which are Job Satisfaction and Job Commitment. The choice of these variables was made deliberately, as their strong commitment to CSR actions might have positive effects on the internal environment and human resources of a company. However, for further understanding of the above variables it is necessary to give some brief introductory definitions for each one separately, in order for us to be capable of justifying the general significance of the current study:

(a) Job Satisfaction is a pleasant or positive emotional state that results from an individual's appreciation of his or her work or work experience and

(b) Job Commitment is defined as the employees' willing not to abandon the organization to which they are occupied and to not take into consideration the aspect of changing a working environment by being occupied by another company. In the factor of job commitment, the extent to which the organization values the employees’ contribution and cares about their well-being, plays a key role (Lee, 2017).

After the completion of this study, a significant gap at this field will be covered, since in the case of the modern Greek corporate world the combination of the analysis of CSR and human resources management has not been studied and analyzed efficiently and officially, and through its results and conclusions, the modern Greek companies will have the opportunity to gain useful information about how CSR affects job satisfaction and employees’ commitment to their organization.

The main purpose of this paper is the study of the corporate responsibility and its aspects on human resources management. This is an issue that is studied on the one hand, through literature review and on the other hand, through primary quantitative research.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Corporate Social Responsibility

The idea of CSR began in America in the early 20th century. American companies began to be attacked by various social media groups because of their size and the anti-social practices they practiced. In addition, the economic crisis at that time, which led many social groups to
impoverishment, accelerated the need for corporate responsibility towards society (Farcane & Bureana, 2015; Smith & Pettigrew, 2017).

At this point, it is mentioned that Koukoumpliakos et al. (2020) point out that "Corporate Social Responsibility expresses the awareness and operation of companies according to social and environmental standards. It is addressed first to the internal environment and then to the external business environment" (p. 112).

The legislature, trying to limit the power of companies, imposed antitrust rules, banking regulations and introduced in the legislation the concept of citizen protection. At that time, senior business executives advised organizations to use their power to achieve social goals in addition to making a profit. Investing money in social causes was mainly about charitable activities on the part of the leaders of the organizations. One characteristic example was Hendry Ford, who advocated employee hygiene and leisure programs (Farcane & Bureana, 2015; Smith & Pettigrew, 2017).

The CSE’s (2020) research that has been conducted, concludes giving useful information about the overall state of CSR in Greek companies. More specifically, this research concluded that despite the difficult economic conditions prevailing in Greece in recent years, and especially after the recent economic crisis of 2008, a large percentage of companies understand the importance of CSR for their further development, and most of the Greek companies support CSR by maintaining or even increasing CSR expenditure. Moreover, the new legislation of the European Union, for mandatory reports from companies that meet specific conditions, which concerns about 370 companies in Greece, the researchers believe that will significantly contribute to the growth of companies that will carry out CSR actions, but also the money that companies spent on them (CSE, 2020).

From the above, it appears that in the Greek reality there is a strong interest in the adoption of CSR strategies by modern organizations. Undoubtedly, the Greek economy was shaken during the last decade and more specifically during the period that falls between the years 2008-2017. This is the period when Greece was hit by the recent economic crisis. With the shock of the Greek economy from this economic crisis, the majority of Greek companies were adversely affected. Nevertheless, the above studies show that the Greek business world did not show disgust towards the principles of CSR, despite the financial difficulties it faced. This proves that CSR is a serious aspect of the daily activity of Greek companies. Thus, it is concluded that Greek companies have understood the benefits they can derive from the adoption of the principles of CSR. In any case, from the above critique of CSR and the benefits that result from it in the human resources of companies, at this point, it appears that in the case of organizations operating in Greece, the levels of job satisfaction of their human resources will be commensurate with the levels at which they have adopted the individual principles of CSR.

2.2 The Benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility for the Organizations

In the context of the research that was conducted by Aspridis et al. (2014), the main goal was the examination of the overall action that business entities are taking in order for them to overcome crises. The researchers are talking about actions that are taken in the context of business ethics, which are falling into the field of CSR. Finally, they end up concluding that CSR can be very helpful in the improvement of employees’ attitudes and of their flexibility and mobility in their workplace. According to Aspridis et al. (2014), CSR might be a useful tool in the hands of the companies, in order for them to be able to overcome any crisis they are facing which is related to their human resources.

Implementing CSR programs can create even more multiple benefits to a company. Companies better assess their corporate risks and improve their competitiveness. They better value the external environment and align their business functions, so as not to harm the stakeholders’ interests. They recognize that business and society need each other, and the financial goals of a company do not conflict with the social ones (Tiba et al., 2018).

The benefits of CSR are evident in the following business areas:

1. It enhances a better, safer and more motivated work environment.
2. It increases the value of the business brand through the development of a stable and long-term relationship with consumers.
3. The company’s reputation is enhanced.
4. It transforms threats into opportunities.
5. It improves a company’s contact with financial institutions (Tiba et al., 2018).

From the above-mentioned, it appears that companies that apply CSR practices seek to ensure a competitive advantage in the market in which they operate (Fordham et al., 2017; Alhouti & D’Souza, 2018).

One more benefit that arises from the research of Koukoumliakos et al. (2018) from the implementation of CSR, is the fact that it helps the smooth integration of business entities into the society.

From the above multidimensional benefits that result from the adoption of high levels of CSR by organizations, there is a direct positive impact of CSR on the human resources. More specifically, when the modern literature proves that an organization that integrates the principles of CSR in its daily activities, results in better crisis management, increased competitive advantage, increased added value, improved image and responsibility of the company and providing a safer work environment, in which more motivation is given to employees, all the above benefits result in a holistic empowerment of the organization, from which employees can only benefit. The stronger an organization is in the industry in which it operates, and the higher its levels of viability, the greater and better-quality benefits it can offer to its human resources, recognizing that employees are its driving force in achieving its organizational goals.

2.3 Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Resource Management

Recognizing the important role that employees play in their productivity and efficiency, companies behave in their human resources with responsibility and social awareness. For this reason, they develop actions related to attracting quality employees, recognizing diversity and providing equal opportunities, ensuring a balance between work and family life, the systematic and continuous training and development of employees and the commitment of the workforce in values and business culture. Below is a detailed analysis of the actions that organizations choose to implement socially responsible policies in their human resources. So, they take into consideration multiple factors. One of them is the factor of diversity in the workplace, which affects the functions of selection (Ng & Sears, 2020), training and development (Sung & Choi, 2013; Na-nan et al., 2017), employee performance appraisal (Ng & Sears, 2020) and remuneration systems (Roberson, 2018).

Furthermore, nowadays, companies, recognizing the importance of the balance between personal and professional life, provide some facilities to their human resources. Flexible business policies and special licenses for the care of dependent members are part of these facilities on the part of the company (Kelliher et al., 2018).

2.4 Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Commitment

One of the most important issues for companies is the degree of employees’ commitment to the values and culture of the organization. Responsible corporate policies contribute significantly to attracting future employees and to the active employees’ commitment to the structures and values of the organization (Azanza et al., 2013; Farooq et al., 2013).

The implementation of responsible social practices by a company can increase the level of active employees’ commitment. Employees who are happy with the company’s social activities show increased levels of productivity and organizational commitment compared to those who work for less responsible employers. While salary used to play an important role in retaining employees within the company, today responsible social practices by the employer are more important than a high salary. In addition, the humanitarian culture within an organization leads to CSR practices that will enhance
employee morale and their commitment to business values (De Silva & De Silva Lokuwaduge, 2019).

All of the above confirm the previous critical analysis. In particular, when an organization adopts high levels of CSR, through which it actively expresses its interest in internal and external stakeholders, as well as society as a whole, it automatically becomes more attractive to its internal customers, that is, to the human resources employed in it. In addition, when an organization has a good image and reputation, which is built from the high levels of CSR it has adopted, it is more likely to attract better quality human resources. This means that this organization is accompanied by a strong bargaining chip towards future executives it is going to hire to fill its job positions and its organizational needs. It also has the margin and the ability to select the best individuals, who meet the appropriate specifications, to staff specific jobs. When an organization, in the context of its daily activities, shows respect for its employees and their needs, it automatically increases the levels of work loyalty, reducing the turnover of its human resources. This means that the organization ends up employing loyal employees, who are well acquainted with its vision and individual organizational goals. It therefore ends up employing employees who are in line with the values, principles and identity of the organization.

3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The main purpose of the conducted primary research is the identification of whether CSR is related to human resources and more specifically to the employees’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Moreover, another research purpose is the identification of the level of CSR of the Greek companies, of the level of their employees’ satisfaction and of the one of their employees’ commitment. Based on the critical analysis given above, the following hypotheses arise:

H1. The levels of CSR of Greek companies are satisfactory.
H2. The levels of job satisfaction of the human resources of Greek companies are satisfactory.
H3. The levels of job commitment of the human resources of Greek companies are satisfactory.
H4. The levels of CSR are positively and statistically significant correlated with the levels of job satisfaction and commitment of human resources.

In order for the above-mentioned research purpose to be covered, the following research questions are going to be answered:

1) How much is the companies’ levels of CSR?
2) How much committed are the employees to their organizations?
3) How much satisfied are the employees by their organizations?
4) Is there any correlation between the CSR and the human resources commitment?
5) Is there any correlation between the CSR and the human resources job satisfaction?
6) Are there any differences at the answers of the participants according to their demographic characteristics?

4. Methodology and Data

The steps which were followed during the conduction of the current primary research are the ones that were suggested by Babbie (2020) and Saunders et al. (2015) for conducting primary quantitative researches through a questionnaire. More specifically, Babbie (2020) and Saunders et al. (2015), pointed out that after the objectives of the research are identified and the research questions are formulated, the researcher can proceed to the choice of the type of research to be conducted. He/she is then able to decide on the number of people who will make up the research sample. Following the above steps, the researcher is going to make the final configuration of his/her research tool (Saunders et al., 2015). Then, as Babbie (2020) points out, the researcher must send the research tool to the potential participants. In closing, it is the turn to collect and analyze the results of the research, as they emerged from the above research process.

The research sample of the present quantitative research consists of a total of 220 employees
and executives of Greek companies. The sampling method followed was convenience sampling. This is a sampling method in which all prospective participants have the same chances of being selected as a key part of the research sample. We also clarify that no other specific characteristics, such as gender, age, educational background or years of occupation in the current company, were taken into account as a criterion for selecting a participant in this primary research.

The research tool of the current primary research is a fully structured questionnaire, which consists of four parts of questions. The first part consists of five closed-ended questions about the demographic and other social characteristics of the research sample. Afterwards, each part measures a specific scale. More specifically, the second part of the questionnaire measures CSR. It consists of 17 5-scaled questions. It is the scale which was presented by Turker (2008). In that scale, the first six questions measure CSR to social and non-social stakeholders. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.876. Questions 7-12 measure CSR to employees. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.873. Questions 13-15 measure CSR to customers. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.823. Finally, questions 16-17 measure CSR to government. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.922. More specifically, Turker (2008), in the context of his study, developed a model, based on which the four sub-dimensions of CSR result in the organizational loyalty of stakeholders to the organization. Regarding the four above-mentioned sub-dimensions of CSR, Turker (2008) developed four subscales, which in total consist of 17 5-scaled questions. Given the high levels of reliability that emerged for each scale of CSR in Turker’s (2008) research and given the reliable results, which it came to, this research tool was chosen for the current research to measure each dimension of CSR in Greek companies. In fact, it is a tool used by additional research that sought to measure the levels of CSR that have been adopted by organizations. Such studies, which have used the same measurement scale, are those of Martinez et al. (2013) and Gallardo-Vázquez & Sanchez-Hernandez (2014).

The third part of the questionnaire measures the organizational commitment. It is about the scale that was proposed by Turker (2008). It consists of 9 5-scaled questions. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.916. More specifically, in the context of this primary research, emphasis was placed on measuring the emotional aspect of human resource commitment in their employment organization. For this reason, despite the fact that there are many additional tools for measuring the job commitment of human resources, this one was chosen. It is a tool originally proposed and developed by Mowday et al. (1979), in its extended form. This research uses the abbreviated version of this research tool, which was first used in the research of Mowday et al. (1982) and is accompanied by high levels of reliability. It is a widely used scale for measuring the commitment of human resources and one of the most reliable tools for measuring the emotional commitment of employees to the company in which they are employed. These reasons contributed to the choice of the specific measuring tool for job commitment. An additional reason for choosing this measurement tool for the present study is that it was used by Turker (2008), who in his research explored the relationship between the four dimensions of CSR and employee commitment in the company in which they are employed. Due to the fact that in the context of the present research, a part of it examines the specific correlation, and given the existence of reliable results from the previous similar research, the selection of the current measurement scale was decided.

The last part measures job satisfaction by the short form of the scale that was proposed by Spector (1985), which is a widely used research tool for assessing the level of job satisfaction. This questionnaire has been used in a variety of research papers, is a valuable research tool with a high degree of internal reliability (Spector, 1985), while not only collecting sample responses, but allows the calculation of satisfaction scores on various employee satisfaction factors. This is why it was chosen as a measurement tool for the current research. It consists of 32 5-scaled questions, while the negative presented ones need to be reversed. After factor analysis, which was conducted, questions 7, 12, 14, 18, 19, 26 measure interaction. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.837. Recognition is measured by questions 5, 9, 20, 22, 28. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.836. Benefits are measured by questions 1, 4, 10, 13, 29, 31. Their Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.748. Quality of work is measured by questions 3, 17, 24, 25, 32. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.752. Interest
is measured by questions 16, 21, 23. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.763. Procedures are measured by questions 2, 6, 8, 11. Their Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.716. Pride is measured by questions 27 and 30. Its Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index is 0.785. Finally, practical issues are represented by question 15. Other researchers that have used the specific measurement scale are Bowling et al. (2017) and Tsounis & Sarafis (2018), who also translated it in Greek and used it in the case of the Greek state. This was another one reason why this specific measurement scale was chosen to be used as a part of the current research tool.

The distribution of the questionnaire was conducted through e-mails, which the researcher sent to Greek companies and was asking for its completion. Afterwards, the researcher was asking the potential participants to send him the completed questionnaire back, in response to his e-mail, as it happened. Also, the researcher reassured the recipients of his e-mails that their complete anonymity will be covered and that no sensitive or personal information of them will be published. The whole process of the distribution of the questionnaire and the collection of the research data had a duration of 3 months. After the collection of the answers of the participants, the researcher entered them manually, per question and per participant to the statistical software SPSS, version 23. SPSS is a software which provides reliable statistical analysis, as it is mentioned and proposed by Chapman (2018). Through SPSS the researcher has a variety of statistical tests -parametric and non-parametric- to conduct, depending on his/her research data and he/she is not restricted to the existing statistical analysis choices that he/she has at his/her disposal (Chapman, 2018).

Finally, it is mentioned that during the conduct and completion of this primary quantitative research, all the rules of ensuring ethical issues and participants’ personal and sensitive data were observed.

5. Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive results of the constructed variables. Descriptives results of the scale of CSR are presented, through descriptive statistics.

Table 1: Descriptives of Constructed Variables

| Construct                                      | Sum    | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------------|
| CSR to social and non-social stakeholders     | 682.33 | 3.1015 | 0.89678        |
| CSR to employees                               | 673.50 | 3.0614 | 0.87609        |
| CSR to customers                               | 772.00 | 3.5091 | 0.98668        |
| CSR to Government                              | 852.00 | 3.8727 | 1.15160        |
| Organizational commitment                      | 781.22 | 3.5510 | 0.85556        |
| Interaction                                    | 789.00 | 3.5864 | 0.83652        |
| Recognition                                    | 680.80 | 3.0945 | 0.82946        |
| Benefits                                       | 651.00 | 2.9591 | 0.88125        |
| Quality                                        | 689.20 | 3.1327 | 0.57547        |
| Interest                                       | 716.33 | 3.2561 | 0.99598        |
| Procedures                                     | 707.75 | 3.2170 | 0.58889        |
| Pride                                          | 805.50 | 3.6614 | 0.89335        |
| Practical                                      | 692.00 | 3.1455 | 1.08402        |

Table 1 shows that the overall mean score of the CSR scale is 55.15 out of 85 (65%). This is not an excellent score but at the same time, is not a disappointing neither moderate one. This is a simply acceptable score of CSR, but in any case, it is considered that it could be even better.

Moreover, the overall mean score (Table 1) of the organizational commitment scale is 31.95 out of 45 (71.02%). This means that it is considered that there surely are margins for further improvement to the participants’ organizational commitment.

Finally, the overall mean score (Table 1) of job satisfaction is 103.51 out of 160 (64.70%). This is
not an excellent score but at the same time, is not a disappointing neither moderate one. This is a simply acceptable score of job satisfaction, but in any case, we consider that it could be even better.

Moreover, Table 1 shows that the highest type of CSR that is followed by the companies of the research sample is the one that is related to government and the type of CSR that is related to employees is the one that has the lowest score. This is the answer to the first research question “How much is the companies’ levels of CSR”. The organizational commitment levels are moderate. This is the answer to the second research question “How much committed are the employees to their organizations”. Finally, all the sub-variables of job satisfaction show moderate scores, while the highest is the one of pride and the lowest is the one of benefits. This is the answer to the third research question “How much satisfied are the employees by their organizations”.

Table 2: Correlation Test CSR-Organizational Commitment

| CSR to social and non-social stakeholders | Pearson Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CSR to employees                         | 0.528               | 0.000          |
| CSR to customers                         | 0.659               | 0.000          |
| CSR to Government                        | 0.536               | 0.000          |

Table 2 shows a positive and statistically significant correlation between all the types of CSR of the companies and the organizational commitment of the human resources. This means that organizational commitment follows the same direction of change of all the types of CSR. This is the answer given to the fourth research question “Is there any correlation between the CSR and the human resources commitment”.

Table 3: Correlation Test CSR-Job Satisfaction

| CSR to social and non-social stakeholders | CSR to employees | CSR to customers | CSR to Government |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Interaction                               | Pearson Correlation | 0.380           | 0.352            | 0.278             | 0.179             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.000             | 0.008             |
| Recognition                              | Pearson Correlation | 0.538           | 0.639            | 0.449             | 0.154             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.000             | 0.023             |
| Benefits                                 | Pearson Correlation | 0.360           | 0.443            | 0.439             | 0.013             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.000             | 0.023             |
| Quality                                  | Pearson Correlation | 0.435           | 0.607            | 0.440             | 0.314             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.000             | 0.000             |
| Interest                                 | Pearson Correlation | 0.236           | 0.281            | 0.085             | -0.039            |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.211             | 0.564             |
| Procedures                               | Pearson Correlation | 0.059           | -0.026           | -0.045            | -0.107            |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.387            | 0.706            | 0.507             | 0.113             |
| Pride                                    | Pearson Correlation | 0.243           | 0.313            | 0.244             | 0.209             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.000            | 0.000            | 0.000             | 0.002             |
| Practical issues                         | Pearson Correlation | -0.005          | -0.054           | -0.040            | 0.141             |
|                                          | Sig. (2-tailed)   | 0.040            | 0.423            | 0.558             | 0.037             |

Table 3 shows that overall, since seven out of eight dimensions of job satisfaction presented statistically significant correlation with at least one type of CSR, while four of them had statistically significant correlations with all the types of CSR, the answer to the fifth research question “Is there
any correlation between the CSR and the human resources job satisfaction”, is positive. In order for the last research question “Are there any differences at the answers of the participants according to their demographic characteristics”, to be answered, five separate One-Way Anova tests were conducted, while the following tables present the statistically significant differentiations that were observed. Differences based on Gender are presented below.

Table 4: One-Way Anova – Gender

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Interaction              | 14,783         | 2  | 7,391       | 11,584| 0,000 |
| Quality                  | 3,088          | 2  | 1,544       | 4,826 | 0,009 |
| Interest                 | 7,283          | 2  | 3,641       | 3,764 | 0,025 |
| Practical Issues         | 14,320         | 2  | 7,160       | 6,393 | 0,002 |

For the differentiations presented on Table 4, further examinations showed that men have higher mean scores to all the above-mentioned dimensions of job satisfaction than women.

Table 5: One-Way Anova – Age

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| CSR to Government        | 28,175         | 4  | 7,044       | 5,774 | 0,000 |
| Organizational commitment| 7,873          | 4  | 1,968       | 2,776 | 0,028 |
| Interaction              | 11,078         | 4  | 2,769       | 4,888 | 0,003 |
| Recognition              | 9,465          | 4  | 2,366       | 3,603 | 0,007 |
| Benefits                 | 26,971         | 4  | 6,743       | 10,130| 0,000 |
| Quality                  | 6,865          | 4  | 1,716       | 5,620 | 0,000 |
| Interest                 | 27,875         | 4  | 6,969       | 7,912 | 0,000 |
| Pride                    | 8,089          | 4  | 2,022       | 3,129 | 0,016 |

For the presented differentiations on Table 5, further examinations showed that in the case of CSR to government, the two-edged group of ages (18-25 years old and 56-67 years old) present the lowest mean scores than the other group of ages. In the case of organizational commitment, the participants who are aged between 18-35 years old showed the lowest mean scores which means that the younger participants have lower levels of job satisfaction. In the case of the above-mentioned dimensions of job satisfaction, it is observed that the younger groups of ages (first three groups of ages) present the lowest mean scores in comparison with the others.

Table 6: One-Way Anova – Education

|                          | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| CSR to social and non-social stakeholders | 23,206      | 4  | 5,802       | 8,157 | 0,000 |
| CSR to employees         | 25,915         | 4  | 6,488       | 9,814 | 0,000 |
| CSR to customers         | 32,274         | 4  | 8,069       | 9,588 | 0,000 |
| CSR to Government        | 74,769         | 4  | 18,692      | 18,634| 0,000 |
| Organizational commitment| 22,385         | 4  | 5,596       | 8,724 | 0,000 |
| Interaction              | 11,505         | 4  | 2,876       | 4,363 | 0,002 |
| Recognition              | 10,489         | 4  | 2,622       | 4,022 | 0,004 |
| Benefits                 | 7,730          | 4  | 1,933       | 2,559 | 0,040 |
| Quality                  | 6,670          | 4  | 1,667       | 5,444 | 0,000 |
| Interest                 | 11,758         | 4  | 2,939       | 3,076 | 0,017 |
| Procedures               | 9,579          | 4  | 2,395       | 7,758 | 0,000 |
| Pride                    | 8,697          | 4  | 2,174       | 3,379 | 0,010 |
For the presented differentiations on Table 6, further examinations showed that in the case of the types of CSR, people coming from other educational level, except secondary education, bachelor, master and PhD, present the lowest mean scores. In the case of organizational commitment, it is observed the exact same picture, which continues in the case of satisfaction of recognition, work quality, interest and the feeling of pride about the organization. In the case of interaction and benefits, people with PhD educational level have the highest mean scores and finally, in the case of the feeling of pride about the organization, people of master educational level present the highest mean score.

Table 7: One-Way Anova – Years of Occupation

| Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig  |
|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| CSR to Government | 21,829 | 3           | 7,276  | 5,851 0,001 |
| Organizational commitment | 5,807 | 3           | 1,936  | 2,706 0,046 |
| Interaction | 9,258 | 3           | 3,086  | 4,629 0,004 |
| Recognition | 10,052 | 3           | 3,351  | 5,147 0,002 |
| Practical Issues | 10,147 | 3           | 3,382  | 2,955 0,033 |

For the presented differentiations on Table 7, further examinations showed that in the case of CSR to government, people with the most years of occupation in the current company present the highest mean scores and the same happens in the case of organizational commitment, where people who have under two years of occupation in the current company present the lowest mean scores. In the case of interaction, people with less years of occupation present the lowest mean scores, while in the case of recognition, the lowest mean score is presented again, in the case of people with less than two years of occupation. Finally, in the last case of practical working issues, the lowest mean score is presented in the case of people who have between 7-10 years of occupation in the current company.

Table 8: One-Way Anova – Job Position

| Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig  |
|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| CSR to social and non-social stakeholders | 15,365 | 4           | 3,841  | 5,138 0,001 |
| CSR to employees | 12,761 | 4           | 3,190  | 4,416 0,002 |
| CSR to customers | 13,527 | 4           | 3,382  | 3,641 0,007 |
| CSR to Government | 20,443 | 4           | 5,111  | 4,070 0,003 |
| Organizational commitment | 13,938 | 4           | 3,485  | 5,119 0,001 |
| Interaction | 18,824 | 4           | 4,706  | 7,527 0,000 |
| Recognition | 10,252 | 4           | 2,563  | 3,924 0,004 |
| Benefits | 15,669 | 4           | 3,917  | 5,454 0,000 |
| Interest | 15,571 | 4           | 3,893  | 4,150 0,003 |
| Procedures | 7,880 | 4           | 1,970  | 6,223 0,000 |
| Practical | 19,539 | 4           | 4,885  | 4,416 0,002 |

For the presented differentiations on Table 8, further examinations showed that in the case of the types of CSR, people coming from job positions of highest responsibilities present the highest mean scores and the same happens in the case of organizational commitment. The same picture remains in the case of the above-mentioned types of job satisfaction, with the ones that are occupied in job positions of high responsibilities, i.e. managers, directors and chiefs, to present the highest mean scores in comparison with the others.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

The results showed that the level of CSR of Greek companies is moderate. While it is not considered
as a completely disappointing result, although there is still enough space for improvement. In this particular issue, the research of CSE (2020) revealed that most of the Greek companies support CSR by maintaining or even increasing CSR expenditure. The results of the current primary research that show a moderate level of CSR implementation by the Greek companies, does not disagree with the results of the research of CSE (2020). The moderate levels of CSR that were found in the context of this primary research don’t mean that there are no efforts made by Greek companies to further implement CSR.

Although, taking into consideration these above-mentioned moderate levels of CSR implementation by the Greek companies, we consider as worth-noted the fact that this implementation is accompanied by a variety of multidimensional benefits. These benefits were extracted by the existing literature and indicatively, they concern the smoother social integration of the business entities which are socially responsible (Koukoumpliakos et al., 2018), the further improvement of flexibility and mobility of human resources and the further improvement of employees’ attitudes (Aspridis et al., 2014), the gain of competitive advantage (Tiba et al., 2018), the further employees’ motivation, the improvement of the company’s reputation and the ease of the company’s access to finance empowerment (Fordham et al., 2017; Alhouti & D’Souza, 2018).

Another point worth mentioning is that from the results of the primary quantitative research conducted, it emerged that the aspect of CSR towards the government is the one that is applied to a greater extent by Greek companies. This means that Greek companies are largely consistent with their obligations to the Greek State. However, this aspect of CSR has shown a positive and statistically significant correlation with specific dimensions of job satisfaction and not with all of them. More specifically, the aspect of CSR towards the government seemed to be related to job satisfaction in terms of issues of interaction, recognition, quality of work and the sense of employees’ pride towards their company. It is also pointed out that this aspect of CSR is the only one that has shown a correlation with employees’ satisfaction with practical issues related to their work.

Therefore, from the findings of the present study, in the case of Greek companies, the special importance of CSR does not seem to have been fully understood by them. The moderate levels of adoption of CSR by Greek companies, combined with the adoption of legislative and regulatory constraints as an additional binding incentive for companies to increase their CSR, which was highlighted in the studies of Farcane & Bureana (2015) and Smith & Pettigrew (2017), leads to the conclusion that, in the case of the Greek reality, the legislative and regulatory frameworks may need to be tightened. Thus, Greek companies are forced to increase their levels of CSR. However, the fact that the CSR of Greek companies towards the government, is the dimension of CSR, that is applied to a greater extent, may indicate that the already existing legislative and regulatory framework is beginning to bring positive results in increasing the level of CSR of Greek companies. At this point, however, it should be noted that our initial hypothesis, which was based on the findings of the CSE (2020) survey on the understanding of the importance of CSR by Greek companies, which is reflected in their own efforts to increase its levels of implementation, are not confirmed, at the time when moderate levels of adoption of the four individual dimensions measured in the present study emerged.

In addition, at this point, the importance of the contribution of the current research is pointed out in presenting a clearer picture of the situation that prevails in the Greek business environment, regarding the levels of adoption of CSR. More specifically, due to the fact that CSR is multidimensional, if during its measurement it is taken into account as a whole concept, distorted results may emerge for the prevailing situation of its adoption. For this reason, the contribution of the present research lies in the equally multidimensional measurement of CSR and this was served by the use of the specific tool for measuring the four sub-dimensions of CSR. Thus, the present research overturns the data on the situation of the Greek reality in terms of the adoption of CSR, which is found to be still at a moderate level, which has much space for improvement and further development.

The aspects of CSR that were correlated with all aspects of job satisfaction were the ones of
social and non-social stakeholders and employees. However, the specific two aspects of CSR were also those that are applied to a lesser extent by Greek companies.

Probably, the result that was mentioned above is due to the fact that in general, the employees are moderately satisfied with the companies where they are employed. This is a remarkable finding that should be taken into account by Greek companies, if they want to increase the levels of satisfaction of their human resources. More specifically, it is suggested to Greek companies to place more emphasis on their CSR towards social and non-social stakeholders and employees.

Our above-mentioned proposal, of course, does not mean that the Greek companies should stop emphasizing on the other aspects of CSR. After all, the research of the current study proved the correlation shown by all aspects of CSR with the employees’ commitment to their companies. It is also no coincidence that even levels of organizational commitment have been modest and can be greatly improved. This is justified by the fact that almost all aspects of CSR are moderately adopted by Greek companies, regardless of the fact that the aspect of CSR to the government is applied at a more satisfactory level.

Therefore, the above proposal to Greek companies is concluded, regarding the fact that they must emphasize, on the one hand on the two aspects of CSR that are correlated with all aspects of job satisfaction, which are the ones of CSR to social and non-social stakeholders and to employees, as well as that they should not overlook the other three aspects of CSR. If this does not become possible, Greek companies risk remaining at the current moderate levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of their human resources. In fact, in an even worse case, if Greek companies will ignore the importance of CSR and its individual aspects end up being applied to a lesser extent than the existing moderate level of their current implementation, then they are even more at risk. That higher risk lies in the fact that they will have to face further decrease of their employees’ job satisfaction, as well as a reduction in their organizational commitment.

At this point, however, it should be noted that our initial assumptions about high levels of job satisfaction and commitment of the human resources of Greek companies were not confirmed. However, the basic hypothesis of a positive and statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and job commitment, with the adoption of CSR by them, was confirmed. Due to the fact that the adoption of CSR is moderate, job satisfaction was equally moderate, as well as the employees’ work commitment. Thus, the current study comes into alignment with what is stated in the study of Aspridis et al. (2014), regarding the fact that the higher the levels of adoption of CSR, by an organization, the better behaviors of human resources in their workplace, due to the fact that it is accompanied by greater flexibility. It is also aligned with those reported in the studies of Fordham et al. (2017) and Alhouti & D’Souza (2018), according to which, the higher levels of CSR, on the part of an organization, lead to the creation of a better and safer work environment, in which more incentives are given to employees, which lead to higher levels of job satisfaction and commitment. It also comes into full alignment with the researches of Azanza et al. (2013), Farooq et al. (2013) and De Silva & De Silva Lokuwaduge (2019), who advocated high levels of correlation between an organization’s CSR and employees’ commitment.

Finally, and by taking into account the above-presented conclusions of the current study, as well as its restrictions, we propose the conduction of a research which will emphasize on the identification of the barriers of an excellent implementation of each type of CSR in the case of the Greek corporate world. We hypothesize that each type of CSR has its own barriers, that may be differentiated by the barriers of the other three types. This is hypothesized due to the fact that each type of CSR had its own different level of implementation.

7. Originality

The present study contributed to the extension of the research of Turker (2008), who sought to measure the correlation of the four dimensions of CSR and employees’ loyalty to their organization. In the present study, the same tools were used to measure CSR and employees’ commitment, as those
used in Turker’s (2008) research. However, the extension is to measure the contribution of corporate social responsibility to an additional variable, which is that of job satisfaction and the dimensions of which it consists. Therefore, the current research is in line with the results of Turker’s (2008) research, regarding the positive and statistically significant correlation of the four dimensions of corporate social responsibility with employees’ loyalty. However, it extends the findings of Turker’s research (2008) by adding the positive and statistically significant correlation between corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction.
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