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Abstract

Purpose – This study was aimed at obtaining a micro understanding of corporate social responsibility (CSR) by investigating the effect of perceived CSR on job performance. Especially, an attempt is made to explore the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism on the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance.

Design/methodology/approach – This study collected questionnaire data from 219 employees of Chinese manufacturing firms, then used hierarchical multiple regression analysis to test our theoretical model.

Findings – Our empirical results demonstrate that perceived internal and perceived external CSR are positively associated with job performance. In addition, perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance, and collectivism positively moderates the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support.

Practical implications – This study highlights the importance of adopting various strategies to conduct CSR practices, enhancing perceived organizational support and leveraging employee collectivism, which would be beneficial to improve job performance.

Originality/value – This study reveals employees' underlying attitudes and behaviors responses to perceived CSR, thereby deepening the micro understanding of CSR. In addition, it extends the literature on social exchange theory by dividing perceived CSR into perceived internal and perceived external CSR and exploring their separate effects on job performance. Moreover, the study reveals the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism, enriching the knowledge based on social exchange theory.
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1. Introduction

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers to a firm's voluntary stewardship practices beyond its legal and economic responsibilities to shareholders. It is a valuable organizational
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strategy that has attracted increasing attention from organizations and individuals (Asiaei et al., 2022; Kim and Kim, 2021). A substantial body of research has concentrated on macro-CSR to explore its relationships with organizational outcomes (Lee and Jung, 2016; Wang et al., 2020a). However, in recent years, there has been a growing shift from examining macro-CSR outcomes to examining micro-CSR outcomes. An increasing number of scholars have attempted to obtain the micro understanding of CSR by exploring the effects of perceived CSR on employee outcomes (Kim and Kim, 2021; Pasricha et al., 2023; Guilliôr et al., 2023).

Previous studies on micro-CSR outcomes have focused mainly on the link between perceived CSR and various employee behaviors, such as voluntary pro-environmental behavior (Raza et al., 2021), innovative behavior (Pasricha et al., 2023), and organizational citizenship behavior (Li and Chen, 2023). However, job performance, a crucial achievement-related behavior that generates value for firms (Lopez-Cabarcos et al., 2022), has not been examined as an outcome of perceived CSR. A continuous focus on the employee perception of CSR in practice is vital (Guilliôr et al., 2023). A growing trend among employees is to consider not only the well-being afforded by firms to organizational members (internal CSR) but also how firms are helping to address society’s biggest challenges (external CSR) (Edelman, 2021). As internal stakeholders, employees instinctively differentiate between internal CSR activities (those directed toward themselves) and external CSR activities (those directed toward external stakeholders) (De Roeck and Maon, 2018; Chatzopoulou et al., 2022). Employee perceptions of internal and external CSR may have different effects on their job performance, warranting further exploration. Social identity theory has been widely used to examine how the employee perception of CSR affects their behaviors (Chatzopoulou et al., 2022), thus may be used to explore the effects of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance.

Employee attitudes such as organizational trust, organizational justice, and organizational identification have been found to mediate the relationship between employees’ perceived CSR and their behaviors (George et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020b; Zhao et al., 2022). However, the mediating role of perceived organizational support, a typical employee attitude (Wang et al., 2020b), in the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance has been overlooked. In addition, individual factors may moderate the mediating mechanisms that trigger employees’ attitudinal and behavioral responses to perceived CSR (De Roeck and Maon, 2018). Among these individual factors, collectivism has been found to significantly influence the relationship between employees and their organizations (Van Knippenberg et al., 2015; Xie et al., 2022). However, few studies have explored the moderating role of collectivism on the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance (via perceived organizational support). Social exchange theory has been widely used in the CSR research to explain the employee–organization relationship (Mohammed et al., 2022). It may also provide potential to explain the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism on the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Therefore, this study draws on social identity theory and social exchange theory to gain the micro understanding of CSR by answering the following three questions:

**Q1.** How does perceived CSR (perceived internal and perceived external CSR) influence job performance?

**Q2.** How does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance?

**Q3.** How does collectivism moderate the indirect effects (via perceived organizational support) of perceived CSR on job performance?

Perceived internal CSR has been found to increase employees’ productivity and generate positive work behaviors (De Roeck and Maon, 2018; Bhatti et al., 2022), thereby improving job performance. Similarly, employees with higher perceived external CSR have better
organizational commitment and work engagement, thus also enhancing job performance (Hur et al., 2018; Paruzel et al., 2021). In addition, perceived internal and perceived external CSR help employees to feel respected and take pride in their firms (Chen et al., 2023; De Roeck and Maon, 2018), improving their perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support, in turn, leads to enhance employee performance by generating positive behaviors (Huang et al., 2021). Therefore, perceived organizational support may mediate the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Additionally, collectivism could promote employee attachment to the organization and support organizational interests (Hur et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2019), thereby enhancing the effects of perceived CSR on job performance. Thus, collectivism may positively moderate the indirect effect of perceived CSR on job performance (via perceived organizational support).

To empirically test our theoretical model, we collected questionnaire data from 219 employees in Chinese manufacturing firms over three stages, then applied hierarchical multiple regression analysis. Our study makes several theoretical contributions. First, it enriches the micro understanding of CSR by exploring the underlying psychological mechanisms related to employee attitudes and behaviors. Second, it offers new insights into the literature on social exchange theory by revealing the influence of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance, extending the research on the outcomes of perceived CSR. Third, by introducing attitude-related variables, it opens the “black box” in the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Thus, by revealing the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism, this study deepens the micro understanding of CSR and enriches the literature on social exchange theory.

2. Literature review

According to the studies of Wang et al. (2020b) and Zhao et al. (2022), the employee perception of CSR can generate a series of underlying attitudes and behaviors. Previous studies have explored the effects of perceived CSR on employee attitudes or behaviors separately. For instance, George et al. (2021) revealed the relationship between perceived CSR and affective commitment, while Latif et al. (2022) explored the effect of perceived CSR on employee pro-environmental behavior. Recently, an increasing number of studies have combined employee attitudes and behaviors to explore the outcomes of micro-CSR. For instance, Liu et al. (2021) investigated the effect of perceived CSR on employee voice behavior and introduced felt obligation and positive emotions as mediators of this relationship. Afridi et al. (2020) explored the link between perceived CSR and innovative work behavior and introduced attitude-related factors (authenticity and employee volunteerism) as moderators. Pasricha et al. (2023) explored the relationship between perceived CSR and employee innovative behavior and introduced organizational pride as a mediator of this relationship. These studies raise interesting questions about the employee attitudes that may be underpinning the relationship between perceived CSR and employee behavior, which could deepen the micro understanding of CSR (Gullifor et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2022).

Social identity theory and social exchange theory are the two most commonly adopted frameworks in micro-CSR research and have been widely used to explore employees’ attitudinal and behavioral responses to perceived CSR (Gullifor et al., 2023; Hur et al., 2022). Social identity theory is the main theory employed to explain the effect of perceived CSR on employee behaviors (Chatzopoulou et al., 2022). For instance, Li and Chen (2023) revealed how perceived CSR execution influences organizational citizenship behavior. Raza et al. (2021) demonstrated the positive relationship between employee perception of CSR and their voluntary pro-environmental behavior. However, the effect of perceived CSR on the most crucial achievement-related behavior, job performance, remains underexamined. In addition, studies are increasingly focusing on the effects of different types of perceived CSR on employee attitudes and behaviors. For instance, Zhao et al. (2019) revealed the positive effects...
of the employee perception of economic CSR, philanthropic CSR, and strategic CSR on organizational identification. Kim and Kim (2021) demonstrated the positive influence of perceived management and customer support for CSR on work engagement. Mohammed et al. (2022) revealed the positive relationship between employee perceptions of ethical and philanthropic CSR and their creativity behavior. Perceived CSR can also be distinguished according to whether it is directed toward employees (i.e. perceived internal CSR) or external stakeholders (i.e. perceived external CSR) (Wang et al., 2020b; Zhao et al., 2022). However, studies on the separate effects of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance are insufficient, leaving a deficiency that must be remedied.

Social exchange theory has emerged as an important perspective in the micro-CSR research to understand how social exchanges shape the relationship between employees and their organizations (Mohammed et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022). According to social exchange theory, attitude-related factors may mediate the relationship between perceived CSR and employee behaviors (Pasricha et al., 2023). In their meta-analysis, Zhao et al. (2022) demonstrated the mediating role of organizational trust, organizational justice, and organizational identification in the relationship between perceived CSR and employee behaviors, in line with social exchange theory. However, the mediating effect of perceived organizational support, a typical employee attitude, on the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance has previously been overlooked. Meanwhile, individual factors related to social exchange theory could moderate the mediating mechanisms that trigger employees’ attitudinal and behavioral responses to perceived CSR (De Roeck and Maon, 2018; Zhao et al., 2022). Previous research has revealed the positive moderating effect of collectivistic orientation based on social exchange theory (Yang, 2020), but few studies have used social exchange theory to examine how collectivism moderates the employee–organization relationship. Therefore, this study adopts collectivism as a moderator to obtain the micro understanding of CSR.

In summary, the existing literature has explored micro-CSR outcomes by combining employee attitudes and behaviors. However, the underlying psychological mechanisms of explaining the effects of micro-CSR on employee behavior via employee attitude remain under-investigated (Gullifor et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2022). Therefore, this study aims to deepen the micro understanding of CSR. Specifically, it seeks to explore the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance according to social identity theory. It then investigates the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism based on social exchange theory.

The research model is presented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Research model](source(s): Figure by authors)
3. Theory and hypothesis

3.1 Social identity theory
Social identity theory focuses on an individual’s comprehension and consciousness of their membership of a social group to which they belong, contending that individual’s identity is partly defined by their social groups (Gullifor et al., 2023). Social identity theory provides an avenue for clarifying employees’ reactions to perceived CSR (Chatzopoulou et al., 2022), which can then explain the relationship between the employee perception of CSR and their behaviors (e.g. Job performance). Employee perception of CSR includes perceived internal and perceived external CSR (Wang et al., 2020b; Zhao et al., 2022). Based on social identity theory, this study aims to explore the effects of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance.

3.2 Social exchange theory
Social exchange theory posits that individuals develop positive reactions as an exchange strategy to repay firms for the support they receive (Chatzopoulou et al., 2022). This theory has the potential to illustrate the mediating mechanism of employee attitudes in the relationship between perceived CSR and employee behaviors. Employees are more likely to react positively to perceived CSR and generate positive behaviors by sensing the organization’s support (Kim and Kim, 2021). Therefore, perceived organizational support, a typical variable related to social exchange theory, may mediate the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. In addition, social exchange theory has been widely adopted to examine attitudes in relational societies such as China (Shore et al., 2009; Duan et al., 2022). Collectivism is one of China’s most widely researched cultural characteristics (Zhu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022), which can also be used to distinguish between individuals in the same cultural context. Thus, as an individual variable, collectivism may moderate the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance (via perceived organizational support), in line with social exchange theory.

3.3 Perceived CSR and job performance
Perceived internal CSR refers to the employee perception of the CSR activities directed toward themselves (Farooq et al., 2017; De Roeck and Maon, 2018). Perceived internal CSR is positively associated with job performance. Job performance refers to the aggregated value of an employee’s behaviors in contributing to organizational goals (Rich et al., 2010). The positive relationship between perceived internal CSR and job performance may be attributable to two factors. First, employees who perceive high internal CSR may feel more confident in progressing their careers, possibly leading to increased productivity (Hur et al., 2018; Song and Tao, 2022). Second, perceived internal CSR may make employees feel that they are respected and treated fairly by their firms, which can encourage positive behaviors (Bhatti et al., 2022). Thus, employees with perceived internal CSR are more likely to improve their job performance. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H1. \] Perceived internal CSR is positively related to job performance.

Perceived external CSR refers to the employee perception of CSR activities directed toward external stakeholders (e.g. the community, the environment, and consumers) (Farooq et al., 2017; De Roeck and Maon, 2018). Perceived external CSR is also positively related to job performance. External CSR activities aim to benefit external stakeholders, which can enhance employee commitment and improve their affection of and identification with the organization (Farooq et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022). As a result, employees with higher perceived external CSR are more likely to take pride in their firms and generate better job performance to maintain its social reputation (Hur et al., 2018). In addition, a high perceived external CSR
positively affects work engagement (Paruzel et al., 2021), promoting employees to stay positive when working, leading to improved job performance. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

\[ H2. \text{ Perceived external CSR is positively related to job performance.} \]

3.4 The mediating effect of perceived organizational support

Perceived organizational support refers to employees’ perceptions of how the organization values their contribution and supports them as respected organizational members (Baranik et al., 2010; Glavas and Kelley, 2014). Perceived internal CSR is positively related to perceived organizational support. First, employees with higher perceived internal CSR usually work in a fair and unconstrained environment, enhancing their growth potential and helping them feel respected by the firm (Chatzopoulou et al., 2022). Thus, employees’ perceptions of organizational support will. Second, internal CSR activities are aimed at improving employee well-being (Farooq et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022), in turn promoting employees to perceive more support from their organization (Chen et al., 2023). Thus, there is a positive relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support. Perceived external CSR is also positively related to perceived organizational support. Employees with higher perceived external CSR are more likely to perceive external prestige and pride, increasing their perceived organizational support (Jones, 2010; De Roeck and Maon, 2018). Additionally, employees with perceived external CSR would easily perceive evaluations of self-focused justice, increasing perceived organizational support (Guillifor et al., 2023; Zahoor et al., 2022).

Perceived organizational support is positively associated with job performance. First, firms that provide greater organizational support consider employees’ goals and values, which can foster employees generate positive work behaviors (Huang et al., 2021), improving job performance. Second, perceived organizational support can increase employees’ job satisfaction by caring about employees’ well-being and opinions (To and Huang, 2022). While job satisfaction is a crucial factor to help employees achieve better job performance (Alwali and Alwali, 2022). Therefore, perceived organizational support can improve job performance.

In summary, perceived internal and perceived external CSR are both positively associated with perceived organizational support, in turn boosting job performance. Thus, perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

\[ H3. \text{ Perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived internal CSR and job performance.} \]

\[ H4. \text{ Perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived external CSR and job performance.} \]

3.5 The moderating effect of collectivism

Collectivism refers to the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as interdependent with others in their social group (Nayir and Herzig, 2012; Zhao et al., 2019). Collectivism emphasizes that individuals prioritize the maximization of collective interests over individuals (Nguyen et al., 2022), which may moderate the relationship between perceived CSR and perceived organizational support, being analyzed in the following.

First, employees with higher collectivism stress organizational harmony and generate positive attitudes toward their firm’s practical activities (Yan et al., 2023).

In this context, employees with higher perceived internal CSR will sense a greater respect from their firms, thus strengthening the relationship between perceived internal CSR and
perceived organizational support. Second, collectivism fosters employees to develop stronger attachments to their organizations (Zhao et al., 2019). Thus, in this context, employees who perceive a higher level of internal CSR are more likely to devote themselves to their work, strengthening the relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support. Therefore, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

**H5.** Collectivism positively moderates the relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support in such a way that collectivism enhances the positive effect of perceived internal CSR on job performance.

Collectivism also moderates the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support. Collectivism encourages employees to prioritize healthy relationships and think about others (Zhao et al., 2019). In this context, employees are more likely to identify with and take pride in their firms’ external CSR practices. Additionally, collectivism requires employees to prioritize the organization’s interests (Hur et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2019). In this context, employees will perceive external CSR as part of the firm’s strategy and have a high level of overall justice, thereby increasing the effect of perceived external CSR on perceived organizational support. In line with these arguments, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

**H6.** Collectivism positively moderates the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support in such a way that collectivism enhances the positive effect of perceived external CSR on job performance.

4. Method
4.1 Data collection
Questionnaire surveys are a widely used method for collecting data in quantitative studies, and they are increasingly popular in micro-CSR research, particularly when gathering employee responses (Pasricha et al., 2023; Mohammed et al., 2022). Investigating Chinese employees’ responses to CSR perception is highly valuable (Zhao et al., 2019). Therefore, this study employs an empirical research method based on a questionnaire survey to explore the micro understanding of CSR. We selected employees in Chinese manufacturing firms for two reasons. First, manufacturing firms consume significant amounts of resources (Rehman et al., 2021), and CSR is crucial to their long-term success (Zhou et al., 2020). Second, Chinese culture is known for its high level of collectivism (Liu et al., 2016), and an increasing number of Chinese manufacturing firms are placing greater value on CSR activities. Based on a previous study (De Roeck and Farooq, 2018), this study selected employees in manufacturing firms as respondents and included only participants whose firms publicly promote CSR activities on their websites. To attract participation, we guaranteed the anonymity of both the respondents and their firms.

To avoid potential common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003), we collected data in three stages with three months intervals between each stage. In the first stage, we randomly selected 971 employees from various functional departments in manufacturing firms in Heilongjiang, Shandong, Yunnan, and Guangdong provinces listed in the China Business Directory. Of the 673 employees willing to participate in the survey, we received 312 valid responses on this stage’s explanatory variables (perceived internal and perceived external CSR) and control variables. Three months later, we approached the same employees with a valid response from the first stage of data collection, resulting in 253 usable questionnaires on perceived organizational support, collectivism, and control variables in the second stage. The third stage was three months after the second stage of data collection, and in the third stage, we requested immediate supervisors in employees’ departments to evaluate their job performance.
performance. The final sample consisted of 219 complete questionnaires after merging the data collected in the three stages, resulting in a response rate of 22.55%. Descriptive statistics of the final sample are presented in Table 1.

4.2 Study measures
This study developed an initial English version questionnaire based on prior research. The questionnaire consisted of all items of constructs in our model, rated on a five-point Likert-type scale. We followed the translation and back-translation procedure by requesting three professional translators who specialize in perceived CSR and job performance to translate our questionnaire to ensure the accuracy and validity of the translation (Brislin, 1970). After that, we formed the Chinese version questionnaire. We then conducted two-round pretests and made minor refinements to some measurement items according to the feedback we received. The final questionnaire items are presented in the Appendix.

Adopted from Erdogan and Enders (2007) and Williams and Anderson (1991), a seven-item scale was used to assess job performance (e.g. “This employee adequately completes assigned duties”). Perceived internal CSR was evaluated with the five-item scale developed by Turker (2009) (e.g. “My company supports employees who want to acquire additional education”). The scale of perceived external CSR was adapted from Farooq et al. (2017) and Turker (2009) and was measured by ten items (e.g. “My company makes investment to create a better life for future generations”). The eight-item scale for measuring perceived organizational support was adapted from Baranik et al. (2010) and Eisenberger et al. (1997) (e.g. “My organization strongly considers my goals and values”). The measurement of collectivism used five items adopted from Chew and Hong (1996) and Nayir and Herzig (2012) (e.g. “I would sacrifice my individual needs for the sake of the group”).

For control variables, previous studies have demonstrated that gender, age, education, and tenure can influence employee reactions to CSR (Glavas and Kelley, 2014; Shen and Zhang, 2019). These above-mentioned demographic variables and occupational fields may also affect job performance. For instance, Blickle et al. (2011) proposed that gender and age affect job performance, Ng and Feldman (2009) indicated that education is related to job performance, and Ng and Feldman (2013) proposed that tenure may influence job performance. Therefore, this study selected gender, age, education, and tenure as control variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>60.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30–39 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–49 years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school or lower degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master or higher degree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager tenure</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–3 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5–10 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. 
Descriptive statistics of samples (N = 219) 
Source(s): Table by authors
5. Results
5.1 Regression analysis
To ensure the reliability and validity of the constructs, this study conducted confirmatory factor analysis before the regression analysis, and estimated the measurement model (Qureshi and Compeau, 2009). The results revealed that all 35 items formed five distinct factors (job performance, seven items; perceived internal CSR, five items; perceived external CSR, ten items; perceived organizational support, eight items; collectivism, five items). The confirmatory factor analysis model also demonstrated acceptable model fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.21$, RMSEA = 0.03, CFI = 0.97, IFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.05, $p < 0.01$) (Gan et al., 2023; Bagozzi and Yi, 2012; Hu and Bentler, 1999).

As shown in Table 2, the Cronbach’s alpha values of all constructs were above 0.7, indicating good reliability in this study (Wang et al., 2022; Pasricha et al., 2023). Then, we tested the validity of the study. The factor loadings ranged from 0.67 to 0.85 and are presented in Table 2. This study computed the average variance extracted and composite reliability of the constructs using the above factor loadings. The values of average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance (JP)</td>
<td>JP1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP6</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived internal CSR (PICSR)</td>
<td>PICSR1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PICSR2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PICSR3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PICSR4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PICSR5</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived external CSR (PECSR)</td>
<td>PECSR1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR6</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR7</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR8</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PECSR10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational support (POS)</td>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS5</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS6</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS7</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (CO)</td>
<td>CO1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO3</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Factor loadings from reliabilities

Source(s): Table by authors
extracted and composite reliability were above 0.50 and 0.62, respectively, indicating good convergent validity. The correlation matrix of the main variables is presented in Table 3, which reveals that all square roots of the main variables of the average variance extracted (from 0.71 to 0.79) were larger than the correlation coefficients (maximum value 0.37). Therefore, the discriminate validity was good (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). This study also adopted Harman’s single-factor test to examine common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The first factor accounted for only 25.75% of the total variance, which is less than the 50% threshold, indicating that common method bias was not a problem in this study (Wang et al., 2022).

This study used three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis to test the mediating role of perceived organizational support (Aiken et al., 1991; Cohen et al., 2014). Table 4 presents the results. The first step examined the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance, and the results are presented in Models 1 and 2. The regression equation of both models was significant (Model 1: $F = 3.78, p < 0.01$; Model 2: $F = 5.46, p < 0.001$). The findings revealed that perceived internal and perceived external CSR positively affects job performance ($b_{PICSR} = 0.29, p_{PICSR} < 0.01; b_{PECSR} = 0.25, p_{PECSR} < 0.001$), supporting $H_1$ and $H_2$. Models 1 and 2 is the base model, and we entered perceived organizational support into the separate mediation models in the second step (Models 3 and 4). The results revealed that perceived internal and perceived external CSR were positively related to perceived organizational support ($b_{ICSR} = 0.16, p_{ICSR} < 0.01; b_{ECSR} = 0.22, p_{ECSR} < 0.001$). Among the control variables, the coefficients of gender and tenure in Model 3 were significant ($b_{gender} = -0.12, p_{gender} < 0.05; b_{tenure} = 0.05, p_{tenure} < 0.1$). In Model 4, only the coefficients of gender were significant ($b = -0.09, p < 0.1$). In the third step, we regressed the relationship between perceived CSR, perceived organizational support, and job performance (see Models 5 and 6). The results indicated that perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support positively influence job performance ($b_{ICSR} = 0.23, p_{ICSR} < 0.01; b_{POS} = 0.35, p_{POS} < 0.001$), and perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support were also positively related to job performance ($b_{PECSR} = 0.19, p_{PECSR} < 0.01; b_{POS} = 0.29, p_{POS} < 0.001$). Therefore, perceived organizational support partially mediated the relationship between perceived CSR (perceived internal and perceived external CSR) and job performance, supporting $H_3$ and $H_4$.

### Table 3.
Correlation matrix of main variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>PICSR</th>
<th>PECSR</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICSR</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECSR</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11†</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13†</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note(s):** 1. †$p < 0.1$, ‡$p < 0.05$, ††$p < 0.01$, ‡‡$p < 0.001$(2-tailed test)  
2. Entry on the diagonal with italic is the square roots of average variances extracted  
**Source(s):** Table by authors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 2 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 3 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 4 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 5 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 6 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.09*** (0.30)</td>
<td>3.31*** (0.23)</td>
<td>3.11*** (0.24)</td>
<td>3.02*** (0.18)</td>
<td>2.01*** (0.38)</td>
<td>2.42*** (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICS</td>
<td>0.29*** (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECSR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25*** (0.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22*** (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.11 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.12* (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.09† (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.03 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.05† (0.03)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em> value</td>
<td>3.78***</td>
<td>5.46***</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>7.30***</td>
<td>6.57***</td>
<td>6.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust R²</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note(s):**
1. *p < 0.1, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01, ****p < 0.001 (2-tailed test)
2. JP: Job Performance, PICS: Perceived internal CSR, PECSR: Perceived external CSR, POS: Perceived organizational support, CO: Collectivism

**Source(s):** Table by authors
To examine the moderating effect of collectivism, we followed the procedure suggested by Aiken et al. (1991) and Cohen et al. (2014) and generated interaction terms through mean centering explanatory variables to reduce nonessential collinearity (Kistruck et al., 2013). The results are presented in Table 5. First, we tested the moderating effect of collectivism on the relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support (see Model 7). The result revealed that the coefficient of $\text{PICSR} \times \text{CO}$ interaction term was not significant ($b = 0.09, p > 0.05$), indicating that $H_5$ was not supported. Next, we entered the interaction of $\text{PECSR} \times \text{CO}$ into the regression equation. The result is presented in Model 8, which demonstrates that the coefficient of $\text{PECSR} \times \text{CO}$ ($b = 0.32, p < 0.01$) was significant. There was significantly more incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.04$) than in Model 4. Therefore, we found that collectivism positively moderates the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support. For the control variables, only the coefficient of tenure was significant ($b = 0.06, p < 0.05$). Following the suggestions of Meyer et al. (2017), this study plotted the marginal effect of perceived external CSR on perceived organizational support at different levels of collectivism (see Figure 2). Figure 2 illustrates that when the value of collectivism (CO) increased from 2.94 to 4 (accounting for 98.63% of the total sample size), the effect of perceived external CSR on perceived organizational support became significantly stronger. In other words, collectivism intensified the positive relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support, thus supporting $H_6$.

5.2 Supplementary analysis
To check the robustness of our results, we conducted two supplementary analyses. First, according to the previous study of Wang et al. (2020a), we applied full models to further test the hypotheses by entering the independent variables, moderator, and all interaction terms based on Model 9 in Table 5. The results are shown in Model 10. The coefficient of the interaction term ($\text{PICSR} \times \text{CO}$; $b = 0.01, p > 0.05$) was insignificant, thus $H_5$ was not supported. However, the coefficient of the $\text{PECSR} \times \text{CO}$ interaction term was positive and significant ($b = 0.30, p < 0.05$), further supporting $H_6$. These results were consistent with those shown in Models 7 and 8. Second, based on the suggestion of Song et al. (2005), we divided the sample into $\text{CO}_{\text{high}}$ (above the mean value) and $\text{CO}_{\text{low}}$ (below the mean value) and conducted a regression analysis between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support. According to the results, the slope was steeper under higher levels of collectivism in the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support ($\text{CO}_{\text{high}}$: $b = 0.44, p < 0.001$ vs $\text{CO}_{\text{low}}$: $b = 0.13, p < 0.05$), which further supported $H_6$. The results of these two supplementary analyses were consistent with the initial test results, indicating a high level of model robustness in our study.

6. Discussion
6.1 Main findings
Based on a sample of 219 employees in Chinese manufacturing firms, our study revealed three findings. First, our findings demonstrate the positive effect of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance. Existing studies have introduced behavior-related factors as perceived CSR outcomes, such as voluntary pro-environmental behavior (Raza et al., 2021) and innovative work behavior (Afridi et al., 2020). This study divides perceived CSR into perceived internal and perceived external CSR, validating and enriching the relationships between perceived CSR and employee behavior. Second, our findings demonstrate the mediating role of perceived organizational support in the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance, extending the previous research that focuses only on the moderating role of perceived organizational support in macro-CSR outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable: POS</th>
<th>Model 3 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 4 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 7 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 8 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 9 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
<th>Model 10 Coefficient (standard error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.11*** (0.24)</td>
<td>3.02*** (0.18)</td>
<td>3.61*** (0.15)</td>
<td>3.61*** (0.14)</td>
<td>2.62*** (0.25)</td>
<td>3.61*** (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICS R</td>
<td>0.16** (0.06)</td>
<td>0.14* (0.07)</td>
<td>0.24*** (0.04)</td>
<td>0.21*** (0.04)</td>
<td>0.11† (0.07)</td>
<td>0.23*** (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECSR</td>
<td>0.22*** (0.04)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.30† (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.09 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.32** (0.12)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.06† (0.03)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICS R × CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECSR × CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.12† (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.09† (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.11† (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.10† (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.05† (0.03)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.05† (0.03)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.06† (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>7.30***</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.11***</td>
<td>5.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust R²</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note(s):** 1. †p < 0.1, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001 (2-tailed test)
2. JP: Job performance, PICS R: Perceived internal CSR, PECSR: Perceived external CSR, POS: Perceived organizational support, CO: Collectivism
3. **Source(s):** Table by authors
By introducing perceived organizational support as a mediator, our findings enrich the existing body of knowledge on micro-CSR outcomes. Third, our findings show that collectivism positively moderates the effect of perceived external CSR on perceived organizational support. This finding aligns with the study of Zhao et al. (2019), who found that collectivism enhances the effect of perceived CSR on employee outcomes. However, contrary to our expectations, our findings found no evidence that collectivism moderates the relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support. One possible explanation is that internal CSR activities reflect the firm taking responsibility for improving the well-being of its employees (Farooq et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022). In this situation, employees would consider themselves part of the firm collective, thus may not be sensitive to collectivism (Hameed et al., 2016). Therefore, collectivism may not readily influence the effect of perceived internal CSR on perceived organizational support.

### 6.2 Theoretical contributions

Our findings make three theoretical contributions. First, our study deepens the micro understanding of CSR by revealing the underlying psychological mechanisms related to employees’ attitudes and behaviors. Previous studies have focused on the separate effects of perceived CSR on employee attitudes and behaviors such as affective commitment (George et al., 2021) and employee pro-environmental behavior (Latif et al., 2022). An increasing number of studies have combined employees’ attitudes and behaviors to explore the outcomes of perceived CSR (Afridi et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021; Pasricha et al., 2023), proposing interesting questions about the micro understanding of CSR. This study integrates the social identity theory and the social exchange theory to reveal the mechanisms between perceived CSR and employee behavior mediated by employees’ attitudes, responding to the recent calls from researchers such as Gullifor et al. (2023), Wang et al. (2020b), and Zhao et al. (2022).

Second, this study enriches the literature on social identity theory by dividing perceived CSR into perceived internal and perceived external CSR and revealing their direct effects on job performance. Previous studies have validated social identity theory for explaining how perceived CSR influences employee behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior and voluntary pro-environmental behavior (Li and Chen, 2023; Raza et al., 2021). However, as a crucial achievement-related behavior, job performance may also be influenced by perceived
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**Figure 2.** Moderating effect of collectivism (CO) on the relationship between perceived external CSR (PECSR) and perceived organizational support (POS)
CSR, which needed further exploration. In addition, although existing studies have explored the relationships between different types of perceived CSR and employee attitudes and behaviors (Mohammed et al., 2022; Kim and Kim, 2021), new insights were needed to shed light on the influence of perceived internal and perceived external CSR on job performance. Therefore, this study contributes to the literature on social identity theory and broadens the understanding of the outcomes of perceived CSR.

Third, this study extends the knowledge on social exchange theory by opening the “black box” in the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Our study responds to recent calls for micro-CSR studies by introducing attitude-related variables into the relationship between perceived CSR and employee behavior (De Roeck and Farooq, 2018; Bhatti et al., 2022). By revealing the mediating role of perceived organizational support, this study contributes to the attitude-related variables that should be considered to explain micro-CSR outcomes. In addition, this study adopts social exchange theory to introduce collectivism to the micro-CSR literature, enriching and verifying Yang’s (2020) research. Therefore, by innovatively exploring the mediating role of perceived organizational support and the moderating role of collectivism in the relationship between perceived CSR and employee outcomes, this study makes an essential contribution to the literature on social exchange theory and strengthens the micro understanding of CSR.

6.3 Practical implications

Our study has several practical implications. First, firms are highly encouraged to engage in CSR practices that benefit both their internal stakeholder (i.e. employees) and external stakeholders (e.g. the community, the environment, and consumers). Ensuring that employees witness these CSR practices is crucial because this can improve job performance. To enhance the employee perception of internal CSR activities, firms should focus on meeting the various needs of their employees and improving their well-being. For instance, firms could establish an internal intranet through which to communicate with their employees, helping to accurately identify their employees’ needs (De Roeck and Farooq, 2018). Additionally, to enhance employee perception of their external CSR activities, firms should emphasize the significance of their external CSR activities to their employees through emails, the corporate website, and the intranet. In doing so, firms can boost employees’ job performance and ultimately benefit themselves.

Second, firms should recognize the importance of perceived organizational support as a channel for transforming perceived internal and perceived external CSR into better job performance. Firms could provide targeted organizational support by offering favorable job conditions, treating employees fairly, and communicating with them frequently. This would increase employees’ perceived organizational support, in turn boosting the transformation of perceived internal CSR into job performance. In addition, firms are encouraged to create support networks to improve employees’ perceived organizational support (Huang et al., 2021). For instance, firms could develop external relationships to provide professional development opportunities for employees. This would improve employees’ perceived external prestige, in turn boosting the transformation of perceived external CSR into job performance.

Third, firms are encouraged to fully leverage collectivism to strengthen the positive effect of perceived external CSR on job performance. Firms are encouraged to utilize the collectivist perspectives of employees to develop a collective culture that caters to employees’ interests. For instance, firms could prioritize job applicants who have a strong sense of collectivism at the recruitment stage and create an organizational environment that emphasizes collective interests (Nguyen et al., 2022). In addition, human resource managers could use various means to boost collectivism among employees by emphasizing the collective identity and
group spirit (Van Knippenberg et al., 2015), especially for employees lacking collectivism. In this vein, employees are more likely to have higher collectivism, thus amplifying the positive relationship between perceived external CSR and job performance.

7. Conclusion, limitations, and future research

7.1 Conclusion

This study developed a theoretical model to explore the micro understanding of CSR. In this theoretical model, perceived CSR (perceived internal and perceived external CSR) is positively related to job performance; perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived CSR and job performance; and collectivism moderates the relationship between perceived external CSR and perceived organizational support. To test the research model, we collected data from 219 employees in Chinese manufacturing firms using a questionnaire based on items from existing studies, then analyzed the data using hierarchical multiple regression analysis.

The empirical results show that perceived internal and perceived external CSR are positively related to job performance, supporting H1 and H2, respectively, and broadening the literature on the outcomes of perceived CSR. In addition, our findings demonstrate that perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between perceived internal and perceived external CSR and job performance, supporting H3 and H4, respectively, and providing deep insights into the underlying psychological mechanisms of employee attitudes and behaviors. Moreover, our findings reveal the moderating role of collectivism on the relationship between perceived external CSR and job performance, supporting H6. However, collectivism did not moderate the relationship between perceived internal CSR and perceived organizational support; thus, H5 was not supported.

7.2 Limitations and future research

Despite the contributions of this study, some limitations should be acknowledged. First, the data were retrieved from self-reported questionnaires, which are widely used in quantitative studies (Wang et al., 2022; Pasricha et al., 2023). Future studies could consider using alternative objective measures to further analyze job performance, thereby overcoming self-report bias. Second, this study focused on the outcomes of micro-CSR from the perspective of social identity theory. However, other perspectives of theories, such as cue consistency theory and self-determination theory, may also be beneficial in explaining the micro understanding of CSR (Hur et al., 2018; De Roeck and Farooq, 2018). Moreover, this study only investigated the moderating role of collectivism in the indirect relationship between perceived CSR and job performance. Future research could explore the moderating role of organizational factors such as CSR–organization fit, which may generate more interesting findings.
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Appendix

Construct/Items (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

JP1 This employee adequately completes assigned duties
JP2 This employee fulfills responsibilities specified in job description
JP3 This employee performs tasks that are expected of him/her
JP4 This employee meets formal performance requirements of the job
JP5 This employee engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation
JP6 This employee neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform
JP7 This employee fails to perform essential duties

Perceived internal CSR (Turker 2009)
ICSR1 My company supports employees who want to acquire additional education
ICSR2 My company policies encourage the employees to develop their skills and careers
ICSR3 The management of my company is primarily concerned with employees’ needs and wants
ICSR4 My company implements flexible policies to provide a good work and life balance for its employees
ICSR5 In my company, the managerial decisions related with the employees are usually fair

Perceived external CSR (Farooq et al., 2017, Turker, 2009)
ECSR1 My company contributes to campaigns and projects that promote the wellbeing of the society
ECSR2 My company implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment
ECSR3 My company participates in activities which aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment
ECSR4 My company targets sustainable growth which considers future generations
ECSR5 My company makes investment to create a better life for future generations
ECSR6 My company encourages its employees to participate voluntarily activities
ECSR7 My company supports nongovernmental organizations working in problematic areas
ECSR8 My company respects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements
ECSR9 My company provides full and accurate information about its products, services, or business models to its customers
ECSR10 For my company, customer satisfaction is highly important

Perceived organizational support (Baranik et al., 2010, Eisenberger et al., 1997)
POS1 My organization cares about my opinions
POS2 My organization really cares about my well-being
POS3 My organization strongly considers my goals and values
POS4 Help is available from my organization when I have a problem
POS5 My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part
POS6 If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me
POS7 My organization shows very little concern for me
POS8 My organization is willing to help me ill need a special favor

Collectivism (Chew and Hong, 1996, Nayir and Herzig, 2012)
CO1 I would sacrifice my individual needs for the sake of the group
CO2 I would sacrifice my well-being for benefit of my group
CO3 I would stay in a group if I were needed even if I were not happy with the group
CO4 I work better in a group than alone
CO5 I would do all I can to build up the status of the group to which I belong even if it entails the loss of my own prestige

Table A1. Questionnaire items of the study
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